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ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

VOLUME I

P. 212b, ADUD AL-DAWLA, l. 11, for al-Makdisi read al-Mukaddasi; l. 13, for al-Makdisi, 499 read al-Mukaddasi, 449; l. 21, for Makdisi read Mukaddasi.


VOLUME II

P. 523b, AL-'DJAZĀRĪ, l. 5, for at Wāṣif read outside Damascus Add to the Bibliography: Donald P. Little, Introduction to Mamlūk historiography, Wiesbaden 1970, 53-7; U. Haarmann, Quellenstudien zur frühnen Mamlukenzeit, Freiburg 1969, 92-116; the same, Édition de la chronique manuscrite syrienne de Sams ad-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ṣalāḥī, in BEO xxvii (1975); C. Cahen, Addenda sur al-'Djazārī, in Israel Oriental Studies ii (1972), 144-7; the same, Rectificatif, ibidem, iii (1973).

P. 537b, DJIDJELLI, l. 3, for west read east

P. 966b, FUTUWWA, l. 2 from bottom, after aḥdā, add xii,

VOLUME III
P. 70b, HĀRĀʾ, last l. but one before the Bibliography, for Ibn Kunfūdhd read Ibn Kunfūdh


P. 167, HANSALIYYA, read Hansaliyya throughout the article.

P. 390b, AL-HILLI, l. 20, for 638/1240-1, died 726/1326 read 602/1205, died 676/1277


P. 751b, IBN AL-'DJAWZĪ, l. 5, for 610/1216 read 511/1116

P. 812b, IBN IYĀS, l. 22 from bottom, for 1421-502 read 1421-1502

P. 825b, IBN KHALDŪN, l. 2, for 732-84/1332-82 read 732-808/1332-1406


P. 1068b, AL-IKHĀN, l. 10 from bottom, instead of Bihānī read Raybānī


P. 1170b, IMĀM, l. 16 from below, for Cairo n.d., i, 327 read Cairo n.d., i, 320-5

P. 1204b, INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, l. 15 from bottom, for M. A. Djināb read M. A. Jheenā

VOLUME IV
P. 39b, IRAN, ll. 8-12, for the sentence Consequently . . . that city read Consequently, when Iranian troops on three separate occasions attempted to recapture Harāt, Britain either despatched armies to prevent them (1857; 1856), or exerted diplomatic pressure to secure their withdrawal (1852).

P. 174b, ISLAM, add to Bibliography: H. Rizziizano, Islam, Aslama and Muslim, Upsala 1949, and D. Z. M. Baneth, What did Muḥammad mean when he called his religion "Islam"; the original meaning of aslama and its derivatives, in Israel Oriental Studies, i (1971), 183-90.
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I
CONTINUATION

IRAN

1. The geological background: The alignments of Iran's principal topographic features, represented by the Kūhā-yi Alburz and the Zagros Chain, are west to east and north-west to south-east, respectively. In broad context, the Alburz is a continuation of the European Alpine structures, while the Zagros chain has been linked through Cyprus with the Dinaric Alps (Fisher, 1956). The structure of the mountain rim of the country has been influenced strongly by tectonic movements which have not only caused considerable folding, giving rise to the mountain ridges, but have also resulted in overthrusting of the anticlines and complex step-faulting, particularly in the east and north-east. Lying between the two mountain systems of the north and south is the block of the central Iranian plateau, though even here large areas have been affected by the powerful movements which created the Alpine Himalayan orogenic systems.

Structural characteristics have an appreciable influence on the extreme regionalism of Iran. The Caspian basin may be regarded as a down-faulted area in sharp contrast to the adjacent main Alburz range, itself discerned as a main northern range, a southern range or Anti-Alburz (Rivière, 1934) with an internal tertiary basin between the two. The Zagros exhibits two structurally characteristic regions including the area of large-scale over-thrusting, as exemplified in the zone between 'Ali Gudarz and Shahr-i Kurd, and the area of lower altitude, where elongated anticlines and synclines are arranged in sub-parallel lines as for example around Do Gunbadān.

The main period of earth movements has been established for the Alburz and the north-east region as belonging to the pre-Cretaceous era, when the permo-carboniferous beds were widely affected. Further movement began in post-Eocene times and continued through to the end of the Miocene, when the close of the Cretaceous saw increased volcanic activity. The major period of folding is attributed to the Pliocene, especially the late Pliocene (Gansser, 1955). The Zagros was influenced considerably by epeirogenic movements dated to Paleozoic and early Mesozoic times with orogenic disturbances beginning in the Upper Cretaceous (Lees and Richardson, 1940). Prolonged folding in the late Miocene and Pliocene saw the emergence of elongated anticlines and synclines compressed against the resistant Arabian Shield.

2. Location and frontiers: Covering some 164 million hectares, Iran stretches from Bāzārgān (39° 20' N-44° 20' E) in the north-west to Sarakhs (36° 30' N-65° 10' E) in the north-east and from Abādān (30° 20' N-48° 15' E) in the south-west to Gvātar (25° 05' N-61° 30' E) in the extreme south-east. The land frontiers of Iran total approximately 4,400 kilometres much of which is aligned along natural features and the subject of established international agreements with the notable exception of the Sha’t al-‘Arab boundary with ‘Irāq. The 460-kilometre border with Turkey runs south from the Rūd-i Aras through the eastern foothills of the Büyük Ağrı Daği and thence roughly along the watershed between the Reštābāyen basin and the Van Golū basin. Of the 900-kilometre frontier with ‘Irāq, the northern section follows the watershed of the Zagros and then the low-lying foothills of Mesopotamia before cutting across on arbitrary alignments to the Sha’t al-‘Arab upstream of the confluence with the Rūd-i Kūrīn. Iran’s border with the U.S.S.R. in Ādār-bābāyān is coincident with the Rūd-i Aras over much of its length except for the eastern extremity, where from approximately 48° E it swings southwards through the Dāshīl Moḩān to the foothills of the Kūh-i Tālīsh, which it follows to the Rūd-i Astārā which forms the boundary to the Caspian Sea (Daryā-yi Māzandarān). The Trans-Caspian border with the U.S.S.R. follows the line of the Rūd-i Atrak upstream from the Caspian Sea to the confluence with the Rūd-i Sūmbār and then crosses the Kopet Dāgh to arc round to the Hari Rūd along the north facing slopes of the northern Alburz ridges including the Golū Dāgh and the Kūh-i Hazār Maσhjīl. Although the Irano-Afghan border runs south along the Hari Rūd over the first section of its 800 kilometres length, the rest of the boundary is more arbitrarily aligned, traversing the inland drainage sumps east of the Kāvin-Birdjānd highlands and the western rim of the Dāshīl-i Na Umīd before cutting east through the Daryāčeh Sīsīn to include much of the lowland around the Daryāčeh Hāmnī-i Şābārī before swinging south-west towards Zāhīdān. After following the watershed of the hill range east of Zāhīdān, the frontier with Pakistan is coincident with the Tahlīb Rūd south to the Hāmnī-i Maṣhīl. Thereafter the frontier trends more or less due south with an abutment eastwards to take in the valley of the Rūd-i Māshīl as far as Kūhak, from whence it swings south-west, in parts along tributaries of the Nehang Rūd, to the coast of the Gulf of Oman at the Khaḥli-dī-i Gvātar.

3. Physical geography: The heartland of Iran is regarded by geographers as a plateau defined in the north by the Alburz system and to the south-west and south by the Zagros Mountains, though continuing eastwards into Afghanistan without firm
delineation. This vast triangular plateau is far from homogeneous and includes not only the extensive desert lands of the Dasht-i Kavir and Lût but also large, though discontinuous, areas of well watered and fertile soils lying between the enclosing mountains and the desert basins which are the centres of theintroceptive drainage systems. Whereas the great deserts contain few, if famous, settlements, many of the country’s richest agricultural areas are located in the lands bordering the plateau, including among others the Dasht-i Kavir, Dasht-i Varâmín, the extended oases of Mağhāb, Sabzavār, Nīshābūr, Simmān, Tehran, Kūm, Yazd and Kirmān and the rich valleys of Ārāk and Hamādān.

The two principal mountain systems add further regional diversity. The Alburz Mountains dominate the topography of northern Iran even in their eastern extensions where many subsidiary ranges give rise to local micro-climates and permit specialised agricultural activities. No less important, the Zagros chain imposes its own regional influences throughout its length from Kurdistān to Bālūjestān, with altitudes sufficient in the west and for a considerable distance south-east to give rise to reliable orographic rainfall capable of supporting forest cover and, in places, a rich agriculture.

Outside the plateau and its surrounding rim lie limited but economically significant lowlands including the Caspian Plain, the Türkoman Šahrā, the inland sumps of the Hari Rūd and Rūd-i Hirmand and the great plain of Khūzistān.

In view of the very considerable regional diversity of the country, detailed review of the main geographical areas is necessary.

3. The Plateau:

(a) The Central deserts: The central deserts of Iran fall naturally into two groupings separated by the mountain range running from the south-east of the highland belt of Khūrāsān from Dastgerdān to Ardestān, the northern section known as Dasht-i Kavir and the southern as Dasht-i Lût. Both areas are themselves slit into a series of sub-basins separated by hill ridges, many rising to over 1,500 metres. Dasht-i Kavir is often presented as a series of ten basins (British Admiralty, 1944), the largest known as Kavir-i Buzurg, in which the main characteristics are clayey, salty soils and extremely brackish groundwater in parts giving rise to ooze flows (Fischer, 1968), namakzar and temporary salt lakes (Mostofi, 1970). Most settlements are located on higher ground about 1,000 metres in altitude and represent for the most part staging posts on the ancient caravan routes linking northern Khūrāsān and even the Caspian area via Simmān and Djiandjak (MacGregor, 1871) with Yazd and Isfahān. Agricultural life is primarily based on oasis cultivation in which the date palm, other fruits and grains and fodders play a major role. The supply of dyes for the carpet industry, formerly of some importance, is now in decline. Mining for lead and other non-ferrous metals retains an albeit smallscale industrial base in the Anārak-Nāpīn area.

Dasht-i Lût forms an elongated basin set between the Kirmān and the Kāyinn-Bīrdjān highlands and contains many complex geographical features, some only recently studied (Mostofi, 1970). The so-called high northern Lút lies between the Dastgerdān-Yazd axis and the Dehūk-Nayband-Rāvar col and is sometimes taken to include the highlands around Anārak. The southern Lüt or Lüt-i Zangi Abmad is defined in the south by the line of the Bam-Zāhīdān road and traditionally and economically excludes Narmānghīr, the Kirmān Desert and Rīgān, though physically this zone, extending up to the Kūh-i Taftān, is included within the Lût proper. Among the characteristic features of Dasht-i Lút is the extensive namakzar-i Shāhīdād occupying a long trough extending on a serpentine 170-kilometre alignment from north-west to south-east, though formerly of greater extent (Gabriel, 1938). In the shallow centre of the Lêt adjacent to the namakzar complex fluvial and later aeolian erosion has produced areas of spectacularly dissected country having much the appearance of ruined towns called Shahr-i Lût. In addition to a series of hill, valley and plain areas, of which six separate units have been recognised (Mostofi, 1970), the other dominating feature of the Lût is the dune mass of the east running from Dīh Salm on a NNESW axis almost to Kahrak on the Barn-Zāhīdān road and in parts exceeding 80 kilometres in width.

Production from the region of Dasht-i Lût is small and poor communications discourage active export of most goods. Agricultural output from the oases tends to be subsistence orientated, though oranges from Shāhīdād and dates from Shāhīdād and Dīh Salm do find their way to markets in Kirmān and Bīrdjān. Mining has more than local importance with lead at Nayband, Kūh-i Garmāb and Seh Čangi and copper at Rā'fa Šarī and Kollehā (Barand et al., 1965).

(b) The plains of the Zagros Slopes: A series of fertile plains and basins surround the central deserts lying along the north-eastern edge of the Zagros Mountains. The most extensive areas are those surrounding Isfahān, Yazd and Kirmān, though many other smaller centres exist with prosperous agricultural bases. Throughout the zone the principal means of water supply is the kandār (p. 29), with river water retaining local importance especially in the Isfahān region. Drainage within the basins is largely internal and a number of salt-lake basins altitudinally and physically accordant with the Dasht-i Kavir (Fischer, 1968) stretch from Sīrdān via Gāvīhūnī to Isfahān. Outside the namakzar soils are generally deep and fertile, supporting a varied agriculture mainly irrigated and with a significant area of dryland grains and a rich associated livestock economy. Among the particularly cottage craft industries are still important employers of labour in this region, with the hand-made carpets of Isfahān, Nāţān, Kāšān and Kirmān accounting for a major portion of Iran’s non-oil exports.

One of the factors permitting the early growth of sophisticated urban centres in this area of Iran has been the existence of readily accessible and varied mineral deposits, particularly the lead-zinc occurrences associated with the Jurassic and Cretaceous limestones around Isfahān, Kāšān and Yazd and orientated with the line of the Zagros overthrusting (Barand, 1965). It is an interesting fact that many of the modern mine enterprises in the area represent new workings on ancient sites. Copper mining also has ancient origins in this area, the deposits to the south of Kirmān at Kūh-i Bahār Asmān and Tal-i Ma'dān near Rāfesdanbān both having been exploited at an early date. More recently, the Sar Čashma copper deposit has been proved and developed. Although iron deposits were not valued so highly or subject to such early exploitation as copper, iron workings dating from Archemenian times have been recorded in this area. Among the largest known ironfields in Iran is the magnetite iron bearing area around Bafk occurring along the eastern lines of the granodioritic intrusions with the Upper Cretaceous sediments.
(c) North-West Iran: North-west Iran including East and West  Ādārbāyjān, Kurdistān and Hamadān with its geological continuation through the regions of Malāyer, Golpāyegan, Şahr-e  Raşā and Balūčistān is considered at the present time to be an integral part of central Iran. The area was intensely folded and faulted during the Alpine orogeny and intrusive processes, localised metamorphism and widespread volcanism are characteristic throughout the zone. Despite the underlying geological similarities, the north-west remains geographically distinct from the areas further east. Topographically, the area has been likened to a series of irregular tablelands (Fisher, 1968), where altitudes attain between 4,811 metres in the main peak of the Sapālpān Dâgh, 3,700 metres in Kūh-i Sahand and 3,506 metres in the Kūh-i Būz Gūdūh. Drainage of the north-western area is intricate in pattern. The Rūd-i Aras drains the north-flowing tributaries running from the Kureh Dâgh and the Bûyûk Aqârî Dağî as well as the Kūhî and Ardabil basins. Much of the south-west of the area is drained by the tributaries of the Rūd-i Zandjān-câyî, which eventually joins the Kizîl Uzûn and the Safîd Rūd system. Other radial drainage lines include those streams west of Mahābâd which link in the Ab-i Zāh, cross the Īrākî frontier, and link with the Zāb al-Asfāl. Draining the north-flowing stream on the western Ādārbāyjān centre on the Dâryācâh-i  Reţāliyeh fed by the Zarînî Rûd and Shîneh Rûd from the south and the Agâj Čây from the east.

Ādārbāyjān is among the better watered areas of Iran and average annual rainfall at Tabriz is 285.6 millimetres, though the surrounding highlands receive heavier rainfall, much of it in the form of winter snows. Dryland grain cultivation is possible over large areas and deciduous fruits are universally important together with the vine and almond. Irrigated culture is found throughout the region, with the most productive areas located in the major river valleys around the towns of Ārdabil, Kūhî, Mahābâd, Miyânâh, Reţâliyeh, Tabriz and Zandjān, where soils are rich and deep and where some shelter is available from harsh winds, frosts and prolonged sunshine.

Ādārbāyjān is extremely mineral rich in two main areas including the Ahar-Golān-Marand area, where large and medium scale deposits of lead-zinc, copper, gold, arsenic and molybdenite exist and the southern Ādārbāyjān region lying in the Angūrān-Takâb-Marâgîeh area, where large and medium-scale deposits of lead-zinc, copper, arsenic, gold, bismuth and other minerals have been located. Small-scale iron fields are worked at Ašfāhâbâd and Gołjûk, while lead-zinc and copper deposits are found between Zandjān and Fīrūzābâd.

The southern rim of the central Iranian plateau land running south-east from southern Ādārbāyjān through Kurdistān and Hamadān to Shahr-e Raşâ is geologically similar to Ādārbāyjān, as noted above, though here a larger element of Mesozoic and Tertiary metamorphism is apparent, especially in the Hamadān-Dârân belt. The rim takes the form of a broken mountain system beginning in the west with the Kūh-i Čehel Časme (3,163 metres) and continuing in the Kūh-i Alvand (3,548 metres) and in Ašfârân Kūh (4,176 metres). South-west of  Nadjaftâb the ridge is less distinct. The areas as far east as Nadjaftâb are agriculturally well-endowed with deep soils in the valleys and reliable rainfall (Hamadān 385.2 millimetres annual average). Both  kândî and river water irrigation supplies are utilised for sedentary agriculture, especially favoured centres for which are Malāyer, Arâk, Golpāyegan, ʿAllī Gūdarz and Nagjaftâb. Livestock is generally important, with a strong transhumant tradition affecting mainly the Kurdistān area. Sizeable mineral deposits occur in the area of Mesozoic and Tertiary metamorphism and lead-zinc is found at Lâḵān, Husaynābâd and Darreh Nokshir south-east of Arâk and at Anjârêh, Vîджîn,  Khānîe Sormeh and Shâh-kūh in the area west and south of  Īsfâhān.

(d) Balūčistān: This region, the easternmost part of Balūčistān, formerly regarded as continuations of the main Zagros system, are now recognised as a south-east limb of the central Iranian zone. To the north, the area is clearly defined by the Kūh-i Bazmān which, reaching its greatest elevation at 3,489 metres, effectively separates the depression of Dašt-i Lūf from the Dâjz Moriyan Ḥâmûn. The mountains of Kūh-i Bazmān are made up of extrusive material with a series of geologically youthful volcanic peaks dominating the range. A north-south syncline running from north of Irânsâhâr to the region of Nusrâtâbâd divides the Kūh-i Bazmān from the Kūh-i Taftān, a geologically mixed region, with extrusive igneous and metamorphic rock in the area of Kūh-i Taftān volcanic peak, a complex zone of ophiolite-radiolarite rocks with ultrabasic masses located west of Taftān and a surrounding mass of Paleogene sediments. Topography throughout the region is irregular and mainly above an altitude of 1,000 metres. In addition to the mountain ridges traversing the area, and noted above, two plateaux lie to the north and south of the Kūh-i Taftān centred on Zâhîdān and Khâsh, respectively, though the former is not endowed with sufficient soil or water resources to offer a base for a strong sedentary agriculture. The Khâsh plateau presents a contrast, with settled cultivation developed over large areas dependent upon adequate if not abundant subterranean water resources and rich and deep soils, where grains, fodder crops, vegetables and orchard fruits give generally reliable returns (Plan Organisa- tion 1960).

Although the Iranian Makrân shows geological similarities with western Baluchistan, intense over-thrusting along a roughly west-east alignment has given the northern Makrân distinctive topography, extremely broken in places and difficult of access and agricultural utilisation. Separating the Dâjz Moriyan Ḥâmûn from the Makrân is the Kūh-i Bašhâgerd, the main west-east ridge of which rises to over 1,500 metres, where the ophiolite-radiolarite areas form a more resistant mass than the surrounding sediments. Coastal Makrân, beginning from Râ’s al-Shîr in the west and continuing into Pakistan in the east, forms yet another distinctive zone of relatively regular anticlines and succeeding synclines aligned more or less parallel with the coastline. The area is pre-eminently one of sediments, geologically forming a depression zone of which the larger part lies below the Gulf of Oman, though the regular folding of the anticline structures gives coastal Makrân a character much different from other major depressions and internal basins in the country. Rapid and intensive erosion of the ridges near the coast by fast-running north-south streams has dissected the anticlines into small hill groups of low elevation except where the geologic outliers of the Cambrian-Paleogene series are exposed to stand out as resistant blocks occasionally attaining more than 1,000 metres in altitude. Despite the occurrence of monsoon rainfall in coastal districts and the existence of ancient  kândî systems, agricultural deve-
development has been inhibited by the unreliability of rainfall, the poor condition of the kanats and, not least of all, by the low levels of technical knowledge of the predominantly Baloch population in both water utilisation and cultivation skills (Spooner, 1968).

Lying between the mountain rims of Balochistan is the Dijaz Moriyân depression, structurally an internal basin and now filled with recent alluvial deposits brought from the hills by numerous streams seasonally flowing to the centre of the basin where kahns and swamp lands cover a considerable area. Away from the Hamun itself, the plains of Bampour and Dijurf, and particularly the latter, offer scope for settled agriculture, though geographic isolation and preoccupation with livestock herding have been constraints on effective use of available land and water resources. Nonetheless, the Bampour-Iranqahar area produces grains, including rice, fodder and tree crops utilising 'kanât' water supplies and temporary 'bands' or earth dams across the major drainage channels to trap water and silt for cultivation purposes. Dijurf has been developed in the very recent period as a major crop and livestock area under government auspices.

Large deposits of chromite have been located in Balochistan and the adjacent areas between Baf and Dijurf occurring in the region of ultrabasic rocks, where magmatic segregation has taken place. The most important deposits are established at Shahriyâr and Amir, north-east of Minab, though scattered sites as distant as Aţâbât and Kâshâr are known.

(c) The East Persian Highlands: The East Persian highland system runs from the Kûh-i Surkh south of Mashhad and links up with the Kûh-i Taftân in northern Balochistan. Kûh-i Surkh is separated from the hill area to the south by the Great Kavir Fault, which arcs across from west to east fading out near 'Alâm-dûr. The Kûh-i Surkh attains an altitude of 3,020 metres north-west of Turbat-i Haydari, though much of its continuation east in the Kûh-i Bizâk and Kûh-i Khvâr rises to over 2,000 metres. South of these highlands a large depression forms a west to east trough, through the foothills of the highlands between Kâshmar and 'Alâm-dûr including the Turbat-i Haydari region which act as an intermediate zone, where areas of good soils and fair underground water resources permit cultivation of grains, vegetables and mixed tree crops. In years of above average rainfall, dayin, or dryland, cultivation is important and some villagers augment their irrigated lands by damming small streams. South of the foothills, soils are poor and namakzar formations characterise the basin bottom from Kavir-i Namak to the Afghan borders, where marshes are also found. Drainage from the Kûh-i Bizâk, the northern Kâyîn-Birdjand highlands and the Dastgerdân flows to the namakzar formations.

West-east faulting in the north Kâyîn-Birdjand highlands separates the Kûh-i Kalat from Kâyînât proper by a high col. Gunabâd village group and its related yâlûtâd, Kâkhk, form a relatively prosperous agricultural area on the foothills and north-facing slopes of the Kûh-i Kalat reliant on kanat water supply. Crustal instability is marked both here and in the areas as far south as Birdjand and many settlements suffer periodic earthquakes of which the last occurred in 1968 affecting Kâkhk and Ferdaus particularly. The Kâyîn-Birdjand Mountains achieve their greatest height in the Kûh-i Ahangerân at 2,877 metres, while the north-west to south-east ridge east of Birdjand also runs for some 100 kilometres at altitudes above 2,000 metres. Drainage of the highlands is to the namakzar in the north and to the small western basins and the Dağh-i Lêt in the west. Southwards the situation is more complex and the line of the hill ranges and the major streams is strongly affected by faulting trending north-west to south-east in the south-east sector and north to south in the south-west sector, with drainage fed to the Daryââh-i Hâmûn-i Hirmand in the former and to the Dağh-i Lêt in the latter case. Agriculture in the Kâyînât and Birdjand is based on 'kanat', punca and earth dam systems with subterranean aquifers replenished by the irregular, though at times heavy, rainfall and snows on the mountain ridges. Some hill villages are famous for saffron and vegetable dyes. Cultivation on small artificial terraces, and there is a considerable export of these products from the region to other parts of the country. The southern col reaching from the main mountain area around Kûhûn to Nûratâbâd is faulted to both west and east and carries little settlement or cultivation with the exception of the lower east-facing slopes around Nêh which sustain minor pockets of cultivation where shelter from the 120-day wind (bâd-i sad-ubrist ûrû) is possible. Further west, oasis date palm culture is found on the fringes of Dağhî Lêt.

(f) The Sistan Depression: Centring on Zâbûl is a large depression clearly marked in the east by north-south faults and running east to the foothills of the Hindu Kush ranges. The principal features of the lowland within Iranian territory are the two permanent lakes of the Hâmûn-i Hirmand and Daryââh-i Hâmûn-i Šâbari, which seasonally link with the Hâmûn-i Pusak in Afghanistan to form a single sweet water lake. The lake is fed by the Rûd-i Hirmand, having its catchment in Afghanistan, while drainage is to the south via the Êlalak Rûd to Gûdî Zara on the Afghan-Pakistan frontier. Despite the ample supplies of water available for irrigation, settled agriculture is poorly developed, not least of all as a result of structural problems affecting ownership and tenancy of land in the area (Lambton, 1953 and 1965). Distance from urban markets and poor roads have also inhibited development, though severe constraints on summer cropping are imposed by the bâd-i sad-ubrist ûrû, which tends to have a scorching effect on crops. Main products of the area are grains and some vegetables and cotton.
basins, with streams mainly falling in torrents down the deep slopes. A more intricate pattern exists in the case of the Safid Rūd, where the north-south stream has captured the Kūzī Uzun and the Shahrūd which occupy an elevated trough in the central basin of the Alburz. Land communications across the Alburz are difficult and hazardous even at the present time. Except for the Kāżvin-Mandīl-Rašt route using the Safid Rūd gap, all other routes are subject to temporary closure in winter as a result of snow-blockage, flooding and landslips. The Tehran-Āmūl crossing using the Rūd-i Harāz valley is especially notorious in this respect.

Although the Alburz tend to be of lower altitude in the east, there is a large element of geological continuity between the main Alburz and the eastern ranges of Kūh-i Hazār Masjīdī and Kūh-i Binālūd than specialists formerly believed, the basic folded sedimentaries of the Cambrian to Paleogene of the Alburz system giving an underlying unity (Bariand, 1965). As noted, however, intensity of folding declines in the northern foothills and has given rise to a more regular series of hill ranges and intervening troughs with topography rather different, therefore, from the main Alburz. The main lines of drainage run along the central valley lying between the ranges, including the Kūh-i Goūl, Kūh-i Allāh Akbar and Kūh-i Hazār Masjīdī and the southern ridges of Kūh-i Alā Dāgh and Kūh-i Binālūd. From a watershed in the Kūčān-Kalātcheh area, the region is drained westwards by the Rūd-i Atrāk and its tributaries towards the Turkoman Saḥrā, while the Kāshāf Rūd drains to the south-east joining the Hari Rūd north of Garmāb ‘Alīya. Livestock herding is important in the hill areas of northern Khūrāsān, while the major areas of intensified agriculture occur both in the lower Atrāk region and the broad plain around Masgḥad and in the extended oases of Nīshābūr and Sabzavār. The vast but poorly watered and isolated Dūvayn plain supports a number of formerly prosperous but now depressed villages reliant on kandī and spring water supply for agriculture and on livestock herding.

The Alburz is poorly endowed with minerals compared to other areas of the country, though exploration is far from complete. In addition to lead-zinc deposits at Donā, Kālār Daštī, Sarbāshā, Rezāābād and Tūyeh, barite is found at Sirā, while small deposits of iron ore have been located at Sīmānān. Old-established coal workings are still actively exploited for both the lower Atrāk region and the coalfields around Masgḥad and in the oases of Nīshābūr and Sabzavār. The main Zagros is distinguished from the zone of overthrusting and its associated imbricated zone (Oberlander, 1965) by a discontinuous major line of overthrusting running from slightly south of Kirmān-kāshān in the north-west to Kūh-i Cāshma north of Mināb in the south-east and including a 200-kilometre wide zone taking in the whole of south-west and south Iran as far east as Ra’s al-Shir with the sole exception of the Plain of Khūzestān. In the main Zagros, conformably lain Cambrian to late Tertiary sedimentary rocks have been folded during Plio-Pleistocene times into extended parallel folds now much eroded and dissected by deep gorges through which the major rivers flow to the Persian Gulf in a complex longitudinal/transverse pattern. The major rivers, all of them perennial, include the Karkhā, Hendidjan, Helleh, Mond and Mīhrān systems, though several small streams make a direct but seasonal route to the Persian Gulf. Although few minerals other than hydrocarbons have been found in the main Zagros, oil and gas fields abound, especially in the dome formations of the Asmari and Cretaceous limestones, which have been the basis for the development of the Iranian oil industry since the early twentieth century, first in the northern fields of Masjīd-i Sułaymān and Lālī and later in the more prolific structures such as Aghā Iṣārī, Aḩwāz, Ga‘z Sārān and Mārīn further to the south. Overlying the Asmari limestone in the oilfield zone are the lower Fārs beds which contain plastic evaporite deposits acting as a seal for the oil-bearing structures (Harrison, 1968).

Despite a relatively heavy and reliable rainfall in the area of the western Zagros (Khurramābāb, 504.0 and Shīrāz 384.6 millimetres) sedentary agriculture is not well developed except around Shīrāz, most of the area falling under tribal group herding systems of land utilisation. Central government control in the area was tenuous until comparatively recent years since access was difficult and tribal control absolute outside the major towns. The main tribal groups occupying this vast area include Kurds, Lārs, Baḥḥītiyār, Kūhīglī, Boyer Ahmād and Kašḵāy, all of which are still concerned with transhumant herding, though growing government pressure on the tribes to settle through enforced security, the establishment of agricultural extension services and a road construction programme is having some effect towards increasing the area under sedentary cultivation. Protection of the extensive oak forests on the higher ridges and valleys of the Zagros is helping to conserve timber resources in tribal areas of the zone. The eastern Zagros is an area of poorer rainfall than the west but a prosperous sedentary agriculture is developing in the major river valleys and plains, particularly around Iṣṭahbānat, Fāsā and Nīrz, with grains, including millet, and sugar beet of importance. Livestock, often under a nomadic regime, remain the basis of the economy of the area, exploiting seasonal grasslands of the Garmīr and Sardīsīr.

The long coastline of the Persian Gulf permits of widespread smuggling activity of luxury goods from the trade entrepôts of the Gulf for the Iranian market. Fishing, on the other hand, is little developed and is of only local significance. Of the ports of the coast between Bandar Daylām and Bandar ‘Abbās, none has yet risen to national importance other than the oil terminals of Dīzārā-i Kharg, Bābregān and Dīzārā-i Lāvān. The agriculture of the coastal strip is extremely poor, limited to grazing and shifting cultivation with the exception of the oases around Bandar ‘Abbās and Mināb.
3.iii. The Iranian Lowlands:
(a) The Khuzistan Lowlands: The lowlands of Khuzistan have been described by Fisher (1968) as the largest single expanse of true lowland in Iranian territory and the area does present a sharp contrast to the rest of the country where mountains are rarely out of view. Structurally, the plain is regarded as part of the Arabian platform with a deep cover of Paleozoic-Mesozoic-Tertiary sedimentary rocks under more recent layers of alluvial material making up a continuation of the Mesopotamian region to the foothills of the Zagros (N.I.O.C., 1959). A high rate of deposition of alluvium still exists in the headwaters of the Persian Gulf dependent on the silt load brought down by the Tigris-Euphrates and Kârûn systems. De Morgan's (1905) classical theory on the infilling of the headwaters of the Persian Gulf and the gradual advance of the land surface there has been widely accepted though Lees and Falcon (1952) have offered an alternative hypothesis on the assumption that the lowlands represent a gradual downwarping of the land surface under the weight of accumulated sediments and that the coastline is therefore more or less in stable equilibrium.

Topographically, the plain is virtually unbroken with a slow rise in altitude from the coast to the abrupt slopes of the Zagros foothills. Not until Andimeshk is reached, 130-kilometres north of Ahvâz, do altitudes rise above 100 metres. The area is drained by the Rûd-i Kârûn in its north-west sector towards the Rûd-i Kûrûn, which is not reached before the Kârûn peters out in salt and mud flats. The north and north-east is served by the Rûd-i Kûrûn and its tributaries, while the east is drained by the Rûd-i Dharrâhi system. Although much of the water is fed to the Persian Gulf through the Shatt al-Arab, a number of narrow creeks known as khar also distribute the river waters of both systems. The largest of these creeks, the Kûhr Mûsâ, serves as a sea-way to the ports of Bandar Shâhpûr and Mâh Shahr, the former rising to importance as a major port and the latter acting as a terminal for oil product exports from the Abâdân refinery. Khuuramshâhâr lies at the junction of the Rûd-i Kûrûn and Shatt al-Arab (the latter officially referred to as the Arvand Rûd in Iran) and is the major commercial goods port for international trade. Abâdân lies downstream from Khurramshâhâr and is the former oil products port for the Abâdân refinery. The city retains its position as an oil processing centre but is no longer a port of any significance. Ahvâz, situated on the Rûd-i Kûrûn 125 kilometres from Abâdân, is the provincial capital and an expanding centre of the oil industry from which most administration and servicing of the field areas is carried on. Until the early 1950s, the agricultural state of the Khuzistân lowland was extremely poor, contrasting sharply with the former prosperity of Archaemenid and Sasanian times. Much of the plain was cultivated by tribal groups under shifting agriculture with only minor pockets of sedentary agriculture in the palm groves around Abâdân and Khurramshâhâr and the gatherings fed by the wadis of the Arvand Rûd in the north and Abâdân and Khurramshâh in the south. Control of the Abî Dîz following construction of the Muhammad Reîsh Shâh dam above Dezfûl has permitted rapid growth of newly reclaimed agricultural areas on the plain where Haft Tappeh sugar cane plantation is an important early example. In addition to the activities associated directly with oil production and export, a number of modern industries utilising natural gas have grown up in Abâdân and Bandar Shâhpûr, while new industries processing heavy and bulky imported raw materials, particularly steel, have developed near Ahvâz. The region is favoured by the existence of excellent rail links which run through the Dîz-Sezâr gap in the Zagros to Tehran and northern Iran.

(b) The Caspian Lowlands and Turkoman Şâhrâ: The Caspian Lowlands and the Turkoman Şâhrâ reach from the Irano-Soviet frontier at Âstârâ in a belt of radically varying width (from two to three kilometres to 50 kilometres) to the east of Gunbad-i Kâbûs. The lowlands are seen as the southern edge of the Asiatic foreland (Harrison, 1958) or as areas of young depressions (Barland, 1965). Much of the Caspian lowland represents the area left by the recession of the Caspian Sea and the characteristic soil cover is non-saline alluvial soils and, in the Bandar Pahlavi-Lâhîdjan region, peat and grey soils (Dewan, 1961). In the Gurgân-Gunbad-i Kâbûs area of the Caspian piedmont, soils are extremely fertile and include deep horizons of podzolic soils. Such fertility combines with heavy rainfall over much of the plains, with the Bandar Pahlavi-Lâhîdjan area receiving an annual average of no less than 1,800 millimetres, though precipitation amounts decline very steeply southwards and more gradually to the east, Bâbulsar receiving 817.9 millimetres and Gurgân 649.8 millimetres.

Drainage is highly variable in type. Many short streams run down to the Caspian Sea between Âstârâ and Rûşvândeh and between Rûdsar and Nûr. The plain is also traversed by the braided distributaries of the Safîd Rûd, some water of which is diverted artificially by tunnel to the Fûmenât district. Flooding of the Safîd Rûd delta was a usual occurrence until the construction of the Safîd Rûd (Şâhshânî Farâhî) dam and its associated re-regulation works and present-day river levels are only fractionally below those of the plain itself, thereby permitting direct off-take of irrigation water for the inundation of rice-paddies which form the major item of land use in this zone. Further east, the rivers tend to be more incised, making irrigation more difficult, though rice remains the dominating crop of the lowlands proper as far east as Gâlûgâh.

Although rice has become increasingly important in the modern period, often on land reclaimed from the sea, swamps and lower slopes of the Alburz, and tea plantations have taken over the undulating land above the Caspian plain, other crops have considerable national importance, including tobacco, citrus fruits (particularly in the Şâhsavâr-Câlûs region), and sunflower seeds. Mulberry trees are present in large numbers and a small-scale silk industry survives as a fractional legacy of the former traditional economic basis of the area. The Gurgân and Gunbad-i Kâbûs plains produce large quantities of cotton and grains on lands only recently reclaimed to arable use. Forestry activity on the higher slopes of the Alburz, where the Hyrcanian forest survives over a considerable acreage, is economically important, though the timber resource has been abused in the past by random cutting for construction and charcoal burning purposes. A flourishing fishing industry exists in the small Caspian ports and coastal villages and along the rivers of the region. The state-controlled caviar interest has had international significance for many years and is of continuing importance despite rigorous supervision of sturgeon fishing made necessary by fears of over-rapid depletion of the species. Local and Tehran markets are supplied with fresh-water fish caught in the rivers, particularly the Safîd Rûd. Although the Caspian
ports suffered eclipse following the end of World War II as a result of restrictions on trade with the U.S.S.R., the many problems posed by the silting up of the harbours and the recession of the coastline, the expansion of the Irano-Soviet trade since 1965 has led to the reinvigoration of trade and communications sectors in the area. Bandar Pahlavi handles both Irano-Soviet exchanges and an increasing volume of international transit trade.

Geography has thus also contributed to a diversity of peoples, a problem which the Achaemenians solved by creating the first empire, one in which minorities were allowed local autonomy in dress, religion, speech, and other aspects of culture within a single political framework. This diversity has continued until modern times. To the southwest, Iran touches Arab country, with many Arabs living on contiguous ‘Irāk soil, as well as on Bahrayn Island (which Iran once claimed). To the northwest the crest of the Zagros splits the Kurdish people, and the northwestern corner of Iran, bordering on Turkey and Soviet Ādharbāyjān, contains populations speaking Azari Turkish, while other Turks are found on Iranian territory east of the Caspian Sea as well as in the southern Zagros. To the east, Iran’s borders with Afgānistān and Pakistan are overlapped by Persian-speaking Čahār Lang Mongols, Balūč, and a few Brāhuis.

The distribution of population in Iran, and the pastoral lands, encloses the nucleus of a desert. Differing responses to these underlying variations in natural conditions and isolation of areas from the mainstream of the nation’s life caused by strong physical barriers to movement between the regions have accentuated Iran’s regional diversity.
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| **Arts** |  |
| --- |  |
| Ardabil |  |
| Dīzful | said to be between 50,000 and 100,000 in 1964. |
| Kawān |  |
| Yāzd |  |
| Kūnim | ca. 450,000 |

ii.—**Demography and Ethnicity**

The distribution of population in Iran, and the ways in which its peoples make their livings, are to a considerable extent a function of its geography (see above). A horseshoe-shaped arc of varying width containing habitable mountains and other arable and pastoral lands, encloses the nucleus of a desert. Because this arc points northwestward, where it merges into the highlands of ‘Irāk and Turkey, the bulk of the Iranian population is concentrated near its borders. Since Achaemenian times this habitation pattern has posed an administrative problem to the successive Iranian governments.

Geography has thus also contributed to a diversity of peoples, a problem which the Achaemenians solved by creating the first empire, one in which minorities were allowed local autonomy in dress, religion, speech, and other aspects of culture within a single political framework. This diversity has continued until modern times. To the southwest, Iran touches Arab country, with many Arabs living on contiguous ‘Irāk soil, as well as on Bahrayn Island (which Iran once claimed). To the northwest the crest of the Zagros splits the Kurdish people, and the northwestern corner of Iran, bordering on Turkey and Soviet Ādharbāyjān, contains populations speaking Azari Turkish, while other Turks are found on Iranian territory east of the Caspian Sea as well as in the southern Zagros. To the east, Iran’s borders with Afgānistān and Pakistan are overlapped by Persian-speaking Čahār Lang Mongols, Balūč, and a few Brāhuis.

The distribution of population in Iran, and the pastoral lands, encloses the nucleus of a desert. Differing responses to these underlying variations in natural conditions and isolation of areas from the mainstream of the nation’s life caused by strong physical barriers to movement between the regions have accentuated Iran’s regional diversity.
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Towns

Towns of 5,000—50,000, ca. 1,109,000 = 4.2% of population

Villages*, numbering over 40,000 ca. 18,661,640 = 71.0% of population

"Others*** ca. 1,740,860 = 6.6% of population

Total ca. 26,284,000 = 100%

* Includes tribal and non-tribal, sedentary and seasonally nomadic.
** Probably includes full nomadic.

TABLE II

Tribal Peoples

Zagros

Kurds (Kurdistan) 600,000 K
Lurs 300,000 P
Bakhtiyarí 300,000 P
Kuh Gailus 150,000 f P
Mamassanis 55,000 f P
Kashgháí 625,000 f T
Klamshes 525,000 f PTA

Northwest, Alburz, and East Caspian Plain

Sháhavans 200,000 T
W. Elburz 30,000 f KT
E. Elburz 280,000 f KT
Turkomans 100,000 f T
Kirkzhíg 50,000 T

Southern Coast and Southeast

Arabs 1,200,000 A
Balúchí 120,000 B
Bráhtús 10,000 f D
Stístán 42,000 f PBD

Total 4,537,500 or 16.5% of whole

K = Kurdish P = Persian T = Turkish B = Balúchí A = Arabic D = Dravidian
f = count by families.

Except for about 15,000 Zoroastrians remaining in and about Yazd and Kirmán, the ethnic Persians, including the tribal ones, are Sháhí, and so are most of the Arabs living in Iran. Over two million more of the Sháh's subjects are Sunnis, particularly the migratory Kurdish tribes of the northwest, the Turkomans, and the Balúchí. Ismá'ílís and Bahá'ís still persist in Iran, and the Lur tribesmen were, and may secretly still be, 'Allí Ikhís.

In 1960 there were still some 60,000 Jews in Iran, engaged mostly in the professions and trade, whereas many of the Kurdish Jews of Sanandaj and Sašãqíz had already migrated to Israel. Almost equally scattered were over 50,000 Armenians, although some had left Iran for Soviet Armenia. Armenian villages may still be seen in the northwest, and the entire suburb, or half-city of Džulfá-Isháhán is Armenian.

Armenians and Georgians, both used to cold weather, occupy throughout the year villages in the summer pastures of the Kashgháí. Like the Jews, the Armenians specialize in the professions, in trade, and also in truck-driving. A colony of Nestorian Christians who call themselves Assyrians and speak Syriac are concentrated in and about Režá'iyé. They number over 20,000. Many others have migrated to the United States. Both the Armenians and the Assyrians have undergone strong American and British missionary influence.

Except for the addition of a certain amount of modern industry, the cities of Iran are essentially commercial. In them handicrafts flourish and imported as well as local products are sold in modern shops and in covered bazaars. During the last thirty or forty years Tehran has replaced Tabriz as the largest city, and has drawn to itself persons from all over the nation, including gardeners from Zabol, Turkoman truckdrivers, an intellectual elite educated mostly abroad, the absentee owners of thousands of villages, and a host of public servants. In summer those who can afford it move to the mountain slopes north of the city or to resorts on the Caspian shore.

The usual Iranian village is an assemblage of mudbrick or pisé dwellings roofed with poplar poles covered with earth. The poles are cut from the closely packed rows of quick-growing poplars that line nearly every canal and stream. In regions lacking such watercourses a row of circular mounds, like hollow molehills, stretches from the hills across the sloping plain to the village. These mounds mark the course of a deep, manmade, underground stream called a kandí [q.v. & see M]. Sheltered from evaporation, it is the product of highly skilled labour. Kandí-diggers are specialists from the Gurgán region who go wherever their services are needed.

Apart from the aforementioned poplars and fruit trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation taller than short grass, for the goats and sheep keep it down and every day women and children go out to collect low bushes and twigs for fuel. There is usually one carpenter in the village, but most of the men are engaged in agriculture, while the boys tend the flocks.

In the absence of the landlord, whom many of the villagers may never have seen, the community is run by his agent, the kathkúhdí, who allocates the land, provides most of the tools, and collects the rent. This usually consists of four-fifths of the grain produced by each man, unless he is the lucky owner of an ox used in ploughing, in which case he may receive the share of five men and may not need to work.

In tribal territory the village may belong to the tribe as a whole, and in non-tribal territory there were, even twenty years ago, a few "free" villages owned by the villagers themselves, and ruled by their own headmen who paid taxes directly to the government. Under the current land reforms instituted by the present Sháh, the number of such villages has increased.

The principal respite from the dreary, impoverished routine of most villagers' lives comes from weddings and other rites of passage, from the celebration of the Nawruz. Beginning at the vernal equinox, this holiday lasts twelve days. In the balmy spring weather, families move out to the fields to picnic and to disport themselves. Each family collects seven trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation apart from the aforementioned poplars and fruit trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation taller than short grass, for the goats and sheep keep it down and every day women and children go out to collect low bushes and twigs for fuel. There is usually one carpenter in the village, but most of the men are engaged in agriculture, while the boys tend the flocks.

In the absence of the landlord, whom many of the villagers may never have seen, the community is run by his agent, the kathkúhdí, who allocates the land, provides most of the tools, and collects the rent. This usually consists of four-fifths of the grain produced by each man, unless he is the lucky owner of an ox used in ploughing, in which case he may receive the share of five men and may not need to work.

The principal respite from the dreary, impoverished routine of most villages' lives comes from weddings and other rites of passage, from the celebration of the Nawruz. Beginning at the vernal equinox, this holiday lasts twelve days. In the balmy spring weather, families move out to the fields to picnic and to disport themselves. Each family collects seven trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation apart from the aforementioned poplars and fruit trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation taller than short grass, for the goats and sheep keep it down and every day women and children go out to collect low bushes and twigs for fuel. There is usually one carpenter in the village, but most of the men are engaged in agriculture, while the boys tend the flocks.

In tribal territory the village may belong to the tribe as a whole, and in non-tribal territory there were, even twenty years ago, a few "free" villages owned by the villagers themselves, and ruled by their own headmen who paid taxes directly to the government. Under the current land reforms instituted by the present Sháh, the number of such villages has increased.

The principal respite from the dreary, impoverished routine of most villagers' lives comes from weddings and other rites of passage, from the celebration of the Nawruz. Beginning at the vernal equinox, this holiday lasts twelve days. In the balmy spring weather, families move out to the fields to picnic and to disport themselves. Each family collects seven trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation apart from the aforementioned poplars and fruit trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation taller than short grass, for the goats and sheep keep it down and every day women and children go out to collect low bushes and twigs for fuel. There is usually one carpenter in the village, but most of the men are engaged in agriculture, while the boys tend the flocks.

In tribal territory the village may belong to the tribe as a whole, and in non-tribal territory there were, even twenty years ago, a few "free" villages owned by the villagers themselves, and ruled by their own headmen who paid taxes directly to the government. Under the current land reforms instituted by the present Sháh, the number of such villages has increased.

The principal respite from the dreary, impoverished routine of most villages' lives comes from weddings and other rites of passage, from the celebration of the Nawruz. Beginning at the vernal equinox, this holiday lasts twelve days. In the balmy spring weather, families move out to the fields to picnic and to disport themselves. Each family collects seven trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation apart from the aforementioned poplars and fruit trees, the typical landscape is almost bare of vegetation taller than short grass, for the goats and sheep keep it down and every day women and children go out to collect low bushes and twigs for fuel. There is usually one carpenter in the village, but most of the men are engaged in agriculture, while the boys tend the flocks.

In tribal territory the village may belong to the tribe as a whole, and in non-tribal territory there were, even twenty years ago, a few "free" villages owned by the villagers themselves, and ruled by their own headmen who paid taxes directly to the government. Under the current land reforms instituted by the present Sháh, the number of such villages has increased.
The northern Kurds live in villages ruled by their own chiefs during the winter, but in spring it was their habit, until forbidden by the government, to migrate each spring to high pastures across the Irākī border, and return before snowfall. They are Sunnis and prefer the type of marriage common among Arabs, in which a young man marries his paternal uncle's daughter. They have three cities, Mahābād, Sanandaj, and Saḵlīz, of which the third, until recently, included a considerable Kurdish-speaking Jewish population. Around Komānāshā the local Kurds have become detribalized tenant farmers and Shiʿī.

In the mountains south of the Kurds live the Lurs, who speak an aberrant form of archaic Persian. Although nominally Shiʿī, they were formerly openly ʿAllī Ḥāš. Like the Zoroastrians, they revere bread and fire. Being split up into numerous tribes and sections, they migrate to their summer pastures as separate bands without overall command. In 1936 Rezā Šāh's army conquered them, with much bloodshed and starvation, forcing many of the survivors to settle in villages under landlords.

Next to the south are the Bakhtiyārīs, who speak a dialect similar to that of the Lurs. They are a powerful confederation under the command of a paramount chief called the Muḥāfizī. In their annual migrations they move simultaneously over five routes from their winter to their summer pastures, crossing the Shustar River partly by fording and partly on inflated skins. Their winter pasture lies on the lowlands and foothills of the lower course of the Kūr in Khūzestān, their summer pasture in the long alpine valley of the Upper Kūr. In both places they have permanent villages, the summer ones occupied by Armenians and Georgians. In between, the Bakhtiyārī chiefs own many of the villages through which they pass. Their migrations require much organization, accurate planning, and exact timing, and armed horsemen police the migrants and their flocks on the way. Kinship ties are strong and succession to the chieftainship is by primogeniture.

Very little is known about the Kuh Galus, who live south and east of the Bakhtiyārīs, except that they are organized into some six tribes, some sections of which speak Turkish, the others Persian. They are under the control of four families which, unlike the ruling elite of the Bakhtiyārīs, include (or did so until recently) few if any men with modern education. The same generalizations may be made of the Mamassanis, about whom even less information is to be found in the pertinent literature.

Beyond the Mamassanis are the Kashghays, members of a powerful confederation divided into twelve tribes. Their Turkish-speaking ancestors moved out of the Central Asian grasslands about 700 years ago, crossing Iran to their present home, the southern Zagros. About half are still nomadic. Every year the latter make the longest biennial migration in Iran, some 350 miles in each direction. They winter between the Fahlian River on the north and the encircling Mand River on the northeast, east, and south; westward it reaches the coast. It is split into two sections by a tongue of Mamassani territory on the Upper Shāhpūr River. Their summer pastures lie in two adjoining regions. One is in the Nīrīz basin, the hills flanking the headwaters of the Upper Pulvar River and the great bend of the Upper Kūr River. The other is on the western side of the Zagros watershed on the plateau between Abūdāh and Shahrēfā. These summer pastures are verdant but treeless, ideal country for breeding horses, in which the Kashghāy specialize, importing stallions from Arabia.

Although they follow several routes on the lower and upper parts of their migration, all must converge at a place called Guyun some twenty miles north of Shirāz, and a vulnerable spot. In Shirāz is their tribal headquarters, a palace occupied by four brothers who rule the tribe, and who can reach Guyun in less than 24 hours. On the 25th of May, the Kashghāy ride both horses and camels along the valley bottoms, while along the ridges to either side mounted men drive their seven million or so sheep, mostly fat-tailed.

Although nominally Shiʿī, the Kashghāy rulers govern by the Turkish ʿadāt, or customary law, instead of by the sharīʿa. The four brothers hold their power in common because, in order to divorce, the confederation needs tight organization, run like clockwork. The brothers must constantly make the rounds of the followers, listen to complaints, administer ad hoc justice, officiate at ceremonies, and make their presences known and felt. Like that of the Bakhtiyārī, their ruling family includes men educated in Europe and America. As might be expected, from time to time their autonomy has been challenged by the central government.

The easternmost of the Zagros nomads are the Khamsehs, so-called because they consist of five units, brought together over 100 years ago under the leadership of the Kavām family of merchants in Shirāz. One unit, the Bāšīrī tribe, is Persian-speaking. A second, consisting of the Jebbara and Shaybānī and other Arab tribes, all speak Arabic, while the third is made up of the Turkish-speaking Aynalu, Bahārū, and Nafar. The first two are now settled while the third has joined the Bāšīrī. In winter the Khamseh nomads live on the coastal plain east of the Kashghāy. They move to and from their summer pastures, also located east of the Kashghāy's, via the Persepolis plain and over different routes. On both migrations, but not in winter or summer quarters, the Bāšīrī are accompanied by Gypsies who provide them with services in return for protection.

Returning to northwestern Iran, in the country bordering Soviet Ādāharbāyjān, we are next concerned with the Turkish-speaking Shāhshavans, or King's Guards. North of Menāb and near Khūy, they occupy about 100 villages with about 100,000 inhabitants, and an equal number of seasonal nomads are organized into four main tribes, living farther east. These tribesmen are seasonally nomadic, living during the summer in felt-covered yurt-like portable dwellings, with their roofs reaching a peak rather than being domed. They are first-rate horsemen, and long served the Shāhs as guardians of the Russian border.

The two northernmost tribes spend their summers on the Savallān Dāgh between Ahar and Ardabil, and winter on the Mughān Steppe, a lowland area shared by the Ādāharbāyjān SSR and Iranian Adharbāyjān. The other two summer in the hills north of Sāwa and Hamadān and move in winter to the inner side of the central plateau, on the northern edge of the Dast-i Kavir, which is snow-free at that season.

In the western Alburz mountains live a few other tribes, both Turkish and Kurdish speaking, who dwell in black tents in high pastures during the summer, and winter lower down, but not far enough down to avoid deep snow; in winter some of their sheep freeze and wolves devour them.

In the eastern Alburz, east of a line between
Gurgān and Dāmghān, the crest of the range divides, forming the walls of a valley whose waters flow into both the Atrak River and the canals of Mashhad. Both Kurds and Turks have lived in this valley ever since Shāh ‘Abbās moved them there from the Zagros in about 1031/1622. While the Turks have since become sedentary, the Kurds are still partly pastoral, and live in black tents.

A different type of pastoral nomadism is practised by the Yamut Turkomans who live in domed, felt-covered yurts north of Gurgān from the southeastern corner of the Caspian Sea to Gunbad-i Kābūs. Beyond the Russian border, more than 600,000 more Turkomans are found in the Turkmen SSR and in Afghanistan. The Turkomans are typical Central Asiatic nomads, who raise horses, cattle, sheep, and hardy one-humped camels. They drive four-wheeled wagons, as well as riding horseback, and many now drive cooperatively-owned trucks. Their women weave the famous rugs known to the trade as Bokharas.

On the outskirts of Gurgān city is a refugee camp of about 500 Kirghiz who fled from the Soviet Union in 1935 and 1936. They are mostly employed by the Highway Department in moving earth in their high, two-wheeled carts.

Moving to the Persian Gulf, we find Arabs scattered all the way from the ‘Irākī border to Pakistan, except for a stretch of shore held by the Kashghāy and the Persian port of Bushire, out of which Persian dhows sail as far afield as Aden and the African coast. Most of the Arab population of Iran is tribally organized, whether sedentary or nomadic, and Shīʿī, although one tribe, the Banū Tamīm, is Sunni. The two largest tribes are the Al Kāthir and the Banū Lam.

Most of the semi-settled tribes keep cattle, sheep, and camels, cultivate rice and other cereals, and either own or work in date groves. This mixed economy sets complicated time-tables for some of them. For example, the Muhaysīn leave their palm groves on the east bank of the Šaṭṭ al-ʿArab in November to sow their grain fields along the banks of the Kārūn River, return in February to pollinate their date-palms, and are off again in May to reap their grain, going back once more to harvest their dates in July and August. Like their brethren west of the Šaṭṭ al-ʿArab, they are in every sense un-acclimatized ethnic Arabs, although none are full-time camel nomads like the bedouin.

Farther east along the coast are maritime settlements of Arab seamen who ply their dhows and bāms to both sides of the Indian Ocean. Lingeh is their principal port. Nomadic, tent-dwelling Arabs also live in small groups scattered along the eastern edge of the Dašt-i Lūt and beyond Mashhad into Soviet territory.

Except for the coast, the southeastern corner of Iran is principally occupied by Balūcīs, whose territory also extends northward between the edge of the desert and the Afghan border to Lake Hamūn, fed by the Helmand River. Others live in Afghānīstān and Pakistan; in the latter country they are most numerous. Their economic adaptation is to desert country where grass grows in winter. In summer they camp near permanent water; along banāds serving dependent Persian villages and along the banks of the Helmand and Hari Rūd. Divided into more than a dozen tribes, the Balūcīs are Sunnis, but they also revere the graves of pīrs, or holy men.

Like the Kurds, they speak an Iranian language of their own. They breed horses, asses, mules, camels, and sheep. Considering themselves a warrior caste, the Balūcīs used to keep the caravan roads open for a fee, to draw rent from villages that they own, and to raid each other for slaves.

Scattered among the Balūcīs are Dravidian-speaking Brāhūls, whose home is in Kalat in Pakistan. They live in small groups of families all the way up the eastern side of Iran to Mashhad and Sārāqbīs. Many of the Brāhūl men serve in the police and the national gendarmerie.

Near Lake Hamūn in Sīstān live four tribes of nomadic Persians, the Sarbandīs, Shāreksīs, Khimars, and Herātīs, totalling about four thousand families. About them we have no detailed information. In the swamps and along the aquatic labyrinth of the mouths of the Helmand is a small population of fishermen and fowlers called Șayyāyād ("hunters"). They catch both fish and ducks in nets, and appear to be the residue of an earlier hunting people.

Viewing the demography and ethnography of Iran

Languages of Iran and Afghanistan
From Caravan, the Story of Middle East, by Carleton S. Coon, London 1952.
as a whole, it would be hard to find another Islamic country of its size as decentralized as Iran is geo-
graphically and containing as many different peoples and languages. Yet since Achaeenian times it has
remained, with a few interruptions, a nation, the world’s oldest empire,  and with the help of modern
transportation and communication, it seems so destined to remain.
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(C. S. Cook)

iii.—LANGUAGES [see suppl.]

iv.—PRE-ISLAMIC MYTHOLOGY

The chief sources for Iranian mythology are the Avesta and the deeds of kings and heroes collected by
the historians and poets of the early centuries of Islam. Their information doubtless came from the
“ancient annals” of Iran, the Khuday-námak. The longest of these works is the famous Shah-náma of
Firdawsi (350/641-411/1020 [q.v.]). The evidence of ancient Greek historians, rock inscriptions and some
Mazdaean books and literary works, rich in pre-Islamic materials but often compiled in Islamic
times, are also very valuable. Besides the Avesta attributed to Zoroaster, there may be mentioned the
Dnkhart (a vast commentary on the Avesta, completed in the 3rd/9th century), and the great
Bundahishn (Book of the Creation). Numerous Mazdaean works written in Pahlavi, the bearers of
the ancient tradition, have in large measure only been known for less than two centuries, and the
Islamic Iranian world was dependent on traditions recorded in Persian and Arabic by early Muslim
writers for its knowledge of a history that was partly only mythology. Ancient Iran continued for a long
time to elaborate its mythology from pre-Mazdaean and Mazdaean sources. In the course of centuries
chivalrous exploits and an exalted human dignity were grafted on to them. This elaboration in its
popular form, written down in Persian, came to an end in the 5th/11th century when the pre-Islamic
sources and the oral traditions gave birth to several “books of kings” and historical summaries culmina-
ting in the Shah-náma of Firdawsi.

Iranian mythology, rich as it is, has some common
features and some undeniable affinities with that of
India, but the power and preponderant role of some
Indian gods are relegated to a secondary level in Iran.
The analogies and differences between the myths
of Iran and those of the Indo-European world are
particularly worthy of interest and reveal some
relationship between their systems of thought. The
tripartite idea of society (priests, warriors and cattle-
breeders/agriculturists) which G. Dumézil remark-
ably demonstrated in the mythology of India and the
Indo-European peoples is at present held in great
favour. These three hierarchical functions which are
confirmed in the Avesta (Y. xi, 6, xiii, 5; Yt xiii,
58-9, xix, 8, xxi, 16; Vi iv, 28, 39, xii, 6, etc.) and to which the Yasna xix, 17, adds a fourth,
that of the artisans, continued with some slight mod-
ifications (priests, dabirán officials, warriors and
artisans-peasants) to make up the social order of
Iran until the end of the Sasanid period. There is
ever reason to believe that the tetraramous division
of society, whether it was due to the Yazna or to the
social reorganization of the Sasanid period, follows
this triad of hierarchical functions.

Certain memories preserved in the Gathas (the
oldest part of the Avesta) and several Yaghts of the
Avesta betoken a pre-Mazdaean mythology. The two
primordial spirits, Spanta mainyu (Holy Spirit) and
Ahra mainyu (Spirit of Evil) correspond to the two
anthithetical aspects of Vayu, at the same time the
good and the bad wind which is the breathing-spirit and
the motive force of the Universe. The Indian counter-
part of Vayu is Váyu who stands at the head of a
series of functional divinities. In the same manner,
but by a reversal of the Indian position, the Iranians
contrasted the nature of the ahura (Indian asura) with
that of the daeva (Indian d£va). These latter, whom
the Indians considered as good, take on a malignant
character in Iran, while the malignant asura make
way for the benignant Iranian ahura. The Indian god
Indra, who is assigned the function of a warrior, sees his role reversed in Iran where he becomes a
demon in the Videvdh (the part of the Avesta dealing
with canonical law and exorcism) x, 9 and xix, 43.

The series of the great Mazdaean divinities is
made up of Ahura Mazda, the supreme god, and six
cities called Amasha Spanta (Holy Immortals) who
surround him: 1) Vahu Manah (Good Spirit), an entity
protecting the conscience of just men and to whom the
ix is connected. Her auxiliaries are the Fravashi (pro-
Geush Urvan (the spirit of the primordial ox) and
Rām, a helping divinity which guides the soul after
death. 2) Āsha (Order-Justice), an entity guarantee-
inng cosmic and moral order. She is seconded by Atar
(the divinity of Fire), Vṛīraga (a god who embodies
the victorious attack) and Sraoša (a god of Vigilance
and Obedience). 3) Šāhāvēr (Kingdom), the entity
presiding over metals and thus over arms and the
army. She fills the role of warrior or rather of de-
defender of the poor, and she is helped by the Sun,
the Sky and Mitras whom a remarkable rise made
a rival of Ahura Mazda and who became the object
of a cult in the west, the cult of Mithraism. 4) Ar-
maiti (Moderation), the goddess of fecundity and
mercy, to whom the earth is linked. The secondary
divinities accompanying her are Ardivisura Anahita
(the waters) and in second place Daena (or Dēn in
Pahlavi), Religion. 5) Haurvatat (Integrity) whose
associated divinities are Tishtiyya (Sirius), Vāta
(the Wind), and the Fravashī (protective spirits).
6) Amaratat (Immortality), the guardian of plants,
and several Mazdaean works written in Pahlavi, the bearers of the ancient tradition, have in large measure only been known for less than two centuries, and the Islamic Iranian world was dependent on traditions recorded in Persian and Arabic by early Muslim writers for its knowledge of a history that was partly only mythology. Ancient Iran continued for a long time to elaborate its mythology from pre-Mazdaean and Mazdaean sources. In the course of centuries chivalrous exploits and an exalted human dignity were grafted on to them. This elaboration in its popular form, written down in Persian, came to an end in the 5th/11th century when the pre-Islamic sources and the oral traditions gave birth to several "books of kings" and historical summaries culminating in the Shah-náma of Firdawsi. Iranian mythology, rich as it is, has some common features and some undeniable affinities with that of India, but the power and preponderant role of some Indian gods are relegated to a secondary level in Iran. The analogies and differences between the myths
multitude of Yazata and Fravashi, who are considered as divinities with less well defined roles, fill out the Iranian pantheon, and hence the idea arises that the origin of angels might be linked to them and to the holy Immortals. A malignant spirit belonging to the train of Ahra Mainyu is opposed to each divinity in the cortege of Ahura Mazda.

If the tripartite division of G. Dumézil is borne in mind, the entities Vahu Manah and Agha correspond to the Indian gods Mitra and Varuna and they fulfill, along with Ahura Mazda, the first function of the Iranian pantheon. The function of the warrior is incumbent upon the Iranian Khsharita as it is upon the Indian Indra. Finally, the function of production and wealth is shared between Armaity (goddess of fertility, the Earth) and the Haurvatat and Amaratat who are related to the Indian divinities, the goddess Sarasvati, the twin Nasayas, and others.

The Mazdaean holy Immortals are at the same time abstract representations giving Ahura Mazda his fullness and beings who, although superior to creatures, remain inferior to Ahura Mazda. They are shown both as personal Agents and personified Powers. The antagonism which sets the Spirit of Good and the Spirit of Evil in opposition, the basis for Iranian dualism, is the metaphysic and the morality of this mythology. According to the great Bundahish (ch. i), the Upper World, spiritual and moral beings, have been the domain of Hormazd (Ahura Mazda) since the beginning of creation, while the nether region is the shadowy world of Ahriman (Ahra Mainyu). An intermediate space divides these two worlds, a mixed world in which good and evil do battle. In this continuous conflict the force of Ahriman faces the army of Hormazd and finally the Spirit of Good triumphs over the Spirit of Evil. Each being must take part in this struggle and it is thanks to his meritorious actions, his good thoughts and words, that Man participates in the final victory.

Ahura Mazda has gradually taken the place of Spanta Mainyu, his own emanation, so as to confront the Spirits of Evil himself. He has granted Ahra Mainyu a respite of 12,000 years and knows his plans in advance.

Alongside this divine mythology, there is a human mythology related to it. In large measure it is presented in the form of historical epics situated (with some exceptions such as the longevity of certain heroes) on the human plane. They tell of a succession of events which are linked together by their own chronology. The first man, Gayomart, directly succeeding the creation of the primordial ox, his source of food, gives birth to an androgynous plant which divides into two, Mashya and Mashyani, the ancestors of human beings. According to the Avesta the first sovereign is not Gayomart, as the Shiklah-nama of Firdawsi states, but Yima (or Djamshid in Persian). A latent force, described as a victorious light (Khvarnah), a witness of celestial favour, protects Iran and numerous sovereigns and ancient heroes. The Khvarnah abandons Yima who has committed a sin (falsehood or pride) and thus Ahzi Dahaka, a foreign tyrant, defeats Yima and steals his kingship. Ohratauna (= Faridun), an Iranian hero who has become king thanks to the protection of Khvarnah, triumphs over Ahzi Dahaka (Y. ix, 8; Vt xiv, 49, xix, 92; Vt i, 17) and puts him in chains on mount Damavand. He is at the beginning of the universal genealogy of races and human peoples since he shared out the world among his three sons: to Iradj went Iran and India; to Salm the countries to the west of Iran, i.e., the lands of the Semites and the blacks; and to Tur the countries to the east of Iran, the lands of the Turks (Central Asia) and the Chinese (the Far East). This division of the world is not without echoes of Noah's giving the country of the Turks to Japheth, the tropical countries to Ham, and the lands of the Semites to Shem.

Several kings of this Peshdadi dynasty, the descendants of Iradj, reign in succession in Iran and then make way for the second mythical dynasty, that of the Kayanids. Yaqt xix (Zamiad Yagh) and Yaqt xiii (Farvardin Yagh) of the Avesta mention a list of Peshdadi and Kayanid heroes and kings on the occasion of praises addressed to their Khvarnah and their Fravah (or Fravashi), i.e., their protective spirits. Among them may be mentioned the Kayanids Kavi Usan (Persian Kay Kavous), Kavi Haosravali (Kay Khosrow), and Kavi Vistasp (Kay Gostasp). It was under Vistasp that Zoroaster preached his doctrine. The Peshdadi and Kayanid kings are personal-types of Iranian mythology. Moreover, it is to be noted that, if the figures of the first dynasty are common with those of India, the Kayanids who make up the second dynasty are specifically Iranian heroes.

These historised myths recount the main facts which occurred in an era without archives. This human mythology mingles with the other divine one and, by a cyclical spiritual and temporal conception of time, the Pahlavi Mazdaean books explain the reappearance of certain ancient heroes and kings, Peshdiddis and Kayanids, who are to play their definitive role at the end of time. The three sons of Zoroaster are to succeed each other every three thousand years from the beginning of the fourth millennium. The last of these sons, Saoshyant, will, together with Kay Khosrow, put an end to the corruption and iniquity of the world. The champion Saoshyant will finally give way to Zoroaster, and the king Kay Khosrow to Gostasp. Thus there will be established eternal life and the return to cosmic origins.

An apocalyptic literature, enriched by elements of myth and folklore, flourished in the Mazdaean books and expressed the hopes of believers.

On the margin of Mazdaean orthodoxy was to be found the belief in a god of time, Zervun, who engendered two sons, Ohrmazd and Ahriman, whose struggle began even in the womb. Ahriman, conceived of doubt, struggled to come into the world before Ohrmazd, but Zervun made his plans miscarry. The cult of Mithras (propagated about the beginning of the Christian era) and Manichaeism (preached after the 3rd century A.D.) preserved the dualist nature of Iranian religious thought, and it was not until its encounter with Islam that the mythical antagonism of Mazdaism was directed towards an absolute monotheism by the accentuation of its moral and transcendental values.

When the prophet Muhammad was born the Sasanian empire, the conquest, which took place in Persia which followed was undertaken mainly from the garrison cities of Bāṣra and Kūfah. The area to the north of Nihavand, taken by the Kifans, was known as Māh Kūfah, while the territory further south round Dinavar was taken by their Bāṣran rivals and known as Māh Bāṣra. The occupation of Khorāsān (17/639—21/643) was organized by the governor of Bāṣra, Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī, who also took part in the conquest of Mesopotamia (18/639—20/641). Expeditions also set out towards Ṭabarïyāḏ from Mawsil. Ardashīl capitulated about 20/641. The final defeat of the Persian army took place at Nihavand in 21/642. Hamadān made peace and further conquests were made in the direction of Ṭabarānīyāḏ (variously recorded under the years 18/639—22/643). Expeditions were also sent against Kāzwin, Abhar, and Zanjandān, and efforts made to take Daylam and Gilān. Hamadān appears to have broken the terms of the peace, for it is recorded as being stormed in 24/645. Rayy and ʿArousīn fell also about 24/644-5. Although the battles of Kādisīyā, Dalalā and Nihavand were decisive in the overthrow of the Sasanian empire, the conquest, which took place piecemeal, was not completed for many years and the conversion of its people took much longer. The conquest was carried out mainly from the garrison cities by Muslim Arabs, who were by this time far removed from their nomadic background. There was some settlement of Arabs chiefly in the towns; and also of some nomadic groups mainly in southern Persia and ʿAhrār. Much of the former system of administration continued in operation. The tax records were kept in Pahlavi by local scribes until the time of Ḥadiṣādi [q.v.] and many of the daḵābīn continued to carry out on behalf of the Arabs the
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functions they had fulfilled under the Sasanians (see also M. Sprengling, From Persian to Arabic, in A. J. S. L., lvi-lvii (1939-40)). From the account of Tabari it appears that prior to Anūshīravān the land tax was assessed on a crop-sharing basis. This led to abuses, and Anūshīravān replaced crop-sharing by measurement as the basis for assessment. He also reformed the poll-tax, grading it according to the taxpayer's income. The seven great families (including the royal family), the leading officials, soldiers, priests, and officials in the service of the king were exempt. The payment of poll-tax was, therefore, regarded as degrading.

After the defeat of the Persian army at Djalūlā, ʿUmar was faced with the problem of the administration of the conquests in the Sawād. He could not conclude treaties as Khālid had done, because large areas had been abandoned by the ruling classes and had remained without a government. He therefore decided to immobilize the land and to levy land and poll taxes on the inhabitants, the revenue therefrom to be fajr for the profit of the Muslim warriors and those who came after them. In the name of the Muslim state, he assumed full ownership of the estates and villages which had formerly belonged to the Sasanian royal family and the nobility who had been killed or fled, leaving the peasants on the land, and of deserted and "dead" lands. This assumption of ownership carried with it the right to cultivate the lands for the state, give them away, sell them, or grant them as assignments, and to impose on the holders ḥārāḏī or ʿwahr. In the case of estates and villages still in the possession of their former owners, ʿUmar considered that the legal title belonged to the Muslim state, on the ground that the Persians who had resisted conquest, but he allowed them to remain in possession on condition that they paid to the Muslim state the taxes which had formerly been paid to Anūshīravān, and acted as the agents of the Muslim state in their collection. This category of land was probably the largest. Alterations were later made in the rates of taxation paid and the crops on which taxes were levied. This arrangement differed from the case of Ḥira and other towns which had treaties providing for the payment of a fixed sum. In such cases the population raised this sum by whatever means they wished, and after its payment were released from further interference by the Arab government.

In addition to land tax, the non-Muslims paid a graded poll-tax, except that in towns which had treaties they paid such tax only as their own officials assessed it. In 20/641 a dārāḏī on the Persian model was set up, and in it were recorded receipts, expenditure, and stipends. It was not, however, until the reign of Muʿawiyah that the foundations of the future bureaucratic system were really laid, when Ziyād, the governor of Basra (45/665—50/670) and of Ṭirāk (50/670—53/673), established dārāḏīs and appointed Arabs and maṣālī as secretaries. Several dahāḥīn became Muslims after the battle of Djalūlā and various groups in south Persia joined with the Arabs, but there is no evidence of widespread conversion after the early conquests. It also seems that some of those who were exempt from the payment of poll-tax in Sasanian times became Muslims rather than pay poll-tax to the Muslims, since to pay such was considered degrading.

The circumstances of conquest varied in different provinces and from this stemmed differences in the tax administration. Towns which did not capitulate before conquest, but asked for an armistice after resistance had seemed hopeless, were required to pay a poll-tax in money and a contribution in kind, which could be increased or decreased as the population changed. The land, having been taken by force, was placed at the disposal of the āḥādīn, but in contradiction to land which had capitulated before conquest (ʿāḥād land) the terms of the agreement (ṣulh) could be changed. Śulḥ and ʿāḥād lands had their own local administration, whereas ḥārāḏī lands were closely regulated by the Arab dārāḏīs. (For a discussion of these problems see D. C. Dennett, Conversion and the poll tax in early Islam, Harvard University Press and Oxford University Press, 1950.)

Although Yazdigird's supporters were still active in northern Fārs, organized resistance ceased after the defeats suffered by the royal army. Some local communities and marbānīs with their troops continued to resist. Others concluded treaties with the Arabs on their own account. Many of the Persian captives became maṣālī and some of Yazdigird's army joined the Arabs. About 23/643 ʿUghmān b. Abī ʿAṣṭa Thakafi made advances into southern Fārs from Bahrayn, supported by Abū Mūsā from Başra. Tawwādī fell and raids were made on towns in Fārs. Further advances were made during the caliphate of ʿUghmān and between 25/644 and 27/647-8 ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmir, who had been appointed governor of the Ṭirāk region, took Atrak, Šāhi, Shirīn, Dārāḏīrīd, and Fāsā. ʿIšaʾišīrī fell in 28/648-9 and Gūr (Firūzābād) shortly afterwards. In the following year ʿAbd Allāh set out for Khurāsān. Yazdigird, pursued by a Muslim force, had meanwhile fled via Kirmān to Marv. Sirdjān, Bam, and Diirūft were conquered, and Hurmuz fell in 30/650-1. Skirmishes with the inhabitants of the mountain districts of Kirmān continued for many years.

From Kirmān the Arabs under Rabīʿ b. Ziyād al-Hārithī pushed north-eastwards into Sistān. His successor was expelled from the country, but another expedition was sent by ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmir under ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Samura, who penetrated to Zamin Dāwar, Bust, and Zābul. ʿAbd Allāh had meanwhile reached Tabasayn and sent Aḥnāf b. Kays to take Kūhštān, whence he pressed on to Marv, which surrendered; Yazdigird fled to Bīlkh and over the Oxus to Tirmiḥ. In 31/651-2 he was murdered in flight near Murgāb. The Muslims under Aḥnāf took Dīzdjān and Bālkh and advanced to Khūwārazm. ʿAbd Allāh had meanwhile set out for Nishāpūr, which surrendered; Bayḫaḵ, Nīsā, and Sarāhsī also fell. Another group went to Harāt (32/653). ʿAbd Allāh then returned, leaving Kays b. al-Hayḥam as governor of Khurāsān.

ʿUghmān died in 35/656. The conquests in Persia were not yet secure, and during the civil war the Arab advance was stayed in Khurāsān fighting broke out between Muḥājir and Rabiʿa. The disorders spread throughout the province and enabled the Transoxanian leaders to regain their independence which had been on the point of being extinguished. Bālkh for a brief period fell under Chinese control. Numerous outbreaks of resistance also occurred in other parts of Persia. In 42/662 Muʿawiyah reappointed ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmir governor of Basra and the east. He sent ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Samura to restore Arab rule in Sistān and Khurāsān. Bālkh was reconquered in 43/663, Sistān reoccupied and Kābūl taken. The reconquest of Khurāsān, begun by Kays b. al-Hayḥam, was continued by Ziyād b. Abī Sulayf, who established a strong garrison in Bālkh shortly afterwards settled 50,000 Arab colonists in Khurāsān. Būhghāra was captured in 54/674 and Samarkand fell in 56/676.
In Khurasan the local leaders had mainly capitulated by treaties (‘ahd) which stipulated that a fixed sum should be paid annually to the Arabs. Local administration remained in the hands of the local leaders. The inhabitants, for the most part, continued to pay land, trade, and poll taxes as they had under the Sasanians; local officials kept the registers and collected the taxes, paying the stipulated amount to the Arabs and keeping the remainder. Conversion in Khurasan, partly because of the large number of Arabs who had migrated there, was probably higher than elsewhere. Large numbers of, mawāli were mentioned as accompanying the Arabs on their campaigns against the Turks of Central Asia. The local tax-collectors do not appear to have released all converts from poll-tax, or, if they did, they increased the converts’ other taxes to compensate for the loss to the revenue of their poll-taxes. This led to discontent and rebellion. (See further Dennett, op. cit.).

‘Irak meanwhile had been reduced to a state of turmoil by the activities of the Khāridjites and the Shi‘a. In 66/685 Mukhtar, launching a revolt in the name of Ibn al-Hanafiyya, seized Kūf. There were mawāli, many of whom were Persians, among his followers but his main support came from the dissatisfaction of Arabs of Kūf; they were not defeated until 67/682. (See M. A. Shaban, The Abbāsid Revolution, Cambridge 1970, 145-6.) In 65/684-5 the Azārīka branch of the Khāridjites withdrew from ‘Irak to Khūṣīstān, and created many disorders in the territory between Bāṣra and Ahwāz. After Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra defeated them in 66/685 they retreated to Fārs. Regrouping themselves, they returned to ‘Irāk and sacked Mādā‘īn, and on the advance of an army from Kūf, they withdrew. They next attacked Iṣlahān, but were defeated and fled in disorder to Fārs and Kīrmān (68/687-8). Once more they reassembled, reoccupied Ahwāz and advanced on Bāṣra. ‘Abd al-Malik had meanwhile recovered control of ‘Irāk and appointed Ḥadidjādī governor of the province in 75/694. Al-Muhallab, whom Ḥadidjādī sent against the Azārīka, forced them to retreat to Kāẓimān and then to evacuate Fārs. Retiring to Džirūf, they maintained themselves there for some years, but finally split among themselves. One group took refuge in Tabaristan, where they were defeated in 78/698-9, while a second remained in Kīrmān, to be extirpated by Al-Muhallab. The last remnants of the Azārīka were finally rooted out near Kūmīs.

Civil war broke out in Khūṣīstān among the Arabs after the death of the caliph Yazīd in 64/683. In 78/697, after a renewed outbreak of disorder, ‘Abd al-Malik added Khūṣīstān and Sīstān to Ḥadidjādī’s government. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī ‘Arāḥū (see Ibn al-Asnām ‘Athir), who was sent by Ḥadidjādī from Kīrmān to Sīstān, recovered part of the province. After Ḥadidjādī had reproached him for not pushing his advance with greater vigour, he returned to ‘Irāk, and attacked Ḥadidjādī in Bāṣra, but was defeated in 82/701. Khūṣīstān was then entrusted to Al-Muhallab, but it was not until Ḥadidjādī sent Kutayba b. Muslim to Khūṣīstān as governor in 83/705 or 86/705 that the Muslim advance was resumed. Lower Tukhārīstān was recovered in 86/705, Bukhāra between 87/706 and 90/709, and Arab authority consolidated in the Oxus valley and extended to Sughd between 91/709 and 93/712. Dissatisfied Arabs of Kūf. The next ten years or so were occupied by military operations of a somewhat confused nature (see Bartold, op. cit., 139 ff.). Arab dominion was not fully restored until the governorship of Naṣr b. Sayyār (121/738—131/748). He decreed that Muslims and non-Muslims must pay kharādi but only unbelievers poll-tax. To enforce this without damage to the revenue, he reduced kharādi and in the stipulated tribute according to the treaty of capitulation. (See further Dennett, op. cit.). Although Naṣr b. Sayyār brought a measure of prosperity to the province and corrected some of the abuses in the tax administration, he failed to restore order fully or to remove the grievances of the Arab settlers, while the resentments of the mawāli were also not entirely removed. It was among these two groups in Khūṣīstān that ‘Abbāsid propaganda achieved its success.

Umayyad rule, for different reasons, antagonized various groups of people. The hegemony of the Syrians was resented by the ‘Irākis and others, pious Muslims were alienated by the profanity and worldliness of the Umayyads, the Shi‘a, whose alleged wrongs culminated at Karbalā, were disaffected, as also were the Khāridjites and many of the mawāli because of their position of inferiority. Persians, however, were to be found mainly only amongst the last named group. Muḥammad b. ‘Ali, a grandson of al-‘Abbās, the prophet’s uncle, who had become the leader of the Ḥāshimiyīṡīya on the death of Abū Ḥāṣim in 98/716, sent missionaries from Kūf to the Persian provinces. The first to have any considerable success was Ḥādīš (first mentioned under the year 105/722-8). He obtained a following in Marv among Arabs, mawāli, Khurramiyā, and Rāwandiyya, uniting these disparate groups by the wish to overthrow the Umayyads. He was executed in 118/736 and disavowed for his extremist views by Muḥammad b. ‘Ali. The latter died in 125/743 and was succeeded by his son Ibrāhīm, who sent Abū Muslim, a mawāli from Kūf, to Khūṣīstān. His main appeal was to the Arab settlers in Khūṣīstān and his movement was primarily directed against Umayyad and Syrian rule. But he also won support from the Persian mawāli and some Zoroastrian and Buddhist dāhānīs. In the new society promised by the revolution all members were to be regarded only as Muslims with the same rights and responsibilities regardless of their racial origins and tribal connections. (Shaban, op. cit., 135 ff.). Revolt broke out in 130/747. The Arabs, preoccupied with their intertribal feuds, made little effort to check it. Marv was seized and the whole of Khūṣīstān fell. Advancing via Ravy and Nīḥāvand, ‘Abbāsid forces crossed the
Euphrates and defeated the Umayyads near Kufa (132/749). Abu 'l-Abbas al-Saffāb was proclaimed caliph shortly afterwards. Another 'Abbāsids army had meanwhile defeated an Umayyad force near Shahrizur in 134/750, and the fate of the Umayyads was sealed by a second engagement, the battle of the Greater Zab, in 132/750. 'Abbāsids troops advanced to Syria, occupied Damascus and pursued Marwān to Egypt, where he was killed (see further Shaban, op. cit.).

The 'Abbāsids victory was followed by the transfer of the centre of the caliphate from Syria to 'Irāk. With this the importance of Persia and the Persians in the development of Islamic civilization greatly increased. Syrian mauwâli in the entourage of the caliph were replaced by mauwâli from Persia and 'Irāk. Whereas the Umayyads had been first and foremost representatives of the Arabs, the 'Abbāsids succeeded to a much greater extent in creating an amalgam of the diverse ethnic and social elements included in their empire. The concept of the universal empire of the Sasanians had already its influence felt under the Umayyads. Under the 'Abbāsids, Sasanian traditions of government and administration were increasingly in evidence. (Cf. H. A. R. Gibb, Evolution of government in early Islam, in SI, iv, 5-17). As warriors, merchants, and 'ulāmā travelled along the great trunk roads which fanned out through Persia, there grew up, in due course, among their people a sense of sharing in a common heritage. This had two components, Islam and īrānīyyat, and was handed down on the one hand by the 'ulāmā and on the other by the udabā'. This reassertion of Persian consciousness first found expression in the Shu'ubiyah movement [q.v.], which was in Persia primarily a literature movement, and in due course the Persian language and Persian literature played an important role in keeping it alive.

'Abbāsids propaganda only temporarily united the heterogenous elements which were opposed to the Umayyads. Once victory had been achieved, the responsibilities of government prevented the 'Abbāsids leaders from satisfying the aspirations of all their followers (cf. Bartold, op. cit., 194). Rebels arose on every side. In Khurasan Abu Muslim sided with Sefid-dāmagān and in Khurramdīnīs under Khurramdīnīs, who had won support in Khurramdīnīs, but was defeated. The fifth, that of Al-Muhanna in 159/776, was the most serious. He declared that he had succeeded Abu Muslim under whom he had previously served, and that Abu Muslim had succeeded Jesus as the incarnate deity. The movement, which was inspired by extremist Shi'i ideology and also had 'social' aspects, won many followers in eastern Khurāsān and Transoxania. It was not put down until 163/778. This was not all. There was also a series of Kharājījī disturbances in Khurāsān, Sistan and Transoxania, notably that led by Yūsuf al-Barm in Bukhāra about 160/777. On the other hand, in Tabaristan the Arabs made considerable advances and from about 141/758 appointed governors over the province.

Meanwhile it was not only in Khurāsān that there was turmoil. In 'Irāk there was intellectual ferment and social unrest. This was expressed in a movement generally known by the term zandaka [q.v.]. Its general purpose appears to have been partly at least to curtail the range of Islam and to keep alive Persian cultural traditions. The zindākīs were thought to have retained, in spite of conversion, their former Manichean convictions and to wish to encompass the downfall of Islam (Cambridge History of Islam, Cambridge 1971, i, 114). The movement also spread among the lower classes as a revolutionary movement. By the time of the accession of Hārūn al-Rashīd (170/780), the Persian provinces were in a state of unrest, and 'Abbāsids authority was challenged in Khurāsān and the Caspian provinces. Harūn made his secretary and tutor, Yahyā b. Ḥakīm (whose father had served al-Saffāb and al-Maṣūr) his vizier. For some seventeen years until their fall in 187/803 Yahyā and his two sons played a prominent and crucial role in the affairs of the caliphate, and continued the work started under al-Mansūr of creating a balance between the two main elements in the empire, the Arab and the Persian.

In the east, the rapacity of the governor of Khurāsān, 'Ali b. ʾĪsā b. Māḥān, had meanwhile caused considerable discontent, and in 180/796-7 Hārūn set out himself to investigate affairs. 'Ali b. ʾĪsā came to meet him at Rayy and secured his position by gifts. Hārūn returned to Baghdād, leaving the causes of discontent unremedied. Rāfī' b. Layṭh, the grandson of Naṣr b. Sayyār, put himself at the head of the malcontents, made an agreement with the Turkish tribes and killed the son of 'Ali b. ʾĪsā (191/807). Hārūn then sent Harḫāma b. Aṣyān to seize 'Ali b. ʾĪsā and confiscate his possessions, and dispatched a free pardon to Rāfī' in the vain hope that he would submit. Rāfī', who had won support in Khwarazm, Bukhāra, Farghāna, and Ugrūsāna, and among the Ghuzz, remained to all intents and purposes master of Transoxania. In 192/808 a revolt also broke out in Aḏharbāyjān, to be followed later by widespread and prolonged disorders by the Khurramdīnīs under Bābak [q.v.].

Finally, Hārūn, having sent Maʿmūn in advance to Marv, set out against Rāfī', but died en route at Tūs in 193/809. Civil war broke out almost at once.
between al-Amin, Harun's son by an Arab wife, who had been declared wa'il 'ashid in 175/792, and al-Ma'mun, the son of a Persian slave-girl, who had been made the next heir to al-Amin in 183/799, and whose sovereignty over the eastern part of the empire had been recognized by al-Amin in 186/802 [see AL-AMIN]. Harun's vizier, Fa'jil b. Rabi', led the troops back to Baghda'd and read the khutba in the name of al-Amin first and then of al-Ma'mun. In the following year al-Amin introduced the name of his son Musa after that of al-Ma'mun. The latter, apparently on the advice of his vizier, Fa'jil b. Sahil, a convert to Islam from Zoroastrianism, refused to be inveigled by his brother into going to Baghda'd and remained in Marv. In 195/810 Fa'jil b. Rabi induced al-Amin to drop al-Ma'mun's name from the khutba and substitute for it that of Musa, and to send an army against al-Ma'mun. The latter made peace with Rabi' b. Layh, leaving him virtually master of Transoxania, struck coins in his own name, took the Shi'i title, imam al-hudha', and sent his general Tahir b. al-Husayn against al-Amin.

After defecting al-Amin's forces near Hamada'd, Tahir marched on Baghda'd and laid siege to the city. It fell in 196/813. Al-Amin was murdered; Ma'mun then appointed Tahir over the whole of Irak. Later Hasan b. Sahil, the brother of Fa'jil, was entrusted with the governorship of the Djibal, Fars, Khuzistan, and Irak, and Tahir was given the Djazira with the frontier regions, Syria and Egypt. Hasan b. Sahil had to contend with various revolts. One of the most serious was in 199-200/815 in Kufa led by Abu Sarayya, who raised the standard of revolt in the name of an 'Alid, Ibn Tabajab (whom he poisoned in due course). There were also teasingly frequent riots in the city of Baghda'd. In 201/817 al-Ma'mun, on the advice of Fa'jil b. Sahil, and probably in the hope of putting an end to 'Alid movements of revolt, declared 'Ali b. Musa al-Rid, the eighth imam, his wa'il 'ashid and married him to his daughter. In the following year, the people of Baghda'd, who had already supported an abortive movement in favour of Mansur b. al-Mahdi, read the khutba in the name of Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi. Rebellion meanwhile had broken out in Egypt, and the disturbances of the Khurramdins under Bubak in Ash'harbajjlan and Arran, which had begun in 201/816, were assuming threatening proportions.

It was now clear that al-Ma'mun, if he was to control his empire, must move from Marv to the centre. In 202/818 he set out for Baghda'd but did not enter the city until 204/819. Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi fled. Fa'jil b. Sahil had meanwhile been murdered at al-Ma'mun's instigation and 'Ali b. Musa poisoned near Tus (203/818). In 205/821, al-Ma'mun appointed Tahir governor of Khurasan and Sistan. He succeeded in making himself virtually independent in Khurasan and founded the first of the semi-independent dynasties in Persia after the Islamic conquest. Tahir's son 'Abd Allah was given Tahir's government in the Djazira and remained in the western provinces until about 213/828-9. Other members of the family also held office in Baghda'd until 270/883-4, which facilitated the rise of the family to semi-independence as governors of Khurasan. It was not only in Khurasan that al-Ma'mun's power was shrinking. Riots occurred in the Djibl in 210/824 and rebellion in Mesopotamia in 214/829 and in Kumm in 216/831. Repeated efforts to suppress the rebellion of Bubak also failed and his revolt had spread to the Djibl by the end of al-Ma'mun's reign.

A new period was now beginning in the history of Persia. By this time she had been fully incorporated into the Islamic world. The Arab settlers had been largely assimilated to the local population. Conversion had proceeded throughout the country, though Zoroastrianism was still, to some extent, tolerated. The former ruling classes, so far as they had survived, had been converted to Sunni Islam, as too had the mass of the people, though there were enclaves of Shi'ism from an early period in some districts, notably Kumm, Khurasan, Khurramdins, and Sava. As the central government in Baghda'd declined old political and social tendencies began to reassert themselves more strongly and new centres of power began to emerge.

In the field of political thought, there was a strong continuity. The Sabian concept of the universal empire was greatly strengthened under the 'Abbaisids. The caliph came to be regarded as the Shadow of God upon earth (though the strictly orthodox never accepted this view). In the course of time this concept was transferred to the temporal rulers, with consequences detrimental to the freedom and dignity of the subject. Similarly, the imam's rights in regard to the ownership of land passed tacitly to the temporal rulers, and his power to delegate authority. Other Sabian concepts, such as the identification of the imam with the social order, and the hierarchical nature of society, also came to be increasingly accepted. Din and dawa were two sides of one coin, with the result that non-conformity and political opposition were inseparable. Hostile movements against the government and the ruling classes thus tended to manifest themselves under the guise of Shi'ism.

Most of the dynasties which arose as the caliphate fragmented came to power within the general political framework of the Muslim world and accepted the prevailing administrative traditions and political concepts, or if they did not before their assumption of power, they rapidly conformed once they had seized power—as in the case of the 'Abbaisids, who quickly abandoned any messianic or extremist tendencies they may have entertained before their victory over the Umayyads. There was, it is true, alongside the "conservative" tendency of society and government a messianic tendency, but its manifestations were usually fleeting. Its most striking expression in 'Abbaisid times was the Isma'ilis, a political movement by Hulagu. Broadly speaking, however, the rise of new dynasties did not materially alter the structure of society, but merely the composition of the ruling class and, sometimes, the relative importance of the different classes. From S2idjuk times onwards the balance between the settled and semi-settled elements of the population was a delicate one. After the Mongol invasion there was a widespread expansion of nomadism accompanied by a dislocation of rural and urban life.

By the death of al-Ma'mun in 218/833 the balance between the civil and military arms of the administrative had been upset. In an attempt to increase the revenue, the tax-farm became increasingly common, but the money received from the farming of the taxes soon ceased to be sufficient to pay the army leaders and their troops. The practice then arose of assigning the taxes not to taxfarmers but to the military themselves, a practice which made it easy for the military, when the central government was weak, to establish their semi-independence. The result of this was, on the one hand, the ruin of the land, and
on the other the failure of the military to support or defend the central government. This militarization of the state and the growing tendency of the military to be occupied not only with the arts of war but also with administration became marked not only in ʿIrāk and the western provinces but also in the east under the Sāmānids and more especially the Ghaznavids. Under the Būyids the military did not normally live on their assignments or ʿiṣḥaʾ, but sent their agents to collect the revenue in return for his ʿiṣḥaʾ the soldier had to perform military service and was in theory subject to detailed regulations and inspection. A provincial governor could distribute the area under his jurisdiction as ʿiṣḥaʾ but he did this as an official of the state. Legally the possession of an ʿiṣḥaʾ did not give the holder rights of jurisdiction over the inhabitants, but in practice it contributed to the spread of patronage under the Būyids there were widespread acts of usurpation by the military. Further, the tendency for the function of the provincial governor, provincial military commander, tax collector, taxfarmer, and ʿuqūd to be combined in one person led to the emergence of large properties virtually independent of the central government. Under the Būyids the military ʿiṣḥaʾ was the dominant type. Under the Great Saldжуks there took place an assimilation of the military office of ʿiṣḥaʾ to the governorate or administrative ʿiṣḥaʾ and the tendency for the ʿiṣḥaʾ to be defined not by fiscal value but by service and to become by usurpation a hereditary domain over which the ʿuqūd had governmental prerogatives (see further, A. K. S. Lambton, Reflections on the ʿiṣḥaʾ, in Arabic and Islamic studies in honor of Hamilton A. R. Gibb, ed. G. Makdisi, Leiden 1965 and C. Cahen, L’évolution de l’ʿiṣḥaʾ du IXᵉ au XIIIᵉ siècle in Annales, E.S.C., 1953).

Throughout, though especially from Saldжуks times onwards, four strands were closely interwoven: administration, taxation, tenure, and military service (though society was not feudal in the technical sense). The main burden of supporting the government rested upon the peasantry. Agriculture, especially in the pre-Mongol period, showed an astonishing recuperative power. This is probably to be explained in part by the fact that the local village communities formed relatively stable and, to some extent, self-governing communities under their own kadkhudds, and in part to the fact that in the pre-Mongol period, although wars were frequent, the numbers engaged were, on the whole, small and the destruction which accompanied campaigns was, for the most part, localized and as such was incidental to the movement of armed bands through the countryside.

In spite of the succession of empires, Saldжуks, ʿIlkhān and Timurid, there was a persistence of administrative tradition from the ʿAbbāsids period and more especially from Saldжуks times onwards. This is not to say that there were no changes or new developments: of course, there were, but the element of continuity is more striking than that of change. The Mongol conquest caused a temporary break, but after the conversion of the ʿIlkhāns to Islam there was a reassertion of Islamic government, though the spread of administrative practices based on custom continued under the ʿIlkhāns and the Timurids, perhaps to a more marked extent than formerly.

One of the reasons for the persistence of administrative tradition is that the conquerors, whether Arab, Saldжуks Turk, Mongol, or for that matter Ṣafavid or ʿAlīdjar, lacked administrative experience; the original basis of their power was, in all cases, tribal, the officials of the bureaucracy had the “expertise” and so successive dynasties relied upon them. The great families of viziers, the Barmakids under the ʿAbbāsids, the Djayhānis, Bāfamis and ʿUtbi under the Sāḥibids, ʿAbbād under the Būyids, ʿAlīmān al-Mulk and his sons and grandsons under the Saldжуks, and the Djuwawis and ʿRaḥīd al-Dīn and his family under the ʿIlkhāns, played a significant role in the transmission of this tradition, as also did the families of mustafabs. The religious classes, at another level, also played an immensely important part in the maintenance of continuity. The ʿulamāʾ, as the guardians of tradition, enjoyed high status and prestige, and were a stabilizing force. In times of political upheaval they carried on as local administrators and often acted as peacemakers. This was particularly true of the ʿAlīdjar, among whom there was a strong hereditary tendency. Alongside this conservatism and continuity, there was also a marked provincial particularism, partly because difficult communications tended to foster isolation, and partly because ethnic differences made for a different ethos of society. The successive empires tended to fragment broadly along similar geo-political lines. ʿIlkhān, the Caspian provinces, Sīstān, Fārs, Kirmān, Kūrdistān, and Alḥarbābāydjān, all tended at one time or another to be virtually independent centres of local power, though it must not be supposed that within these different provinces there was necessarily uniformity. Some of these local movements had special and distinguishing characteristics. At the same time, the various movements arising in the different parts of Persia did not develop in isolation, but often reacted upon each other.

Under the Umayyads the Central Asian frontier was re-established broadly where it had been under the Sasanians. They handed on their function as wardens of the marches to the ʿAbbāsids. With the decline in the power of the caliphate, the local dynasties which governed ʿIlkhān, first the Tāhirids, then the Sāḥibids, and later the Ṣafavids, took over this task. The first two, broadly, represented the landowning classes and orthodoxy, although they established virtually independent local dynasties, they sought the authorization of the caliph, as did later dynasties, and there was no implication of revolution in their rise to power. Māḥmūd of Ṣafavān also ruled within the previously existing Muslim political framework. In the latter half of the 4th/10th century the ʿIkār Khūrāsān broke into Transoxania while the Ghuzz moved into Transcaspia, and finally into the ḍār al-ʿalām. The Saldжуks, who established themselves as the leaders of the Ghuzz, in due course found themselves in possession of an empire centred on Persia, and became themselves the wardens of the marches. Towards the end of the reign of ʿAlīdjar those Ghuzz who had remained in Central Asia overran Khūrāsān, The Kh“arazmghūān, who succeeded the Saldжуks in the east, failed to hold the marches against the Mongols in the 7th/13th century.

Although the maintenance of a stable border in the north-east was a condition for the stability of the interior of Persia, Khūrāsān was not itself a suitable centre from which to exercise domination over the whole area. Al-ʿAlīmān was forced to move from Marv back to Ṣāfāvān, and the Saldжуks transferred their capitals progressively westwards and southwards, from Nīshāpūr to Rayy and finally into ʿAlīdjar. Ṣafavān, the only one of the Great Saldươūns to attempt to rule permanently from Khūrāsān, was unable effectively to control ʿIrāk. In Ṣafavīd and ʿAlīdjar
times the maintenance of the north-east frontier against encroachments by the Uzbegs and Turkomans was a perennial problem. The frontier finally established in the reign of Nāšir al-Dīn Shāh was far to the south and west of the mediaeval frontier.

The Caspian provinces with their forests and mountain valleys and difficult communications proved hard to conquer. During the early Islamic period Kāzvin remained a frontier district. From the reign of ‘Umar to that of al-Ma‘mūn, seventeen expeditions are recorded against Daylam. From about 250/864 the mountain fastnesses of Daylam served as a refuge for the ‘Alids against the ‘Abbāsīds, where they formed a new centre of resistance hostile to both Bāghdād and Khurāsān, the governors of which sought to extend their dominion over the Caspian provinces. Conversion in the Caspian provinces had been slow. In 259/873 a large number of Zoroastrians were converted by Nāšir al-Haḵḵ Abū Muḥammad in Daylam, and in 299/912 Ḥasan b. ‘Alī is said to have converted the inhabitants of Ṭabaristān and Daylam, who were still partly idolators and partly Magians, to Islam (Mas‘ūdī, viii, 279). Many of the movements which originated in the Caspian provinces were characterized by Shi‘i tendencies. Here, as elsewhere, the Shi‘i movement tended to be associated with local movements and to draw into its ranks the discontented. It was not a clear-cut anti-Arab movement supported by Persians. Shi‘ism was rather a convenient banner under which to unite in hostility to the ruling class, whether this was Arab in the person of governors appointed by the caliphs, or local rulers who had retained their Zoroastrian faith and who, when they did not feel strong enough to throw off control, either out of fear of local rivals or of rebellion by their subjects, cooperated with the caliphs. The Būyids, who came from Daylam, professed Ithnā‘Ashari Shi‘ism, though the earlier ‘Alid movements in the province were Zaydi. The Caspian provinces were not only difficult to conquer: they were also difficult to unite. Numerous local dynasties flourished, often simultaneously, sometimes paying tribute to the central government, but more often holding it, and sometimes extending as far as Ḥarbārīyān (see also V. Minorsky, *La domination daulamite*, in *Soc. des études iraniennes*, iii (1933), and *Daвлад*).

The neighbouring province of Gurğān, of a rather different physical character, had been a frontier province in Sassanian times over against the nomads from the north. In the 3rd/9th century the ‘Alids of Ṭabaristān extended their influence over it, but in 316/928 Mardavīd b. Ziyār, by origin a Gilaki in the service of the Daylamite leader Asfār b. Shīrūya, whom he overthrew in 316/931, founded a kingdom, which lasted for about a hundred years, nominally dependent, first on the Sāmānids and then on the Ghaznavids. In Saldūq times Gurğān came more fully under the control of Khurāsān and one of the main concentrations of Ghuzz was to be found in its steppes with their plentiful grazing. In the late 18th century it became of importance as the province from which the Kāḏārs (q.v.) drew their main support. Sīstān (which included much of the modern Afghanistan), partly surrounded by a desert barrier, tended to be isolated from the developments in other parts of Persia, except for a brief period under Yaḵūb b. Layḥ and ‘Amr b. Layḥ. The special characteristic of political movements in Sīstān in the early centuries of Islam was their Ḥūrūfi tendency. Under the Ghūrīds (q.v.) Sīstān tended to look east. After the break-up of the Ilkhān empire, Harāt became the centre of the Kāḏārs, who had acted as governors on behalf of the Ilkhāns in the heyday of their power. Still later, after the death of Ṭimbūr, it became the centre of the eastern Timurid empire. (See also C. E. Bosworth, *Sīstān under the Arabs from the Islamic conquest to the rise of the Saffarids*, 30-250/651-304, Rome 1968).

Fārs, which had been the original seat of power of both the Achaemenids and the Sassanians, tended to be somewhat isolated from the rest of Persia in the early years of the Islamic period. This was partly due to the fact that much of it was difficult mountain country occupied by a tribal population, which formed an obstacle to its conquest and control [see IlAţ]. Conversion appears to have been slow. Iṣṭahārī, writing in the 4th/10th century, states that the maḏāfs were more numerous in Fārs than in any other province. Under the Būyid ʿAḍud al-Dawla (338/949—372/982), Fārs enjoyed prosperity and importance. After the break-up of the Great Saldūq empire Fārs was ruled by the Saldūqī dynasty (543/1148—686/1287). Later in the 8th/14th century Fārs became the centre of the Muṣaffarid dynasty, and in the 18th century of the short-lived Zand dynasty.

Kirmān was bounded on the north and east by the great desert. The mountain districts of the province, though sparsely inhabited, resisted the Arab advance and gave much trouble to later rulers also [see IlAţ]. Under the Saldūqīs of Kirmān it formed a prosperous and semi-independent kingdom but suffered in the disorders committed by the Ghuzz at the end of the Great Saldūq period. Kūrdīstān was ethnically separate from the rest of Persia. Both the physical configuration of the country and the tribal nature of society there militated against political unity. It looked to Mawsīl. Like the Caspian provinces, parts of Fārs and Kirmān, it was difficult campaigning country, and proved a “thorn in the flesh” of the caliphate and the subsequent empires. Few of their rulers succeeded fully in controlling it, and it tended to break away the moment there was a weakening of the central government. The Arab Dynasty of the Ḥamādnās in the 4th/10th century (see M. Canard, *Dynastie des Ḥamādnās des Jurastre et de Syrie*, i, Algiers—Paris, 1951), the Kurdish dynasty of the Marwānids who superseded them in Dīyār Bakr in the 5th/11th century, and the Ukaylīds, who held Mawsīl from 380/991 to 489/1096, attained some importance and exercised influence beyond the borders of Kūrdīstān. Under the Saldūqīs Mawsīl looked increasingly westwards. It became under the Zangīds one of the most important states of Western Asia, but with little influence on the history of Persia. With the rise of the Ottoman and Şafāvid empires, Kūrdīstān became disputed frontier territory.

The neighbouring province of Āḏharbāyjān was also partly inhabited by Kurds. It was the scene of the Khurramdīnī disorders in the first half of the 3rd/9th century. Subsequently a number of minor local ruling families held sway: first the Sādīgs (276/889—317/929), then the Kurd, Daysam, who was a Ḥūrūfi, followed by the Muṣaffīrīds, who had Bāṭinī leanings, and others. In 513/1126, towards the end of the Great Saldūq period, the atabeg Ilīdūz established himself and founded one of the succession states to the Saldūq empire. Under the Mongols, after the destruction of Bāḵtād, the political and economic centre of the empire shifted from Tīrāḵ and the Dījābāl, where it had been under the Buyids and Saldūqīs, to Āḏharbāyjān. Isfahān,
which had been the main city of Persia under the Great Saljuqs, although it became one of the centres of power of the Indjuids, one of the succession states to the Ilkhan empire, did not fully recover its importance until the reign of Sháh 'Abbás. Numbers of Ghuzz had settled in Adharbayjádn in Saljuq times, and from Mongol times onwards it was inhabited predominantly by Turkish tribes. On the break-up of the Ilkhan empire, the main centre of activity tended to move from Adharbayján to Fárs, Kírmán, and 'Irák-i 'Adíjam, perhaps partly because Adharbayján was becoming at this time subject to raids by the Kıpchaks. A succession state was established by the Djalá'îrîds, who ruled intermittently over Adharbayján and 'Iráq.

In the second half of the 9th/15th century Adharbayján became the centre of the rising Safavid power, and Tabriz became the capital in the early years of the 10th/16th century. Just as the Saljuqs moved their capitals westwards from Khurásán to the centre of Persia, so also the Safavids moved progressively eastwards, from Tabriz to Kízàn and 'Isfáhán. In the 19th century Adharbayján, with the advance of Russia through the Caucasus, succeeded Khurásán as the crucial frontier area. Here, too, the frontier eventually established after Persia's defeat by Russia in 1828 was considerably inside the modern border.

The period from the death of al-Ma'mún up to the Mongol invasion falls into three periods, those of the minor dynasties, the Great Saljuq empire (447/1055-552/1157), and the Khwarazmsháhís, ending with the sack of Baghdad by the Mongols in 656/1258. During the first of these, the western provinces dominated by Baghdad developed along rather different lines from Khurásán and the east, although there was a certain influence of the one on the other. This was partly because of the difference in society in the two areas and partly because of differences in political development. Baghdad and the neighbourhood had experienced all the vicissitudes of the political and economic decline of the caliphate after the death of al-Ma'mún. In Khurásán, on the other hand, the old structures were maintained to a greater extent: the local ruling families still retained a good deal of their former influence and there was a rich merchant class engaged in the caravan trade with China and other countries. On the other side of the frontier there were still a number of independent principalities, often at war with each other. Under the Tahirids, who came to power in the east, and their successors the Sámnáidis, there was a reassertion of old social tendencies, whereas under the Búyáids, society was in an advanced stage of disintegration. The Ghaznavids, the successors of the Sámnáidis, were in due course overthrown by the Saljúqúids, under whom the lands of the eastern caliphate were re-integrated and a new system of government worked out, combining features found in both the eastern and western provinces in a new symbiosis. The Tahirids during their fifty or sixty years' rule based their power on a community of interest of the dikbánns, though the influence and rights of this class were not so rigidly enforced as they had been in Sasanian times. Externally their main problem was to hold the frontier against the nomad Turks from Central Asia and prevent their intervention in the disorders which occurred in Transoxiana. Táhir, whose father and grandfather had been governors of Bushán, reached Khurásán as governor in 606/821-2. His rule, apart from some Kháridjite disturbances, was brief and uneventful. By 207/822 he had consolidated his power. In that year he omitted al-Ma'mún's name from the hajj, but providentially died the same night (or shortly afterwards) as al-Ma'mún. (See D. Sourdel, Les circonstances de la mort de Táhir, in Arabica, 1958). In spite of this act of overt rebellion, al-Ma'mún recognised Táhir b. Táhir as his successor. Kháridjite disturbances, especially in Sistán, continued during his governorate. On his death in 213/828-9 al-Ma'mún, perhaps with a view to regaining some of his lost authority in the eastern provinces, appointed his favourite, 'Abd Allah, who was at that time conducting operations against the Khurramdínis in Dinávar, to succeed Táhir. He advanced to Níshápúr and put down the Kháridjite disturbances which had become widespread. Al-Mu'tásim, who succeeded to the caliphate in 218/833, confirmed 'Abd Allah in his government.

Unrest meanwhile spread throughout the Abbásid empire. The Turks, whom al-Mu'tásim had enrolled in greater numbers in his bodyguard than had former caliphs, increased in power and violent quarrels between them and the people of Baghdad occurred repeatedly. In Adharbayján Bábak and the Khurramdínis were still in a state of rebellion. In 220/835 the Aflún (q.v.) was placed in charge of the campaign against them and eventually defeated them in 222/837. In Tabaristán Mázíyár b. Khárin, the last of the Kháriní dynasty, whose father and grandfather had been governors of his possessions by the Bánwand, the Isphabúd Shahríyár, had taken refuge with al-Ma'mún, embraced Islam and been sent back to Tabaristán as governor, apostasized and rebelled. The Aflún, who was sent against him, appears to have encouraged him to rebel. Al-Mu'tásim then sent 'Abd Allah b. Táhir from Khurásán against him; Mázíyár was captured and executed in 226/844, and 'Abd Allah made his uncle, Hasan b. Husayn, governor of Tabaristán. 'Abd Allah b. Táhir's rule in Khurásán and Transoxiana appears to have been enlightened. There are indications that he encouraged agriculture and fostered the spread of learning. He was succeeded in 230/844-5 by his son Táhir, who had become governor of Tabaristán in 218/842-3 in succession to his great uncle. Táhir II continued to rule Transoxiana from his capital in Khurám. He ruled until 248/862-3. Trouble from the Kháridjites in Sistán continued, and during his reign the 'ayyár under Ya'qúb b. Laytih, the Şaffárid, increased in power. Under Táhir's successor, Muhammad, Tabaristán was lost to the Táhiríds, when the Táhiríd governor, after being defeated in 250/864 by Hasan b. Zayd, the 'Alíd, abandoned the province in 252/866. Family quarrels also broke out among the Táhiríds, and one branch made common cause with the Şaffárids in Sistán.

Ya'qúb b. Laytih, the son of a peasant of Khárin, who became apprenticed to a coppersmith — hence the name of the dynasty he founded—subsequently, with his brothers, joined a band of mutásawwúsás led by the Táhiríd governor, Dirham b. Nájr b. Şallih, and took part in operations against the Kháridjites. He was then made amir of Bus, but in 247/861 drove out the Táhiríd governor and made himself master of Sistán. Ya'qúb's relations with the Kháridjites are not entirely clear. According to some accounts he was a Kháridjite at the beginning of his career. Later attributions of Şi'í sympathies to the Şaffárids would appear to be unfounded. He extended his rule to the Kábúl valley, Sind and the Mikrán, and in 253/867 he conquered Harat and Bushán from Táhir b. Husayn b. Táhir.

Meanwhile al-Mu'táziz, who had succeeded to the caliphate in 252/866, was unable to control his go-
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... the governor of Fars, 'Ali b. Husayn. Ya'qūb was the victor and took not only Kīrman but also Fars. In 257/872 al-Mu'tamid, following a somewhat similar policy, appointed Ya'qūb over the Tāhirid provinces of Tukhārīstān and Balkh. According to another group of sources, however, Ya'qūb had already taken Tukhārīstān and Balkh together with Gardīz, Gardīz, and Kūt in 257/870, when the caliph gave him a diploma for Tukhārīstān, Balkh, Fars, Kīrman, Sīstān, and Sīnd. Finally in 259/873 he marched on Kūrāsān, took Nīshāpūr, and made Muḥammad b. Tāhir prisoner.

Ya'qūb then turned his arms against Ḥasan b. Zayd, the 'Alīd, in Gurgan. The latter fled without giving battle. In 260/874-5 Ya'qūb went again to Fars, and in 262/876-7 he sent an envoy to the caliph al-Mu'tamid. Alarmed by Ya'qūb's growing power, al-Mu'tamid, or the regent al-Muwaffak, had given in that year a diploma for Transoxania to the Sāmānīd, Naṣr b. Ḥamd. Naṣr in doubt, in the hope that he would counter the spread of Ya'qūb's influence. Weakened by the rebellion of the Zandj, who by 264/877 were raiding within seventeen miles of Bāghdād, the caliph now gave Ya'qūb a diploma for Transoxania, Kūrāsān, Tabaristān, Gurgan, Fars, Kīrman, Sīnd and Hind, and made him military governor of Bāghdād, and titular governor of the holy cities. Ya'qūb, nevertheless, continued his advance on Bāghdād, but was worsted by the caliph in an engagement outside the city (268/879). Ya'qūb's defeat, however, was not decisive. By the terms of the peace the Saffārids were recognized as the rulers of the provinces mentioned in the diploma already given to Ya'qūb, and in return they were to pay an annual tribute of twenty million dirhams.

Ya'qūb died shortly after this. He was succeeded by his brother 'Amr, who made 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh b. Tāhir his deputy in Bāghdād, perhaps in the hope of enlisting Tāhirīd support against the growing power of the Sāmānīds. 'Amr's succession was contested by his other brother 'Ali. He was defeated and held captive by 'Amr. The provincial governors also began to throw off their allegiance, while in the holy cities 'Amr's rights of precedence were challenged by the Tūnūnīd. 'Amr's life, like that of Ya'qūb, was largely spent in expeditions from one part of the empire to another, to deal with rebellious governors, and in particular in wars on the eastern frontier of Sīstān. With the defeat of the Zandj in 269/883 by al-Muwaffak, pressure on the caliphate began to lessen and intrigues against 'Amr at the caliph's court began. An envoy was sent to him to demand the tribute due and the despatch of his son to Bāghdād as a hostage. 'Amr retired from Fars to Kīrman, followed by al-Muwaffak. In 271/885 Muḥammad b. Tāhir was again declared governor of Kūrāsān and was represented by Rāfī b. Ḥarḥama, who had conquered Nīshāpūr in 268/882. Matters did not yet reach breaking-point. In 275/889-90 'Amr agreed to pay ten million dirhams tribute for Kūrāsān, Fars and Kūrāsān, sent presents to al-Muwaffak, and retired to Fars. About this time 'Ali b. Layḥ escaped from captivity and joined Rāfī b. Ḥarḥama in Kūrāsān against 'Amr. In 276/889-90 al-Muwaffak seized the occasion offered by this embarrassment to 'Amr to withhold from him the privileges of the military governor of Bāghdād, to which office he had ap- pointed him earlier that year. 'Amr in retaliation dropped al-Muwaffak's name from the Khwān in Sīrāz in 277/890-1 and advanced on Kūrāsān. Al-Muwaffak meanwhile died in 278/891. His son al-Mu'tahdīd, who became caliph on the death of al-Mu'tamid in 279/892, made peace with 'Amr, confirmed him in his governorships and ordered him to set out for Kūrāsān against Rāfī b. Ḥarḥama in 279/892-3. After a long-drawn-out campaign Rāfī was eventually put to flight, and 'Amr entered Nīshāpūr in 283/896-7. Rāfī, after briefly joining the 'Alīdīs in Tabaristān, fled to Khwārazm, where he was killed in the same year. With his death disturbances in Kūrāsān subsided.

No much is known of the civil administration of Ya'qūb and 'Amr, but their military organization is reputed to have been excellent. A distinction seems to have been made between public and private revenue. 'Amr apparently had three treasuries, one for revenue from land and other taxes, which was utilized for the upkeep of the army, a second for revenue from the personal property of the ruler, which was expended upon the upkeep of the court, and the third for revenues from occasional taxes (āḥādir), and confiscations, the proceeds of which were largely used to reward faithful servants, followers and envoys. The army was the object of special care, and paid every three months through the ṣarīd (see Bartold, op. cit., 190-22; and C. E. Bosworth, *Arms of the Saffārids*, in *BSOAS*, 1968).

In origin the Saffārid movement seems to have been a “popular” movement and to have been regarded by the landowners and merchants of Kūrāsān and Transoxania as a threat to the established order. Opposition was directed against Ya'qūb's alleged Khāridjite tendencies, but it may be that the real grounds for it was the “popular” nature of the movement. Once Ya'qūb and after him 'Amr, had extended their power beyond Sīstān it seems probable that the “popular” nature of their movement was to some extent lost. They retained their influence in Sīstān, however, and reappeared after the death of Māhmūd of Ghazna and still existed as a local ruling house when the Mongols invaded in the 13th century.

The Saffārids were faced not only with a revival of the power of the caliphate under al-Mu'tahdīd, but also by the rise of a new power in the east, the Sāmānīds, who were extending their influence in Transoxania. Their ancestor, Sāmān, appears to have been a small landowner from the neighbourhood of Bukhārā. During the caliphate of al-Ma'mūn, the sons of Asad b. Sāmān were ordered to help Harthama against the rebellious Rāfī. In return they received governorships in Kūrāsān. Under the Tāhirīdī Nūb b. Asad was in Samarkand and in 261/ 874-5 the caliph al-Mu'tamid gave Naṣr b. Ḥamd a diploma for Samarkand. When Bukhārā was sacked by Ḥusayn b. Tāhir al-Tārī from Khwārazm in 260/ 873-4, Naṣr b. Ḥamd, in response to an appeal from the people of the city, sent his brother Ismā'īl to their aid. In the same year the caliph gave Ismā'īl a diploma for Bukhārā. Having received this Ismā'īl hurried to Bukhārā. Ismā'īl turned his army against Naṣr. Ismā'īl is represented as the victor and as acting with great moderation in victory. This may or may not be true. What probably happened is that they arrived at a deadlock, neither able to defeat the other. In any case, Naṣr remained governor of Transoxania until his death in 279/892, when he was succeeded by Ismā'īl, who received a diploma from the caliph in 280/893.
In 285/898 ‘Amr demanded a diploma as governor of Transoxania, in return for which he offered to overthrow the ‘Alid ruler of Tabaristan. Al-Muqtadir, anxious for the decline of ‘Amr, probably saw in his demand an opportunity to weaken him by playing him off against Isma’il. Whether ‘Amr was overconfident of his ability to overthrow Isma’il, or whether he feared that Isma’il would, as his power grew, intervene in Khurasan, and thought it better to forestall him, is not clear. In 286/899 ‘Amr’s command was transferred to Bukhara, while Isma’il defeated the Samanid forces, and in the following year ‘Amr himself was captured and sent to Baghdad. His sons retired to Sistan. For some years they continued operations against the Samanids in Sistan and the local rulers in Fars, but were unable to restore Sha’f¯arid fortunes.

By 289/902, when al-Muktafi succeeded to the caliphate, the Samanids had gained the whole of Khurasan, and in the diploma which Isma’il received from al-Muktafi Rayy Kazwin, and Zandjan were added to Khurasan. The Samanids were, however, unable to establish effective control over the western regions and disputed them with the Sadjids, who had been more successful when power was overthrown at al-Muwaqqaf had appointed Muhammad Ala‘in Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Abi’l-Sadj governor of Agharbaryaygan in 276/889-90. The rapid extension of Samanid territory put a certain strain on Samanid organization, although this was not immediately felt. Ahmad b. Isma’il, who succeeded in 295/907, established his claim by force of arms. He extended the Samanid domains still further by temporarily occupying Sistan in 298/910-11. Tabaristān, on the other hand, was lost to the ‘Alids when Ḩasan b. ‘Ali al-Utrush (al-Nāṣir al-Kabir) staged a successful revolt, making skilful use of the discord existing among the local rulers in the Caspian provinces.

The Samanids, like the Tahirids, had a certain affinity with the marzdans on the eastern frontiers of the Sasanian empire. Theirs was the last attempt to maintain the old social system against the general levelling tendencies of Turkish military government. The two centres of their kingdom were Samarqand and Bughara; on the periphery there were a number of states which acknowledged Samanid overlordship and in some cases paid a nominal tribute. Among them were Khwarazm, Ghurjistān, al-Shahr, Dūzdān, Isfāhān and Sughdniyān. The bureaucracy under the Samanids was well-developed and on a somewhat similar model to the bureaucratic administration of the caliphs at Baghdad. Nāshrākhūmi mentions nine government offices or diwan, those of the vizier, mu‘tawafī, sāḥib quṭrat, sāḥib mu‘ayyid, muqaddam, and muqaddabi, the diwan-i mamlaaka-i khāṣṣ, the diwan-i awkāf, and the diwan-i kadā (Ta‘rikh-i Bughār, ed. Riḍwān, p. 31). According to Bartold there was a tenth diwan, the diwan-i barid. The chief civil official was known as the khwādja-i buṣurg. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Ahmad Dāwhānī, who held this office under Naṣr b. Ahmad, was, perhaps, a more important figure than his sovereign.

The army was composed of a nucleus of Turks, mainly purchased or captured on the frontiers and brought up as slaves, and levies supplied by the dikhāns. The leading military commander had the title sipakdār and from Nishāpūr administered Samanid territories south of the Amū Daryā. The chief military offices and provincial governments were held by members of local ruling families and by Turkish slaves. The court was elaborately organized with a hierarchy of officials. The main offices were held by the military classes. The domestic affairs of the court were under an official known as the wakīl. In the provincial governments many of the same offices and departments were found as at the centre, though there was no uniformity throughout the empire. In the early period of Samanid rule, the civil power held the upper hand: the army was subordinate and the troops were paid in cash, but were not barred from acquiring land. Ibn Hawākal states that taxes were lower in the Samanid empire than anywhere else and wages higher. The taxes, levied in two installments, totalled some 40 million dirhams. Officials were paid quarterly and their pay amounted to about half the revenue. This favourable position of income in relation to expenditure allowed considerable mildness to prevail in the tax administration. Trade and industry were highly developed. Mukaddasi gives an extensive list of exports from the various towns. Trade with the nomads of Central Asia was also important (ii, 468 ff.; see further, Bartold op. cit., 235 ff.).

Ahmad b. Isma’il, after a reign of nearly six years, was murdered by his Turkish guards in 301/913. His 8-year-old son Naṣr succeeded. During his reign the spirit of revolt entered the Samanid house itself and Naṣr spent much of his long reign, which lasted until 331/942, in purging the state of his cousins and brothers. About 318/930 three of his brothers, who were imprisoned in Bukhara, were liberated with the help of seditious elements in the city, including Shī‘is and Khārījītes, and one of them, Yābūy, proclaimed amir. The movement was abortive.

In the west the Sadjids had maintained themselves against further Samanid advance. In 305/917-18 Yūsuf b. Abī’l-Sadj defeated a force sent against him by the caliph al-Muqtadir, but was forced, in spite of this, to give up Rayy, and some two years later, although he defeated an army led by the caliph’s general Mūnis, retired to Zandjan. Mūnis followed him, defeated him near Ardabil and brought him to Baghdad. In 310/922, he was set free and given the government of Rayy and Agharbaryaygan. Later he was defeated and killed by the Carmathians (316). Agharbaryaygan was then disputed between the Khārījīte Kurd, Dāysam b. Ikhrāhim, and the Muṣafīrs, in the end prevailed.

More important than the attempts by provincial governors to seize the opportunity to establish their independence was the spread of the Carmathian movement, which was eventually captured by the Isma‘īlis, who founded the Fatimid anti-caliphate in 297/910. Between 321/930 and 328/940 Fatimid propaganda made great strides in Khurasan and Transoxania. Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Nasafi (al-Nakhshabi), a Fatimid missionary, won over a number of prominent officials and eventually Naṣr himself. The ‘ulamā‘ and the Sunni notables were unable to meet this challenge alone and were forced to turn for help to the Turkish nucleus of the army. Naṣr, following a plot to overthrow him, abdicated in favour of his son Nūḥ and was thrown into prison in 330/942. Al-Nasafi and his supporters were massacred. Henceforward the army decided the course of events. Joining in the struggles for supremacy between the rival claimants, they eventually brought the state to ruin.

Khwarazm revolted in 332/943-4 and in the following year Abū ‘Abd Allâh Muḥammad b. Khurāsān, rebelled. By this time also, the favourable financial position which had prevailed earlier had changed for
the worse. There were acute shortages of funds and the army's pay was often in arrears. There were desertions ... His reign was largely occupied by internal rebellions and a series of expeditions against the IJamdanids, the last of which ensued between the rival amirs and governors.

With the decline of the Sämanids and the failure of the caliphate to maintain its temporary revival under al-Mu'taḍid, the northern provinces of Persia became the scene of the exploits of a series of Daylamite leaders who were little more than robbing barons, the common characteristics of whose rule were love of money, extortion, and cruelty. In 308/920 Laylâ b. Nu'mân seized Nişâhpûr from the Sämanids on behalf of Hasan b. Kâsim, the 'Alid, who succeeded Hasan b. 'All al-Utrush in 304/917. He failed to hold it. Some years later Kâkî took Rayy, but, unable to establish his independence, entered Sämanid service. Meanwhile Asfâr b. Shîrûya had proclaimed himself in Sârî but was defeated by Mâkân b. Kâkî. He then took refuge with the Sämanid governor of Khorûsân, Abu Bakr b. Ilyâs. When the latter died, Asfâr received the allegiance of his troops and seized Rayy, Tabâristân, Kazvin, Kumm, Kâshân, and Luî Kûlîk. He was overthrown in 319/931 by one of his own generals, Mardâwdî. b. Zîyâr, the founder of the Zîyârî dynasty. Mardâwdî, who, according to Ibn Miskawâyh, appears to have had visions of restoring the old Persian empire (vii, 5, 489; cf. also Ibn al-Ăţhir, viii, 216), took Kazvin, Rayy, Hamadân, Kangavar, Ïnâvar, and Burûdijrî, and then turned back to invade Tabâristân and Gurgân, which had been seized by Mâkân. Among Mardâwdî's followers were the three sons of Bûya, 'All, Hasan, and Abûmad. They had originally been in the service of the Mäkân, but had deserted him for Mardâwdî. When the latter extended his conquests southwards, he appointed 'All b. Bûya governor of Khorûsân.

At first 'All appears to have considered entering the service of the caliph, who was by now a puppet in the hands of the amir al-umarâ'î, but his overtures were ignored. He then took Isfâhân, but retired to Arrâšjân when Mardâwdî sent his brother Wushmîrî against him, and seized Fârs in 321/933, while his brother Abûmad occupied Kîrman in 322/934. Mardâwdî, on receipt of this news, set out himself for Isfâhân and sent another army from Khûzistan to march on the Bûyids. 'All thereupon renewed his allegiance to Mardâwdî and sent his brother Hasan to him as a hostage. Mardâwdî meanwhile appears to have conceived the plan of conquering Baghdâd, but before he could put the plan into operation he was assassinated by his Turkish slaves in 323/935. He was succeeded in part of his domains by Wushmîrî, who spent his reign in a constant state of war with the Sämanîds, Bûyids, and others and eventually accepted Sämanîd overlordship.

Hasan b. Bûya rejoined 'All on the assassination of Mardâwdî and they occupied Isfâhân. Mâkân had meanwhile taken Kîrman and acknowledged Sämanîd overlordship. Later he left Kîrman in an attempt to regain Gurgân and Tabâristân. About 325/937-8 he threw off Sämanîd allegiance and when the Sämanîd governor of Kûrûsân sent an army against him he appealed to Wushmîrî for help. Hasan b. Bûya, prof-
which was in 353/964. The balance of these was in his favour, and from time to time he exacted tribute from the Buyids, but he failed to press his claims entirely. When finally the Hamdâns became increasingly engaged in Syria in a struggle with the Fâtîmids, pressure on the western flank of the Bûyids ceased. Mu'izz al-Dawla also undertook various operations against the Barâdis [q.v.] in Khuzistan, and finally extinguished them in 349/960-1. He was succeeded in 356/967 by his son Bakhtiyâr 'Izâ al-Dawla, who was an ineffectual ruler.

When Bakhtiyâr's Turkish mercenaries revolted and seized power, 'Adud al-Dawla, the son of Rukn al-Dawla, who had been ruling in Shirzâr since 338/949, set out for Baghâdâd in 346/954 to restore order. He forced Bakhtiyâr to abdicate, but because of the protests of Rukn al-Dawla he re-established Bakhtiyâr and returned to Shirzâr. In 346/956 Rukn al-Dawla died and was succeeded by his son Mu'ayyid al-Dawla in Rayy and by another son Fâghr al-Dawla in Hamadân. Bakhtiyâr took the opportunity to march on Shirzâr and provoke a conflict with 'Adud al-Dawla. He was defeated. 'Adud al-Dawla occupied Baghâdâd in 367/977 and seized Fâghr al-Dawla's territories also, but allowed Mu'ayyid al-Dawla to rule as his subordinate.

Under 'Adud al-Dawla, who ruled first in Fârs (338/949—356/967) and then in Fârs and Irâz (356/967—374/983), the Bûyids reached their height. Bûyid troops occupied Balûqistan and the Mikrân and even operated in 'Omân. On the Khurâsân border, where there had been constant conflicts with Sâmânid governors usually ending in a Sâmânid victory, there had been a sudden weakening of the Sâmânids, who were defeated towards the end of 371/982. 'Adud al-Dawla's death at the critical moment prevented any further Bûyid advance into Khurâsân. 'Adud al-Dawla, the only real figure of a ruler among the Bûyids, established an effective administration. He reorganized the postal system, put down brigandage, and fostered commerce. He followed a policy of religious toleration and suspended the public celebration of sectarian ceremonies which had been introduced by Mu'izz al-Dawla in Baghâdâd. He was a great builder and patronized men of learning and theologians. He did not, however, entirely lose the characteristics of his race: old taxes were increased and new ones introduced. (See further H. Busse, Chaisif und Grosskönig, Beirut 1969).

After the death of 'Adud al-Dawla the Bûyid dynasty declined rapidly. Until the reimposition of orderly government by the Saljûqs the western provinces were torn by interminable conflicts. The administration was completely broken up, agriculture ruined, and the old money economy destroyed beyond repair. A contributory factor in this decline was the change in the flow of trade connected with the rise of the Fâtîmids (see 'Abbâsids, and B. Lewis, Fâtîmids and the route to India, in Istanbul Ithâsat Fak. Mecn., 1950, 355-66).

In due course Khurâsân fell, not to the Bûyids, but to the new power rising in the east, the Ghaznavids. Two favourable circumstances attended their rise: first the absence of any strong power in western Persia able to fill the vacuum created by the decline of the Sâmânids, and secondly the existence on their frontier of the decaying empire of the Hindû Shâhâs, which offered to them a new field of operations. Alpâtkân, the commander of the Sâmânid forces in Khurâsân, after an abortive rising in favour of 'Abd al-Malik b. Nâb in 350/951, withdrew to the eastern frontiers and took Bust and Ghazna. After an interregnum following his death in 352/953, Sebuktegin, one of his gušâms, assumed power in 356/977. He regarded himself as governing on behalf of the Sâmânids but paid no tribute to them. In 356/977 a revolt by his general Nâb summoned him to Transoxania to aid him against rebels. After a successful campaign Sebuktegin was given the governorships of Balkh, Turkhâristân, Bâmiyân, Gûhîr, and Ghârdjâstân in 384/994, and his son Mahmûd was made commander of the army with his headquarters in Nîghâpur. When the Karâkhânids invaded Transoxania in 386/996, Nûb again appealed to Sebuktegin for help. By wise peace which was concluded with the Karâkhânids the frontier was established on the Katwân steppe. Sebuktegin died in 387/997. He left his domains to various members of his family, but by 388/998 Mahmûd, temporarily abandoning Khurâsân, had made himself master of the territory held by his father. In the following year he seized Khurâsân and took the Khâba in the name of al-Kâdir, whose succession the Sâmânids had not recognised, continuing to read the Khâba in the name of his deposed predecessor, al-Ṭââsî. In return Mahmûd was granted a diploma by al-Kâdir for Khurâsân (389/999). In 390/1000 Mahmûd made an expedition into India, capturing some fortresses near Lamghân. The following year he invaded India again, defeated Jaipal, and took a great quantity of booty. Subsequently he made several successful expeditions into India, the most famous of which was in 396/1006, when he destroyed the idol temple at Sumnath. The attempts made by the last of the Sâmânids, Abû 'Ibrâhîm Ismâ'îl (d. 395/1005) to recover Khurâsân were in vain. The former Sâmânid territories were now divided between the Ghaznavids and the Karâkhânids. In 398/1008 Mahmûd defeated Ilîg Nârî and Kâdir Khân Yusuf near Balkh. He then extended his authority over Ghârdjâstân, Khârāzam, Sîstân, Gûhîr, Tabaristân and Gurgân. The conquest of Khârâzam in 408/1017 gave him a preponderance over the Karâkhânids, and when civil war spread in the Karâkhânid kingdom, he invaded Transoxania in 415/1025, but does not appear to have made permanent gains. In 417/1026 Mahmûd received a diploma from the caliph al-Kâdir for the conquered provinces. The caliph made no attempt to enter into relations with the Karâkhânids except through Mahmûd.

Mahmûd was a strict Sunnî, and since at the time of his rise the Fâtîmids were pressing in through Syria towards Baghâdâd, where the caliph was a puppet in the hands of the Bûyids, considerable glamour attached to him as the first ruler who came to the rescue of the 'Abbâsîd caliphate, though in fact it was not until 'Uthîrî Beg arrived in Baghâdâd that it was relieved of tutelage to the Bûyids. So far as Mahmûd's administration is concerned there was outwardly little change, but the spirit of the imperial organization was changing. The state was no longer a civil power which maintained an army. The court was to a greater degree than had formerly been the case military and tribal. The army had become the state and its commander the sultan, and the only function and duty of the people was to pay taxes. Mahmûd did not, however, solve the problem of how to support the army: the new system was to be worked out, not by the Ghaznavids, but by the Saljûqs. In 420/1029 Mahmûd entered Rayy, which had been in the hands of the Bûyid, Majdî al-Dawla, and left his son Mas'ûd there with orders to complete the conquest of Bûyid territories. Hamadân and Isfâhân fell, but in 427/1030 Mahmûd died and
Mas'ūd hastened back to Khurasan to claim the throne. The early years of Mas'ūd's reign were occupied by struggles for power between rival factions. With his withdrawal from Rayy, the local branch of the Būyids, the Kātkūyids, threw off their allegiance. The real threat to the Ghaznavids, however, was to come from elsewhere. During the reign of Maḥmūd, groups of Ghuzz had passed into Khurasan and the interior of Persia. The first considerable movement was in 426/1033, when Maḥmūd ordered the tribes under Isrā'īl b. Saldjūk, to which he had seized, to migrate into Khurasan. In 425/1033-4, two brothers, Tughrīl Beg and Çağhi Beg Dāʾūd, the sons of Mīkāʾīl b. Saldjūk, and their uncle Yaḥbūh b. Saldjūk moved from Transoxania to the borders of Khwārazm, but were obliged to move again in 426/1034-5 on the death of Hārūn the Khwārazmshāh. A number of them crossed the Oxus into Khurasan and asked permission to live under Mas'ūd's protection. During the next few years they were constantly on the move in search of new pastures, harried by and harrying the Ghaznavids, until finally they met in battle at Dandanḵān in 431/1040. Mas'ūd was decisively defeated. Ghaznavid rule was brought to an end in Khurasan, though the Ghaznavids continued to rule in Ghazna until dispossessed by the Ghurids [q.v.] in 569/1173-4. Further weakened, they retired first to Kābul and then to Lahore.

The Saldjūk period in some ways represents a culmination of previous developments, in others a new departure. There had been from the 3rd/9th century onwards much recruitment of Turkish slaves in western and eastern Persia, and the Ghaznavids were, by origin, a slave dynasty. During their rule there was an increased militarization of the state, but no major change in its structure. The Ghuzz movement was different: it was a tribal migration, and the Saldjūks who emerged as its leaders became, almost by chance, the rulers of a vast empire. This, at its height, stretched from Transoxania to Syria and Anatolia, though the last two were never under the effective control of the Great Saldjūk sultan, and included Khurasan and the rest of Persia, Irāk-i Ṭurk, and the Dzhazira. The numbers involved in this migration were not large: those taking part were to be counted, perhaps, in tens of thousands. They seem to have caused remarkably little dislocation economically [see 111.2]. Small though their numbers were, they altered the balance of the population in two ways: henceforward the two main elements were Persian and Turkish—the dichotomy of the early centuries between 'Arab and ʿalām was replaced by that between ṭurk and šāğišt, and secondly there was an expansion of nomadism and a more strongly marked dichotomy between settled and semi-settled. This dichotomy, in the early period of Saldjūk rule, coincided, to some extent, with that between Turk and non-Turk, and this in turn corresponded, in large measure, with the dichotomy between the military and the rest of the population.

The Saldjūk leaders were not simply the leaders of a nomad tribal group. They were also familiar with urban life, and from the very beginning of their transformation into the rulers of an empire they had settled capitals. As heirs to an empire and to the civilization which had developed in the lands of the Eastern Caliphate, they became the defenders of Sunnī Islam and under them a great revival took place, which made possible the unification of the Sunnī world, against which the Crusaders were unable to achieve lasting success. As heirs to an empire it was not long before a conflict developed between them and the Turkoman nomads, whose main concern was for new pastures and who, in religion, had the attitude of the ghāzī. Since many of the Turkomans pushed on to the Georgian, Armeeno-Byzantine and Caucasian frontiers to undertake the activities of ghāsī, it was in Anatolia rather than Persia, however, that this Islam took root. Support for Sunnīsm was imposed upon the Saldjūks by political circumstances: opposition to the Būyids dictated a pro-Sunnī and an anti-Shīʿī policy. From the time of Malikshāh onwards, however, the Būyids had been deprived of their political power, the strict orthodoxy of the Saldjūk sultans was modified. A pro-Sunnī attitude was also imposed upon them by their need to win the support of the ūlām in order, in turn, to gain the support of the masses—though they failed to carry with them those who were discontented with the established order, and who were to be found among all classes.

Under the Saldjūks, al-Ghāzālī [q.v.] worked out a new relationship between caliph and sultan, from which stemmed a series of interconnected jurisdictions, whose stability depended upon orthodoxy or right religion, and the personal loyalty of the sultan to the caliph, and of subordinate officials to the sultan. The power of the Saldjūks was thus given a şarʿī basis and differed from that of the Būyids, which had been usurped. Since Islam still had relevance to the daily life of the people this reformulation was of more than theoretical importance: it made possible the preservation of the religious life of the community and enabled political life to run its course within the framework of Islam. That the sultan's rule was given a şarʿī basis did not, of course, stop the arbitrary use of power, but it tempered its use and, generally speaking, prevented it reaching lengths which were felt to be intolerable by the people.

The Saldjūk theory of state, as well as its primary Islamic basis, had another basis, which derived its inspiration from Sasanian theory and was expressed by Nīzām al-Mulk, the vizier of Alp Arslān and Malikshāh. According to this theory the sultan was directly appointed by God. His power was absolute and required no justification, and against it the population had no right to freedom. This theory, like the Islamic theory, also emphasized the independence of kingship and religion, and of stability and right religion. It rested, however, on justice rather than right religion. This was to be achieved by the maintenance of each in his rightful place. To these two bases the Saldjūks brought a third, which derived from the practice of the steppe: the practice of consultation. This was, perhaps, never very strong, and as the power of the central government was strengthened and the Saldjūks came to rely less on the Turkoman tribes and more on an army composed of slaves and freedmen, so the Islamic theory tended to be superseded by the conception put forward by Nīzām al-Mulk, while the element of consultation weakened and virtually disappeared.

The establishment of a strong central government provided order and discipline, secured the defence of the Muslim community and Muslim lands, and created conditions in which Muslim life could be lived and the various classes carry on their occupations in relative security. But it failed to remove the underlying dissatisfactions, and the Saldjūk period is also marked by the appearance of a new phase of the Ismāʿīlī movement, known to Arab historians as the new propaganda "al-daʿwa al- Giámīda" in contradistinction to the "old propaganda" "al-daʿwa al-ḥaddna" of the Fāṣīmīds, and its followers as the Bāṭinīyya.
In the field of administration there was a long continuity of practice stretching back beyond the Saljuqs, but, consequent upon the changed political, economic, and social circumstances which prevailed, certain developments which had begun before their arrival took definite shape and provided a pattern which was to persist in its essentials down to the 20th century. The two main aspects of the sultan's administration were the dargāh or court and the divan (p.n.), which was the chief department of the bureaucracy. The former was essentially military, composed of amirs, slaves, and freedmen, though it was also frequented by the chief officials of the bureaucracy, the religious classes and learned men. The relations between the dargāh and the divan were not clearly formulated. The vizier, the chief bureaucratic official, bridged the gap between the two. In the reigns of Alp Arslân (455/1063—465/1072) and Malikshāh (465/1072—485/1092), the vizirate reached its height under Nizām al-Mulk (q.v.), who supervised all aspects of the administration. Later the vizier declined in importance and there was an increased militarization of the state and a contraction in the area of its direct operation. (See further A. K. S. Lambton, *The internal structure of the Saljuq empire*, in *The Cambridge history of Iran*, ed. J. A. Boyle, 1968, v, 203-82).

This was accompanied by the emergence of what tended to become a "hereditary" domain or ištālī over which the mukta'ā had governmental prerogatives, which included the collection of taxes (in the details of the local arrangements for the assessment and collection of which there is a striking continuity), the holding of the masālim court, and the general supervision of security and religious affairs. This development coincided with and was partially the consequence of the change in the military forces of the state. As the army became composed not of Turkoman tribes but mainly of slaves and freedmen, the problem of providing their pay and of financing the administration in general became urgent. The ištālī was simply a device to solve the problem. Under a strong ruler it did not necessarily involve a relinquishment of the control of the central government or decentralization, but in the long run it made for a decline in the power of the sultan relative to that of the amirs and finally under the series of weak rulers who succeeded Muḥammad b. Malikşāh contributed to the political disintegration of the empire.

This tendency was further aggravated by the atabegate, an institution peculiar to the Saljuq period, which had a social and a political aspect. The atabeg (q.v.) was placed in charge of a prince's education and normally married to his mother. If the young malik was assigned a province, the atabeg attached to him was responsible for its administration. Politically the objects of the atabegate was to control the malik and prevent his rebellion, but as the power of the amirs increased relative to that of the sultans, the atabegate was used, not so much to prevent the rebellion of a Saljuq malik as to retain the nominal allegiance of a powerful or rebellious amir (see further *The internal structure of the Saljuq empire*, op. cit.). This was the origin of the various atabeg dynasties which arose on the decline of the Great Saljuq empire.

After the battle of Dandankān, as the Saljuqs consolidated their conquests in Khurāsān and moved westwards, the majority of the Ghuzz became associated with them, though full control was never established over the movement as a whole. Outlying groups, although acknowledging the nominal overlordship of the Saljuqs, continued to act independently. Many of them pushed on into Syria and Asia Minor. The geographical extent of the operations of the Ghuzz was thus wider than the area over which the central government exerted control. Politically the Great Saljuq empire was a loose confederation of semi-independent kingdoms. Of these, the Saljuq kingdoms of Rām and Syria broke away at an early date and developed along more or less independent lines, while the Saljuq kingdom of Kirmān, whose founder Kawūrdu b. Čaghri Beg was appointed governor of the province by Tughril Beg in 433/1041, also became virtually independent and exerted little influence on the general course of events. During the reign of Tughril Beg (429/1036—455/1063) the power the Saljuqs was based on the Turkoman tribes. Alp Arslân and Malikşāh, during whose reigns the Great Saljuqs were at the height of their power, relied increasingly on armies composed, not of Turkomans, but of Turkish slaves and freedmen. After the death of Malikşāh, these slaves and freedmen as mukta’ās and atabegs, became the dominant class, and eventually, as the power of the central government waned, set up virtually independent kingdoms.

Under Tughril Beg there was on the one hand an expansion north-westwards, which was facilitated by the weakness of the Byzantine empire, and on the other a consolidation of the gains made in Persia. Čaghri Beg remained in Khurāsān and ruled in the east until his death in 452/1060. In 440/1050 Ibrāhīm Ināl, Tughril’s half-brother, undertook a campaign into Armenia, and in 446/1054 Tughril captured Ardjish and besieged Manzikert. In the following year Tughril entered Baghādād. Already in 439/1059, when the Saljuqs had first entered Nishāpūr, al-Ḵātūn had sent an envoy to them, and in 439/1049 after Dandankān, when they had written to the caliph asking him to bestow upon them the sovereignty of the lands they had already conquered, the caliph in reply had invited Tughril to Baghādād. Other pre-occupations prevented his coming until 442/1053-6. Shortly after his entry, al-Ralīm, the Būyid general, was seized and the rule of the Būyids broached the end, although a branch of the family continued to rule in Yazd as Saljuq governors for several years. On this occasion, however, Tughril was not granted an audience by the caliph: this honour was reserved until his second visit to Baghādād in 449/1058. Meanwhile in 448/1056 Arslān Khāṭūn, Dā’ūd’s daughter, was betrothed to the caliph.

Al-Ḡasāšī, the Shī'ī Turkish general, to whom power had passed in Baghādād on the fall of the Būyids, fled on Tughril’s entry. He was joined by many of the Arab Shī’ī tribes on the Syrian border, and appealed to the Fātimids for help. Tughril followed him and operations took place between them in northern ʿIrāq in 430/1043-45. Ibrāhīm Ināl seized this opportunity to rebel a second time—the first had been in 441/1059-60, when he had refused to hand Hamadān over to Tughril. The latter was forced to leave Mesopotamia to deal with Ibrāhīm Ināl. Al-Ḡasāšī thereupon marched on Baghādād and proclaimed the Fātimid al-Mustāṣfirīan caliph. Al-Ḵātūn, who had sent an urgent message to Tughril to return to Baghādād, took refuge with Kuraysh, the Qūṣaylī, who entrusted him to Muhārīrī b. Bādārīn, Tughril, after he had overcome Ibrāhīm Ināl’s revolt with the help of Dā’ūd’s sons, Yākūṭ and Ḍawūr, retook ʿIrāq. Al-Ḡasāšī was killed and the ʿAbbāsīd caliph restored, but the administration of Baghādād was taken over by Tughril.
The caliph's function was henceforward to occupy himself with religious leadership: temporal affairs were delegated to the sultan, though in Baghdad itself there was, to some extent, a conflict of authority.

By 451/1060 Tughril was master of Mesopotamia up to Syria and the Byzantine frontier, though on his death there were outbreaks of disorder by the bedouin of ‘Irāk. His ambitions were meanwhile growing and in 453/1061 he demanded the hand of the caliph’s daughter in marriage. This caused the caliph great annoyance—even the Buyids had not demanded this of him—but after negotiations and threats the marriage contract was eventually ratified in 454/1062 outside Tabriz. When Tughril came to Baghdad in the following year the caliph’s daughter was taken to his residence, and when he left Baghdad in 456/1061 she accompanied him.

So far as the relations of the Saldjūqs with local ruling families were concerned, in the early period of their expansion, the local rulers probably looked upon them as a reserve of mercenaries to draw upon in their quarrels. The payments received by them were not tribute (as they are often represented in the sources) but payments to mercenaries for their services, and when the Ghuzz left the district these payments naturally ceased. As the Saldjūq conquests spread in some cases the local rulers were driven out, in many cases they were confirmed in all or part of their possessions in return for tribute. By the end of Tughril’s reign, however, administration by Saldjūq officials was becoming increasingly common. In due course the former ruling families were merged into the Saldjūq imperial structure. Marriage alliances were made with them and hostages were often taken to lessen the likelihood of rebellion.

The loose confederation over which Tughril had established some kind of central control was far from being firmly united at his death in 455/1063. In accordance with his will, Sulaymān b. Dā‘ūd was declared his successor by his vizier al-Kunduri. Seeing, however, that the amirs opposed his accession, al-Kunduri proclaimed Alp Arslān, another of Dā‘ūd’s sons, who had been his father’s chief lieutenant in the east. Yabhān b. Saldjūq, governor of Harat, and Kutulmish, a Saldjūq of northern Persia, both rebelled and were defeated in 456/1063-4. These events probably mark a turning point in the position of the sultan: if control of the empire was to be retained, it was clear that a standing army loyal to the sultan was necessary. As the conception of an autocratic ruler replaced that of the ruling khān, and the moral basis of Saldjūq authority weakened, some substitute had to be found for the former tribal loyalties. To some extent the central government supplied an element of unity, but this could be effective only as long as it was supported by a strong central army. This condition was fulfilled under Alp Arslān (455/1063—456/1072) and Malikshāh (456/1072—458/1074), and the latter in particular succeeded in imposing a measure of control throughout the empire.

Under Alp Arslān conquests in the northwest continued. Parly to co-ordinate and partly to control the various groups operating on the Byzantine frontier, Alp Arslān intervened himself and took Ani in 457/1065 and laid waste Cilicia and stormed Caesarea in 459/1067. Romanus IV Diogenes mounted a counter-offensive and had some success in campaigns in 456/1068 and 451/1069, but a third campaign ended in a crushing defeat at Manzikert and his capture in 463/1071 (see C. Cahen, La campagne de Manzikert d’après les sources musulmanes, in Byzantion, ix (1934), 613 ff.). In 465/1072 Alp Arslān was assassinated while on an expedition against the Karakhanids. He had appointed Malikshāh his wali ʿalad in 458/1066 and with a view to safeguarding his accession had allocated different parts of his kingdom in the form of ʿādād to various of his relatives. Nevertheless Malikshāh’s accession was disputed by Kāwurd, the Saldjūq ruler of Kirmān. He was defeated and killed, but his descendants continued to rule in Kirmān. In 466/1073-4 Malikshāh marched east and turned the Karakhanids out of Tirmidh and assigned Balkh and Tūghrāstān to his brother Tekish. The latter rebelled in 473/1080-1 and again in 477/1084-5. In 470/1077-8 Malikshāh assigned Syria to another brother, Tutush. Although Malikshāh’s nominal authority appears to have been recognized in Syria, he twice had to intervene in person (see H. A. R. Gibb, The Damascus chronicle of the Crusades, London 1932, 20-1), but in 484/1091 Tutush came to Baghdad to pay homage to him. In 482/1089-90 Malikshāh made an expedition to the east to deal with disturbances there. During this he received the submission of the Khān of Kāshāgar. Further consolidation took place inside Persia. The Shabānūkārā [q.v.] of Fārs were subdued, the states of northernmost Persia, except Shīrān, were annexed, and the Kurdish dynasty of the Marwanids, which had played an active role in the earlier struggles between Tughril, Ibrahim Ināl and the Buyids, was brought to an end in 478/1085-6, although the last Marwanid possession was not finally lost to the Artukids, Hūšān al-Dīn Taymūrtāsh b. Ḥilāl, until 532/1137-8. Various operations were undertaken against the Uqaylids, with whom earlier Tughril’s relations had been marked by a spirit of compromise. They had by this time begun to expand westwards, but with the death of Sharaf al-Dawla Muslim b. Kuraysh at Antioch in battle with Sulaymān b. Kutulmish in 478/1085 their power disappeared.

The decline of the Uqaylids facilitated the rise of another Arab dynasty, that of the Mazyadids in Hilla. They were Shīʿis, as were the majority of the Arab tribes in the region, and were, generally speaking, ready to submit to their next powerful figure in ‘Irāk, and became the leader of an Arab revolt against the Saldjūqs.

An attempt to exercise a stricter control over the caliph was made by Nizām al-Mulk, who sought to control him through the appointment of his own nominee to the caliph’s vizirate. Relations with the caliph became further strained when Malikshāh’s daughter, who was betrothed to al-Muktadi, nominee to the caliph’s vizirate. Relations with the caliph became further strained when Malikshāh’s daughter, who was betrothed to al-Muktadi, complained of his neglect after being taken to the caliph’s residence in 480/1087-8. In 484/1091 when Malikshāh came to Baghdad, he ignored the caliph’s presence and demanded that he should revoke the nomination of his eldest son in favour of his son by Malikshāh’s daughter and retire to Basra (or according to some accounts to Damascus or the Hijāz). The caliph demanded a delay and was relieved of Malikshāh’s demand by his assassination in 485/1093.

An important step towards strengthening and regimenting the religious institution—apart from the reaffirmation of the caliph’s position as the head of the Islamic community by the early sultans, and
the limitation of his functions to the religious sphere—was the development of the madrasas [q.v.]. The initiator of this movement was Niẓām al-Mulk, whose intentions were presumably to provide government officials trained in the tenets of orthodoxy to implement his political policies and to use the 'ulamd* educated in the madrasas to control the masses and combat the spread of the Ismā'īlīs. He did not found the madrasas, as is sometimes claimed, but he was responsible for their spread, which began for them in the reign of Malikshāh and caused the new madrasas to eclipse all other contemporary institutions of learning. Numerous madrasas were built by Sālđūq rulers, their ministers, and others, partly for the reasons mentioned above, but partly also to gain the support of the 'ulamd*, in order, through them, to gain the support of the masses (see further The internal structure of the Saljuq empire, op. cit.).

With the failure of al-Ḥasanī to establish Fāṭimid power in Baghdād, Shī'ī propaganda apparently ceased or was carried on in secret, and when the Sāl̇dūq invaders overthrew the Fāṭimids, they went on the defensive. In the reign of Malikshāh a revival of the Ismā'īlī movement took place, not, perhaps, unconnected with the vigorous steps taken to strengthen the orthodox institution. His reign had brought a measure of order but it had not removed all the old discontents, and by its stricter control and insistence on greater uniformity of thought had probably brought new ones. The "new propaganda" broke away from the old over a dynastic dispute (see further B. Lewis, The Assassins). Its founders regarded Niẓār as the successor of al-Muṣtamnīr instead of al-Mustāfī. A grandson of Niẓār, who with his son was murdered in prison in Egypt, was allegedly brought up at Amāmatūt by Ḥasan-i Sābḥū (see M. G. Hodgson, The order of the assassins, the Hague 1955, 66-7). The latter and his two successors, Kiyyū Buzurg Umid (518/1124—532/1138) and Muḥammad (532/1138—557/1162) claimed only to be emissaries of the imām, but the fourth grandmaster, al-Ḥasan al-Dīkhri hi ʿīlī-Salāmūn (557/1162—581/1166), proclaimed himself to be the son of the infant brought from Egypt and the first of a re-creɔlization of imāms. Politically the new institution was marked by extreme violence. The first assembly of the followers of the new propaganda took place, according to Ibn al-ʿAṭārī, in Sāva in the reign of Malikshāh. In 483/1090 they gained possession of Amāmatūt, in the neighbourhood of Khawzān, which became their headquarters. In the following year they established themselves in Kūhistān in east Persia. Malikshāh in 485/1092 sent expeditions against them in both districts. The one despatched against Amāmatūt was routed by a sally by the garrison. Niẓām al-Mulk was assassinated by a Bāṭinī shortly afterwards. When Malikshāh's death followed a few weeks later, the expedition withdrew. The other sent to Kūhistān also failed to make headway and on Malikshāh's death broke up.

Malikshāh and the sultans after him all left young, or fairly young, boys to succeed them, and the death of the sultan was almost always followed by struggles for supremacy among his surviving uncles, brothers, and cousins. The size of the sultan's standing army after the death of Malikshāh decreased, whereas those of the amirs increased. This change in their relative strength was an invitation to the amirs to assert their independence, and especially from the death of Māḥmūd b. Muḥammad (525/1131) onwards the internal political history of the Sāl̇dūq empire consists largely of a series of struggles by the amirs and atabegs to establish their supremacy over the sultan and set up virtually independent governments. Further, since the road to Asia Minor had become blocked by the Turkmans already there, and a stable Christian kingdom had been established in Georgia, the Turkmans had fewer outlets for their activities and were more ready to join in the struggles for the throne. The incorporation into the state of the Turkoman tribes, to whom the Sāl̇dūq family and its relations owed their origin, had proved an intractable problem. Some had been enrolled in the service of the sultan, but the majority continued to live a semi-nomadic existence, with a general tendency to move westwards. As the basis of the power of the Sāl̇dūq state shifted from the Turkmans to slaves and freedmen, the position of the Turkmans in relation to the rest of the population worsened. Apart from Syria and Anatolia, the main concentrations of Turkmans were to be found in Gurgān, the Dīyaṭra, ʿIrāk and ʿĀdharbāyjān, and to a lesser extent Khūzistān. The weakening of the Great Sāl̇dūq empire on the death of Malikshāh and the subsequent dissolution of the kingdom created by Tutuš in Syria to some extent restored the position of the Turkmans and several of them succeeded, within a few years, in founding independent principalities. The fact that some of them, such as Khānār b. Artūk [see Artūkīs], were the offspring of the sultan, helped them to transform themselves quickly into small territorial princes when the central authority declined.

On the death of Malikshāh, his wife Turkan Khāṭūn succeeded in putting her son Māḥmūd on the throne. He was nominally sultan for some two years (485/1092—487/1094), but Turkan Khāṭūn was ultimately unable to defeat the opposition which gathered round Barkyārūk. Ismā'īl b. Yākūtī, Barkyārūk's maternal uncle, in response to an appeal from Turkan Khāṭūn, marched against Barkyārūk with an army from ʿĀdharbāyjān and Arrān, of which provinces he had been governor under Malikshāh. He was defeated. Turkan Khāṭūn's death in 487/1094 was followed shortly afterwards by that of Māḥmūd. Tutuš also made a determined effort to obtain the sultanate but was finally defeated and killed by Barkyārūk in 488/1095. This was the last attempt to unite Syria with Persia and the eastern provinces. The Great Sāl̇dūq sultan continued for a time to be recognized nominally in Syria, but the control he exercised was negligible. By 490/1097 Barkyārūk had obtained possession of Kūharsān, of which his uncle, Arslān Arghū, had made himself master on the death of Malikshāh, and was recognized over the whole of Persia except Kirmān, and in ʿIrāk. In 492/1099-9 his brother Muḥammad rebelled. After many vicissitudes, in 497/1103-4, Barkyārūk established a slight superiority but at the cost of disorder throughout the country and a decline in the prestige of the sultanate. By the terms of the peace Muḥammad's status was virtually that of an independent ruler in Arrān, ʿĀdharbāyjān, Dīyaṭra, Mawṣīl and Syria. Sandjaric in Kūharsān was also to read the šahābah in his name.

The internecine strife between the Sāl̇dūq princes on the death of Malikshāh enabled the Bāṭīns to strengthen their position. In 489/1096 they obtained possession of Girdkūh, situated near Dāmghān on the main route from Kūharsān to western Persia. About the same time they also seized Šāhādīs just outside Ṣafāhān, whence they threatened the capital itself. About 493/1100 they infiltrated Barkyārūk's court and army. Eventually the sultan (who had him-
self been accused of Isma'ili sympathies) gave permission for measures to be taken against them. In 494/1101 he came to an agreement with Sandjar, who had been governor of Khurasan since 492/1098, for combined action against them, and an expedition was sent by Sandjar to Kuhistan, which achieved some success, as did another expedition three years later.

On the death of Barkyaruk in 498/1105, although he had nominated his son Malikshah as his successor, his brother Muhammad soon established himself as sultan. The Great Saldjuk sultanate once more extended over the whole of Persia with the exception of Kirmān, which continued under the Saldjuk of Kirmān. Muhammad's reign did something to restore the prestige of the sultanate, but the unity of the empire was never again effectively imposed. Fārs was pacified by Čawli Sakao, who was governor from 498/1104-500/1106 and 502/1109-505/1113. Sandjar nominally governor of Khurasan on behalf of Muhammad, was, in fact, all but independent, and engaged in consolidating his position, which was to enable him to make himself sultan after the death of Muhammad. Sa'da ḥ b. Dubays, who had encouraged the internal divisions of the Saldjuk empire in order to establish his own independence, rebelled in 501/1106 but was killed in battle. With his death the Arab revolt collapsed. That his son Dubays was appointed to succeed him, although in keeping with the Saldjuk policy of toleration and compromise, is, perhaps, also indicative of the inability of the Saldjuk to administer the Arab tribal districts except through their own leaders.

Operations against the Bāṭinis, which under Barkyaruk had not been seriously pressed, were prosecuted vigorously. In 500/1106-7 Muhammad undertook in person successful operations against them in the neighbourhood of Isfahān. Shāhūdīz was captured after a prolonged siege. Muhammad then sent an expedition to Alamūt. Operations continued for eight years and the castle was on the point of falling when it was saved by Muhammad's death. Isma'īlī forces near Ṭarāfīdīr in Fārs were also attacked.

On the death of Muhammad, although he had nominated his son Maḥmūd as his successor, Sandjar was generally regarded as the head of the family. Maḥmūd ruled in the west from 511/1118 to 522/1133, but his rule was disputed at different times and in different districts by his brothers, Maṣūd, Tughril, and Sulaymān Shāh and their atabegs, and in 513/1119 Sandjar intervened and defeated him at Sāva. Sandjar, however, returned to Khurasan and allowed Maḥmūd to rule in the west. Although he and his successors used the title sultan, their status was that of maḥlis. Various Saldjuk princes on their own initiative, or on the initiative of different amirs and atabegs, rebelled against Maḥmūd and his successors. Sandjar was forced to interfere on a number of occasions, but proved unable to restrain the increasing ambitions of the amirs and atabegs or to prevent the ultimate fragmentation of the empire, preoccupied as he was by the increasing pressure on the eastern frontier from the Karā Khītāy and the growing strength of the Khwārazmshāh. He suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the former in 530/1134, and 'Alā' al-Dīn Atsiz, who had succeeded his father Muhammad b. Anūs Tālān as governor of Khwārazm in 521/1127, temporarily occupied parts of Khurasan after Sandjar's defeat.

The caliphs also took part in the family quarrels of the Saldjūks, and as the caliph emerged again as a military power the amirs began to join him as they joined the other temporal leaders. After the death of Muhammad b. Malikshah a triangular struggle took place for the possession of Ḥarak between the caliph and al-Bursukī against Dubays, who was later joined by the atabeg ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī, ruler of Mawṣil since 521/1127, with the sultan playing an uneasy part in the background. The first caliph to assemble an army and advance in person in Saldjuk times was al-Mustarshīd (512/1118-529/1135). Finally, on the death of Maṣūd b. Muḥammad in 547/1152, al-Muktafi established himself as the dominant power in Ḥarak, exercising both temporal and religious power.

During the disorders which followed the death of Muhammad, the Ismaʿīlīs were to some extent able to recover their position in Khūsistan and northern Persia, though Ḥasan-ʾi Sāḥib died in 518/1124. In 520/1126 Sandjar resumed operations against them in Khūsistan. These were only partially successful, and the Ismaʿīlīs, benefiting from the preoccupations of Sandjar on the eastern frontiers and with the Ghuzz in Khurasan, were able again to increase their power. The fact that the Ghuzz became increasingly restive and intractable towards the end of Sandjar's reign was due to the fact that their numbers brought about by a southward movement of the Ghuzz who had remained in Central Asia, which was occasioned by the expansion of the Karā Khītāy into Transoxania. The control of the frontier against the inroads of the Ghuzz became increasingly difficult, and in 548/1153 battle was joined with them. Sandjar was defeated and held captive for over two years, during which the central government in Khūsistan broke down and the province was overrun by the Ghuzz. Sandjar escaped in 551/1156 but died the following year.

With the death of Sandjar, the Khwārazmshāh Il Arslān, who succeeded his father Atsiz in 551/1156, emerged as the most powerful ruler in the eastern provinces. He was, however, unable to establish his undisputed rule against the Ghuzz who had defeated Sandjar, and was nominally a tributary of the Karā Khītāy. In the west the Saldjuk empire had split into warring principalities. In Mawsil the Atabegs looked west and were largely occupied in a struggle with the Crusaders. In Ḥarak the caliph was disputing supremacy with the Saldjūks of Ḥarak, while in Luristan and Aḥtarbāyjān atabeg dynasties were establishing themselves, and in Fārs the Salgharids came to power. The last named, whose rule in Fārs began about 547/1148, were descended from Salghar, a Turkoman chief who had been one of Tughril Beg's bādīs. They were a successful and popular local house under whom considerable prosperity prevailed.

Il Arslan's death in 567/1172 was followed by civil war. His son, Tekish, finally established himself as Khwārazmshāh and when the power of the Karā Khītāy weakened towards the end of the 12th century, he became independent. About 588/1192 the caliph al-Nāsir appealed to Tekish for help against Tughril, the last of the Saldjūk sultans of Ḥarak. They defeated him in 590/1194 near Rayy. Tekish proved a more formidable rival to the caliph than Tughril, and towards the end of his reign he demanded that the khuds should be read in Baghdad in his name. In 592/1196 fighting took place between the Khwārazmshāh's army and the caliph's to the disadvantage of the latter and skirmishes continued between them for the next few years until Tekish's death in 596/1200.
This conflict with the caliph played a part in alienating the religious classes and the population from the Khwārazmshāh. Muhammad b. Tekiş, who succeeded, came into collision with the Ghūrids, who invaded Khurāsān about 597/1200-1. They were eventually worsted and by 612/1215-16 their territories had been annexed by the Khwārazmshāhs. Some years earlier, about 607/1210-11, the Karā Khīṭāy were turned out of Transoxania, and in 612/1215-16 the Khwārazmshāhs undertook a campaign against the Kīpchaks. On this occasion Muhammad came into contact with the Mongol vanguard for the first time. Meanwhile Muhammad reiterated Tekiş’s demand that the khuṭba be read in Baghdād in the name of the Khwārazmshāh, but met with an uncompromising refusal. He then declared the caliph a usurper and marched on 'Irāq. In 614/1217 he defeated successively the Salghārīds of Fārs and the atabegs of Aḏghārbāyjān, but in the winter of that year an army sent from Hamadān to Baghdād was annihilated by the Kurds. The threat of trouble in Khwārazm, led by the religious classes, forced Muhammad to leave the west before he could make good his defeat. After his return to Khwārazm, hostility between him and his mother, Turḵān Khwātūn, who had placed herself at the head of the opposing faction, became open. The army, composed largely of Kīpchaks and Kāндī to Turks (who were not, as had been the slave troops of the Salḏīḫūs, thoroughly familiar with Islam), was also riddled with faction, and there was a standing opposition between them and the Persian element. In, or about 615/1218 Čingiz Khān sent a body of merchants to gather information about the empire of the Khwārazmshāhs. When they reached Uṯrār they were plundered and put to death by the local governor with the connivance of the Khwārazmshāh. Čingiz sent envoys to Muhammad’s court to protest, threatening war if satisfaction was not given. One of the envoys was murdered and the other two were sent back with their beards shaved off. This action precipitated the Mongol invasion. In the subsequent operations the Khwārazmshāhs retreated before the Mongols, and many of their troops deserted. Meanwhile the Mongols, Uṯrār, Buḫkhrā, Uṯzkand, Djamad, Baŋkāt, Khudjand, Samarkand, Balkh, and Mārve were sacked and their inhabitants massacred. Nīshāpūr fell in 618/1221. Muhammad had meanwhile retired to Kāzwīn, and thence to Ġīlān and Māzandārān. He eventually fled to the island of Ašghāb in the Caspian where he died in 617/1220-1.

Dissonance and faction prevailed in Khwārazm. Muhammad’s son, Djalāl al-Dīn Mengubīrdī, was unable to establish himself. Fighting a rearguard action, he eventually crossed the Indus (618/1221). The Mongols pushed on through northern Persia and left through the Caucasian Gate near Darband in 620/1223. Djalāl al-Dīn, having failed to deprive the slave kings of Delhi of their kingdom, returned some three years later from India to Kirmān, and thence to Fārs and the Dībāl. He clashed with the Seljuq and the atabeg of Aḏghārbāyjān, and having defeated the latter made a foray into Georgia, and embarked on a struggle with the Āyyūbidîs, who were split by internal dissensions. He seized Akhḵāt, but was defeated in 628/1230 near Erzindjān. With the accession of Ogedei in 626/1229 the respite given by the death of Čingiz in 624/1227 came to an end and a new Mongol attack was launched in 627/1229. Djalāl al-Dīn, unable to regroup his forces, fled to Dīvār Bakr, and was murdered by a Kurdish peasant in 628-9/1230.

By the death of Ogedei in 638/1241 the Mongols had overrun northern Persia and had made further conquests in northern Mesopotamia, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. After his death, the Mongol advance was temporarily held up by dissensions. At the kurilīyat in 649/1251 Hūlagū (Ḫūlegū) was appointed to lead an expedition to occupy all the territories between the Oxus and the extreme limits of Egypt, and entrusted with hereditary rights of sovereignty as the representative of the Great Khan in the conquered lands. After lengthy preparations he set out and crossed the Oxus in 653/1256. He was joined at Kīgh in 654/1256 by Arḡān Āḵā, who had been appointed governor of Persia by Mūŋķe. One of the Hūlagū’s first steps to consolidate Mongol domination in Persia was to exterminate the Ismāʿīlīs, who had by this time become virtually territorial princes, and as such made and changed alliances with other local rulers. He overthrew their strongholds in Kūḥistān and in 654/1256 took Alḵāmāt and sent Ruṅk al-Dīn Khwāhūsh, the grandson, to Kārkūrm, where he was put to death. Then the Ismāʿīlīs survived in Persia only as a minor sect (see further B. Lewis, op. cit.).

From Hamadān Hūlagū called upon the caliph al-Muʿṭaṣīm to surrender to the Mongols. His reply was considered unsatisfactory, and Hūlagū marched on Baghdād. After a siege of some sixty days it fell and was sacked. The caliph and those of his family who could be found were put to death. Hūlagū then pushed on to Aḏghārbāyjān and made his headquarters at Marāḡā. In 657/1259 he set out for Syria and took Aleppo in 658/1260, and Damascus surrendered. On news of the death of Mūŋķe (657/1259), Hūlagū returned to Mongolia, leaving an army in Syria. Its defeat at ‘Arḡī by the Mamlūks in 658/1260 stayed the Mongol advance on Egypt. The Mongol empire now split up. Berke, who ruled in the Kīpchak steppes, sought to assert his supremacy over Hūlagū and invaded Persia via Darband and Shīrwān, but was defeated in 660/1262. In the following year Aḥbaḵ, Hūlagū’s son, invaded Berke’s territory but was defeated and retired to Dāḡistān. Hūlagū meanwhile marched northwards. The Hūlagūs of the Mongol invasion see Bartold, op. cit., and J. A. Boyle, Dynastic and Political History of the Il-Khans, in The Cambridge History of Iran, v.

The Mongol invasion was carried out by a horde organized for war with the deliberate intention of imposing political domination. Its immediate effect was the devastation and depopulation of the eastern provinces of the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate. ‘Irāq, once the metropolitan province of the ʿAbbāsīd empire, did not recover for centuries. (See further I. P. Petruševskiy, The socio-economic condition of Iran under the Il-Khāns, in The Cambridge History of Iran, v). Only Fārs partially escaped by the timely payment of tribute. The invasion also altered the balance of population by introducing new Turkish tribes, brought about a widespread extension of nomadism leading to the destruction of agriculture and urban life, and sharpened the dichotomy between turk and ṭāḏīḵ and between settled and semi-settled. In the early period of Mongol domination the conquerors lived apart from the local population in tents and encampments. The Mongol leaders and their ministers owned large flocks, which were placed under the care of officials called ḡāḏāns. Their depredations were a constant source of anxiety to the settled people. The practice of reserve pasturage for the Mongol army was also a burden on the local people. A new feature of society was the extent to
which the Mongol leaders personally indulged in trade (cf. Dastur al-Kdtib, 203 ff.). The Yasa of Cingiz Khan was followed by the early Ilkahn, as the son of the dynasty of Hulagü was called, and quoted by the later rulers. New practices and taxes, notably kudar, originally a cattle tax and later a fixed tax on peasants and nomads, kalān, a land tax, possibly levied partly in the form of labour service, and jamgūha, a tax on trade and urban crafts, possibly originally a poll-tax on urban dwellers and merchants, were introduced. The Mongol leaders, or some of them, and their relatives, and the religious leaders enjoyed certain immunities from taxation. The administration was largely in the hands of officials who had served preceding dynasties, and the new customs were in due course to a large extent assimilated to existing Islamic and customary usages. With the conversion of the Mongols to Islam there was a reassertion of the traditional theory and practices of government. The head of the bureaucratic administration was known as the shāhī diwān, whose duties were similar to those of the traditional vizier.

As Persian rulers, the Ilkhan were subject to the same limitations as other dynasties which ruled in Persia. They were faced with the problem of defence against the peoples of Central Asia and Turkestan in spite of the fact that there were now Mongols on both sides of the Oxus. They were also confronted with a second problem of defence, namely the maintenance of the Caucasus frontier. This region formed a bulwark in the defence of the region to the north and the south of it and was repeatedly fought over by the Ilkhan and the Golden Horde, and later from the 10th/16th century to the 12th/18th by the Safavids, and in the 19th century was disputed by Russia, the heir to the Golden Horde, and finally obtained by her (see further B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, 2nd ed., Berlin 1955). In the west the Ilkhan sought to expand by overthrowing the Mamluks in Syria and Palestine, but they were unable to establish their domination outside the western frontier of Mesopotamia, which became the geo-political boundary of Persia.

The reign of Abakā, who succeeded Hulagū, was spent in ceaseless campaigns against the Golden Horde, in repelling attacks from Transoxania, and operations against the Mamluks, which ended in a Mongol defeat at Marqal al-Safar in 680/1281. Abakā's successor, Tegider, the seventh son of Hulagū, announced his conversion to Islam after his accession and took the name Ahmad. It is possible that this was a political gesture to be seen against the failure of the Mongols to take Syria (see Spuler, op. cit., 78). Whether this is so or not, Tegider Ahmad's policy of favouring Islam caused unrest among the Mongol leaders to whose support he owed his accession. Civil war broke out and Arghūn seized the throne in 683/1284. During his reign, an abortive attempt was made to enlist support in Europe for a continental crusade against Islam. Internally there was a marked improvement in the position of the Christian and Jewish communities and an increase in their influence. Arghūn was succeeded by his brother Gaykhatū in 690/1291. His reign, which is marked by numerous rebellions and losses to the Mamluks, is chiefly remarkable for growing financial stringency, and the disastrous attempt to solve this by the introduction of paper money known as ʻāra. Baydu, grandson of Hulagū, governor of Irāk, seized power in 694/1295, but was eventually overthrown by Ghāzān, who was then governor of Khurāsān, in 694/1295. Ghāzān made a public profession of Islam after his victory.

Under Ghāzān (694/1295-704) the Ilkhans reached their height. The links between them and the Great Khan, which had already been greatly weakened though still borne witness to on the coinage and in documents, were finally broken. This was partly because of Ghāzān's conversion and partly because of the disintegration of the Mongol empire on the death of Kubilay in 694/1294. In 695/1295-6 the Caghatay Khan Duwa b. Baraız invaded Khurāsān from Transoxania, and the religious leaders attempted to give security of tenure to those in undisputed
possession of land by obtaining a fatwa giving validity to the provision in Cingiz Khan's ydsah, by which all land claims lapsed after thirty years, and by putting a stop on transactions in land the tenure of which was disputed. The pay of the army was also reorganized and in 703/1303 he reintroduced with modifications the old system of land assignments (iSfâds) to the soldiery (see further Landlord and peasant in Persia, and I. P. Petrushevsky, op. cit.).

With the death of Ghâzân in 703/1304 decline set in. There were no more expeditions to Syria. The Turkish rulers in Asia Minor began to throw off Mongol rule. Fârs and Kirmân became increasingly independent. Oljeytâl (703/1304—716/1316), who transferred his capital to Sulâniyya, failed to complete the reforms of Ghâzân. The empire was divided into rival factions, the most powerful of which were the Câpanâids [q.v.] and the Dîlalîrs [q.v.]. Ghâzân was succeeded by a child, Aâbâ Sa'id (716/1316-736/1336), after whose reign the Îlkân empire broke up, various amirs and provincial governors assuming their independence. (For details of the rule of the Îlkâns see further J. A. Boyle, op. cit.) A period of restless stirrings and repeated expeditions by the different leaders to extend their domains at the expense of their rivals ensued. In the east in Harât there were the Karts [q.v.] and in Luristan the Atabegs, also called the Hâzaraspîds [q.v., both of whom pre-dated the Îlkân khans and acted as their governors in the heyday of Îlkân power. In İrâk and Âdâbarbâyqân there were the Dîlalîrs, whose founder Hasan-i Buzurg first attempted to rule through a series of puppet khâns, and in Fârs and Îrâk-i 'Adîjam the Ingûids [q.v.], Muzzafarrîds [q.v.], who were perhaps the most successful of the succession states, although internecine strife eventually caused their destruction. Their main centres of power were Fârs, Yazd and Kirmân. In the last-named province they succeeded the Kutlugh Khâns (the Karâ Khîtâyîvân), whose founder, Barâk Hâdjîb, had established himself in Kirmân after the overthrow of the Khâtârzamgâh by the Mongols. He and his successors ruled as Mongol governors. The last of the Kutlugh Khâns, Kutb al-Dîn Shâh Dîshân, died in 793/1380-1. One of the most interesting of the succession states was that of Shâhâbdîrîd in Sabwâr. There, like the Sayyîdis of Marâq, who also established themselves as small local rulers, appear to have based their power partly on a "popular" movement (see further, I. P. Petrushevsky, Sabbâdâris, translated by Muhammad Karîm Khîhâvîr, in Fârskhang-i Irân Zamin, x, 1-4 (1962). All of these local rulers, except the Dîlalîrs, who survived in Lower Mesopotamia until 835/1429, were extinguished by Timûr, if they had not already disappeared.

The Câhtagât khânate, which bordered the Îlkân kingdom on the north-east, had been temporarily usurped by Kaydü, Ogedeî's grandson. It was recovered by Duwa b. Barâk on Kaydü's death in 700-1301. It consisted of two parts: the western part formed by the oases of the Oxus-Jaxartes basin, excluding the lower course of the Oxus in Khâtârzam which belonged to Djîsgâh, and the east of part, comprising the Zungarian steppes and known as Mughulûstân. In the former the Mongols ruled over a sedentary Muslim population, but in the latter the Câhtagât khân were the leaders of pagan nomads. In Mughulûstân the Mongol khâns retained their domination, but in Transoxania power passed into the hands of the local Turkish amirs, the most influential of whom in the 13th-14th century was Karâghân, who seized power in 747/1346-7 and ruled some twelve years. His death was followed by an uninterrupted period of war and strife between the Turkish and Mongol khâns of western Türkistan. About 761/1360 Tughluq Timûr, the newly converted Eastern Câhtagât khân, sought to assert his dominion over the western as well as the eastern part of the Câhtagât khânate.

Among the conflicting parties and interests, Timûr gradually established himself as the defender of the Islamic borderlands against these renewed attacks from Central Asia. At first, not strong enough to show uncompromising resistance to the invaders, he made terms with Tughluq Timûr, who gave him Kîch as a swâyârghâl. He then entered into an alliance with Amir Hûsûn, the ruler of Balkh. The next few years (763/1362—769/1367) were a period of great confusion, in which the struggle between the Mongol and Turkish leaders ebbed and flowed. In 766-7/1365 Timûr and Amir Hûsûn, after being defeated by Ilyâs Khwâdja Tughluq Timûr's successor, abandoned Samarkand, which was, however, successfully defended by the townspeople under the leadership of the "ulama". When they eventually returned to Samarkand, conflict broke out between them. Timûr was forced to retire to Kûhrâsân, but when a new Mongol attack threatened, Amir Hûsûn was reconciled to him. The Mongol threat proved to be only temporary, and Timûr now turned against his erstwhile ally and took Balkh in 771/1369. Although Timûr's military power was based on the nomads of western Türkistan, since they were closely linked to the settled population through commercial interests and the protection of the caravan routes, and their chiefs were beginning to acquire property in the towns and to be more fully islamicized, he served, at this period, the interests of both the nomads and the settled population: to the former, who had been rent by squabbles among themselves, he gave cohesion and unity and to the latter security to pursue their commercial activities and to continue their religious life.

Timûr's next step was to take the offensive against the nomads of eastern Türkistan, and in a series of campaigns between c. 771/1369—781/1378 he defeated both them and the Kipchaks in Khâtârzam. He then turned his arms against the interior of the Iltümûs. In 782/1380-1 he invaded Persia, subduing Kûhrâsân, Mâzandâran, and Sîstân. In 786/1384-5 he made a second expedition into Persia, invading Mâzandâran again and pushing on to Âdâbarbâyqân, 'Irâk-i 'Adîjam, and Georgia, coming back via Shîrâz and Ispâhân. In 790/1388, the Kipchaks under Tukatmîsh overran the oases of the Oxus-Jaxartes basin up to Samarkand, but withdrew when Timûr returned from Fârs. Two years later, he pursued them into the Kipchak steppe and defeated them at Urtapâ in 793/1391. He then went again to Fârs and thence to 'Irâk, Armenia, and Georgia, which he subjugated (793/1393 to 798/1396), before returning once more to Samarkand. From the spring of 800/1398 to the spring of 801/1399 he was occupied in his Indian campaign and the following autumn (802/1399) he set out for Asia Minor on his most famous campaign, which culminated in the defeat of the Ottomans at the battle of Ankara in 804/1402 and the capture of the Ottoman sultan, Bâyazîd. In the following year Timûr raided Georgia and in 806-7/1405 returned to Samarkand, whence he set out for China, but died en route at Utrâr in 807/1405 (see further H. Hookham, Tamburlaine the conqueror, London 1962, and R. Grousset, Les empires Mongoles).

Timûr's empire looked back to the Mongols, but although many of its institutions derive from
Mongol practice, his administration had an Islamic veneer and alongside the begs (or amirs), nd'ibs, yasafrlik (public guards), yasa'uls (officers charged with the keeping of the public peace), dārūghās, falconers, hunters, and so on, were the whole range of officials known in pre-Mongol times. Under Hasan Bāykar a sophisticated bureaucratic administration existed, at the head of which was the diwān-i dā', responsible for military and civil affairs. A special diwān, the diwān-i hūsaini, dealt with Turkish and military affairs (see further, 'Abd Allāh Marwārdi, Sharaf-nāma, ed. H. R. Roemer, Wiesbaden 1952). In military affairs Timūr carried on Mongol tradition but introduced certain innovations. Although he started his career as the defender of the sedentary Islamised population of western Turkistān against the nomads of eastern Turkistān these terms are relative: the basis of Timūr's military power was the nomadic tribes, who made regular summer and winter migrations in which the whole horde took part. Clavijo gives a vivid description of Timūr and his horde (Clavijo: Embassy to Tamerlaine, 1403-1406, ed. G. Le Strange, Broadway Travellers, 1928, 191 ff.). Their flocks were numbered for taxation. Tradesmen and craftsmen followed the armies, supplying their needs, and the booty obtained in caravans was bartered and sold in these bazaars. Colonies of workmen were transplanted to Tabriz and Samarkand from Syria, China, and other parts of Persia. Artisans were organised in guilds. Some of these were forced to give free labour for the ruler, and in time of war were requisitioned. Samarkand became under Timūr a great industrial and commercial centre. Silk, glass, ceramics, and paper were manufactured there. Trade, which had fallen off since the conversion of the Mongols to Islam, was encouraged with China, India, Persia and Syria. Tabriz became an important entrepôt.

Timūr's religious policy appears to have been dictated by political expediency. In Khorāsān he supported strict orthodoxy but in Syria he appeared to the defender of 'Alī and the imāms. Two important dar-wās orders, the Ni'matullāhī and the Nāqshbāndī, were founded during his reign. There was a trend towards a closer control of the religious institution which was continued under the Timurid dynasties of the Black Sheep and the White Sheep and reached its culmination under the Şafavīds. Şarafī officials were placed under the supervision of a new official known as the sadr, who was entrusted with their dismissal and appointment, the upkeep of mosques, madrasas, graveyards, and ḥākākhs, and whose duty, in general, was to further right religion (see especially document 9 in the Sharaf-nāma, op. cit.).

On Timūr's death internecine strife broke out, from which two main kingdoms emerged. Mirān Shāh, the third son of Timūr, and his sons Abū ʿAbd Allāh Bāyqara and Muḥammad ʿUmar, obtained western Persia, with their main centres at Tabriz and Baghdād, and ʿShāhrukh, Timūr's fourth son, Khorāsān, to which he subsequently added Transoxania. The Timūrid state in western Persia did not last long: the Djalā'īrs recovered Baghdād and the Turkomans of the Black Sheep, whom Timūr had driven out of Armenia, Adharbaydžān and Baghdad (see further below). ʿShāhrukh was faced by numerous revolts and on his death his kingdom rapidly disintegrated, to fall in part to the Black Sheep and in part to the Uzbeks, who invaded Transoxania at the turn of the 9th/15th century. In spite of the political decline, a brilliant cultural revival took place under the successors of Timūr and continued down to the end of the dynasty.

Bibliography: In view of the general character of the above article, for detailed bibliographical information reference should be made to the historical, geographical, ethnological, and religious articles dealing with Persia. (A. R. S. Lambton)

(b) Turkomans to Present Day

The devastating campaigns of Timūr in Iran between 820-821/1415-16 swept away the minor dynasties which had sprung up in various parts of the country after the Mongol invasions, and left a political and social vacuum from the Oxus to the Euphrates. In this vacuum various rival forces fought for supremacy for nearly a century. The establishment of the Şafawīd dynasty in 907/1501-2 led to the re-integration of Iran and ʿIrāk-i ʿArab under one stable administration, certainly for the first time since the break-up of the Tūrkmān empire, ca. 736-1335, and, if one takes into consideration the important city of Harāt, virtually for the first time since the invasions of Čingi Khan [p. 15].

At the time of the death of Timūr in 807/1405, his descendants found themselves in secure possession only of Khorāsān and ʿIrāk-i ʿAdīm, outside Transoxania itself. In the course of the next fifteen years, however, ʿShāhrukh b. Timūr successively annexed the provinces of Gurgān and Māzandarān (809/1406-7), Fārs (817/1414-15), and Kirmān (819/1416-17), and in 823/1420-1 felt strong enough to invade Adharbaydžān, which had passed into the hands of the Kara Köyunlu (Black Sheep) Turkomans.

The Kara Köyunlu group of nomadic Turkoman tribes, like their rivals the ʿAḵ Köyunlu (White Sheep) Turkomans, had settled in Saldijik times in Armenia, Upper Mesopotamia and Anatolia. In the second half of the 8th/14th century, the Kara Köyunlu moved eastwards into north-west Iran, and established themselves in the region of Lake Van as vassals of the Djalā'īrs [q.v.]. In about 792/1390 the Kara Köyunlu amīr Kara ʿYūṣuf seized Tabriz and declared his independence of the Djalā'īrī sultans. Both rulers were dispossessed by Timūr, but regained control of Adharbaydžān and ʿIrāk-i ʿArab respectively within a few years of the death of Timūr.

Kara ʿYūṣuf rapidly enlarged the area under Kara Köyunlu control. In 819/1419 he defeated Sultan Abūnā Djalā'īr and annexed the whole of ʿIrāk-i ʿArab except for a small area of southern ʿIrāk. He asserted his authority over various local rulers in Shirwān and Georgia. In 822/1420 he invaded ʿIrāk-i ʿAdīm and expelled the Timūrid officers from the cities of Sulṭānīyya, Tārum, Kāzwin and Śāwā. Kara ʿYūṣuf had made the Kara Köyunlu the dominant power in western Iran, ruling directly over Adharbaydžān, and Fārs from another, thus uniting eastern Persia under his rule. He subsequently attacked the Black Sheep, occupied Adharbaydžān, and penetrated Armenia, but was unable to defeat the Black Sheep decisively and was forced to leave them in effective possession of Armenia, Adharbaydžān, and Baghādād (see further below). ʿShāhrukh was faced by numerous revolts and on his death his kingdom rapidly disintegrated, to fall in part to the Black Sheep and in part to the Uzbeks, who invaded Transoxania at the turn of the 9th/15th century. In spite of the political decline, a brilliant cultural revival took place in Harāt under the successors of Timūr and continued down to the end of the dynasty.
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Kara Yūsuf's death in 823/1420 was followed by dissenion among his sons, and Shāhrukh was able to subjugate ʿĀḏarbāyjān. The Kara Koyunlu carried on a guerrilla war against the Timurids, and in 832/1429, and again in 839/1435, Shāhrukh was forced to return to ʿĀḏarbāyjān to stabilise the situation. The Timurid governor was replaced by a Kara Koyunlu prince subservient to Shāhrukh.

Shāhrukh [q.v.], whose reign had represented a measure of stability and reconstruction, died in 850/1447. The Kara Koyunlu leader Djiānghāsh immediately went over to the offensive and, taking advantage of divisions among the Timurids, extended the Kara Koyunlu empire to its greatest extent. He seized Sūltānīyya and Kāzwīn in 850/1447, overran the whole of ʿĪrāḵ-i ʿAdjam and Fārs within the space of a few months in 856/1452, and in 862/1458 occupied ʿHārāt, the capital of Timurid Khūrāsān. A revolt in ʿĀḏarbāyjān forced Djiānghāsh to cede Khūrāsān to the Timurid Ābd ʿAṣīd, who transferred his capital from Samarḵand to ʿHārāt, but Djiānghāsh continued to rule over ʿĀḏarbāyjān, the two ʿĪrāḵs, Fārs, the shores of the Sea of ʿUman, Kirmān, Sarīt, Armenia, and Georgia, until his death in 872/1468.

During the reign of Djiānghāsh a new contender for power in Iran appeared in the shape of the ʿSafawids. Under the leadership of Djiunayd [q.v.] (851/1447–864/1460), the now strongly ʿShīʿī ʿSafawid movement entered a new militant phase, and for the first time its leaders aspired to temporal power. Djiānghāsh considered the threat so real that he ordered Djiunayd to disperse his forces and depart from Ardabil, should he fail to comply, Ardabil would be destroyed. Djiunayd fled, and ultimately took refuge at the Aḵ Koyunlu court in ʿDīyār Bakr (861-3/1456-9). The political advantages of an alliance against their mutual enemy, the Kara Koyunlu, led the militantly ʿShīʿī Djiunayd and the zealously orthodox Aḵ Koyunlu ruler ʿUẓūn Ḥasan to sink their religious differences, and to cement their alliance by the marriage of Djiunayd to ʿUẓūn Ḥasan's sister. Djiunayd was killed in battle in ʿShīrāzn in 864/1460, but his successor Ḥāydar maintained the close alliance between the ʿSafawids and the Aḵ Koyunlu by marrying ʿUẓūn Ḥasan's daughter.

In 872/1468 the Kara Koyunlu ruler Djiānghāsh attacked ʿUẓūn Ḥasan. He was defeated, and the Kara Koyunlu empire was overthrown. The Timurid ruler ʿĀbd ʿAṣīd saw this as an opportunity to extend his authority westwards from Khūrāsān, but he too was defeated by ʿUẓūn Ḥasan, and put to death. The Aḵ Koyunlu thus succeeded to the Kara Koyunlu empire in Iran, ʿĪrāḵ-i ʿArab, ʿDīyār Bakr and Armenia, but an attempted Aḵ Koyunlu coup at ʿHārāt was frustrated by Sūltān ʿHusayn ʿMīrzā [q.v.], whose occupation of ʿHārāt in 875/1470 inaugurated a period of some thirty-five years of relatively stable and prosperous Timurid rule in Khūrāsān. ʿUẓūn Ḥasan also had aspirations to extend his empire westwards, but, after some initial success against the Ottomans, he was decisively defeated in 878/1473.

The death of ʿUẓūn Ḥasan in 882/1478 marked the beginning of Aḵ Koyunlu decline, as rival princes, supported by, and sometimes dominated by, ambitious imams, successively contested the throne. In the twenty-five years which remained before the last Aḵ Koyunlu ruler, Murād, was expelled from Iran in 908/1503 by Shāh ʿĪṣāmīl I [q.v.], the only thread of continuity is the inexorable progress of the ʿSafawid movement towards its goal of achieving power in Iran by revolutionary means. This progress was marked by the death in battle of two more ʿSafawid leaders (Ḥaydar [q.v.], in 893/1488, and ʿAll in 899/1494), and by the breakdown of the Aḵ Koyunlu-ʿSafawid alliance. Once the mutual enemy, the Kara Koyunlu, had disappeared from the scene, it was only a matter of time before the political and military ambitions of the ʿSafawids came into conflict with those of the Aḵ Koyunlu.

In 893/1488 Aḵ Koyunlu troops were the major factor in the defeat of Ḥāydar, and in 899/1494 the Aḵ Koyunlu sultan Rustam, having released ʿAll from imprisonment because he needed his help against a rival prince, then had to crush him when support for him developed on an alarming scale. ʿAll's brother, ʿĪsamīl, escaped, and for five years directed from his exile in ʿGīlān the final stages of the ʿSafawid revolution. His emissaries went to and fro between ʿGīlān and their bases in Anatolia, Syria and the Armenian highlands. It was from these areas that ʿĪsamīl derived the elite of his fighting men, his most fanatical adherents, men of the Rūmūl, ʿUstādīlū, Ṭakākūlū, Ḍhūlī-Ḵādār, ʿUrmān, ʿṢāmilū, ʿArūmān, ʿAḏār, ʿKāḏār, ʿUstādīlū, and other Turkoman tribes. These men considered ʿĪsamīl to be both their political and temporal ruler. They had acquired the celebrated sobriquet of ḵīšlī-bāšī ("red-heads", T. ḵīšlī-bāš). By virtue of the distinctive crimson hat, with the twelve folds denoting the Ḫīnā ʿasḥārī ʿismāʿīls, which had been devised for them by Ḥāydar. In 905/1499 ʿĪsamīl made his bid for power; by the autumn of 1500 he had been joined by 7,000 ḵīšlībāš at his rendezvous at Erzinjān. He turned aside to crush the Shīrānshāh, who had killed both his father and his grandfather, and then, at the battle of ʿṢhārūr, he routed Alwānd Aḵ Koyunlu. ʿĪsamīl entered Tawrīz (907/1501), had himself crowned as the first shāh of the ʿSafawid dynasty, and proclaimed the Djaʿāfārī rite of Ḫīnā ʿasḥārī Shīʿīsm to be the official religion of the new ʿSafawid state. He had two main reasons for taking this step: first, he wished clearly to differentiate the ʿSafawid state from the Ottoman Empire, into which it might otherwise have been absorbed; second, he aimed at creating by this means a sense of unity among his subjects, a sense of separate identity which would permit the evolution of a national state in the modern sense of the term. The change to Shīʿīsm seems to have been accepted by the people at large without any serious display of opposition. ʿSafawid propagandists had, of course, been active for a long period, but there are other factors which may have helped to produce a climate of religious opinion favourable to ʿSafawid Shīʿīsm, for example, the activities of heterodox and antinomian groups such as the Ṣurūfīs, and the activities of other Shiʿī Orders in Persia, some of which were unquestionably permeated by Shīʿī ideas. Many, but not all, of the ʿulāmāʾ resisted the change. Some who did were put to death, notably at Shīrūz; others fled first to the Timurid court at ʿHārāt, and later, after the conquest of Khūrāsān by the ʿSafawids, to the ʿUzbek capital at Buḫūrā. To impose doctrinal unity, the ʿSafawids appointed an official termed the ʿulāmāʾ, who was the head of the religious institution, but in practice derived his authority from the political institution.
The first ten years of Isma'il's reign were spent in conquering the rest of Iran and Mesopotamia. In 903/1500 a victory over the remaining Ak Koyunlu forces under Sultan Murad, near Hamadán, gave him control of central and southern Iran; Mäzandarán and Gurgän were subjugated in 909/1504; Diýar Bakr was annexed in 913/1507, Baghádád was captured in 914/1508, and Kurásán was annexed in 916/1510 after a crushing defeat of the Uzbeks at Marv. The victory at Marv, however, did not solve the problem of the defence of the eastern marches against the nomads, and, only two years later, a Safawid army was routed at Ghuḏujwán, just east of the Oxus, and the Uzbeks swept across Kurásán as far as Mašhad. Isma'il restored the situation, and an uneasy truce with the Uzbeks followed.

The Sunni Uzbeks in the east and the Sunni Ottomans in the west were the principal enemies of the Safawid state. The existence on the borders of Anatolia of a powerful Şí'i state, which claimed the allegiance of large numbers of Turkoman tribesmen living within the borders of the Ottoman Empire itself, was a threat which the Ottomans could not ignore, and in 920/1514 Selim I launched what proved to be the first of a long series of invasions of Iran by Ottoman forces. On 2 Radjab 920/23 August 1514 the Safawid capital, Tabriz, was sacked almost entirely by cavalry at Cáldírán [q.v.] by the fire-power of the Ottoman muskets and artillery. Selim had to withdraw from Tabriz after a short occupation, but the Ottomans annexed the province of Diyár Bakr, and the regions of Mārāş and Albístán.

The Safawid defeat at Cáldírán had important repercussions. Isma'il lost his faith in his own invincibility, and during the remaining ten years of his life never again led his men into battle. The kizilbāsh, who had revered their ruler as the Shadow of God upon earth and had worshipped him as the manifestation of God, were disillusioned. The actions of the kizilbāsh after Cáldírán, and particularly after the death of Isma'il, show clearly that, although they preserved the outward forms, they considered the concept of their leader as the Shadow of God upon earth, immortal and infallible, to be a polite fiction. From this time, too, the term Šuŷī, implying a relationship between murdh and murid which the kizilbāsh had in practice, though not in theory, repudiated, occurs less and less frequently in the sources. The status of Šuŷīs declined, and the term "Šuŷī" acquired a definitely pejorative significance under the later Safawids.

Shāh Isma'il died on 19 Radjab 930/23 May 1524, and was succeeded by his son Tahmásp, then ten and a half years of age. The extent to which the theocratic concept of the early Safawid state had broken down in practice was demonstrated by the ten years of civil war between rival kizilbash factions which marked the beginning of his reign. The authority of the shah was usurped by kizilbash chiefs, who were the de facto rulers of the state during this period. In 940/1533, however, Shāh Tahmásp made clear his intention to rule in fact and not in name only, and, for most of the remainder of his long reign of fifty-two years, he maintained a precarious ascendancy over the turbulent kizilbāsh.

Most Western and Oriental sources give us a totally unfavourable picture of Tahmásp [q.v.]. They portray him as a melancholy recluse who swung between extremes of abstinence and intemperance, as a man capable of great cruelty. Nobody has given Tahmásp credit for holding the Safawid state together for more than half a century, in the face of the most determined onslaughts by the Ottomans under their greatest conqueror, Süleymán the Magnificent, and by the Uzbeks under one of their most powerful leaders, ʻUbayd Alláh Khán. Between 930/1524 and 944/1538, the Uzbeks launched five major attacks on Kurásán. Between 940/1533 and 961/1553, the Ottomans made four full-scale assaults on ʻĀḏarbáýján. Baghádád was captured by the Ottomans in 921/1515, and thereafter ʻĪrāq, ʻArab remained in Ottoman hands, except for a brief interlude between 1032/1623—1048/1638. Tabriz was occupied on several occasions, and Tahmásp transferred the capital to Kažvín, which was not so close to the Ottoman frontier. Attacks by foreign enemies were not the only problem confronting Tahmásp. During the first decade of his reign, Iran was gravely weakened by kizilbash inter-tribal rivalries and by the defection of groups of kizilbash to the Ottomans; moreover in 941/1534, and again in 955/1548, Tahmásp had to deal with rebellious brothers. In 962/1555 Tahmásp negotiated the Treaty of Amasya, and Iran obtained a respite from Ottoman attack for thirty years.

The reigns of Isma'il I and Tahmásp I represent a period of change and adjustment. Under Isma'il, as August 1534, an attempt was made almost entirely to reconcile the Šuŷī organization inherited from the Šafawīyya Order with the administrative organization of the Safawid state. The failure of this attempt posed problems in regard to which Tahmásp temporized and to which ʻAbbás I provided solutions which were effective only as short-term measures. The failure precisely to define the scope and function of the principal offices of state during this period produced some degree of conflict between the holders of these offices, and meant that the boundary between the "political institution" and the "religious institution" was never clearly demarcated. The movement away from the theocratic form of government which obtained after the establishment of the Safawid state was noticeable even before the death of Isma'il, and this tendency was reflected in changes in the scope and function of the principal offices of state, and in their relative importance. In particular, the status of the wakīl-i nafīṣ-i nafīs-i humāyūn, the alter ego of the shah and his vicegerent both in his religious and his political capacity, declined until his position was little different from that of the vizier, the head of the bureaucracy; the power of the šāds, once their primary task of imposing doctrinal unity had been achieved, also declined; and the shah himself attempted to restrict the power of the ṣamī al-ʻumūr?.

In 982/1574, Shāh Tahmásp became seriously ill, and the Safawid state was once again involved in a crisis. At first, the dissensions which broke out among the kizilbash appeared to be merely a recrudescence of the factional struggles which had imperilled the Safawid state fifty years previously. But the new crisis was, in fact, of a very different nature. The question from 982/1574 onwards was not which of the kizilbash tribes should achieve a dominant position over its rivals, but rather, whether the kizilbash as a whole could maintain their privileged position as the military aristocracy in the Safawid state, in the face of the challenge from new ethnic elements in Safawid society, namely, the Georgians and Circassians. The majority of these people were the offspring of prisoners taken during the course of four campaigns waged in the Caucasus by Tahmásp between 947/1540—1 and 961/1553. In addition,
a certain number of Georgian noblemen voluntarily entered Safavid service during Tahmāsp's reign. By the time of the death of Tahmāsp in 984/1576, the power of the Georgian and Circassian women in the royal harem was such that they intervened in political affairs and engaged in active intrigue with a view to securing the throne for their own sons. In this way, they introduced into the Safavid state dynastic rivalries of a new kind.

The struggle for power between the kīzīl-bābā and the Georgians and Circassians, continued during the reigns of Ismā‘īl II (984/1576—985/1577) and Sultan Muḥammad Shāh (985/1578—996/1588), and was finally settled in favour of the latter by the measures taken by Shāh ʿAbbās I (q.v.) (996/1588—1038/1629) — measures which radically altered the social basis of the Safavid state.

The situation which ʿAbbās faced at his accession was critical in the extreme. The Ottomans had resumed operations in Aḏharbāyjān, and the citadel at Tabrīz had been in their hands since 993/1585. In the east, the Uzbeksstormed Harāt in 997/1589, and swept on across Khūrāsān as far as Maḥhad. To free his hands to deal with the Uzbeks, ʿAbbās was forced to negotiate a humiliating peace with the Ottomans which left more Persian territory in Ottoman hands than ever before (998/1589-90). The events of his youth had left him no place no faith in them. The position of the kīzīl-bābā, and the extent of their activity in creating a standing army which would be paid direct from the Royal Treasury and would be loyal only to himself. From the ranks of the Georgians and Circassians (thereafter termed khwālmān-i bābā-yi sharīf) he formed a cavalry regiment of some 10,000 men, and a personal bodyguard of 3,000 men. A regiment of musketeers, 12,000 strong, recruited from the Persian peasantry, and an artillery regiment, also of 12,000 men, completed the new standing army of 37,000 men. In order to pay these new troops, ʿAbbās resorted to the device of increasing the extent of the crown lands (bābāsā) at the expense of state lands (mamālık). The mamālık provinces were in general governed by kīzīl-bābā amirs, who consumed in the areas under their jurisdiction most of the taxes which they levied, to some extent militated against extortion. Once such provinces were converted to bābāsā lands, they were placed in the hands of a komptor or interment of the Crown, who had no interest in maintaining their prosperity but whose sole concern was to remit to the Royal Treasury the maximum amount of money possible, in order to gratiate himself with the shah. Under Shāh ʿAbbās I (997/1589—1038/1629) and Shāh ʿAbbās II (1052/1642—1077/1666), this process was accelerated to such an extent that even the frontier provinces were brought under the direct administration of the Crown, except in time of war, when kīzīl-bābā governors were reappointed. Ultimately, this policy impaired the economic health of the country and weakened it militarily. Every increase in the extent of crown lands at the expense of mamālık lands meant a corresponding decrease in the power of the kīzīl-bābā, and, in practice, the new ghuḍām regiments did not possess the fighting qualities of the old kīzīl-bābā tribal forces.

In the short term, however, the creation of the ghuḍām regiments enabled ʿAbbās gradually to reassert the authority of the ruling institution, and so to stabilize the internal situation in Iran. Even so, it was not until 1007/1600 that he dared to commit his forces to a pitched battle against the Uzbeks. In that year, ʿAbbās gained a great victory over the Uzbeks, and liberated Harāt after ten years of Uzbek rule. With the north-eastern frontier at least temporarily secure, ʿAbbās turned his attention to the Ottomans, and by 1016/1607 the last Ottoman soldier had been expelled from Safavid territory as defined by the Peace of Amasya in 1555.

Throughout his reign, ʿAbbās continued his policy of weakening the position of the kīzīl-bābā and strengthening that of the ghuḍām, on whom he principally relied for support. He sought to break up kīzīl-bābā tribal groupings, and he constantly replenished his ghuḍām forces by fresh drafts of Georgian, Circassian, and (from 1013/1604 onwards) Armenian prisoners. The revolution in the social structure of the Safavid state which he thus effected was reflected in changes in the highest levels of the political institution and the religious institution. The titles of wakīl and amīr al-umārāʾ, which were so closely associated with the organization of the early Safavid state and with the period of kīzīl-bābā supremacy, were no longer used. The kīzīl-bābā, as the commander-in-chief of the drastically reduced kīzīl-bābā forces was henceforth usually termed, was still one of the highest officers of state, but his power was balanced by that of the commanders of the new non-kīzīl-bābā regiments, the tufangšt-ābāsī and the kullār-ābāsī. The influence of the sādīr, who was a political appointee, decreased once doctrinal unity had been imposed throughout the Safavid dominions, and, with the increasing crystallization of Ithnā ʿashari theology, the mudāfiḥs became the most powerful members of the religious classes. Finally, with the increasing separation between temporal and religious powers, and the growing tendency towards centralization of the administration, the vizier, as head of the bureaucracy, became one of the most influential officials in the state, and frequently adopted, and with the grandiose titles of tīwād al-dawla and sādīr-i ʿaṣām.

The reign of ʿAbbās I in many ways marks the highest point of Safavid achievement. Commercial rivalry in the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean between the Dutch, the Portuguese, and the English, meant the development of diplomatic relations between Iran and the West. Spain, Portugal, and England sent ambassadors to ʿAbbās's court, and foreign monastic orders, such as the Carmelites, the Augustinians, and the Capuchin friars, were given permission to found convents in Iran. In 1007/1597 ʿAbbās transferred the capital from Kāzvin to ʿIsfahān; the more central location of the latter city made it a more satisfactory base for operations against either the Ottomans or the Uzbeks. ʿAbbās addressed himself with characteristic energy to the task of transforming ʿIsfahān into one of the most beautiful cities in the world. He embarked on a huge programme of public works, which included mosques, madrasas, caravansarais, and khammāms. The Masджd-i Shāh (begun in 1020/1611) and the Masджd-i Shaykh Lutf Allāh (begun in 1021/1603), situated in the famous māyīn of ʿIsfahān known as Nāṣir-i ʿAlā, are two masterpieces of Iranian architecture. The reign of ʿAbbās also marks the highest point in the renaissance of Iranian arts which had begun under the Timurids in the 9th/15th century and which continued throughout the Safavid period. Except perhaps in painting, in which the productions of the Tabriz school during the reign of Tahmāsp are superior, the artistic productions of the period of ʿAbbās are unsurpassed. In book painting and the illumination of manuscripts, in ceramics, textiles, and the manufacture of carpets and rugs, the Iranian genius achieved its finest expression.
The Safawid state, as rebuilt by Shah ʿAbbās, had an imposing facade, behind which the decay which spread with increasing rapidity during the second half of the 17th/18th century was not immediately apparent. Of the Safawid rulers who followed ʿAbbās, only his great-grandson, ʿAbbās II (1052/1642—1077/1666), was a ruler worthy of the name. The degeneration of the dynasty must be attributed to the pernicious practice, instituted by ʿAbbās I himself, of incarcerating the royal princes in the haram and never allowing them any contact with the outside world. Prior to ʿAbbās I, it had been the custom to place the royal princes, and in particular the heir-apparent, in the charge of one of the kizīlabāsh provincial governors. Such a governor, termed ḥala or ṣabāje ḥ, was responsible for the physical and moral welfare of his charge, and for training him for his future responsibilities. Occasionally, an ambitious or rebellious ḥala would use the young prince committed to his care as the focal point of a revolt against the ruler. But this possibility was infinitely to be preferred to the certainty that a prince, brought up by the court eunuchs, in the debilitating atmosphere of the haram, would be totally unfitted to rule when the time came to place him on the throne. The increasing control of political and administrative affairs exercised by the officers of the haram, in association with the vizier, and the dynastic struggles for the succession resulting from the intrigues of the women of the haram, are indeed two of the main features of the later Safawid period and two of the principal reasons for the decline of Safawid power. A third reason, the increase of ḥadsa lands at the expense of mamālik provinces, which reduced both the economic prosperity and the military strength of the country, has already been mentioned.

Under Shāh Sulaymān (1077/1666—1105/1694), who was an alcoholic, and under the pious but uxorius Shāh Sultān Husayn (1105/1694—1135/1722), neither of whom took any interest in state affairs, the progressive breakdown of the central administration was marked by increasing inefficiency and corruption at all levels of government. The military machine had been allowed to run down to such an extent that the Shāh had to turn to the Georgians for help in dealing with a band of Balūch marauders in 1110/1698-99. This warning went unheeded, and in 1121/1709 a group of Ghulzāi Afghans seized Kandahār, which had been in Safawid hands since 1058/1648. Further north, the Abdāl Afghans ravaged large areas of Khūzستان, and the whole eastern frontier was in jeopardy. In 1131/1719 the Ghulzāi chief, Maḥmūd, having subdued the Abdālīs, temporarily seized Kirmān. Emboldened by the lack of resistance, he returned to the attack two years later, and routed a pathetically weak Safawid force at the battle of Guhnābād, 18 miles east of Isfahān, on 20 Jamuʿādā I 1134/8 March 1722. Too weak to storm the city, Maḥmūd blocked it. Treachery within the city, and incompetence and irresolution on every side, delivered the Safawid capital to the Afghans in October 1722. Some 80,000 people are said to have perished during the siege from starvation and disease, and the population of Isfahān today is probably only one-third of what it was in Safawid times.

The Afghāns, though they never subjugated the north and west of the country and though their hold on the remainder was precarious, ruled Isfahān for seven years, 1134/1722—1142/1729. At Ḵawzīn, Tamāsp, a son of Shāh Sultān Husayn, proclaimed himself Shāh Tamāsp II. In 1138/1726 the Ottomans broke the long peace with Iran which had existed since 1048/1639, and the Afghān ruler Ashraf was forced to give de facto recognition to the Ottoman occupation of west and north-west Iran. About the same time the Afgār chief Nādir Khān emerged as the most powerful of the tribal chiefs lending their support to the Safawid house, and in 1142/1729 he drove the Afghans from Isfahān and re-established the Safawid monarchy in the person of Tamāsp II. It soon became clear, however, that Nādir Khān's support of the Safawids was only a device to enable him to use pro-Safawid sentiment for his own ends. In 1145/1732 he deposed Tamāsp II in favour of the infant ʿAbbās III, for whom he acted as regent. Four years later, he abandoned this fiction, and had himself crowned as Nādir Shāh. This marked the extinction of the Safawid dynasty, which had existed only in name since 1134/1722.

Nādir Shāh (1148/1736—1160/1747) consciously modelled himself on Timūr, and there are some points of similarity between his career and that of his exemplar. Like Timūr, Nādir was primarily, indeed solely, a soldier, and, like Timūr, he was totally unable to administer the territories overrun by his armies. As a result, just as the campaigns of Timūr had left a vacuum in west Asia, so Nādir disrupted the administrative system inherited from the Safawids, impoverished the state, and led to a general breakdown of law and order. The result was half a century of civil war as the Zands and the Kāḏjārs fought for supremacy in the vacuum created by Nādir. Nādir restored national dignity and prestige after the humiliation of the Afghan episode, and recovered Iranian territory which had been usurped by the Ottomans, the Russians, and the Afghans. After an ineffectual siege of Baghābd in 1145/1733 (the Iranian army still had no proper siege artillery), and an initial defeat at the hands of the Ottoman relief army, Nādir turned the tables on the Ottomans on 1 Diumādā II 1146/9 November 1733, and the Ottoman commander, Ṭopaʿl ʿOḡmān Pāsha, was killed. A provisional treaty between Nādir Shāh and Abāmād Pāsha, the Ottoman governor of Baghābd, provided for the return to Iran of all territory seized by the Ottomans in the previous ten years, but the treaty was never ratified by the Porte. In 1147/1735 Russia surrendered Bākū and Darbān, and Nādir struck further blows against the Ottomans. ʿAbd Allāh Pāsha Kūprūlū-zāde, governor of Kārs, was killed at the battle of Aḵ Tepe: ʿAll Pāsha surrendered at Gandja, and Isfahān Pāsha at Tīfīs; Erivan fell soon afterwards.

Had Nādir Shāh at this point devoted his efforts to reorganizing the administration of the country on a firm basis Iran might have entered the 19th century better equipped to deal with the internal and external problems of that period. Instead, his growing megalomania led him to invade India, as Timūr had done before him. A necessary preliminary was the capture of Kandahār, a frontier city which had been held alternately by the Safawids and the Mughals during the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries, and had been in Afghan hands since 1121/1709. To raise money for his Indian campaign, Nādir levied taxes with more than usual ruthlessness, and Kirmān suffered particularly severely. Kandahār surrendered to Nādir in Dhuʿl Kaʿda 1150/March 1738. Ghazāna was occupied in June, and Nādir, crossing the Khaybar Pass, entered Peshawar. Lahore paid a large indemnity, and thus escaped the sack. After an engagement with the Mughal
army at Karnal in Dhu‘l-Ka‘da 1151/February 1739, Nādir made his triumphal entry into Delhi on 9 Dhu‘l-Hijja 1151/20 March 1739, and let his troops loose to pillage the city. In this, too, he faithfully followed the actions of his model, Timūr, who had sacked Delhi in 801/1398. After levying the enormous sum of 20,000,000 rupees in tribute from the Mughal Empire, Nādir returned to Iran laden with his spoils, which included the famous Peacock Throne and the Kūh-i Nur diamond. The Mughal Emperor Muhammad Shāh ceded to Nādir Shāh all his territory west of the Indus. On their return from India, Nādir’s armies overran Turkistān, the ancient Transoxania and Khūzestān, and Nādir signalled this eastward expansion of his empire by transferring his capital from Iṣfahān to Maḥshhad. Maḥshhad had fewer associations with the Ṣafawīs—although of course the shrine of the imām ʿAlī of his own officers. His death was followed by a period of anarchy and civil war. In the south, the period of anarchy and civil war. In the south, the period of anarchy and civil war.

In 1153/1741 Nādir Shāh was at the height of his power, but signs of approaching insanity were already visible. His madness was characterized by an overweening lust for power and the most extreme avarice. He became subject to ever more violent fits of rage, associated with the inflicting of ever more terrible punishments. Instead of using his Indian treasure to replenish the exchequer, he which he had exhausted by his endless campaigns, hoarded it in a special treasure-house at Kāfšān [q.v.] in Khūrāsān, and imposed further crippling tax burdens on the people to finance expeditions which had no strategic justification, such as his disastrous campaign in Dākhīstān in 1154-55/1741-2. Revolts broke out in various parts of his empire, and his attempt to effect a reconciliation with the Sunnī ‘ulama‘ did not add to his popularity. On 1 Džumādā II 1160/20 July 1747 he was assassinated by a group of his own officers. His death was followed by a period of anarchy and civil war. In the south, the Zand dynasty gave that part of the country at least a brief respite in the form of orderly, and on the whole good government. After the death (1193/1779) of Karlīm Khān Zand, however, the Zands were weakened by dynastic feuds, and this gave the Kādžārs, who from their base at Astaraḑābād had gradually brought most of northern Persia under their control, their chance. ʿĀkā Muhammad Khān Kādẓār escaped from Zand captivity at Shīrāz and embarked on a sixteen-year struggle to assert his authority over that of rival Kādżār chiefs, and to overthrow the Zands. By 1209/1795 he had achieved both objectives.

The new rulers of Iran, the Kādžārs, were of Turkoman stock. Like the Afšārs, they had formed part of the group of Turkoman tribes which had brought the Ṣafawīs to power, and which had constituted the military aristocracy of the Ṣafawī state. The Kādžārs, however, like two other Trans-Caucasian Turkoman tribes, the Afšārs and the Bayāts, did not come into prominence until the middle of the 10th/16th century. The first ruler of the new dynasty, ʿĀkā Muhammad Shāh, possessed undoubted administrative ability. Making Tehran his capital, he restored security and public order, and reunited Iran under a strong and efficient central administration for the first time for more than a century. By the end of the 18th century, he became a byword for bloodthirstiness. His ruthless elimination of all possible rivals caused riots within the Kādžār ranks, and militated against the stability of the dynasty. The succession was disputed both in 1250/1834, and again in 1264/1848. Outwardly pious, he cared nothing for an oath, and did not hesitate to obtain his ends by treachery. On 21 Dhu‘l-Hijja 1211/17 June 1797, two years after his coronation, he was assassinated by two of his soldiers. He was succeeded by his nephew, Fath ʿAli Shāh.

Fath ʿAli Shāh [q.v.] had scarcely ascended the throne when he was forced to recognize that a major change had occurred in the relations between Iran and her neighbours in general, and between Iran and the Great Powers in particular. The advent of the 19th century saw the beginnings of Great Power rivalry in Persia which directly or indirectly affected the political, social and economic life of the country. Already ʿĀkā Muhammad Shāh, by his atrocities in Georgia, had caused that country to abandon its traditionally Persian orientation and turn to Russia. Russia had eagerly seized this opportunity to resume that southwards movement toward the Persian Gulf which had been a cardinal point in Russian policy since the time of Peter the Great. By 1806 Russia had demonstrated that, in the military sciences, Iran had fallen behind the West to an alarming extent during the 18th century. If Iran was to preserve its independence, it needed modern weapons and an army trained on modern lines. This point was emphasized when the Russians annexed Georgia in 1800. Fath ʿAli Shāh’s political naiveté and ignorance of world affairs led him to sign the Treaty of Finkenstein (4 May 1807) with Napoleon. Article 4 pledged France to work for the restitution of Georgia to Persia. In return, Fath ʿAli Shāh promised to declare war on Great Britain (art. 8), and to allow French troops the right-of-way across Iran as part of Napoleon’s Grand Design for the invasion of India. The Treaty of Finkenstein, however, was rendered a dead letter almost immediately by the Treaty of Tilsit (2 July 1807), which brought to an end hostilities between France and Russia, and gave Russia a free hand to resume her policy since the time of Peter the Great. Russia had demonstrated that, in the military sciences, Iran had fallen behind the West to an alarming extent during the 18th century. If Iran was to preserve its independence, it needed modern weapons and an army trained on modern lines. This point was emphasized when the Russians annexed Georgia in 1800. Fath ʿAli Shāh’s political naiveté and ignorance of world affairs led him to sign the Treaty of Finkenstein (4 May 1807) with Napoleon. Article 4 pledged France to work for the restitution of Georgia to Persia. In return, Fath ʿAli Shāh promised to declare war on Great Britain (art. 8), and to allow French troops the right-of-way across Iran as part of Napoleon’s Grand Design for the invasion of India. The Treaty of Finkenstein, however, was rendered a dead letter almost immediately by the Treaty of Tilsit (2 July 1807), which brought to an end hostilities between France and Russia, and gave Russia a free hand to resume her aggression against Iran. Russia lost no time in pressing her advantage. By the Treaty of Gulistān [q.v.] (12 October 1813), Iran lost all her rich Caucasia provinces, and only Russian naval vessels were allowed to operate on the Caspian Sea. A border dispute caused war to break out again in 1826, and the Treaty of Turkomanchai (22 February 1828) imposed even more severe terms on Iran. Iran ceded Erivan and Nakhchivan, and the Aras river was fixed as the Russo-Iranian border. Iran had to pay a heavy indemnity, but the most significant clause in the Treaty was that concerning “capitulations”, i.e., extra-territorial rights for Russian officials resident in Iran. The “capitulations” [see IMTIYAZAT] infringed the rights of Iran as a sovereign and independent nation, and marked a new phase in the relations between Iran and the Great Powers. Other countries, including Britain, hastened to follow the Russian example and to demand extra-territorial rights for their nationals in Iran, and the direct penetration of Iran by foreign influences may be said to date from this time.

Fath ʿAli Shāh’s position, Muhammad Shāh, who succeeded to the throne in 1834, attempted to recover territory which had been lost in the east.
to the Afghans, Britain went to the aid of the Afghans, and Muhammad Shah had to abandon the siege of Harat. Throughout the 19th century, British policy was dominated by one obsession, the defence of India. To achieve this, Afghanistan had to be maintained as a buffer-state, and Iran could not be allowed to regain the territory which had been taken from her by the Afghans. Consequently, British armies were dispatched from India in 1837, when Iranian troops threatened to recapture Harat, and in 1852 and 1856, when they succeeded in re-taking that city. Finally, by the Treaty of Paris in 1856, Iran was forced to recognize the independence of Afghanistan and to reconcile itself to the permanent loss of a city which in Timurid and Safavid times had been one of the great cities of Khurâsân.

During the reign of Muhammad Shâh, the first rumblings of social protest found expression in the politico-religious revolt which followed the manifestation of the Bâb (1844). The Bâb declared himself to be the Hidden Ímân (the Mahdi or sâhib al-samâd), and in 1848 the Bâbis declared their secession from Islam and the shârsâ. The revolt was harshly repressed by the government, and the Bâb himself was executed at Tabriz in 1850. An unsuccessful attempt on the life of Nâşîr al-Dîn Shâh in 1852 led to further persecution of the Bâbis. The movement split into two groups, termed Bahâ'îs and Azâllis, of which the former is the more important. Its leader, Bahâ'î Allâh, was banished from Iran, but Bahâ'ism was later widely disseminated in Europe and America [see BAB; BABIS; BAHA' ALLAH; BAHÁ'IS].

Nâşîr al-Dîn Shâh, who came to the throne in 1848, and whose long reign was ended only by his assassination in 1896, was a more able man than either of his two immediate predecessors. He appreciated the need for change, if Iran was to retain her independence and to break the political stranglehold which was being exerted by Britain and Russia. During his reign, however, the other half of the Russian pincer gripping Iran lengthened inexorably. In 1865 the Russians captured Tashkent, and extended the khânsate of Khiva. In 1866 they took Bukhârâ and, from their new base at Krasnovodsk on the eastern shore of the Caspian, pushed steadily forward into Central Asia. They put an end to the khânsate of Khiva in 1873, crushed for ever the Turkoman tribes of the steppe at the battle of Gök Tepe [q.v.] (1881), and completed the conquest of Trans-Caspia by occupying Marw in 1884. The Atrek river was established as the new Russo-Iranian frontier in the east.

Nâşîr al-Dîn Shâh instituted a policy of granting concessions to European powers, in the hope that this would improve the economic prosperity of the country. The net result, however, was that by the end of the 19th century, most of Iran's economic resources were exploited or directed by foreign concessionaires, who obtained sweeping concessions in return for paltry sums of money which satisfied the shah's immediate needs. In 1872, for example, a British subject, Baron Julius de Reuter, obtained the exclusive right to exploit all minerals in Iran (except gold and precious stones), to build factories, to construct railways, canals and irrigation works, to exploit the forests, to create a national bank and public utilities (such as a telegraph system), and to control the customs. Strong Russian pressure led the shah to rescind the concession, and, as compensation, the British received a concession to establish the Imperial Bank of Persia (1889). The Russians followed suit with their Banque des Prêts, or Loan and Discount Bank. In 1890, the celebrated Tobacco Concession was awarded to a British company. A letter written by Sayyid Djamâl al-Dîn al-Afghâni [q.v.] to the chief mudhâjah ad-Sâmârâ, caused the latter to issue a fatwâ prohibiting the use of tobacco by all believers until such time as the shah cancelled the concession. The mudlâs and mudhâjahâs organized demonstrations in Bâbâsî, Isfahân, and Tabriz, and the shah had to revoke the concession in December 1891. This was a significant occasion: for the first time popular opinion had openly opposed the shah, and the shah had had to give way. As usual, popular opinion had been voiced through the medium of the religious classes, who could, in certain circumstances, be counted on to take the lead in opposing the shah and the government.

Growing discontent with the incompetence and corruption of the government, and resentment at foreign political pressure and economic control, found expression during the last quarter of the 19th century in the form of a challenge to the traditional pattern of society. Secret societies (anjûmans) were formed whose members discussed the ideas of Western liberalism and problems of social reform [see DÂM'IVYVA]. Out of this social ferment grew the Constitutional or National movement, which began by demanding a measure of social and judicial reform, the dismissal of certain tyrannical officials, and the expulsion of certain foreign concessionaires, notably the much disliked Belgian Director of Customs, and ended by demanding the promulgation of a Constitution and the establishment of a National Consultative Assembly [see DUSTUR: IV.—Iran]. Although the Fundamental Law was signed by Muzaffar al-Dîn Shâh until 30 December 1906, the first National Assembly (Madjlis) was convened on 7th October 1906.

The victory over despotism, far from being won, had in fact barely begun, and the Nationalists, absorbed in their struggle with the shah, were unable to prevent Iran falling even further under foreign domination. Muhammad 'Ali shâh, who succeeded his brother in 1896, was unable to stem the tide of Russian intervention, and on 3 Mubarram 1330/24 December 1911 the Majlis was again forcibly closed. During World War I, although Iran was a neutral, her territory became a battlefield for Turkish, Russian and British forces, and Iran emerged from the war in a state of administrative and financial chaos. Lord Curzon's solution was an independent
Iran firmly under British tutelage, and the Anglo-Iranian Treaty of 1919 provided for the appointment of British advisers to the Iranian Government. The treaty was never ratified by Iran. The Bolsheviks, after the collapse of the short-lived Soviet Socialist Republic of Gīlān [see Djangal], concluded the Soviet-Iranian Treaty of 26 February 1921, by the terms of which they renounced the imperialist policies of the former Tsarist regime. Five days before the signature of this treaty, Rezā Khān seized power by coup d'etat. Rezā Khān was the commander of the Cossack Brigade, created in 1879 by Naṣir al-Dīn Shāh as a royal bodyguard and used by Muḥammad ʿAll Shāh to suppress the Nationalists in the period 1907-9. The atmosphere of the post-war period was favourable to Rezā Khān's attempt to re-establish national integrity and independence: the Constitution had been suspended; there had been a complete breakdown of government authority; the treasury was empty, and famine conditions prevailed. Rezā Khān first thought of abolishing the monarchy and establishing a republic, but, faced with strong opposition from the ulāmā and other traditional elements, he abandoned the idea. Ahmad Shāh was deposed in 1923, and Rezā Khān was proclaimed shah in December 1925 and crowned on 25 April 1926 as the first ruler of the new Pahlavi dynasty.

Rezā Shāh was determined to launch Iran into the 20th century. Prior to his accession, despite the fact that Iran had been officially converted from a mediaeval Islamic state to a modern constitutional monarchy by the granting of the Constitution in 1906, there were few signs of change in the traditional structure of society. The far-reaching programme of westernization, modernization, and centralization of the administration, on which Rezā Shāh embarked, involved a major upheaval of the traditional social order, and the abolition or modification of many traditional Islamic institutions. Without possessing an ideology, he succeeded in carrying out a revolution. He was impatient with the intellectuals, whom he blamed for Iran's weak and divided state. Unlike Atatürk, he made no long statements of policy, wrote no articles. His failure adequately to express his objectives and the people's needs, in fact, was a source of weakness. In so far as he succeeded in his objectives, his policies were beneficial to Iran. He completely reorganized the army and created the first unified standing national army in Iran. Between 1921 and 1941, on average one-third of the national budget was allocated to the armed forces. He reorganized the Civil Service on Western lines. In successive phases he laid the foundations of a modern judiciary system: the Penal Code was promulgated in 1926 and the Civil Code in 1928, the year which saw the abolition of the much hated capitulations. Each step necessarily meant a further blow at the position of the shariʿa and at the power of the religious classes in general. In the field of education, the maktabs, where pupils of all ages were taught in one room by an ʿālim, were swept away. Compulsory education for both sexes was introduced (it has not yet been fully implemented, particularly in rural areas), and the curricula were modernized. Teachers' Training Colleges were established, and the University of Tehran was founded in 1935. In 1940 all foreign missionary schools were taken over by the government. In the field of commerce, Rezā Shāh established a number of state monopolies, partly to strengthen the Iranian economy vis-à-vis Britain and Russia, and partly to provide additional revenue. The entire cost of the Trans-Iranian Railway, constructed from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf between 1926-38, was defrayed by means of a tax on tea and sugar, which were state monopolies. Rezā Shāh did much to develop industry in Iran, and his efforts to develop an Iranian textile industry succeeded in making Iran to a large extent independent of Russian textiles. On the debit side, Rezā Shāh, as his reign progressed, showed increasingly despotic tendencies. He became impatient of all criticism, and skillfully suppressed political parties, trade unions, and the Press. The Madjīs was reduced to the status of a rubber-stamp. Two areas in which Rezā Shāh failed signally were agriculture and relations with the tribes. Not until 1937 did he make any attempt to improve the lot of the peasants or to introduce legislation to encourage landlords to improve methods of cultivation. Even then, because the implementation of the legislation was entrusted to the very landowners at whose interests it was aimed, nothing was achieved. In regard to the tribes, his policy of enforced resettlement, often in unsuitable regions, failed, and his severe treatment of many tribal leaders left a legacy of bitterness.

During Rezā Shāh's reign, German political and economic influence in Iran increased to a marked degree. Since the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, Iran had been psychologically prepared to accept the friendship of a third power which might act as a buffer against British and Russian pressure. Germany, which had no previous history of interference in Iran's affairs and which seemed to be at a safe distance, was welcomed by Rezā Shāh as the "third power". Germany's share of Iranian trade jumped from 8% in 1932 to 45% in 1940. Much of the machinery and heavy equipment needed for Rezā Shāh's programme of industrial expansion was supplied by German, and after Germany's annexation of Czechoslovakia, by Czech firms. German architects designed many of the new government and public buildings in Tehran. In 1936 the German Minister Dr. Schacht visited Iran, and expressly exempted Iranians, as being "pure Aryans", from the provisions of the Nuremburg race laws. On the heels of German technicians came German cultural officials and "tourists", who soon constituted an effective Fifth Column in Iran. In 1941 Britain and Russia presented an ultimatum to Rezā Shāh, calling on him to expel large numbers of these Germans from Iran. Rezā Shāh refused, and on 25 August British and Russian forces simultaneously invaded Iran. Rezā Shāh abdicated and went into exile; he died at Johannesburg in 1944. His son, Muḥammad Rezā Shāh, succeeded to the throne.

The position faced by the young shah was one of the utmost difficulty. There was a dearth of leaders—one consequence of Rezā Shāh's concentration of power in his own hands. Effective government was in any case virtually impossible while the country was occupied by foreign troops. The liberalizing of internal conditions released forces of an illiberal character—forces of the extreme right, such as the fīdāʾiyyān-i islām [q.v.], a terrorist organization which came into being about 1943 and which was later protected by the religious leader Ayāt Allāh Kāshānī, and forces of the extreme left, such as the Tudeh party, which was formed in 1942. Initially, the Tudeh party attracted many frustrated intellectuals of leftish sympathies who were not
necessarily Communists, but the party fell more and more under Communist influence and direction, and in 1945 the Tudeh, in close co-operation with the Russians, engineered the overthrow of the authority of the central government in Aḏarbāyjān and Kurdistan. By the terms of the Tripartite Treaty of Alliance (29 January 1942), the Allies had promised to withdraw their troops from Iran within six months from the termination of hostilities with Germany and its associates, but Russian troops did not leave until May 1946. Deprived of Russian support, the Autonomous Republic of Aḏarbāyjān and the Kurdish People's Republic collapsed before the advance of the Iranian army in October 1946.

German influence in Iran came to an abrupt end in 1941, and the United States now became the "third power" in Iran. American involvement rapidly increased after the formation in 1942 of the Persian Gulf Command, which developed the port facilities at Khurramshahr, Bandar ʿAbbās and Bandar Shāhpūr, and assisted in the supply of war material to the Soviet Union through Iranian territory. The United States also furnished Iran with military and financial advisers. Among the latter was Dr. Millsapgh, who had functioned in a similar capacity in Iran from 1922-27. Finally, in 1942, the United States extended "Truman doctrine" to include Iran as well as Turkey and Greece, and was thus definitely committed to the maintenance of Iran's independence.

The Tudeh Party rapidly recovered from its defeat in Aḏarbāyjān in 1946, and its increased militancy caused widespread insecurity and unrest. On 4 February 1949 a Tudeh Party member made an attempt on the life of the shah. This action was at once followed by the outlawing of the Party and by the reimposition of martial law. The second important event of 1949 was the inauguration of the First Seven-Year Plan for Economic Development. The third significant event of 1949, a year which in many respects marks a turning-point in the history of modern Persia, was the formation of the Iran National Front by Dr. Muṣād dik of the National Front. This was a coalition of groups of every political hue, from the neo-Fascist Sumka Party and the extreme right-wing fīdāʾīyīn-i islām led by Kāshānī, through the centre block of the Iran Party, composed of bourgeois nationalists and the intelligentsia, to left-wing intellectual groups such as Mākki's "Truman doctrine" to include Iran as well as Turkey and Greece, and was thus definitely committed to the maintenance of Iran's independence.

In 1950 the shah took the first positive steps in the direction of social and economic reform when he established the Imperial Organization for Social Welfare, and transferred to this organization, for distribution to the peasants, the crown lands. He further appointed to the office of Prime Minister General ʿAll Ṣafīdān, an honest, patriotic and energetic man. General Ṣafīdān immediately launched an anti-corruption drive which was so effective that more individuals arrayed themselves against him and the shah. On 7 March 1951 General Ṣafīdān was assassinated by a member of the fīdāʾīyīn-i islām, an act which put an end to orderly progress towards reform. Dr. Muṣād dik introduced into the Majlīs a bill calling for the nationalization of the oil industry. On 29 April, Dr. Muṣād dik became Prime Minister, and at once implemented the oil nationalization law and appropriated the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company's installations. Muṣād dik's National Front supporters, deprived of the principal target for the xenophobia which had held them together, soon showed signs of disunity. Muṣād dik himself tried to disassociate himself from oil revenue, and faced a financial crisis; furthermore, once he had achieved his "negative equilibrium", the poverty of his political thinking became apparent. Far from ushering in a social revolution, Muṣād dik found himself obliged to demand plenary powers and to resort to unconstitutional means in order to maintain his own position. The dissolution of the Senate (the upper house of the Iranian Parliament, provided for in the 1906 Constitution but not convened until 1950), in July 1952, was followed by that of the Supreme Court (November 1952) and of the Majlīs itself (August 1953). In addition, Dr. Muṣād dik imposed martial law and curbed the Press. After January 1953, when Muṣād dik insisted on an extension of his plenary powers, he found himself in a position of increasing isolation as National Front leaders such as Makki, Bākāi and Kāshānī successively broke away from him. On 13 August the shah issued a fārmān dismissing Muṣād dik and appointing General Zāhīdī Prime Minister. Muṣād dik refused to take cognisance of the fārmān, and the shah temporarily left the country. On 28 Murād 1332 s./19 August 1953 Zāhīdī suppressed the Tudeh mobs over which Muṣād dik no longer had any control, and succeeded in exiling his political rivals from the country. The shāh returned to Iran, and in November 1953 Muṣād dik was brought to trial on a charge of treason, on the grounds that he had defied an imperial fārmān and had abrogated the constitutional procedures and basic laws of the land. He was sentenced to three years' solitary confinement, from which he was released in August 1956.

After the fall of Muṣād dik, the oil dispute was settled (August 1955) by formation of a consortium of British, American, Dutch and French companies, which ran the industry on behalf of the National Iranian Oil Company. On 3 November 1955 Iran joined the Baghdad Pact, with Great Britain, Turkey, Pakistan and Iran; Iran withdrew in 1959, and the alliance was renamed the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). The shah, advocating a policy of "positive nationalism", indicated that he intended to exercise greater personal control over the administration of the state than he had prior to the dictatorship of Muṣād dik. In 1957 the National Security Organisation (SAVAK) was formed. The shah attempted to check corruption. In 1958 the Imperial Investigation Organization was set up to receive and investigate complaints from the public against any official of the bureaucracy, judiciary, or army, and this was followed by several laws designed to discourage bribery and peculation by government officials. In 1958 the Pahlavi Foundation (Busūyāt-i Pahlavī) was set up to administer certain resources of the Crown and to expend the income accruing from these assets on social services. On 5 October 1961 the shah handed over to the Pahlavi Foundation property valued at more than £ 47,500,000, comprising farms, villages owned by the shah, hotels, the shah's holdings in the Iranian oil tanker fleet,
and all stocks and shares held by the shah. These funds and assets were constituted into a "waty," or trust, for charitable, social, educational and health services. In this way, the shah has virtually divested himself of the personal fortune which he had inherited from his father. The birth of a son and heir (Rezā) to the shah and the Empress Farah on 31 October 1960 was a stabilizing factor in Iranian affairs, in that it assured the continuance of the Pahlavi dynasty (succession is through the male line only). Nevertheless, the political outlook continued to be uncertain. The shah's policy of "repolitization" had resuscitated the National Front, which contained many of Musaddik's former supporters. The shah's experiment in "controlled democracy," in which two artificially-created parties known as "Milledam" and "Mardam" were to represent the government party and the "loyal opposition" respectively, predictably failed. The shah had to annul the elections of August 1960, and the new elections, begun in January 1961, were accompanied by such widespread disorders that on 9 May 1961 the shah, using powers which had been granted to him in 1949, dissolved the Madjlis and the Senate. He took this action not only "for the protection of the nation's rights and interests, and to safeguard the Constitution," but also in order that "no obstacles should hinder the strong Government which had been created to institute fundamental reforms."

As an earnest of his intentions, the shah promulgated the Agrarian Reform Bill (15 January 1962). Prior to this, all legislation designed to break up the large estates, and thus make land available for distribution to the peasants, had consistently been blocked in the Madjlis. The shah had completed his programme, begun in 1951, of distributing crown lands to the peasants, but his example had not been followed by the large landowners. Under the provisions of the Agrarian Reform Bill, no landowner was to be allowed to own more than one village, regardless of size; all villages in excess of this allowance were to be bought by the State and sold to the peasants. Considerable progress was made in 1962 in implementing the new regulations, and land reform was a major item in the shah's six-point programme which was approved by national referendum in January 1963; other radical reforms were the enfranchisement of women, and the creation of the "Literacy Corps" to combat illiteracy, particularly in rural areas. This six-point programme was opposed by the National Front, and opposition from the religious classes culminated in serious rioting in the capital and the major provincial cities in June 1963. In September 1963, after an interval of more than two years during which the shah ruled by decree, general elections were held, and the newly-formed National Union Party, a coalition pledged to give full support to the shah's reform programme, gained a strong majority in the Madjlis. The elections were boycotted by the National Front. The election of six women to the Madjlis no doubt reflected the fact that, in these elections, women for the first time were able to vote.

Since 1963, the shah has made steady progress with his "white revolution," or "revolution from above," despite further acts of violence by those opposed to his policies. On 21 January 1965, for instance, the Prime Minister Hasan 'Ali Mansūr, whose New Iran Party, formed in December 1963, commanded a large measure of support in the Madjlis, was shot and mortally wounded by a supporter of an extreme right-wing madžlahidī. In April 1965 yet another attempt was made to assassinate the shah. The greatest hope for the future, perhaps, lies in the achievements of the Third Economic Development Plan, inaugurated in 1962, which was designed to advance Iran's economic and social development. The Third Economic Development Plan, inaugurated in 1962, has been severely hampered by drastic cuts in the budget of the Plan Organization, but in October 1963 the shah pledged more money for this purpose. On 29 July 1963 Iran and the Soviet Union signed an Economic and Technical Co-operation Agreement for the construction of a barrage on the River Araxes which will irrigate 145,000 acres on both sides of the frontier. The oil industry, under the control of the National Iranian Oil Company, continues to expand, and production increases as new oil-fields are discovered.

There has been a gradual détente between Iran and the Great Powers as the latter have relaxed their political and economic pressure. Simultaneously, relations between Iran and its immediate neighbours have become closer as a result of the establishment in 1965 of the Regional Co-operation for Development Corporation (R.C.D.). The participants in this corporation are Pakistan, Iran and Turkey, and already joint schemes are in progress in such fields as communications, industry, education and health. The stability of the dynasty has been further assured by the birth of a second royal prince, 'Ali Rezā, on 28 April 1966, and particularly by an amendment to the Constitution effected on 7 September 1967. This amendment provides that, if the shah dies before Crown Prince Rezā comes of age, or if the shah is unable to carry out his duties, the Empress Farah will act as Regent until the crown prince reaches the age of twenty. In such a case, the Regent will be assisted by a Council of Seven, including the Prime Minister, the Presidents of the Madjlis and the Senate, and the President of the Supreme Court. On 26 October 1967, the shah, then in the twenty-seventh year of his reign, was officially crowned. This was a symbolic act, since the shah had repeatedly declared that he did not wish to be crowned as long as Iran was under foreign domination. There is no doubt that Iran today (1971) is more truly independent than at any time since 1800. The reforms introduced by the shah have already brought about radical changes in the struc-
ture of Persian society, and this trend is likely to become more marked in the years to come.
(R. M. Savory)

VI.—RELIGIONS

When the Arabs destroyed the Sasanian empire they also dealt a heavy blow to the national religion of ancient Iran, Zoroastrianism. As the official cult of the state, the Mazdean church had become dependent on the support of the political body and had identified itself to a large extent with the existing social order. As a result of this the clergy had lost touch with the broad masses of the population. Although our knowledge of the religious situation during the last days of the Sasanids is very limited, it seems certain that Zoroastrianism was no longer a very vital force, at least not in the orthodox form of the religion. Sectarian movements, the true nature of which is still rather difficult to ascertain, provided alternatives to the official doctrines and practices.

The most important of these was Zurvanism. In the Islamic theocracy, which during the first century of its existence was dominated by the Arabs, the Zoroastrians could only retain their identity as one of the tolerated religious minorities. In general, the Arab conquerors did not insist on an immediate conversion of their foreign subjects. In most cases, they were satisfied with the conclusion of a treaty which guaranteed freedom of cult to the non-Muslims in exchange for tribute. Originally the Zoroastrians (Magãs [q.v.]) were not included among the "people of the Book" (Ahl al-Kitãb [q.v.]), but very soon the doctrine was adapted in such a manner as to extend the contractual protection (dhimmã [q.v.]) to the Zoroastrian communities as well. Traditions containing decisions made by the Prophet in favour of the Zoroastrians in Bahrayn and Yaman were adduced in support of this new interpretation.

Thanks to the tolerant attitude of Islamic officialdom, the Mazdeans were able to consolidate their position by retreating into small close communities standing aside from the life of the Islamic commonwealth. In this way they were able to survive the coming of Islam for several centuries, especially in rural districts and in those provinces where the Arabs did not settle in great numbers. Fire-temples continued to function in many parts of the country.

The main centre of intellectual activity of the Zoroastrian theologians was Fãrs. The archaic Pahlavi literature has preserved numerous references to ancient Persian poetry. The Barmakids, the Iranian viziers of Harun al-Rashid, were descended from a small but interesting Judaeo-Persian literature [q.v.], consisting mainly of religious works, has been preserved.

Since the 2nd century B.C., Mahãyana Buddhism had penetrated those parts of Central Asia which were inhabited by Iranian peoples. Already in pre-Islamic times it had had to retreat before Zoroastrianism but it continued to be of some importance in the region of Gandhara and Balkh during the first few centuries of the Islamic era. The Buddhist convent of Naw Bahãr (from Sanskrit niãta niãhãra "new monastery") was very renowned and figures often in early Persian poetry. The Barmakids, the Iranian viziers of Hãrãn al-Rashíd, were descended from an abbott (pãrmaq) of the convent [cf. Al-Bãrãmiká].

The process of Islamization which eventually made Iran a thoroughly Islamic country took several centuries to be completed. The great historians of the Arab conquest (e.g., al-Balãkarî, al-Tabãrã), as well as a number of local historians (e.g., the Ta'rîh-i Sistãn, al-Nãrshãkhi on Transoxania and Ibn Isfandiyãr on the Caspian provinces), have transmitted a great variety of reports on the conversion of groups or individuals originating from different regions and scattered over a large period of time. It is hardly possible to form a coherent picture of the process as a whole out of incidents which not frequently seem to contradict each other. Undoubtedly, the chaotic character of the evidence corresponds with the nature of the actual historical development.

As there was no consistent policy on the part of the government, local conditions as well as social differences usually decided the course of events. The individual arbitrary decisions of local officials were often a very important factor.
The first report about the acceptance of Islam dates from as early as the battle of al-Kadisiyya when Daylam cavalry troops (asāwirā, also designated as Ḥamrā Daylam) deserted from the Imperial army and came to terms with the Arabs. This included conversion to the new religion as well as the settlement of these mercenaries in the recently founded miṣr of Kūfa (cf. L. Caetani, Annali, iii/2, p. 216-20). On some occasions Iranian notables were deported to the centre of the Caliphate to serve in the Umayyad administration and were remembered by later generations as the pride of their regions (cf. e.g. Tāʾrīkh-i Sīstān, ed. M. T. Bahār, t8 ff.).

Conversions of this kind required a complete assimilation to the way of life of the conquerors, including the adoption of Arabic names. Reports of forced conversions or the violation of the sanctuaries of the protected religions are rare, but this may be partially due to the predominantly Islamic bias of the sources.

The pattern of Arab settlement [cf. al-Afar, iii] largely determined the pace of the Islamization of the different regions. In the cities of Khurāsān and of northern al-Djībāl, later also in those of Transoxania, large Arab garrisons were stationed which had a great influence on the rate of conversion among the townspeople. It has been suggested by several scholars that the urban class of artisans and tradesmen adopted the new religion so easily because in Sasanian society they had been discriminated against on account of their low status in the Mazdean scale of social values. Of the other social classes, the peasants were least open to outside influences and accepted Islam only very slowly. This cannot be explained exclusively by their isolation and the conservative scholars who had survived the downfall of the Sasanian empire. Although the diḥkān (q.v.) and maršāns were sometimes invited to become Muslims, their symbiosis with the Islamic government was not dependent on a religious affiliation but was essentially a political and economic necessity.

Massive conversions could still take place in Iran as late as the 5th/11th century. The rise of šīʿism did much to bridge the gap between the broad masses and the bearers of the religious tradition who mainly belonged to the upper classes of society. Members of the pietist Karrāmīyya sect were also very active as missionaries. The šīʿī propaganda of the Zaydīyya is to be credited with the Islamization of the Caspian provinces.

Being a Muslim brought many social advantages to a non-Arab subject of the Islamic theocracy, but during the period of Arab hegemony which lasted till the downfall of the Umayyads in the middle of the 2nd/8th century, the convert could only aspire to the status of a second-class citizen. As a client or mawālī (pl. mawālī, q.v.), the non-Arab Muslim enjoyed the protection of an Arab tribe or family but was subject to certain disabilities.

Although the Iranian mawālī often participated with great enthusiasm in the wars against unbelievers (e.g., at the time of the conquest of Soghdia and afterwards in the struggle with the pagan Turks), the disadvantages of their status made them a potential ally to any politico-religious movement that came out in revolt against Umayyad rule.

The participation of Iranian mawālī in a sectarian movement is recorded for the first time in the accounts of the rebellion of al-Mukhtar (q.v.) who in 66-7/685-6 defended the claims to the imāmat of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafīyya (q.v.) and demanded revenge for the death of al-Ḥusayn. His personal guard was recruited from the Ḥamrā mawālī in Kūfa. They are described as kāfūrkāhī (q.v.) literally "believer clubs"), a designation which reappears in the sources when they mention the Iranians who took part in the 'Abbāsid revolt. [See also KAYSĀNIYĀT].

The Azārika (q.v.), a Khārījiite group which, after having been defeated in Ṭirāk, continued its opposition in various parts of Iran (685-9/698-9), was also supported by many Iranian clients. Another šīʿī pretender, 'Abd Allāh b. Muṣṭaʿwīya (q.v.), was equally forced to retreat into Iranian territory after the failure of his rising in Kūfa (127/744). Taking advantage of the general atmosphere of discontent prevailing in the later Umayyad period, he succeeded in uniting dissenters of quite different religious and political parties under his command. Among them were Yazdīūs, Khārījīs and even prominent members of the 'Abbāsid family. This sect, known as al-Djānābīyya (q.v.), displays doctrinal features that are common to many other early šīʿī heterodoxies (e.g., esoteric knowledge invested in the imām and the concealment (ghayba) and eventual return (raḍī'a) of the founder of the sect). None of these movements, however, originated in Iran. They were the products of the syncretistic religious culture of Ṭirāk where Iranian ideas formed only one of several constituent elements. [See further s.v. OXANIA].

From 116/734-4/327/746, the Soghdians were in open revolt over the poll-tax. This rebellion acquired a religious dimension through the collaboration of a group of pious Arabs like Abu 'l-Ṣaydā' Sāliḥ b. Ṭārif, who had been a successful missionary among the Soghdians, and al-Ḥārīb b. Sura'yā (q.v.). In the interests of Islam, they supported the claim of the mawālī to full rights as Muslims and they summoned the Umayyad government to return to the ordinances of the Kuṭān and the sunna. The secretary of al-Ḥārīb, Dājām b. Ṣawān (q.v.), was one of the earliest Islamic theologians working in Iran.

The non-Muslim subjects showed a remarkable restraint towards the strife among the different factions of the Muslim community. The orthodox Mazdeans, the most numerous group, made no attempts to take advantage of this confusion. The movement of Biḥṣ Mīr b. Farwārdīn (q.v.), who proclaimed himself a Prophet about 129/747 in Khorāsān (near Nishāpūr), originated in a sectarian environment. He claimed to be sent from heaven in order to reform the Mazdean religion. His message, which is said to have been laid down in a book written in Persian, was mainly concerned with religious practice. The prescriptions he gave were aimed at an adaption of Zoroastrianism to the material and ritual conditions of the time. The most outspoken opposition to his activities came from the orthodox Zoroastrian clergy.

In the last years of the first century A.H., the 'Abbāsid family, through the famous testament of Abū Ĥāṣīm (q.v.), had acquired the leadership of the most active section of the early šīʿī movement. From Kūfa, the traditional centre of politico-religious opposition against the Umayyad regime, an effective propaganda was organized, focused on the province of Khurāsān where conditions seemed especially favour-
able for stirring up a massive revolt. The activities of the ‘Abbāsid missionaries were directed to all the groups, whether Arab or Iranian, who had reason to be discontented with the present situation. To Iranian participants, the problem of equality within the Muslim community provided the main incentive. Another issue of a religious nature was the claim of revenge for the Zaydī pretender Yaḥyā b. Zayd [g.v.], who had been killed in battle with Umayyad troops in 125/743 when he was trying to win support in Khurāsān. The religious motivation of the ‘Abbāsids themselves is not quite clear [see AL-NĀṣIRIYYA], but it is certain that they did not desire any emphasis on extreme points of doctrine, as is apparent from their disavowal of one of the prominent agitators, Khidāsh, when he was tried and executed on the grounds of spreading “khurrami” heresies, as well as from the vehement action taken by Abū Muslim, the architect of ‘Abbāsid victory, against several heretical movements.

In retrospect, the founding of the ‘Abbāsid caliphate appears to be a turning point in the development of Islam in Iran. Iranian Muslims, whose numbers were rapidly increasing, could now partake on an equal footing in the affairs of the Islamic community. The theocracy itself, on the other hand, became to a certain extent "Iranized" as a result of the infiltration of a great number of Iranians into all the branches of its central administration. Many cultural traditions of ancient Iran were integrated into Islamic culture. There was also a large measure of participation by the Iranian Muslims in the elaboration of the great theological and juridical systems of Islam which took place in the early ‘Abbāsid period. The cities of Khurāsān and Transoxania developed into important centres of Islamic learning.

The immediate effects of the revolt which brought the ‘Abbāsids into power seemed at first to point to a quite different line of development. A wide-spread discontent with social conditions, as well as a receptiveness to heterodox religious ideas, notably among those sections of the population which had only been touched very slightly by Islam, the very elements on which the leaders of the revolt had built their success, continued to form an obstacle to political stability in the Iranian provinces. The severance by the ‘Abbāsids of their former relations with sectarian groups and, more specifically, the crude disposal of the popular leader of the movement in Khurāsān, Abū Muslim, provided the incentive for a long series of politico-religious risings. They were often headed by former collaborators of Abū Muslim, who made him the object of a messianic expectation similar to those current among the early Shi‘i ghulāt. It was believed that after a period of occultation (ghayba) he would return in the company of the pre-Islamic heretic Mazdak and of the Mahdi. A pronounced anti-Islamic tendency was expressed in the prophecy of a return of Zoroaster and the destruction of the Ka‘ba. The idea of metempsychosis (landsak) was also present: a divine element was thought to have been transmitted to Abū Muslim’s daughter Fāṭima and to his son Fīrūz Mahdi. Collectively these movements are designated as the Abū-Muslimiyā. Another general term used in reference to a variety of these sects is Khurramiyya or Khurramdiniyya [g.v.]. This appellation is used in particular to characterize a number of customs, among which community of goods and wives are cited as the most objectionable, deviating from the Islamic way of life. A historical connection of the movement of Mazdak in Sasanian times has often been suggested but cannot be substantiated by the available evidence.

Most of these movements manifested themselves in the rural districts of eastern Iran and Transoxania. The leaders of the revolts were Sinbād, Ṣaḥāk al-Turk, Ustādīsht and the “veiled Prophet”, al-Mukanna‘ [g.v.], whose followers were known as the Mubayyida or Ṣaḥīf-ṣūrāʾ on account of their white garments. The most dangerous rebellion was led by Bābak [g.v.], and took place in Aḥjarbāyjān. It was only subdued after a long campaign directed by the best general of the Abbasid army, the Rāwandiyya [g.v.], which projected spiritual leadership, based on a divine incarnation, in the person of the caliph al-Manṣūr [g.v.], also originated in Iran, but its main activity was in ‘Irāk. The geographers and historians of the 4th/10th century still make mention of remnants of these sects in isolated parts of the country (for historical details see IRAN, HISTORY and the references given there).

Among the early ‘Abbāsid caliphs who still had a direct control over all the Iranian provinces, al-Ma‘mūn [g.v.] showed a special interest in this part of his empire. His attempt to make an alliance with the Husayni branch of the ‘Alids by appointing the imām ‘Alī al-Riḍā as his heir to the caliphate was little more than an episode. Yet it left permanent traces in Iran in the form of the two most venerated shrines of the Iranian Shi‘is: the Āstān-e Mūsā-i Riḍāi, the grave of the imām ‘Alī al-Riḍā [g.v.], who died under suspicious circumstances in Tūs (the present-day Mashhad [g.v.]) in 203/818, and the tomb of his sister Fāṭima al-Ma‘ṣūma in Kumm. The religious disputes held at the court of this caliph in Marv, in which representatives of various Islamic and non-Islamic denominations took part, show the great differentiation of religious opinion prevailing at this time as well as the relatively tolerant attitude adopted by the government.

In the long run, however, Iran developed into a predominantly Sunni country, which it remained until the end of the Middle Ages. The rise of semi-indepen
dent dynasties in the eastern parts from the early 3rd/9th century onwards in no way checked this general trend. Both the Tahirids and the Sāmānids acted as guardians of Sunnism and the Caliphate appears to be a turning point in the development of Islam in Iran. Iranian Muslims, whose

The religious situation in Iran during the second half of the 4th/10th and the beginning of the next century can be reconstructed to some extent from scattered pieces of information which have been transmitted by the geographers and historians of this period. The Kūdāb Āhsan al-tahāsīm of al-Muḳaddasī, written in 375/985, is a particularly rich source as far as the geography of religion is concerned (cf. the compilation of these references in P. Astard, Iran, passim as well as B. Spuler, Iran, 145 ff. and the Karte III with Erläuterungen at the end of this work).
Together these data point to a confusing diversity, even within the community of the people of the Sunna. It is therefore difficult to trace the main lines of division between the various doctrinal and juridical schools. In general there was a preference for the Hanafi school of law in the eastern provinces, especially among the lower classes. The Shi'a had strongholds in Kirmān, Tabaristān and in several parts of Transoxania. The position of the mu'taḍzila in the western provinces is less clear. For some period of time smaller schools like the Zähiriyya [q.v.] founded by Dā'ūd al-ISFĀHĀNĪ [g.v.] and the Thawriyya of Sufyān al-Thawri [q.v.] had a fair number of followers in Iran. The doctrinal school of the Mu'taḍzila had, from the time of its efflorescence under the protection of the early 'Abbāsids onwards, penetrated the Iranian provinces with much success. It managed to hold its ground there for a very long time after the reaction of the Ḥanbali traditionalists had put an end to its dominant position in 'Irāk. The struggle with the emerging neo-orthodox schools founded by al-AṣGHĀRĪ and al-MĀṭURID continued at least till the time of the Saljūqs. The kalām of the Mu'taḍzila became of lasting significance to Iranian Islam on account of its influence on the doctrinal system of the ISFAHĀNĪ-'Ashrāfī branch of the Shi'a. The larger cities usually contained a number of different religious minorities who are an equal and strife. The antagonism of social groups designated as 'aṣābiyyāt [q.v.] merged with the controversies among the adherents of the various ritual or doctrual schools. Not unfrequently, this took the form of small-scale civil war within the cities (cf. Cl. Cohen, *Mouvements populaires et autonomisme urbain dans l'Asie musulmane du moyen âge*, in *Arabica*, vi (1959), 27 ff.).

The sect of the Karramīyya [g.v.] originated in Khurāsān out of the teachings of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Karrām (d. 255/869). It found its following chiefly among the artisans. The most remarkable traits of the Karramīyya as far as practical religious life is concerned were the emphasis on traditionalist piety, the foundation of *mawālid* or private movements which have survived for later institutions of religious education, and the vehement missionary zeal of the sect, directed as much to the heterodox groups within Islam as to the non-Muslims. The height of its development was reached at the beginning of the 5th/11th century when they acquired a considerable influence on the Ghaznavid rulers as well as on the early Ghurids [q.v.].

Ṣūfism appears in Iran for the first time in the second half of the 4th/10th century. One of the earliest representatives was the great Ṣūfī Shaykh Abū Yazīd al-Bīṣṭāmī [g.v.]. The foundation of the school of the Malāmātīyya [q.v.] is attributed to Ḥamdūn al-Kassār [q.v.] of Niğdār. The emphasis on absolute sincerity and indifference to all outward appearances of piety, characteristic of the Malāmātīyya, became a distinctive mark of the mysticism of Khurāsān as compared with the Šūfism of 'Irāk. In the first half of the 5th/10th century pupils of the 'Irākī schools settled in eastern Iranian towns, e.g. Mūsā al-Anṣārī (d. ca. 320/932) in Marv and al-Ṭākhafī (d. 328/940) in Niğdār. The great extension of Šūfism in Khurāsān was recorded a century later by al-Hudhrirī [g.v.] in his *Kashf al-maḏāhib* [q.v.].

A second centre of early Šūfism was Fārs where the first important Shaykh was Ibn al-Khafī [g.v.] (d. 371/982). His teaching had a profound influence in this province which lasted for many centuries. It was continued by Shaykh Abū Iṣhāk Ibrāhīm b. Shahrīyār (d. 428/1035) [g.v.] of Kazarun, the eponym of the Ishāqīyya or Kazarūnīyya, one of the very first Šūfī orders not only in the area of Shia Islam in general.

Until the rise of the Shafīwīs about 1500 A.D., the Shi'a remained a religious minority in Iran. As a matter of fact, it did not constitute a homogeneous group but consisted of quite different parties which were opposed to each other as much as the Sunnīs were opposed to all of them together. The small but militant movements of the Ghulāt, which were particularly active during the Umayyad period, as a rule did not originate in Iran but emanated from southern 'Irāk. The great majority of the Shi'ites living in Iran adhered to the quietist attitude in the matter of the political leadership of the community which had been adopted by the Husayni branch of the 'Alīids after the tragic failure of al-Husayn's expedition to 'Irāk at Karbalā'. Apart from their views on the doctrine of the Imām [g.v.], they did not differ significantly, either in doctrinal or in ritual questions from the Sunnīs. This large moderate group of the Shi'a, originally referred to by the general name of al-Rāfdīyya [q.v.], was from an early date strongly represented in the northern cities of al-Dībāl or 'Irāk-i 'Adlāmi. Shi'ism was brought here by the Arabs who settled in this area when this part of the country was still a frontier with the not yet Islamized Caspian regions. Kuwaytī, in particular, is an area of continuous rivalry and strife. The celebration of the most holy day of the Shi'a, the day of 'Ashūrā, was continued by Shaykh Abu Isfrak Ibrahim b. al-Bistami [q.v.] in his *Kashf al-majidub*. The foundation of the school of Imam al-Muhammad b. Sayyid Hasan b. Zayd, entitled al-dī' al-kabīr (the great diwān) was recorded a century later by al-Iṣḥāqī (d. 328/940) in Marv and al-Thakafi (d. 328/940) in Niğdār. In the first half of the 4th/10th century pupils of the Shi'a were opposed to each other as much as the Sunnīs. This large moderate group of the Shi'a, originally referred to by the general name of al-Rāfdīyya [q.v.], was from an early date strongly represented in the northern cities of al-Dībāl or 'Irāk-i 'Adlāmi. Shi'ism was brought here by the Arabs who settled in this area when this part of the country was still a frontier with the not yet Islamized Caspian regions. Kuwaytī, in particular, is an area of continuous rivalry and strife. The celebration of the most holy day of the Shi'a, the day of 'Ashūrā, was continued by Shaykh Abu Isfrak Ibrahim b. al-Bistami [q.v.] in his *Kashf al-majidub*. The foundation of the school of Imam al-Muhammad b. Sayyid Hasan b. Zayd, entitled al-dī' al-kabīr (the great diwān) was recorded a century later by al-Iṣḥāqī (d. 328/940) in Marv and al-Thakafi (d. 328/940) in Niğdār. The great extension of Šūfism in Khurāsān was recorded a century later by al-Hudhrirī [g.v.] in his *Kashf al-maḏāhib* [q.v.].

Of the most important Shi'i festivals such as the remembrance of the investiture of 'Ali at Ghaḍir al-Khumm [g.v.] and the mourning (ruṣūya) of the martyrs of Karbalāh in the month of Muḥarrām [g.v.] is for the first time recorded in the Buyid period. The mission (da'wā) of the Ismā'īliyya [g.v.] in Iran had already started before the end of the 3rd/9th century. The initiative was taken by the Kara-
tians [q.v.] who, in addition to their centres in the Arabian territories bordering on the Persian Gulf, had a footing in Khustain as well. From here the missionary Khalaf was sent to the Shi'ites areas in al-Dhibal. From their base near Rayy, the Isma'iliils, who in this part of Iran were known for a long time as Khafairy, tried to extend their influence to the Caspian regions, and to Khurasan and Transoxiana. After the establishment of the Fatimid caliphate in Egypt propaganda was directed from Cairo. Missionary activity in Iran was on the whole not very fruitful, in spite of the frequently outstanding intellectual capacities of the da'is. The efforts were chiefly directed to the conversion of influential men of the ruling classes. Some spectacular but not very permanent achievements were made, e.g., the conversion of the Samanid amir Nasr II b. Ahmad by the da'is Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Nasafi, which led to the former's forced abdication in 331/943, and of one of the latest Buyid rulers, Abü Kaidjar, who was won over to the Fatimid cause by al-Mu'ayyad fi l-Din [q.v.]. The latter, by winning over a Turkish commander in the Buyid service, al-Basasiri [q.v.], almost succeeded in establishing Fatimid suzerainty in Baghdád. But this was frustrated by the intervention of the Saljuq chief Tughril Beg, who rescued the 'Afsharids from their foreign state. Some of them even reached the rank of vizier. The alterations between Sunnis and Shi'a continued, however, in disputes and literary polemics, as well as outbursts of physical violence. An invaluable source for our knowledge of these controversies is the Kitáb al-Nakd wa' l-Baq' L ma'adih al-nakd fi nakh fad'á'kh al-Rawdáy by Naṣr al-Din Abu 'l-Rashid 'Abd al-Djall il-Kazwini al-Razi, an apology for the Shi'a in reply to a Sunni literary attack. In the course of the 5th/11th century Shi'ism was well on its way towards becoming one of the dominant forms of Islam in Iran. Its greatest progress was made among the predominantly Sunni population of the eastern provinces while the Shi'ites, in general, took a critical stand towards mysticism. The numerous Şuffi shaikhis of this period still lived and worked within the small circles of their pupils, established usually in convents (ribáy, khánkháh) but without organizational ties. They taught by their words as well as by the example of their spiritual life, and did not pay much attention to the scholastic elaboration of Şüfi doctrine, to which, in the schools of 'Iráq Şifism, the name of al-Qumayd [q.v.] is especially connected. The ideas of the great Şufi shaikh of Khurasan living in this period are best known from the hagiographic works written by their followers (e.g., Abü Sa'id b. Abi 'l-Khayr [q.v.], Abü 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Kharakánl [q.v.], and Ahmad-i Djamí [q.v.]). One of the first theoreticians of mysticism in eastern Iran was 'Abd Allâh al-Ansárí [q.v.] of Harášt (d. 481/1089). The reconciliation of Şifism with the doctrines of Sunni orthodoxy which took place in this century was largely due to the efforts of eminent Khurasání mystics like al-Kusrayr [q.v.] and Muḥammad al-Ghàzâlî [q.v.]. On the whole, the Turkish rulers of Iran, as well as their Iranian bureaucrats, favoured the Şüfi shaikhis, chiefly out of respect for the miracles (karâ-mâl) attributed to these holy men. One of the most decisive influences of Iranian mysticism, spreading to the farthest corners of the Islamic world, was the activity of Şufi brotherhoods known as tarikas [q.v.]. Apart from the Kâzârúnyiya of Fars already mentioned, most of the early orders were formed in the 6th/12th century. Among them was the fraternity of the Khâdijân founded by
Towards the end of this century two great farıbas emerged almost simultaneously at opposite sides of Iran. In Irās and western Iran the Suhrwardiyah, which was based on the teachings of Abū Hāfs al-Suhrawardī [g.v. (d. 632/1234-5)], was raised for a short time to the position of an official Şuí organization by the caliph al-Nāṣir. A secondary branch of the Suhrwardiyah was established in Multān on the Indian subcontinent. The order of the Kubrawiyyah goes back to the Khwādju Yusuf al-Hamadhānī (d. 555/1160) in Khurasan, but better known through its Transoxanian branch, the Yasawiyya, named after the Turkish Şuí Shaykh Ahmad Yasawi [g.v. (d. 562/1166)]. With the expansion of the Turks to the West the Yasawi type of Şuísm was introduced in Anatolia where it was continued by the Bektashiyyah.

During the interval between the decline of Il-ğhanid power after the death of Abū Saʿīd in 736/1336 and the rise of Timūr, the discontent of the population with Mongol rule found an outlet in the revolt of the Sabrādīs [g.v.] in Khurāsān. A religious dimension was given to this movement by the collaboration of the Shaykhīyya-Behrūziyya, a Şuí order of Şūfis established in Sāzbāwr by Shaykh Khalīfa (d. 736/1335) and his pupil Hasan Behrūzī (d. ca. 739/1338). To a branch of this order belonged Mir Kiwām al-Dān al-Marāghshī, a sayyid who in the same period was a small Şuí state in Mazādarān. His dynasty, residing in Āmul, is known as the Sādāt-i Marāghshī.

The attempts of the caliph al-Nāṣir [g.v.] to assert the secular power of the ʿAbbāsids as well as their leading position in the religious matters of the Sunni community led to sharp conflict with the Khwāzārab-shaḥs, who were supported by Şuíls seeking revenge for the repression suffered under Sunni rule. As a part of this struggle Shah Muhammad tried to establish a rival caliphate for which he put forward, as his candidate, a member of the ʿAlīd family. This scheme was frustrated by the Mongol invasion.

The effects of the Mongol conquest decisively changed religious conditions in Iran. Retrospectively, these changes appear to form a prelude to the establishment of a Şuí state a few centuries later. The disappearance of the ʿAbbāsids caliphate had weakened the position of the Sunnis, who were deprived of this living symbol of the unity of the Islamic community, without having any theological expedient to account for the vacancy of its leadership such as the Şuílī possessed in the doctrine of the ḡayba. The secular power had, moreover, for the first time since the Arab conquest, passed into the hands of unbelievers. Up to the time of the conversion to Islam of Ghażān Khan and the Mongol aristocracy (694/1295) the Ilkhānīs, with the sole exception of the Muslim Ahmad Beg (681/1283-683/1285), were either Şamānists, Buddhists or Nestorian Christians. Temples and churches had been erected in various places and Buddhist bahāshis came to Iran from Central Asia and India. An interesting example of their spiritual influence is provided by the conversations with Buddhist ascetics recorded in the biography of the famous Kubrawi Şaykh ʿAlī al-Dawla [g.v.] al Simnānī. Other groups of non-Muslims were also able to acquire a greater political influence than had previously been possible. The rise to power of the Jewish vizier Saʿīd al-Dawla during the reign of Ṭabārīz Khan (683/1284-690/1291) and the prominent place he gave to many of his co-religionists provoked at the time of his downfall one of the rare instances of an anti-Jewish outburst in the history of Iranian Islam.

In so far as the early Ilkhānīs showed any interest in the religious affairs of their Muslim subjects, they not unfrequently favoured the cause of the Şuí Shā. Already under Hūlūgī the prominent Şuí scholar Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī [g.v.] reached a position of great influence at the Mongol court. Apart from his many other intellectual pursuits, he founded a school of Şuí theology which flourished throughout the Mongol period. Although Ḡazān officially adhered to the Hanafi madhkūb, on several occasions he showed his devotion towards the ʿAlīd family, e.g., by making the pilgrimage to the holy shrines in Irās and by founding "houses of the sayyids" (dar al-sayyids) in many of the larger towns providing shelter and support to indigent and wandering descendants of the ahl al-bayt. His successor Oldjaytū (703/1304-716/1316) even temporarily joined the Şuí after earlier having shifted his allegiance from the Hanafiyya to the Şuífiyya.
to the Sunni shari'a in spite of a considerable influence of Shi'i ideas.

The dynasties which dominated Western Iran during most of the 9th/10th century were based on federations of Turkoman tribes. Among these still only superficially Islamized nomads an intensive religious propaganda was spread in the course of this period. It radiated from Ardabîl in Ardârâyâlgân, which from the early 8th/14th century onwards was the centre of a Sunni mystical order founded by Shâyschuk Šâfî al-Dîn [q.v.]. (d. 735/1335). Under the leadership of his descendants, this tarîka won great support among the tribes living in the borderland between Anatolia and Iran. This expansion was accompanied by a shift in the religious orientation of the Şafawid family towards Shi'i concepts, which included the belief in a divine incarnation in the spiritual leader (mursûd) of the order. This change seems to have taken place when it was guided by Shâyschuk Ūnâyd [q.v.] (851/1447-864/1460), and became particularly clear at the time of his successor Shâyschuk Haydar [q.v.] (864/1460-893/1483). From this time onwards the Şafawids claimed descent from the line of Hûsâyni imâms. The politico-religious confederation of Turkoman tribes which they formed was known as the Kildâbâ [q.v.]. Similar traces of extreme Shi'i doctrines, though far less clear than in the case of the Kildâbâ, appear among the Kara Koyunlu [q.v.], especially during the reign of Sultan Dîhân Shâh (841/1438-872/1467) (cf. V. Minorsky, BSOAS, xvi/1 (1954), 271-97). The other Turkoman power in this area, the Aq Koyunlu [q.v.] was, however, unquestionably Sunni.

Two other Shi'i movements with ghâlât doctrines, focused on the concepts of incarnation and messianism, and not similarly to those of the 15th century Şafawiyya, were the sect of the Ahl-ı Hakî [q.v.], which spread from its place of origin in the area of Shâhrâzûr into western Iran, and the Muşâ'âša [q.v.], which spread from its place of origin in the area of the Arab tribes in Khuzistân and southern Irâk. The latter started with the appearance as Mahdí of Sayyid Muhammad b. Falâh in about 840/1436. He formed a small theocratic state which under the suzerainty of the Şafawid şâhs continued to exist for a considerable period as a buffer state between Iran and Ottoman Irâk.

The great expansion of Şofism is one of the main characteristics of spiritual life during the three centuries separating the Mongol invasion from the rise of the Şafawids as rulers of Iran. The most obvious signs of this in religious practice were the pious devotion offered by men of quite different social status to the mystical shaykhs and the growth of the Şofî brotherhoods. The orders which came to flower in the course of this period have maintained themselves in Iran up to the present day in spite of a dramatic reversal of their success in the subsequent period. The Kubrawiya [q.v.] produced a number of outstanding mystical philosophers like 'Alî al-Dâwla [q.v.] al-Sîmânî (d. 736/1335-6) and Sayyid 'Alî al-Hamâdânî [q.v.]. (d. 786/1385). A gradual convergence of the lines of thought of Sunni mysticism and Şofî imâmology is the most interesting feature of their works. The main theme is the identification of the doctrine of the shayba of the Imam-Mahdi with the concept of the permanent existence of a hidden Mirah [q.v.] at the top of a hierarchy of Şofî saints. (See further M. Molk, Les Kubrawiya entre sunnisme et shiisme et thèmes aux siècles de l'hégirique, in REI, xxix (1961), 61-142).

The second great organization of Iranian Şofism, the Ni'mat Allâhî Order, was founded by Shâh Ni'mat Allâh [q.v.] Waîlî (d. 835/1431). Although this tarîka has split into many independent branches in later times, its spiritual centre is still the shrine of the founder at Mâhân in Kirmân. The individual wandering darwîsh [q.v.], a well-known figure of Iranian social life until quite recently, had his prototype in the members of the kalândârî [q.v.] groups.

Among the Şofis, who in this period were still a minority, the tendency towards reconciliation with Sunnî Şofism can also be observed. Sayyid Haydar Âmüll (d. after 787/1385) in his main work, Djâmis Al-Asrâr, laid great emphasis on the fundamental unity of both strains of esoteric thought in Islam. They converge in the acknowledgement of a common source of religious inspiration: the teaching of the imâms, who appear at the beginning of nearly all the chains of tradition (silsilas [q.v.]) of the Şofis. (Cf. H. Corbin, in Mâlanges Henri Mâstî, Tehran 1963, 72-101; see also the edition of the Djâmis by H. Corbin and Osman Yahaya, La philosophie shî'îe, Tehran-Paris 1969).

As elsewhere in the Islamic world of that day, the pantheistic philosophy of Ibn al-'Arabi [q.v.] did not fail to have a profound influence on metaphysical thinking in Iran. It found a particularly fertile soil in Shi'i doctrines, though far less clear than in the case of the Kubrawiya. Among the earliest writers on mystical philosophy although they had not yet been synthesized into a coherent system of doctrine. This congeniality, which is notable especially with the great mystical poets of the 7th/13th century, made it very easy for the commentators of subsequent generations to interpret their works in terms of the scholastic patterns of the philosophy of al-Sâdî al-Wadîdî. Beginning with the poets of the early 7th/14th century like Shâh Ni'mat Allâh Waîlî and Mâhâmî-î Shâbstari [q.v.], these models were consciously applied in all Şofî poetry. The impact of Ibn al-'Arabi affected both Sunnis and Şofis. To the latter belonged the earliest writers on mystical philosophy who can be regarded as his adepts in Iran: Sa'dî al-Dîn Hamûya (d. 650/1252) and his pupil 'Azîz al-Dîn Nasâî.

The proclamation issued by Shâh Ismâyîl in 907/1501 on his ascent to the throne in Tabriz as the first Şafawid ruler marks the most decisive turning-point in the history of Iranian Islam. The population of the newly conquered empire was enjoined to adopt the Şofî form of the call to prayer and to practise the cursing of the first three patriarchal caliphs. The former kaleidoscopic pattern of religious allegiances, which up to that time had always shown a predominance of Sunnism, was now replaced by theocratic unity based on the claim of the exclusive sovereignty in matters spiritual and secular of the 'Alî Amyms. In its earliest stage the Şafawid state was dominated by the Turkoman tribal chiefs of the Kildâbâ who at the same time constituted the leading caste of the religious body. The shah, who was also the murshid of the Şafawî order, was according to contemporary reports of European observers worshipped as God. This is confirmed by allusions to a divine incarnation made by the shah himself in his Turkish poems (cf. V. Minorsky, in BSOAS, x (1942), 1007 ff.).

Apart from the belief in the mission of their religious guide, the intellectual content of the Kildâbâ movement seems to have been very limited. Before long the movement proved to be unequal to the task of converting the majority of the people of Iran, with its ancient Sunni traditions, into a homogeneous Şofî community. The initiative was taken over by the 'ulamâ' of the Ithnâ-Şasharîyya [q.v.]., the only
section of the Shi’a numerous and sophisticated enough to provide religious leadership on an adequate level. The indigenous tradition of Shi’i scholarship was considerably reinforced by the emigration of ‘ulamā’ from centres outside Iran like Djabal ‘Amīl in Syria and al-Bahrayn. A powerful clergy came into being which gradually extended its influence and endeavoured to eliminate the traces of the heterodox origins of the Šafawīs. At the same time, however, the emergence of this class posed the fundamental question of ultimate sovereignty within the theocracy. According to the Ighna-‘ashari doctrine of the imāma [q.v.], the Hidden Imām continues to govern the world during his ghayba and his sovereign rights cannot be shared by any secular power. In the 11th/17th century it had become a point of discussion whether the interpretation of the will of the imāma was entrusted to one of the living members of the ‘Alid house (which implicitly meant the Šafawī shāh) or whether it was the prerogative of the collective opinion of the community as interpreted by the doctors of the Shi’ā. About the same time shah ‘Abbas I was, for political reasons, forced to break the military power of the Khiẓbīš. For a short while the shah tried to find a new base for his position as a spiritual leader in the Nuktawīyya [q.v.], a sect of Khurāsān in which remnants of various earlier Shi’i movements seem to have reassembled. At the time of the last Šafawī ruler, Shīh Sultān Husain (1105/1694-1135/1722), the theologians virtually dominated the state.

The central religious official in the Šafawī state was the sadr [q.v.], whose function had existed already in the Timūrid period. He was charged with the supervision of religious affairs and institutions in general. At the local level he was represented by the ghaybah al-Īslām [q.v.], who was appointed in most of the larger cities and controlled more directly the jurisdiction of the shari’a courts. Towards the end of the 11th/17th century the office of the sadr declined and was replaced by that of a muallābāghi (Turkish: head mullah). The members of the clergy were mainly dependent on the revenue of wakfs, but some of them also acquired great personal wealth and enhanced their prestige among the populace and made them more or less independent of the support of the political power. The shahs, for their part, took a great interest in the maintenance of the pious foundations and the embellishment of the holy places of the Shī’a, both inside and outside Iran. Shīh ‘Abbas I, who transformed his own landed property into waqfī, assumed the title of administrator (muawalā) of the extensive possessions of the shrine of the imām al-Ridā, the actual duties of which were performed by a mu’tawallībāghi residing in Mashhad. The Shi‘i clergy was hierarchically divided into the higher group of the ‘ulamā’ and the lower one of the muallās [q.v.]. The duties of the latter were restricted to education and some functions deriving from the practical application of the shari’a. Among themselves the ‘ulamā’ constituted two opposing theological schools, the Aḥbārīs who rejected all speculative theology and demanded a strict adherence to the hadith of the Prophet and the imāms, and the Uṣūlīs [q.v.] who clamed a right of direct resort to the ultimate sources (usūl) of the faith for the fully qualified scholars of Islam. On the basis of this claim these scholars could call themselves muṣṭafākīd. From this emerged the later institution of the Mardqāt-i tablīk [q.v.].

The history of the conversion of the people of Iran to Shi‘ism is still largely unknown in its details. Apparently, it was not quite completed before the 12th/18th century. The victims of the first wave of actual persecution at the time of the conquest by Shīh Ismā‘īl and his Khiẓbīš were predominantly Sunni theologians. Among the Shī‘is, the order of the Kāzarūnīyya in Fārs suffered very great losses as a result of this persecution. Outbursts of violence against dissenters continued to take place throughout the Šafawī period. During the reign of Shīh Sultān Husayn the powerful muallābāghi Mūḥammad Bākīr al-Maqdīsī [q.v.] intensified the persecution of Shi‘ism in which the Khiẓbīš were not spared. Most of the Iranian jāzīs had virtually ceased to exist at the beginning of the 121/18th century.

Religious topics were very much in prominence in the intellectual life of Šafawī times. In Persian poetry the preoccupation with mysticism was replaced by the cultivation of Shi‘i themes such as the elegies on the holy martyrs. These products of classical literature also influenced the various forms of a rich religious folk-literature. Traces of this can, for instance, be found in the libretti used for the recitals of the rawākhabdīn [q.v.]. According to the autochthonous tradition, the passion plays (ta’āsiya [q.v.]), the occurrence of which is not documented before the late 12th/18th century, were instituted by Shīh Ismā‘īl as a means of propagating Shi‘i sentiment among the Iranians. Whatever the historical value of this assertion, it shows at least the important part played by religious literature in this respect. Through the efforts of the expanding religious class a large theological literature written in Arabic came into being, the magnum opus of which is the Bihār al-anwār [q.v.]. According to the autochthonous tradition, the passion plays (ta’āsiya [q.v.]), the occurrence of which is not documented before the late 12th/18th century, were instituted by Shīh Ismā‘īl as a means of propagating Shi‘i sentiment among the Iranians. Whatever the historical value of this assertion, it shows at least the important part played by religious literature in this respect. Through the efforts of the expanding religious class a large theological literature written in Arabic came into being, the magnum opus of which is the Bihār al-anwār [q.v.].

The most important contribution of Šafawī Iran to Islamic culture was the philosophical school of Isfahān which resuscitated the philosophy of ighrāk [q.v.], first elaborated by Shīhāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī [q.v.] al-Maṭkūrī in the 7th/12th century. Forerunners of this school were the eminent Shi‘i scholars, Shīyāh Bahā‘ al-Dīn al-‘Aǧmī and Mīr Muḥammad Bākīr al-Dāmād [q.v.], but the actual founder, as well as its foremost representative, was Mullā Śadr al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī [q.v.], usually known as Mullā Śadrā. Other notable members were Mullā Muḥsin-i Fayd-i Kāshānī, Mullā ‘Abd al-Razzāk-i Lāhījī and Mīr Abū l-Kāsim-i Fīndarīski. A late 13th/19th century follower of the Isfahān school was Ḥādījī Mullā Ḥādī-i Saḥwārā (1212/1792-8-1255/1838). The strong gnostic element in their philosophy made them suspicious in the eyes of the orthodox mujtahīdīs. They did in fact have an impact on the development of new religious tendencies deviating from the mainstream of the Ḥādījī-‘ashariyya such as the school of the Shīyāhīyya and the Bābī religion.

Since the establishment of the Shi‘i theocracy in Iran, the allegiance of the political power to this form of Islam has only been interrupted twice. The first occasion was the short reign of Ismā‘īl II (984/1576-985/1577), the second the period of Nādīr Shīh [q.v. (1148/1736-1160/1747)]. Notwithstanding the fact that his tribe, the Afshars, had taken part in the original Khiẓbīš confederation, he pledged himself at the time of his election as Shīh Ismā‘īl of Iran in 1148/1736 to an attempt at a reconciliation between the Ḥādījī-‘asharī Shī‘a and the Sunnism of the surrounding Islamic peoples. To this end he suggested a transformation of the Shī‘a into a fifth school of Islamic law, the Dījāfariyya, which would share in the state of
mutual recognition existing between the four Sunni madhābis. Although this proposal was favourably received by a council of Sunni and Shi'i scholars held at Naqšābād in 1256/1743, it was rejected by the leading Sunni power, the Ottoman sultan.

Under the rule of the Zand dynasty, the government returned to a strict observance of orthodox Shi'ism. One of the signs of this was the reinstatement of a Shāykh al-īslām in Shirāz. During this period a revival of Sufism came about as a result of the missionary activity of Maṣūm (Ali Shāhī, who was sent to Iran by the "pole" (kul) of the Indian branch of the Ni'mat Allāhī order. This provoked a fierce persecution end with the execution of Maṣūm (Ali Shāhī in 1212/1797-8. The drive force behind this was the dominating mudāji-khid of this time, Aḥmad Muhammad Bākīr-i Bihbīhānī (1127/1715-20/1803). Living in Karbala', as a leading scholar of the Uṣūlī school, he succeeded in bringing to an end the predominance of the Aḥbārīs at the holy shrines (ṣābābāt) in ʿIrāq, a predominance which had existed there since the end of the ʿAfsāwīd period. At the same time, the Shi'i theory of the uṣūl al-fishāh was being elaborated and greater emphasis was laid on the right of ʿīthākhādī. These developments were of great significance for the relationship between the dynasty of the Kāḏārīs and the clergy during the 13th/19th century. The latter came to hold the spiritual leadership whereas the shāhs could no longer point to an 'Alīd descent as a counterweight. The situation of the chief centres of Shi'i learning outside the boundaries of the Iranian state did very much to strengthen the position of the clergy whenever they opposed the policy of the Kāḏārīs. But even inside Iran they enjoyed a large measure of immunity, an important part of which was the traditional right of asylum (bast [q.v.] ) accorded to places of religious importance.

During the reigns of the early Kāḏārīs, the Shi'i clergy was able to exert a considerable influence on the affairs of the state. FathʿAllāh Shāh (1211/1797-1250/1834), who in all possible ways endeavoured to foster the growth of the religious body, showed himself especially indefatigable and indefatigable in this respect. On more than one occasion they actually interfered with his foreign policy. Under his successors relations between the state and the religious leaders became more strained. The latter's fierce opposition to the growing impact of western influences in Iran finally led to their active support of the popular protests against foreign monopolies like the tobacco concession of 1891-1892 and their involvement in the struggle against the authoritarian rule of the Kāḏār shāhs during the constitutional revolution at the beginning of this century. The Iranian government, on the other hand, as it more and more assumed the attitudes of a modern secular state, became less willing to respect the traditional privileges of the religious class.

Almost at the same time as the controversy between Aḥbārīs and Uṣūlīs was settled in favour of the latter, a new schism divided the Shi'i theologians. The doctrines of Shaykh Ahmad al-ʿAbsārī [q.v.], which were mainly concerned with the role of the Hidden Imam as a mediator in men's striving towards moral perfection and with problems of eschatology, were condemned as heretical by the mudāji-khādis. As a result of this the sect of the Shaykhīs [q.v.] was formed out of what had only been a school of Shi'i theology. After the death of al-ʿAbsārī in 1241/1826, his teaching was continued by Sayyid Kāẓim-i Rashī (d. 1259/1843) who, from his residence in Karbala', was able to exert his influence through the Iranian pilgrims. Afterwards the Shaykhī sect split into three branches: the Akāīšī, the Akāīshī, the Akāīshī, which, although the Akāīshī, is of any significance today. The centre of the present community is the madrasa of Kirmān. Larger groups of Shaykhīs are also to be found in Tehran, in Ḥāḏarbāyḡān and Fārs, as well as among the employees of the oil industry in Khūzistān. (Cf. G. Scarcia, Stato e dottrine attuali della setta scita degli shiākhi in Persia, in Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni, xxv (1954). In 1260/1844 Sayyid ʿAli Muḥammad of ʿIrāq revealed himself as the Bāb [q.v.] or "gateway" who had come to inaugurate a new prophetic cycle. This meant no less than a breach with the Islamic shari'a, as was explicitly confirmed by a conversion of the followers of the Bāb in 1264/1848 at Bādāghāt. The first stage of this new religion was a period of persecution to which the early believers often reacted with violence. The Bāb himself was executed in 1266/1850. After an attempt on the life of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh in 1266/1852, the persecution reached a climax and the movement was wiped out as far as public life in Iran was concerned. Although it continued to have its secret sympathizers, especially among merchants and other groups of the middle class of Iranian society, its further development as an organization could only take place during the 20th century. The succession to the Bāb was for some time a matter of contention between Mirzā Husayn-ʿAli Nūrī and his brother Mirzā Nūrī, who, among their following, were respectively known as Bahāʾ Allāh [q.v.] and Ṣubb-i Aṣal. The former, who was able to get the support of the large majority, initiated a reform of the Bābī religion, which, as the religion of the Bahā'is [q.v.], extended its aspirations and activities far beyond the limits of Iranian religious life.

The renaissance of Sūfism in Iran, which had started in the late 12th/18th century, had continued during the Kāḏārī period in spite of the often violent opposition of the mudāji-khādis. During the reign of Muhammad Shāh (1250/1834-1264/1848), it even received official backing as the shah had become an adept of Sūfism and had died from the mudāji-khādis. On more than one occasion they actually interfered with his foreign policy. Under his successors relations between the state and the religious leaders became more strained. The latter's fierce opposition to the growing impact of western influences in Iran finally led to their active support of the popular protests against foreign monopolies like the tobacco concession of 1891-1892 and their involvement in the struggle against the authoritarian rule of the Kāḏār shāhs during the constitutional revolution at the beginning of this century. The Iranian government, on the other hand, as it more and more assumed the attitudes of a modern secular state, became less willing to respect the traditional privileges of the religious class.

Almost at the same time as the controversy between Aḥbārīs and Uṣūlīs was settled in favour of the latter, a new schism divided the Shi'i theologians. The doctrines of Shaykh Ahmad al-ʿAbsārī [q.v.], which were mainly concerned with the role of the Hidden Imam as a mediator in men's striving towards moral perfection and with problems of eschatology, were condemned as heretical by the mudāji-khādis. As a result of this the sect of the Shaykhīs [q.v.] was formed out of what had only been a school of Shi'i theology. After the death of al-ʿAbsārī in 1241/1826, his teaching was continued by Sayyid Kāẓim-i Rashī (d. 1259/1843) who, from his residence in Karbala', was able to exert his influence through the Iranian pilgrims. Afterwards the Shaykhī sect split into three branches: the Akāīšī, the Akāīshī, the Akāīshī, which, although the Akāīshī, is of any significance today. The centre of the present community is the madrasa of Kirmān. Larger groups of Shaykhīs are also to be found in Tehran, in Ḥāḏarbāyḡān and Fārs, as well as among the employees of the oil industry in Khūzistān. (Cf. G. Scarcia, Stato e dottrine attuali della setta scita degli shiākhi in Persia, in Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni, xxv (1954). In 1260/1844 Sayyid ʿAli Muḥammad of ʿIrāq revealed himself as the Bāb [q.v.] or "gateway" who had come to inaugurate a new prophetic cycle. This meant no less than a breach with the Islamic shari'a, as was explicitly confirmed by a conversion of the followers of the Bāb in 1264/1848 at Bādāghāt. The first stage of this new religion was a period of persecution to which the early believers often reacted with violence. The Bāb himself was executed in 1266/1850. After an attempt on the life of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh in 1266/1852, the persecution reached a climax and the movement was wiped out as far as public life in Iran was concerned. Although it continued to have its secret sympathizers, especially among merchants and other groups of the middle class of Iranian society, its further development as an organization could only take place during the 20th century. The succession to the Bāb was for some time a matter of contention between Mirzā Husayn-ʿAli Nūrī and his brother Mirzā Nūrī, who, among their following, were respectively known as Bahāʾ Allāh [q.v.] and Ṣubb-i Aṣal. The former, who was able to get the support of the large majority, initiated a reform of the Bābī religion, which, as the religion of the Bahā'is [q.v.], extended its aspirations and activities far beyond the limits of Iranian religious life.
articles relating to each of the manifold aspects of Iranian Islam.
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(vii).—Literature

As the literature of Iran in its widest sense can not be surveyed in this article, a preliminary definition of its contents is necessary. Essentially, the article is restricted to Persian literature, by which we will understand the poetry and belles-lettres prose works composed in the New Persian literary language in as far as they have been produced by the Muslim population of Iran from the 3rd/9th century onwards. After a treatment of the origins of this literary tradition and of some of its main characteristics, a historical survey will be given encompassing both the
literary works of the past and of the present. This
definition excludes the literatures of pre-Islamic
times, the writings of the non-Muslim communities
(e.g. Judaeo-Persian literature [q.v.]), the learned
prose works, the literatures of other New Iranian
languages and folk-literature. The cultivation of Per-
sian letters outside the boundaries of present-day
Iran is taken into consideration only as far as and as
long as it has been directly connected with the literary
life of Iran intérieur. Some references to general
works about most of these excluded branches of Iran-
ian literary activity have, however, been entered
into the Bibliography.
I. General Aspects.
a. The origins of Persian literature.
About the beginnings of Persian poetry, several
different traditions have been handed down. Accord-
ing to one of them, the first Persian poem was
composed by the Sasanian king Bahram V Gôr
(421-439 A.D.). This initiative remained fruitless, it
is said, on account of the opposition by the Zoro-
astrian clergy who regarded all forms of poetic speech
as being based on falsehood and as a dangerous tool
in the hands of heretics. Whatever the historical
value of this story might be, it is at any rate signifi-
cant in as far as it perfectly illustrates the literary
conditions in pre-Islamic Iran during the last few
centuries preceding the Arab conquest. The fact
that the same monarch is credited with Arabic
poems as well, moreover, points to the complex origin
of Persian literature: on the one hand, from patterns
of linguistic art as they are known to have existed
in pre-Islamic Iranian culture; on the other, from
Arabic literature as it had developed during the
first two centuries of Islam out of the Bedouin
poetry of the Dîjhiliyya. The traditional literary
critics of the Middle Ages, like ʿAwfi [q.v.] and
Shams-i ʿKayâs [q.v.], have denied this double ancestry.
To them, Persian poetry was entirely a product of
Islamic culture. Its formal and thematic conventions
were either taken over from Arabic poetry or newly
invented by the first Persian poets. An important
role as a creator of new forms in assigned to Rudaki
[q.v.]. The information concerning literary activity in
Sasanian times that was available to these mediaeval
critics was not accepted as evidence of the existence
of a pre-Islamic poetry in Iran but was interpreted
as referring only to a kind of rhymed prose set to
music, not to be confused with serious literature.
Modern scholarship has established beyond doubt
that Iran did have an independent literary tradition
from ancient times onwards. This included poetry
with a set of prosodic and metrical rules of its own,
the historical development of which can be traced up
to a certain extent. The oldest documents of Iranian
literature, the Gathas, have been found to be partly
poetical texts with an arrangement into stanzas of
different length and with a metrical system based on
the number of syllables. Within this system at least
five variants are known. This prodigy is quite similar
to that of the Vedic texts. Poetical fragments have also
been discovered in the younger parts of the Avesta.
A new metrical principle seems to be involved in
these last texts, viz. the fixed number of accents. Most
of the Middle Iranian languages were also used
for writing poetry. The Manichaean hymns in Parthi-
ian and Middle Persian that have been found among
the Turfan-manuscripts are partly translations from
Syrian models, partly original compositions. Many
of them are acrostic poems based on the order of the
Semantic alphabet. In some of these hymns there are
evocations of nature at the time of spring which are
very much reminiscent of later Persian lyrical poetry.
In the so-called Book-Pahlavi literature a number of
texts have been shown to be original poems dis-
guised by later Zoroastrian traditions as prose works.
They represent different strains of Middle Iranian
literary culture: the Ayyâhār (or Yâdgar-i Zarariant
belongs to the national epic (cf. E. Benveniste, JA,
cxiv (1932), 245-93), the allegorical tenzone Drâkh-i
Aşirîg to the literature of wisdom (cf. idem, JA
cxvii (1930), 193-225). In both cases, linguistic evi-
dence points to a Parthian origin. There are also
remnants of religious poetry like the hymns on Zurvân
discovered by H. S. Nyberg in the Bundahihïg (JA,
cxiv (1929), 214-5) and a number of other Zoroastrian
poems of a didactical or visionary nature (cf. E.
Benveniste, RHR, cv (1932), 337-80; J. C. Tavading,
Indo-Iranian Studies, i (1950), 86-95; idem, IRAS
(1955), 29-36; W. B. Henning, SBOAS, xii (1950),
641-8). The meters of Middle Persian verse presents
considerable difficulties as a result of the corrupted
state of the available material. According to W. B.
Henning (l.e.), the predominant principle is not syl-
labic but accentual; there are also unmistakable
traces of rhyme, although this was not used with great
consistency, while the dating of the known specimens
is still uncertain. Imitation of Persian models is,
therefore, not excluded. In addition to these speci-
mens of poetry, some examples of belles-lettres
have been preserved as well. Furthermore, a number
of Pahlavi works have survived in Arabic translations
or at least in the New Persian versions based on the
latter. Extremely popular were the collections
of Indian stories such as the Kallâ wa-Dîmna [q.v.],
Bilawhar wa-Yâddasf [q.v.] and the book of Sindibáb
[q.v.]. They had been introduced in Iran during the
later Sasanian period. Their preservation is due to
the translators of the 2nd/8th century among whom
Ibn al-Mûkaffâ [q.v. is the most prominent. Refer-
ences to a fairly extensive novelistic literature in
Middle Persian are to be found in Arabic sources of
which the Fîrist of Ibn al-Nadîm should be mentioned
in particular. Nearly all of this literature has dis-
appeared in Islamic times but not without leaving be-
hind numerous traces both in Arabic and Persian
literature. In this way, most of its subject-matter
has in fact been incorporated into Islamic literature.
This process of assimilation took place at such an
early date that this ancient Iranian lore could play
an important role in shaping the typical Islamic civili-
ation of the Middle Ages. Instances of this cultural
influence are: the legendary or semi-historical tales
about the Iranian kings which through the late
Sasanian codification in the Ksavîyî-nâmâh not only
reached its definite form in the Shâh-nâmâ of Firdawsi
[q.v.] but also became a part of Islamic world-history;
the gnomic literature of the andars surviving in
numerous didactical works in poetry and prose, more
specifically in collections of maxims like the one put
at the name of the vizier Buzurgmîr [q.v.]; finally, a
number of romantic themes both with and without
a historical background, a famous example of which is
the Parthian romance of Wîs u âdâmîn adapted from
a Pahlavi model by Fâqîr al-Dîn Gurgânî [see Gurgânî].
The Arabic sources also tell us something about
the activities of court minstrels and musicians
at the time of the last Sasanian kings. The names of
some of these artists like Barbîd, Sarkâsh and Nîfsa
remained famous far into Islamic times and we know
a few titles of their songs.
From this and similar materials it has been pos-
sible to reconstruct a long tradition of minstrel po-
eygoing back to Parthian times and perhaps even
earlier. As a form of oral literature closely connected with the art of music, it continued to flourish up to the time of the Arab conquest. Even after that event it did not vanish completely but left its influence on the popular poetry of Iran as well as on the practice of the Persian poets of the classical tradition. The minstrel tradition was clearly distinct from the written literature that was mainly cultivated by the class of professional scribes who monopolized the difficult writing system of Pahlavi. The Zoroastrian clergy, whose bias against poetry is exemplified by the anecdote about Bahram Gur cited above, adpered for a very long time to an oral tradition of the religious texts (see further Mary Boyce, *The Parthian gosdn and Iranian minstrel tradition*, JRAS (1959), 10-45).

Several modern scholars have tried to correct the traditional view of the origins of Persian poetry by making use of this new evidence for the existence of a pre-Islamic poetry in Iran. Special attention has been given to the possible connections between the quantitative metrics of classical poetry, described by the theoreticians of the Islamic period in terms of the Arabic system of al-Khalli [see *arznd*], and older indigenous metrical patterns. According to some, the later prosody is nothing but an adaptation of earlier syllabic or accentuated metres. Although this conclusion seems too rash in view of the limitations and uncertainties of our knowledge of Middle Persian prose works in epic tradition after the coming of Islam, together with the minstrel poetry dissolved as a self-conscious artisic tradition, it is a wellknown fact that several of the great poets of Baghdaa who created the new style of Arabic poetry during the 2nd/8th century were of Iranian descent. The oldest of these was Bashshar b. Burd [q.v.]. Abû Nuwas [q.v.] actually used Persian words and expressions in some of his poems (cf. M. Minowi, *Madgalla-i Dânishkada-i Adabiyyat, Dânishgdh-i Tihrdn*, i, 3 (1333 sh.), 132 f. with further references). On the evidence of two late Middle Persian or early New Persian poetical fragments Ch. Rempis has tried to establish an Iranian lineage for two forms of Persian poetry. In a hymn on the firetemple of Karbâyî, preserved in the local history Ta'rikh-i Sistdn, he recognized a stanza of a stream of poems comparable to the later Persian *mathnawi*- and *mukhamsi*-verses; in the ceremoidal address of the *mâbâdhn mûbadh* to the King of Kings at the New Year festival, transmitted in the *Nauruz-nâmâ*, a work ascribed to *Umâr-i Khâyâm, a specimen of the double rhymed *mathnawi* in Pahlavi (ZDMG, cl (1951), 233 ff.).

No matter how great a continuity can be reconstructed in Iranian literature, the fact remains that the minstrel poetry dissolved as a self-conscious artistic tradition after the coming of Islam, together with many other elements of ancient Iranian culture. Since the time of the Umayyad caliph 'Abd al-Malik [q.v.] Arabic had replaced Pahlavi and Greek in the chancelleries of the Muslim empire. The religious minorities continued to have literary languages of their own. In Iran the Zoroastrian clergy continued to cultivate the archaic Pahlavi whereas the Jews strove to preserve a vernacular form of Persian that was close to the actual speech of those days. Within the Muslim community, however, Arabic dominated all literary activity during the first few centuries of Islam. At a very early date the Iranian *mawdîl* appear to have taken an active part in Arabic poetry. A few names are even known from Umayyad times: Abû Ziyâd b. Salmâ (d. after 100/718) used Persian words in Arabic lines; Ismâ'il b. Yâsâr, of *Ahdârshâyândin* extraction, dared to singing the praise of the Persians in front of the caliph Hîghâm [cf. V. A. Eberman, *Persî srdî arabikhsî bâzât epikhî Omeyyaydn, in Zâgânk dadad khatâvand*, reprinted as *Shu'ûbiyya [q.v.],* for the struggle for equality of Arabs and non-Arabs—in particular the Iranian *maâilî*—that in the early 'Abbâsid period was fought out on the field of literary culture (adab). It should be pointed out that the question of the use of the vernacular in literature did not enter at all into this controversy. It is a wellknown fact that several of the great poets of Baghdaa who created the new style of Arabic poetry during the 2nd/8th century were of Iranian descent. The oldest of these was Bashshar b. Burd [q.v.]. Abû Nuwas [q.v.] actually used Persian words and expressions in some of his poems (cf. M. Minowi, *Madgalla-i Dânishkada-i Adabiyyat, Dânishgdh-i Tihrdn*, i, 3 (1333 sh.), 62-77). It is likely, though difficult to assess in detail, that the emergence of new trends in the poetry of the multiracial urban society of 'Irâd during this period owed much to Iranian influences. More evident is this impact in Arabic prose literature as well as in such a short-lived phenomenon as the adaptation of Middle Persian proverbs, epic, religious or *mawdâni-verses* as parodied by Abâs ibn *‘Abd al-Hamîd al-Lûbihîl [q.v.]. Arabic poetry was also cultivated with great intensity in the great cities of Khurâsân and Transoxania. A rich province of the early Islamic period, it was the theatre of many other elements of ancient Iranian culture. Since the time of the Umayyad caliph Abd al-Malik [q.v.] Arabic had replaced Pahlavi and Greek in the chancelleries of the Muslim empire. The religious minorities continued to have literary languages of their own. In Iran the Zoroastrian clergy continued to cultivate the archaic Pahlavi whereas the Jews strove to preserve a vernacular form of Persian that was close to the actual speech of those days. Within the Muslim community, however, Arabic dominated all literary activity during the first few centuries of Islam. At a very early date the Iranian *mawdîl* appear to have taken an active part in Arabic poetry. A few names are even known from Umayyad times: Abû Ziyâd b. Salmâ (d. after 100/718) used Persian words in Arabic lines; Ismâ'il b. Yâsâr, of *Ahdârshâyândin* extraction, dared to
mudhir Bakhtyari, n.p. 1342 sh.) | Ph. Safa, Ta'rikh, i, 147-51. The distich attributed to Abu Hafidh Sughdi might very well be a citation from his lexicon (cf. G. Lazard, Les premiers poètes persans, i, Tehran-Paris 1964, 10 f.). A more serious claim to precedence as the author of a Persian poem composed according to the rules of Arabic prosody can be held by 'Abbas or Abu 1-'Abbas al-Marwazi, who is named by 'Afwil (Lubab, i, 21) as the author of a kasida in honour of the caliph al-Mamun composed at the occasion of the latter's arrival in Marw in the year 193/809. This account is rejected by most modern scholars, mainly on stylistic grounds. The lines quoted by 'Afwil show a dexterity of poetical diction that suggests a much later time of origin (cf. G. Lazard, i.e., 12 and the references there; for contrary opinions see Chr. Rempis, i.e., 227 and J. Rypka, History, 135).

Whether this notice of 'Afwil is to be accepted as historical or not, the rise of Persian poetry appears to us essentially as one aspect of a larger development of political and cultural emancipation in the Iranian provinces of the caliphate. It has often been styled an "Iranian renaissance" though it should be understood that this may not be interpreted as a return to pre-Islamic culture. As the final outcome of that process of Iranization which was facilitated by the 'Abbasid revolution, it really meant the acceptance of the Islamic element as an integrated part of the Islamic commonwealth and its civilization. In politics, this found its expression in the short intermezzo of de facto independent rule of Iranian dynasties between the periods of Arab and Turkish domination; in the domain of culture, in the elevation of Persian to the rank of a literary language. In its oldest form it was known as dari [q.v.], originally a south-western dialect which since the 2nd/9th century had spread over the whole area where Iranian languages were spoken [see further IRAN LANGUAGES].

The eastern parts of Iran took the lead in the use of the vernacular in writing. In the west and the south, Arabic retained its supremacy even under the rule of the Daylamite Buyids.

From the time of the Tahirids, only a few names of Persian poets are known to us and next to nothing of their work has been preserved; although it is recorded that at least one of them, Hanzala of Badghis, had his poems collected into a divan. Thanks to the data transmitted by the Ta'rikh-i Istaswan we are somewhat better informed about the poetry at the court of the 'Afdardids. This source contains a detailed account of the birth of Persian poetry which presents a convincing picture of the way it actually happened, even if similar occurrences can easily be imagined to have taken place in the entourage of other local rulers as well. The notice has the form of an anecdote situated at the court of Ya'qub b. Layth when he was being hailed by the poets after the capture of Harat and the victory over the Khurdijsites. As the amir expressed his annoyance on account of the fact that he could not understand anything of these Arabic pamphlets, one of his secretaries, by the name of Muhammed-i Wa'il, started to compose poetry in Persian, "And he made the first Persian poetry addressed to Iranians. Before him, no one had done such a thing for, as long as they were pahls (i.e. before they became Muslims, both in a religious and in a cultural sense), lyrics used to be sung to them at the sound of the lute (rud) in the khusravand manner. When the Iranians were defeated and the Arabs came, poetry among them was in Arabic and they all had knowledge and understanding of it. No one amongst the Iranians rose to such a greatness that they would sing poems to him, before the time of Ya'qub. The only exception was Hamza b. 'Abd Allah al-Shari, but he was a learned man and knew Arabic." (ed. Mub. Ta'ki Bahar, Tehran 1314 sh., 210). The expression bar farah-i khusrawand in this passage corresponds to the terms surud or naur-i khusrawand as they occur in the descriptions of the minstrel and his art at the Sasanian court in other sources. Scattered pieces of a few other poets of the Saffarid period have also been preserved but the material is too limited to give us more than a vague idea of the poetry of this time. The poets made use of Arabic prosody though the lack of technical perfection they display characterizes them as first trials at handling a new linguistic medium of literary expression. The real history of Persian literature only began with the next period, the time of the Samanids of Transoxiana.

b. General traits of the Persian literary tradition.

Already from the earliest phase of its history Persian literature presents itself as a clearly defined tradition that guides as well as limits the artist in his creative work. Within this traditional pattern there are not only strict rules for prosody but also stringent prescriptions with regard to the choice of themes, images and metaphors. In spite of the dramatic developments that occurred in the course of time in Iranian society, its artistic traditions displayed a remarkable resistance to fundamental changes, at least until the overwhelming influence of Western civilization made itself felt with all its force in the present century. In the preceding section we have referred to some of the elements out of which this tradition has been built up. Ancient Iranian literature may have played a much greater role than has been thought before. Undoubtedly there have also been indirect influences from Indian and from Hellenistic culture. As a typical product of mediaeval Islamic culture Persian literature was syncretistic. It was able to absorb these heterogeneous elements and give them a place in a new harmonious unity. This adaptability can also be observed in other forms of Persian art. The mould in which this literary tradition was cast was, however, Arabic literature. In the 3rd/9th century the latter had already gone through some of the most dynamic stages of its history. It had developed a formal and conceptual idiosyncrasy that would determine the literary activity of the Arabs for many centuries to come [see further ARABIVYA. B. ARABIC LITERATURE, especially the sections i and ii]. This determined also to a large extent the Persian tradition. The work of the early Persian poets was in particular influenced by the "new poetry" of the early 'Abbasid period, although some Persian poets still tried their hands at imitations of the old Bedouin kashda and its repertoire (e.g. Manuchihr, Mu'izzil). The poets of the Hamdandi school equally should be mentioned in this respect. In particular al-Mutanabbi was very much admired in Iran. The nature poetry of al-Sanawari [q.v.] and the genre of the prison ballad of Abi Piras al-Hamdani [q.v.] also provided models for the Persian poets (cf. U. M. Daundota, The influence of Arabic poetry on the development of Persian poetry, Bombay 1934; Viktir al-Kik, Ta'hir-i furang-i 'Arab dar ag'dar-i Manuchihr-i Dughani, Beirut 1971).

The faithfulness of the artist to the established patterns was greatly favoured by the methods of training recommended to the beginner. He was advised to learn the craft by memorizing large quantities of verse from the works of the great masters of the
preceding generations. In addition to this he was urged to become a scholar since learning was considered to be a great asset in poetry. Finally he should study the different branches of literary theory and criticism. The censure of the critics, either the professionals in their learned works on nakhd-i ghāṣr or the educated public in its informal reactions, will have done its share to contain any attempt to go too far beyond the accepted bounds of tradition.

A similar restraint was put on the poet by his social status. Until the end of the 19th century most Persian poets were in some way or the other dependent on patronage. Literary life was mainly centred at the courts of greater or smaller monarchs. If the position of the poet as a craftsman was economically based on the favours of the princely maecenas, he was at the same time indispensable to the court. His task was not confined to entertaining but included also the advertising of the virtues and exploits of the ruler. From the eagerness with which poets were attracted to the courts it can be concluded that this form of political propaganda was regarded as effective. Apart from the sultans, the amirs and the atabegs, the poets sang the praise of lower members of the ruling class as well: viziers, generals or prominent jurists and theologians. From the 5th/12th century onwards the patronage was also assumed by the urban aristocracy. The persistence of this relation-ship between poet and maecenas (madāh) is illustrated by the continuous use of titles like amīr or maliḵ al-ghuṣrāt (poet laureate) from the times of Maḥmūd of Ghazna (ʿUnquri) to the last days of the Kājārs (Bahār). A counterpart to the panegyrical function of poetry was formed by satire [see ḥīkāt, ii]. If poetry had the power to enlarge the prestige of the patron, it could also be used to damage a reputation. This weapon might be used against the enemies of the patron or of the poet himself, but it could also be wielded against the former when he disappointed the poet's expectations. This social function of Persian court poetry certainly did not hinder its reaching at times a high degree of artistic perfection. Sometimes the symbolism of political power and literary talent may even have stimulated the endeavours to attract to it by means of patronage. The effectiveness of a literary work as a medium for social and political publicity depended on a large degree on its artistic value. (Several authors have left explicit statements of the opinions concerning the poet and the function of his profession in society prevailing in their times, e.g.: Nizāmī-i ʿArūḏ, Čāhār maḥālā, ed. M. Kazwinī-M. Muʿīn, Tehran 1955-7, text, 42 ff.; tr. by E. G. Browne, JRAS (1899), 661 ff.; Kay-Kān, Ḵābūnānī, ed. Ghulām-Husayn Yūṣufī, Tehran 1345/1967, 198-92; Shams-i Kays, al-Muṣṭafā fi maṣṣāfīr aḏhār al-ṣadājām, bāṭima, ed. M. Kazwinī, Leiden-London 1999, 415 ff.; ed. M. Radawī, Tehran 1338 sh., 445 ff.; see also Naṣr Allāh Fāsafī, Zindādānī-i ḥādīrān-i darbārī, in Čand maḥālā-i taʿrīkhī wa-دادī, Tehran 1342 sh., 327-51.)

Next to its other functions literature has in Iran always served as a medium for instruction and edification. Didactical works were among the first manifestations of Persian literature. Even the heroic epic, as we know it from the Šahnāmā of Firdawsi and the works of his imitators, is full of moralising asides. Religious themes also appear at a very early date. At first they consisted of ascetic warnings (maḏāfāt) which had their parallels already in Arabic literature in the subḥiyāt of poets like Aḥū Nuʿūmī and Abu l-ʿAtājī [qq.v.]. Gradually ecstatic mysticism found a way of expression in most forms of literature whether poetry or prose. This conquest by Ṣūfism is by far the most decisive development that took place in the history of Persian literature. Some poetical forms became almost completely absorbed by it. The line of development A. Bausani has sketched for the Persian ghasās [q.v.]—from the address to the mamduḥ through an identification with the maʿṣāḥ, the beloved as the object of an erotic poem, to the maʿṣūd, the transcendental Beloved—who very well serve to characterize this whole process of transformation. The attitude of absolute loyalty towards the maecenas which had to be expressed by the panegyrical poet was already in the early court poetry often associated with the total submission of the lover to his beloved as a metaphorical device. For a mystical application of this poetry with all its conventions this fundamental attitude did not need, therefore, to be changed. All that was necessary was a new interpretation of the symbols used. One of the results of this was a great amount of ambiguity in Persian poems. It is by no means always clear whether a poem is addressed to a venerated person in this world or in a transzendental sphere. This ambiguity constitutes one of the greatest problems of the interpretation of the work of a poet like Ḥāṯīz, who seems to fuse the panegyric, the erotic and the mystical into one. His case may not be as unique as it is sometimes presented. Although some of the Ṣūfī poets certainly did withdraw from all attachments to this world in actual life and projected their poetically phrased veneration exclusively to the mystical object, or perhaps to the person of their spiritual leader (pīr), it is undeniable that mystical ecstasy did turn out to be not always incompatible with that relationship to an earthly maecenas. In the course of time the flavour of Ṣūfism to such an extent permeated lyrical poetry that its absence was felt as an aesthetic defect (cf. the remark of Shibli Nuʾmānī, cited by J. Rypka, History, 233).

Another characteristic that made Persian verse a pliable medium for the expression of mystical ideas was its idealism. Quite often, and not least by modern Iranian critics, the early poetry in the so-called Ḵūrāsānī-style is qualified as realistic. This misunderstanding arises from the fact that the poet seems to speak about things in the outer world whereas in fact he evokes a poetical world in which the objects of his description possess an ideal and im-mutable form. His verbal garden is more akin to paradise than to any specific garden on earth, his idolized beauty is more like a ḥārī than like any particular human being. Even when he speaks about topical events such as a military campaign, a hunting-party or a festival he does not depict them as concrete events, but treats them on an abstract level. In the same way his often very detailed attention for natural phenomena does not concern the things themselves but rather the metaphorical possibilities they offer him as symbols. Together they form a fixed stock of images that tend to acquire stereotyped symbolic values. A great number of these have been accepted as tropic expressions in the ordinary use of the language, e.g. narcissus (nargis) for the eye, ruby (laʿlī) for lips, cypress (ṣarās) for slim stature.

The originality of an artist can only be evaluated within the framework of the artistic tradition which defines the boundaries of his work. In the case of Persian lyricism with its pronounced classicism this means that creative invention can only be applied on
the smallest elements of the poem, i.e. the individual lines (bayts) and the images and metaphors on which they are based. The poets vie with each other in formal perfection and refinement of expression, not in novelty of ideas. Sometimes this takes the form of citation (tadmin) which consists in incorporating a line of another poet into one's poem in order to be able to add an original line expressing the same idea in a still subtler way. This preoccupation with the single line of poetry has resulted in a remarkable loose structure, in particular in the ghalz. Recent research on the ghasals of Hafiz [q.v.] has for a great deal been concentrated on attempts to ascertain the structural principle of these poems which is thought to be of an associative character.

C. Forms and Themes.

The most obvious mark of its ties to Arabic literature is the prosodic system that governs classical Persian poetry. At least theoretically all poetical forms, whatever their origin, have been defined in terms of the flexible system of šarād [q.v.] as formulated by al-Khall. Both quantitative metres and, to a lesser extent, the use of rhyme were novelties to Iranian literature. Differences in linguistic structure between the two languages presented the first Persian poets with many difficulties as can be noticed in the technical deficiencies (from the point of view of scholastic theory) in the diwan of the oldest poets who has left an extensive collection of other respects as well, the kasida [q.v.] can be regarded as a different internal rhyme (aa, bb, cc, etc.). In other respects as well, the kasida [q.v.] can be regarded as a basic form. It is the most unquestionable piece of the Arabic legacy. True to its origin it is first and foremost a medium for panegyric poetry and the foremost connected with the social role of many Persian poets. The kasida usually consists of three parts: the prologue (nasib, taqdb), the actual panegyric (madīh) and the concluding appeal to the generosity of the patron (duʿāʿ). The literary convention required that the poet should give special attention to the embellishment of the opening (madīh) and concluding lines (maṭlaʿ) of the passage where he has to introduce the prologue to the panegyric (gurţāz, makhla, taḵālils). The most interesting part is undoubtedly the prologue. A great variety of topics can be used as themes. The choice is often decided by the topical occasion of the poem. Descriptions of nature in spring or in autumn were current in odes to be recited at the nawrūz or the mihrāsdin festivals. The fire festival (duʿās-ni-sada) at the end of winter called for descriptions of bonfires. Another famous theme was provided by wine and viniculture. The life of the court gave opportunities to chant the hunting parties or the campaigns of the patron or to describe the symbols of his royal status (e.g. the sword, the pen, the horse). A special branch of kasida poetry was formed by the elegy (marzīya). A more personal note seems also to be struck in complaints about old age or about imprisonment as well as of the passage where he has to introduce the prologue to the panegyric (gurţāz, makhla, taḵālils). All of these are conventional themes which can be traced back to the tradition of Arabic poetry. Very soon the kasida was equally used for the expression of secular moralism, religious topics and even mysticism. The most common form of the prologue was that of a description (wasf), but sometimes other devices were applied as well, such as semantic riddles (baq̲aʿ, ʿisaf), enigmas (mundzara) or plays of question and reply (šurūṭ wa-duʿaf). Until the time of the Mongol invasion the kasida was the most important lyrical form. It reached a height of rhetorical perfection in the hands of the poets of the Seldjük court (Muʿizz, Anwarī) and in the school of Aḍjarbāyjān (Khākānī). From the 7th/13th century till the classicist renaissance of the middle of the 12th/18th century it was relegated to the background, although the intervening period still produced outstanding poets of the kasida like Sādbārī and Sādāwī [q.v.] and Urṭīf [q.v.]. At the time of the Safawids the elegiac kasida was used for religious poetry mourning the holy martyrs of the Shiʿa. The decline of the kasida in the Mongol period coincided with the full development of the ghasal. It succeeded as the principal form of lyrical poetry. The prosodic characteristics of the ghasal are identical with those of the prologue of a kasida; it has approximately the same length and exactly the same pattern of rhyme. Although no specimens that can be attributed with certainty to Sāmānīd and early Ghaznavid times (4th/10th-middle of the 5th/11th century) have survived, the occurrence of ghasals in a romantic madīna, Warba u Gubākā by Ayyūbī, proves that it was known already as a separate form during the latter period. At a later stage of its development the use of the poet's nom de guerre (takhallu) in the maṭlaʿ became an inseparable element of the ghasal. Some researchers have tried to relate the origin of this usage to the origin of the Persian ghasal itself, in particular in its function as a mystical poem (cf. e.g. E. Bertel's, Istoriya, 519; A. Ateq, IA, s.v. ghasal). This view is incompatible with the evidence. Its use is from the earliest period onwards attested in the panegyric kasida. In the disān of Sanāʿī, one of the oldest poets who has left an extensive collection of
The Persian quatrains (rubā’ī [q.v.], also named du-hayti or tarānā) is not only defined by the number of lines but also by its pattern of rhyme (aaba, less commonly aaaa) and by its metre, to be described as a series of variants of the ideal metre ḥaṭadāj according to traditional theory. This is undoubtedly an artificial construction but the real origin of this form of short epigrammatic poems is still uncertain. Various themes can be chosen as a subject for the rubā’ī. At an early date they occupy the biographies of Sūfī ḥavīks and in mystical treatises. Best known to Western readers is the philosophical quatrains. Erotic and anacreontic themes were by no means incompatible with this form. It is also frequently used for topical poetry, for inscription on buildings, tombstones etc.

The possibilities offered by the much simpler rhythm of the mathnawī [q.v.] have been exploited to the full in Persian literature. A rich epic poetry has been based on it, comprising many works of great extent. The only rarely used musdawwadī [q.v.] of Arabic poetry can hardly be compared with it. Although the factual evidence pointing to an Iranian origin for the Persian mathnawī is very limited, the importance this form has had from the very beginning makes it at least likely that it continues some kind of older indigenous literary form. Three main groups can be distinguished in the Persian epic: (a) the heroic epic, based on ancient Iranian mythology, the legendary as well as the historical lives of the kings of Iran and other heroic cycles that became attached to this [see further hāmāsā, ii.], (b) the romantic epic, elaborating in most cases famous stories about a pair of lovers whose names provide the title of the poem. These stories come from quite different origins. Some of them are episodes taken from the heroic epic (e.g. Khusrāw u Shīrīn), others go back to Iranian (e.g. Wis u Rāmin), Hellenistic (e.g. Wāmīk u Adhrā) and Arabic sources (e.g. Laylā u Madīnān), or are derived from the Kūrˈān (Yūsuf u Zailikīhā). Nearly all of them developed into literary models which were imitated by successive generations of poets. The poetical language of the romantic mathnawī is more rhetorical than that of the heroic epic. Lyric intermezzi often interrupt the intrigue. There are always a few passages added with moralistic aphorisms. With the growing influence of mystical philosophy on literature, the romantic tales acquired an allegorical meaning. (c) The didactic mathnawī includes a diversity of works the main purpose of which is instruction of one kind or another. This can be the vulgarization of science, moral precepts of a secular nature or the exposition of philosophical, religious or mystical truth. The poems of this category belong to epic literature in as far as they make use of narratives to typify the theoretical subject-matter. Frame-stories are also used to wrap the contents in an attractive epic form (cf. e.g. Rūdākī’s Kālīla u Dimnā and several of the mystical mathnawīs of ʿAttār). In the great tradition of the so-called Sūfī mathnawī anecdotes became particularly important. In these last works stories can be found that were taken from the Kūrˈān, from ʿInādī, from the kīyāṣ al-anbāsījī and the hagiography of Sūfī saints as well as from a great number of other sources. (Of some of the most important among these works the narrative elements have been analysed and related to their sources; cf. on Sanāʾī: M. Rādawi, Taʿālīḵāt-i Ḥadīthāt al-khākīh, Tehran 1344 sh.; on ʿAttār: H. Ritter, Das Meer der Seele, Leiden 1955; on Dījāl al-Dīn Rūmī: R. H. Nicholson, The Mathnawī of Jalāludīn Rūmī, vols. vii and viii (Commentary), London 1937-40; Bādī al-Zāmān Fūrūzāndār, Maḏḥahīkh-u kīyāṣ wa tamkīlīkh-i Mathnawī, Tehran 1333 sh.: idem, Sharḥ-i Mathnawī-i sharif, 3 vols., Tehran 1346-9 sh., left unfinished). A favourite allegorical technique is the sabānī hāl, “the speech of state”. This means that animals, things, or even metaphysical and legendary beings are introduced as speakers illustrating through a description of their own mode of existence the abstract ideas put forward and the doctrine of the poets.

As metre and rhyme were, in the classical tradition, regarded as almost indispensable to a genuine literary composition, prose could only play a modest role in Persian literature. It had, moreover, to compete with the mathnawī in most narrative genres. Still, when considered from a more impartial point of view, a rich and varied literature of prose works of artistic value appears to exist. Anecdotes are also a favourite instrument of prose-writers even if their works are of an entirely utilitarian intent. It is, for that reason, not always possible to draw a clear line between artistic and non-artistic prose. A survey of different genres of story-telling in prose is given s.v. HIKAYA, ii.

Conspicuous traits of the stylistic development of Persian prose are their interlacement of prose with poetical fragments and the increasing abundance of rhymed prose for which full advantage was taken of the possibilities offered by the vocabulary of Arabic. From the Mongol conquest onwards the tendency towards formal embellishment went to such extremes that meaning became almost completely subordinated to form. A trend to simplify the language of literary compositions started early in the 13th/14th century. For a detailed history of Persian prose style see M. T. Bahār, Sahākhānāšt, 3a taṭrīkh-i tāsawwur-i nārī-i fārsī, 3 vols. Tehran 1321 sh.

In the course of this survey there has been occasion to refer to several of the genres current in Persian literature, in particular in as far as they were connected with one of the poetical forms. In addition to this, some reference should be made to the genre of the balandarīyāṭ, a type of wandering dārāngh who practises in its extreme form the antinomian way of life of malāmatīyya [q.v.] mysticism. Poems of this genre can be quatrains (Bāhā Tāhir, ʿAttār) or may have a form intermediate between the kāṣīda and the ghaṣal (cf. esp. Sanāʾī). It seems to have absorbed the literary tradition of provocative identification of the poet with forms and symbols of non-Islamic religions (kufrīyād) which is attached already in Arabic poetry of ʿAbhāsid times and in Persian poetry appears as early as Daḵīlī [q.v.]. The balandarīyāṭ later on
merged with the mystical ghazal (cf. H. Ritter, Das Meer der Zeile, 487 ff.; idem, Oriens, xii (1959), 14 ff.). Another genre worth mentioning here is the shahr-āshāb or shahr-angīs, short poetical witicisms on young artisans, usually quatrains but also occurring as kasidas. In the latter case, they have been worked out to a satire on a whole town. Although themes of this kind can be found at quite an early date they really became popular only from the 10th/16th century onwards. The importance of the shahr-āshāb poems as documents of social conditions has been overrated (cf. A. Mirzoev, Sayyūdī Naṣafī i ego mesto v istorii tadzhikskoy literaturi, Stalirabad 1955, 143 ff., cited by J. Ryplka, History 297, 302 ff. See also on this genre: M. Dż. Mahdīb, Sabk-i Khurāsānī, 677-99; A. Gulčīn-i maštān, Shahr-āshāb dar shīr-i fārsī, Tehran 1346 sh.). There are also genres that are strictly bound to prosodic forms, e.g. the Sāhāndā, a short mahmūr piece in the metre mutahābīn on themes belonging to the topic of wine-drinking. The oldest specimens date from the 8th/14th century (Salmān-i Sāwādī, Ḥāfīz). An anthology of works of this type was compiled by ʿAbd al-Nabī Faḵr al-Zamānl Kazzwīnī in 1028/1619. (Taghīkra-i Maykhānā, ed. by Gulčīn-i maštān, Tehran 1340 sh.).

The poetical language, its images and metaphors have only been explored to a limited extent so far. The nāmār poetry in the narrow sense has been inventiorized and analysed by C.-H. de Fouchécour, La description de la nature dans la poésie lyrique persane du XIe siècle. Inventaire et analyse des thèmes, Paris 1969. Special attention is given to the symbolism of the erotic-mystical ghara in the chapter on Ḥaṭi, motivs i forme della poesia persiana of A. Bausani, Storia, 239-95; cf. idem, Persia religiosa, Milan 1959, 250-54; Manšūrī Murtadāwī, Ḥāfīz yā muḥādāma dar Ḥāfīz-šinaštī, Tehran 1344 sh. The Zoroastrian background of many themes is examined by M. Muʿīn, Mondazaynā wa taʿlīkh-i ān dar adabīyyāt-i ārāri, Tehran 1326 sh., 1338 sh.1


II. Historical Survey.

a. Periodization of Persian literary history.

Most histories of Persian literature derive the arrangement of their subject-matter largely from the divisions of Persian literary history. This method is to a certain extent justified by the fact that royal courts have always been very important in the literary life of Iran. Schools of poetry can quite conveniently be identified and labelled by reference to the political centres on which they depended. Apart from the theoretical objections that can be brought forward against the exclusive use of a political frame of reference, one of the main practical disadvantages is that it cannot account for literary developments that intersect the boundary lines of political history. An arrangement based on a classification of forms and genres, as has been chosen for instance by E. Ḩethē and, more recently, by A. Bausani, can do more justice to the intrinsic history of literature as an autonomous artistic tradition. In the present survey, a broad historical scheme has been adopted which leaves sufficient room to trace out at least the most essential lines of the purely literary development. Within each historical section a secondary arrangement according to the main genres of literature (lyric poetry, epic poetry, prose) has been followed as far as possible.

Several attempts have been made to work out a more fundamental theory of periodization. A. Zarre has based his trifold division of Iranian literature as a whole on the principles of Marxist literary theory. The feudal period encompasses both the classical Persian literature and the literature of the Middle Iranian period (cf. Oṭark in Vostok, shornik, ii, 26). Suggestions for a much more refined scheme based on autonomous literary developments as well as on political and economic factors have recently been made by A. N. Boldirev and I. S. Braginskyy (cf. I. S. Braginskyy et al., Problemi periodizatsii istorii literatury narodov Vostoka, Moscow 1968, containing reprints of articles published earlier in Narodl Azii reprints of articles published earlier in Narodl Azii

A specimen of this is the poem designed by Ḥādīdīk al-šīrī fārsī. The most authoritative work dealing with the disciplines of prosody as well is al-Muḍjam fī maʿāṣir asḵār al-ʿadhām (ed. by Shams al-Dīn Muhammad b. ʿAlī al-ʿRāzī, Shams-i Kays for short (ed. by E. G. Browne and M. Kazzwīnī, London 1909; ed. by Mudarrīsī-Rādawī, Tehran 1314 sh., 1338 sh.).3
Clature but is essentially based on stylistic criteria. This theory distinguishes three different styles each of which is typified by the poetry of a specific region during a certain period of time. (a) The style of Khuršān or Turkistān (sabh-i Khurāsānī, sabh-i Tur- kistānī), i.e., the comparatively simple and balanced style of early Persian poetry up to the Sādījīk period. It is ruled by the principle of harmonious use of images and metaphors within the limits of one line (maward-nār). The language both of prose and verse is still the old dārī which has not yet been overloaded with Arabic loanwords and expressions. The main forms of poetry are the ḭasīda and the maʿlūmah, especially the heroic genre. (b) The style of Yrbā (sabh-i Yrbāšī) is characterized by a development towards a rhetorically more sophisticated type of poetry, the language of which is much more influenced by Arabic. There is also a tendency to use difficult learned allusions. In the course of the period of the Yrbāšī style, the ghasal and the romantic epic become the most prominent forms of poetry. It is equally the time of the rise of Sūfī literature in all its various forms. Most of these developments affect prose literature as well. There exists some uncertainty about the exact beginnings of this style. The shift of the main centre of literary life to the west during the second half of the 6th/12th century is reflected in its name, but unmistakable traces of similar stylistic trends can be found in the literature produced in the eastern parts of the country from the end of the preceding century onwards. (c) The Indian style (sabh-i Hindī [q.v.]) is in its origin as a clearly defined poetical style more narrowly associated with historical and geographical factors than the two others. These factors are the radical changes in Iranian society resulting from the victory of the Šafawīs in the 11th/16th century and the migration of many Persian poets to Indian courts, which took place simultaneously. The characteristic traits, as they have been described by A. Bausani, are: deviations from the rule of harmonious use of imagery, leading to a “baroque” extension of the stock of images and metaphors allowed in poetry, the predominance of mystical-philosophical themes, and an extreme tendency towards allegory. This style reached its full development in the time of the Tāhirīds and the Saffārīds. For the earlier period our knowledge entirely depends on the fragments transmitted by a number of sources of quite different nature. The most important categories are the anthologies (tadhkhīra [q.v.]), foremost the Luḥāb al-albāb by ʿAwfī [q.v.], lexicographical works, the oldest extant work being the Luḥāt al- Furs by Asadī [q.v.], and works on literary theory. Usually the fragments do not amount to more than one or two lines. Complete lyric poems of the 4th/10th century are very rare. Perhaps the most ancient specimen is a ḭasīda on the cultivation of wine by Rūdakī preserved in the Taʾrīkh-i Sīsān. The first attempt to reassemble these scattered pieces was made by H. Ethīn in a series of monographs published between 1872 and 1875. Several scholars both inside and outside Iran have continued this line of research (cf. G. Lazār, Les premiers poètes persans (ixe-xe siècles), Fragments rassemblés, édits et traduits, 2 vols., Tehran-Paris 1964, with further references).

The court of the Sāmānīd āmirs in Būḥārā in the 4th/10th century is the first great centre of literature about which some detailed information is available. Both the āmirs and the prominent men of their entourage, like the Balʿams [q.v.] and the members of the military clan Simghūr, encouraged men of learning and poets to use the vernacular as a literary language. There was much interest in Iranian lore but in the whole the literary tradiotional forms were expanded to fit new patterns of Islamic culture. A particularly splendid episode was the reign of Naṣr II (301/914-331/942), the patron of Rūdakī [q.v.] (d. 329/940-1), who was the most distinguished figure of the Sāmānī literature. More than 100 bayts from his works have been preserved, considerably more than of any of his contemporaries. He cultivated a great variety of forms but the traditional forms of the Safawīs in the invention of several forms of poetry are certainly unhistorical. There are indications that the literary activity of the Ismāʿīlīya [q.v.] exerted some influence on the intellectual circles at the Sāmānī court. The anonymous commentary on a didactical ḭasīda by Abu ʿl-Haṣam Gurgānī (ed. by H. Korbin and M. Muʿīn, Tehran-Paris 1953; cf. G. Lazār, op. cit., i, 24) contains references to the interest taken in the doctrines of this Ismāʿīlī philosopher by Rūdakī and two other poets: Shahīd of Balkh, who himself is also known as a philosopher, and Muḥṣīf, one of the viziers of Naṣr II. Another notable poet of the earlier Sāmānī period was Farsāwī. To a later generation belong Abu ʿl-ʿAbbas Rābinjānī, Abu ʿl-Saʿāb of Harāt, Muʿīf of Balkh and Daḵīḵī [q.v.]. This last, who is best known through his epic work, was also a great master of the early lyrical style. Much attention has been paid to his allusions to Zoroastrianism, which are best explained as early instances of the topic of the kufriyyāt and should not be taken at their face-value. From the increasing number of poems of the last decades of this century, special mention should be made of Kīshā (born 341/952), the first to write religious poems showing his ʿRīfīte sympathies. Other names are Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Lawkārī, Sīpīhī, Bāḏī Balkhī, Shūrawī, Abu ʿl-Mathāl, Shākir, Dūljābī, Ammārī Marwāzī, Amir Aḏkhīdī and Ismāʿīl Muntazīr, the last two mentioned being members of the Sāmānī house.

The local rulers of Cāghānīān, the Alī Muhāḏdī, were equally interested in Persian poetry. They patronized Daḵīḵī during a part of his career and later Mundūjī Tirmidūjī as well as some of the great poets of the Ghaznavīd period. To the west, Persian poetry penetrated to the court of the Šafawīs in Gurgān and even to the residence in Ravy of the Būyīd vizier.
"Şâhib" Ismâ'îl b. 'Abbâd al-Ťalâkâni [see ISMÂ'ÎL] (d. 409/1018-19), who is also renowned as a writer and a patron of Arabic letters. Among the first poets at these courts were Manṭûkî Râzî (d. between 367/977 and 380/991) and Ḥusrawî Sarâghslî (d. before 383/993). The popularity of poetry in dialects (Tabârî, Ġilâkî) in northern Iran during this period is worthy of note.

The Turkish Ghaznavids inherited the cultural traditions of their former colons, the Sâmânîs. Their remote capital, Ghazna, was, during the first half of the 5th/11th century, the most brilliant centre of intellectual and literary life in Iran. All this was the result of a conscious policy pursued by the early Ghaznavids to attract scholars—the most celebrated among them being al-Bīrûnî [q.v.]—and poetical talents to their court. It was inspired by a keen sense of the propagandist value of patronage. The writers and poets of this time put great emphasis on the glory of the dynasty and on its legitimacy. Poets accompanied the sultans on their campaigns, particularly on the raids into Indian territories, and celebrated their victories (e.g. the destruction of the temple of Shiva at Somnâgh in 416/1026). Sultan Mâmûd himself entered into literature on account of the stories about him and his favourite slave Ayâz [q.v.].

Thanks to a much fuller documentation of the literary production, we can now for the first time study the lyricism of the Khûrâsânî style in all its details in the works of the poets of the early Ghaznavid school. The period is dominated by three poets who exerted an influence on Persian poetical style that lasted throughout the centuries: ʿUnûsûr [q.v.] (d. 431/1040-41), Farrûghî [q.v.] (d. 429/1037-8) and Manûchîrî [q.v.] (d. about 432/1040-1). ʿUnûsûr, the poet laureate of the court of Sultan Mâmûd, is first of all a great panegyrict, which made his work a favourite source for the older writers on the rhetorical schemes. The descriptive art of the prologues is more fully developed in the poetry of Farrûghî, especially in the formalized descriptions of nature. His style is characterized by the use of parallelism in the structure of the two parts of the distich. Manûchîrî shows a great amount of individuality within the common tradition in the choice of his images. He is especially famous on account of the strophic poems.

The works of the other poets of the period have only been transmitted in a very imperfect way. We can have at least some idea about the poetry of Lâbbîl [q.v.] (d. after 429/1037-8) and ʿAbbâzî (d. ca. 432/1040-1). Râbîʿa Kûzdârî of Balkh is probably the earliest female poet of Iran, although the chronology of her life is uncertain. She became the heroine of a popular romance (cf. Fr. Meier, *Die schöne Mahsârî*, 27-42). The poet Bâhrâmî is known to have composed some treatises on prosody which were used as textbooks for a considerable time but have not been preserved. Abu ʿl-Fath Bustî (d. between 400/1009 and 405/1013) is said to have left two diwâns, one in Arabic and one in Persian.

A second centre of patronage was the residence of Amir Naṣr, a brother of Sultan Mâmûd and governor of Khūrâsân. In Rayy lived the poet Ǧaḫâdârî (d. 426/1034-5) who, in spite of his service to the Bûyûd court, was in close contact with the Ghaznavid sultan as well.

The defeat of Sultan Masʿûd I at the hands of the Saljuks in the battle of Dândânkân in 432/1040 divides the history of the Ghaznavids into two parts. After this event they lost control over the western parts of their empire and drew back upon the eastern half, i.e., the present-day Afghanistan and the conquered areas on the Indian subcontinent. They did not abandon their cultural interest, however. Poetry was now also patronized at the court of the Ghaznavid viceroy in Lahore. This can be regarded as the starting-point of Indo-Persian literature. Quite prominent names are to be found among the first poets at the court of the Panḍâb: Abu ʿl-Farâdhî Rûnî (d. after 492/1098-9) and Masʿûd-i Sâd-i Salâmân [see MASʿÛD-I SâD-I, d. 483/1094-7—515/1212-2). The latter brought many new elements into the style of panegyrical ǧâsidâ which anticipated later developments finally resulting in the style of ʿIrâk. His work is known to have influenced Anwâr. Masʿûd-i Sâd is especially famous because of his prison-poems, reflecting personal experiences, although as a genre the ḥâdîssîyâdâ were already a part of the Arabic-Persian tradition. The importance attached to poetry in the capital itself is demonstrated by the large friezes containing poetical inscriptions that has been unearthed in the ruins of the palace of the sultan (cf. A. Bombaci, *The kâfic inscription in Persian versas in the court of the Royal Palace of Masʿûd III at Ghazni*, Rome 1966). The reign of Sultan Bahramshâh (512/1118-552/1251) was very fruitful. Muḥtârî (d. probably 554/1159 [q.v.]) was a versatile writer of ǧâsidas. The fame of Sanâhî [q.v.] (d. about 555/1160-1) is particularly based on his religious and moralistic poetry. A great number of his panegyricts belong to the genres of the "ascetic poems" (szâdîyyâdâ) and the ǧâlândariyyâdâ. A similar preoccupation with religious and ethical themes is to be found in the diwân of the great Ismâʿîlî poet and philosopher Nâṣir-i Ḥusraw [q.v.] (d. about 465/1072-73). Sanâhî's extensive collection of ghâzals has been mentioned already on account of its significance for the history of this poetical form. Another notable poet of the ghâzal was Sayyid Ḥasan-i Ghaznavi Ashraf (d. 556/1160-1).

The foundation of the Saljuq sultanate in Iran unified the country both politically and in a religious sense. This new situation gave the cause of Persian letters a better chance to win the western provinces. Asâdî [q.v.] of Tûs compiled his dictionary *Lughât al-Furs* in order to make the writer's parts of Iran acquainted with the vocabulary of the eastern literary language. He himself emigrated to Ardârbâyân where he found a patron in Abû Dulaf, the ruler of Naḵchûwân. The first prominent poet born in the west was Kaṭrân [q.v.] (d. after 465/1072-3). He attended the local courts of Taḥrîz and Ghazna. Local centres of power emerged also in other parts of the country and offered the poets a greater variety of chances. Best known among the provincial panegyrists was Azrâkî [q.v.] (d. before 465/1071-3), who glorified the governor of Harât as well as the Saljuq Sultan of Kirmân. The central seat of power, the court of the Great Saljuqs, was during the 5th/11th century not very conspicuous for its interest in poetry. We know a few names such as Lâmi [d. ca. 455/1063] and Burhânî (d. 465/1072-3), but the one truly great poet was the latter's son Muʿizzî [q.v.] (d. between 515/1212 and 521/1218), who later on joined the group of poets at the court of Sandîar in Marw. Here the art of the ǧâsidâ was elaborated with great rhetorical refinement. A great master of this art was Anwâr [q.v.] (d. probably 585/1189-90). Other lyricists of great talent were Abîdî Shâbir (d. between 538/1143 and 544/1148) and Diâbî (d. 555/1160).

In Central Asia Turkish dynasties continued to favour Persian panegyrict. Under the Ilkhan, Buḫârâ had its own school of poets led by the rivals ʿAmâšk [d. ca. 543/1148-9] and Rashîdît of Samar-
The most interesting figure was the satirist Suzairi [q.v.] (d. 562/1166-7) who directed his ridicule against several of his colleagues. In the time of the Khwarezm-shahs the most influential man of letters was Rashid al-Din WasWat [q.v.] (d. 575/1177-8 or 578/1182-3). Besides being a poet, he was a prolific writer in Arabic and Persian prose.

The growing insecurity of life in Khurasan from the middle of the 6th/12th century onwards, mainly a result of fresh invasions of Turkish Ghuzz tribes, caused an increasing number of poets to emigrate to the west. This trend is exemplified in the career of Aghiri-i Aghsikal (d. ca. 570/1174-5) and Zahir-i Faryabi [q.v.] (d. 598/1201-2), who both travelled to the Saldjuk court in 'Irak and further to the Ildegizids atabegs in 'Ardharbavdgan. At the same time there emerged a short-lived but not insignificant school of poets in 'Isfahan dependent on the patronage of local aristocrats such as the 'Ali- Khwajgan and the 'Ali-Sa'id. To this group belonged Djamal al-Din Isfahani (d. 588/1192-3) and his son Kamal al-Din Isma'il [q.v.] (d. 635/1237-8) as well as the lesser known Shara'i al-Din Shufuwa. Closely related to the work of these poets was the school of 'Ardharbavdgan. It comprised the encomiasts of the many local rulers of north-western Iran, among whom the Ildegizids and the Shirvanshahs were the most prominent. The outstanding lyrical poet was Shara'i al-Din [q.v.] (d. 652/1254-5), the last great poet of the shaida of pre-Mongol times. Mention should also be made of Falaki Shirwani [q.v.] (d. about 550/1155-6), whose divan contains a number of remarkable habisyydd, and Mu'jir-i Baylakani (d. about 594/1197-8), one of Khakani's pupils.

The ghazal continued its development into one of the majors forms of lyricism throughout the 6th/12th century. The course of this process since late Ghaznavid times can be traced in the diwan of Adib-i 'Sahir, Anwari, Djalal al-Din I'sfahan, Zahir Faryabi and Khakani. The mystical application of the symbolism of the ghazal shows itself in an unequivocal form only at the very end of this century in the work of Farid al-Din 'Attar [q.v.].

Another form that became a favourite of Saldjuk times was the rubii. We find it in the 5th/11th century already used for religious thoughts. The poems are ascribed to famous Sufi shaikhams like Abu Sa'id b. Abi 'l-Khayr [q.v.], Ansari [q.v.] and Abu 'l-Hasan Khurasani [d. 425/1034-5]. The du-baytis of Baha Tahir 'Ursun [q.v.] (d. 401/1010) contain early examples of the kalandari themes. They show their affinity to popular poetry by the use of dialect forms. At the end of the period the mystical quatrains is again well represented in the Muhkamndama of 'Attar, a huge collection of rubii-yiiyt arranged according to topics by the poet himself (cf. H. Ritter, Philologika xvi, in Oriens, xiii-xiv (1961), 195-228). The philologicalagnosticism of the famous quatrains of Umar-i Khayyam [q.v.] (d. probably 515/1121-2) has some affinity to this mystical trend but cannot be identified with it. This short poem lent itself to the expression of quite profane topics as well. Anacreontic and erotic themes closely related to those of the ghazal are to be found in the poems of the female poet and singer Mahsati [q.v.]. Like Rabi'a, she is historically a rather vague personality and appears also as the heroine of a popular novel. It should be noted that most Persian poets have left collections of quatrains.

Among the fragments of Samandi poetry there is a remarkably large number of matnawii-lines, but it is very often impossible to define the exact nature of the poems from which they originate. It is clear, however, that in addition to the versions of the heroic epic in prose, already at the turn of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries an attempt was made to treat the same subject-matter in the form of a matnawi. The poor remnants of this work by Mas'udi of Marw just permit the conclusion that it comprehended the whole range of the royal epic as we know it in the classical form of the Shakhnama of Firdawsi [q.v.], which was completed about 400/1009-10. Through the latter work a fragment from the unfinished maqamlawi of Da'iki has been preserved. After Firdawsi the heroic epic continued in the form of monographic poems dealing with the adventures of individual heroes. Especially favourite were the members of the Sistanian dynasty of vassals to which Rustam belonged. The most important writer of this genre is Asadi [q.v.] (the theory of the two Asadis now has few defenders) with his Gargshahpurnama. The strong influence of the romance of Alexander shows itself in the emphasis on philosophical discussions and journeys to far and mysterious countries. The tales about Alexander [see ISKANDARNAMA] formed the only part of the epic of the kings that ultimately survived as a separate genre in the literature of the matnawi. The classical model of this branch was provided by the double Iskandarnama of Ni'ami [q.v.]. [See further HAMASA, ii].

The oldest subject of a romantic maqalawi that can be identified is the story of Yasuy u Aziiblik [q.v.], based on the 12th sura of the Qur'an. Of the several versions known to have been composed in pre-Mongol times only one has been preserved. This poem used to be ascribed to Firdawsi but recent research has rejected this and attributed it to a certain Amami who wrote it after 476/1083 for a Saldjuk prince (cf. J. Rypka, History, 157 f.). It contains references to two versions of the 4th/10th century by Abu 'l-Mu'ayyad and Bakhitiyar. The same story was later treated by 'Am'ak. From the romances written by 'Usurn [q.v.], Wamiik u 'Ahrdr, a story going back to Helenistic sources, has been partly recovered recently. Two others, Khang-but u surzh-but, inspired by the statues of Buddha at Bamiyan, and Shdbahr u 'Ayn al-Nayd have been lost. Another recent discovery is Warka u Gulya, a Persian version of the story of Sultan Mamlud. It is a love story, situated in Arabia in the lifetime of the Prophet, and not unlike the European romance of Floire and Blancheflor.

Towards the middle of the 5th/11th century Falghr al-Din Gurgani [q.v.] elaborated an ancient Parthian tale, transmitted up to his times by Pahlavi literature, in the maqalawi, Wis u Ramin. The significance of this work for the history of Persian literature lies not only in its origin, thoroughly investigated by V. Minorsky, but especially in the influence it exerted on the further course of courtly romance. Several stylistic conventions and topics were introduced by Gurgani and afterwards developed by a long line of imitators. A particularly close relationship appears to exist between this work and Keraww u Shrin of Ni'ami [q.v.] (d. 565/1459). While Gurgani's story itself was abandoned, Ni'ami set the pace for future generations both as far as the subject-matter and the formal conventions are concerned. The same can be said of his other romances: Haft Paykar, the romanticized lifestory of Bahram Gur, serving also as a frame-story for seven splendidly told fairy tales, and the celebrated Arabian story of Laylat u Madjin. Ni'ami treated these subjects with great psychological depth. On the other hand he enriched the romantic maqalawi by using the imagery of lyric poetry to the full, treating it with all the rhetorical
ingenuity characteristic of the ‘Irākī style. He is justly regarded as the real founder of the Persian romantic epic. The *Nasīrīndma* by ʿAttār [q.v.] also belongs to this category. The *maθnāwī* was from the earliest times onwards used for didactic purposes as well. Rūdākī composed versions of the Indian collections of fables and tales *Kalīla u Dimna* [q.v.] and *Sindibādnāma* [q.v.]. They were both repeatedly remodelled by later writers both in prose and in verse. To the same group of works belong the Bilawhar u Yaddāsaf (*Bīdāsī*) [q.v.], fragments of which have been recovered from the Turfan manuscripts. Although written with Manichaean characters, the language of this text shows unmistakable signs of a New Persian original which can be dated in the Sāmānīd period (cf. W. B. Henning, *Persian poetical manuscripts from the time of Rūdākī*, in *A Locust's Leg. Studies in honour of S. H. Taguidāshed*, London 1962, 89-104). Narratives of this kind were from pre-Islamic times onwards especially valued on account of the element of moral instruction they contained. They can therefore be classified as a branch of the didactic epic. Another type is represented by the *Aṣaṛinīndma* of Abī Shākūr of Bālkh completed in 336/947-8. Quite a number of fragments have been retrieved which can be ascribed to this work with some certainty. As far as we can judge from these remnants, it consisted of a series of aphorisms predominantly of a moralistic nature and illustrated by the use of inserted anecdotes. If this description is correct, it would mean that the *Aṣaṛinīndma* prefigured a structural type on which most later works of secular or mystical didacticism were based. The first and perhaps most important instance of this is the *Bīdāsī* of Sānāʾī [q.v.], usually regarded as the beginning of a long tradition of Sūfī maθnāwīs. The anecdotes in this work are very short and entirely subordinated to the theoretical contents they serve to exemplify. Although the poem has sometimes been described as an encyclopaedia of Sūfism, the *Bīdāsī* contains, in fact, besides mystical elements, a wide range of other themes such as philosophy, ethics, science and even panegyrics. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that diverging lines of development originate from this point in the history of the gevašt. On the one hand, the *Māḥzan al-asrār* of Nizāmī, dealing mainly with secular ethics, is notwithstanding its different metre and the far more rigid composition, according to the statement of the poet himself, written in competition with the work of Sānāʾī. On the other hand, ʿAttār’s *Aṣaṛinīndma*, built on the same principle, is entirely devoted to mysticism. In both works the narrative has become a fully elaborated element in its own right. Quite a different type of structure is revealed by the “frame-story” maθnāwīs of ʿAttār [q.v.], the most famous of which are the *lidāhānāma*, the *Maṇṭīk al-tayr* and the *Mūṣībādnāma*.

Some of the maθnāwīs produced in this period cannot be classified into any of the three categories outlined above. Still to the Sāmānīd period belongs the *Dīnghīndma* of Ḥakīm Mayṣārī composed between 357/967-8 and 370/981. It gives a popular exposition of medical theory and practice and therefore hardly belongs to literature proper (cf. G. Lazard, *Premiers poètes*, i, 36 ff.). Metaphysical doctrines combined with ethical maxims and some amount of gnostic speculation are to be found in the *Rawgānīndma* of Nāṣīr-i Khusrav, in which no anecdotes have been used. A number of short maθnāwīs has been ascribed to Sānāʾī, but only two of these can with certainty be regarded as authentic: *Karṇāma-i Balkh* containing both eulogy and satire, the latter directed against some of the Sūfis and poets of Ghazna, and *Sayr al-sabād ilā-š-Muʿād* depicting the gnostic’s journey through the cosmos followed by a panegyric. To a similar type belongs the *Hunārīndma* of Muhktārī. A very original work is the Tūḥfūt al-ʿIrākīyin of Khākānī. Conceived as the poetical journal of a pilgrimage, it contains a variety of other materials as well, out of which the repeated addresses to the sun deserve to be noted.

Among the many cultural achievements of the Sāmānīd period, the creation of a Persian prose literature takes a very prominent place. Nearly all the works of this early time that have been handed down are non-artistic writings and cannot concern us here. Still, some information is available which points to the existence of a number of works in prose that, at least on account of their subject-matter, are relevant to literary history. To this group belong the prose versions of the epic of the kings, three of which are known to have existed although no more than the introduction to one of them, composed in 346/957 by Abū Maṣūr al-Maʿmārī (or Muʿammarī), has been preserved. It is not quite certain whether the fragments dealing with the hero Gārshāsp, cited in the *Ṭāʾirīkh-i Siṣṭān* and attributed there to Abū ‘l-Muʿāyyad of Bālḵ, have been taken from the Sānāʾī version of this prolific writer or from a separate “Book of Garshāsp” that in the same genre produced during the 5th-6th/11th-12th centuries. In prose, heroic themes are further developed in an extensive literature of popular novels. To the 6th/12th century belong the works of Abū Tāhir Muhammad b. Ḥasan Ṭarūṣī (or Ṭarṭūṣī). His *Dārābīndma* elaborates the legends about the last of the ancient Iranian kings with many fantastic details. It ends with a treatment of the history of Alexander, one of the favourite subjects of this narrative literature. Another novel of Ṭarūṣī deals with a hero of Islamic times, Abū Muslim (cf. I. Mélkhoff, *Abū Muslim, le Porte-Hache du Khorassan*, *dans la tradition épique du moyen orient*, Paris 1962). The chivalrous romance *Sānakh-i ‘Ayyār*, which was originally written by Sādāka b. Abī ‘l-Kāsīm of Shīrāz, but has only been preserved in a later version dated 585/1189, is entirely a work of fiction.

An alternation between versions in prose and in verse is equally observable in the tradition of the Indian collections of fables and stories. For two of these there is evidence of Persian prose renderings in the Sāmānīd period (*Kalīla va Dimna, Sindibādnāma* [q.q.v.]). They have been replaced by later adaptations made with an intent to make these works more palatable to the literary taste of a later generation. The principle of the frame-story, so characteristic of these Indian books, was borrowed for a Persian imitation in the *Bakhṭīyārīndma* [q.v.], while the animal fable introduced by the *Kalīla va Dimna* was cultivated in the collection entitled *Marshīndma*, which was originally composed in the Tabari dialect. [See further Hikāya, ii.]

The fashion of embellishing prose by the application of rhymed and measured phrases was known already from the early 5th/11th century from the sayings attributed to the Sūlī Ṣayḥ Abū Saʿīd b. Abī ‘l-Khāyir [q.v.] and, more particularly, from a string of vīdāls usually ascribed to Anṣārī [q.v.] (cf. on the philological problems attached to these texts and their authenticity, G. Lazard, *La langue des plus*...
anciens monuments, 111 f.), of which the small collection of prayers called Mundždšt has become quite celebrated. The style of Arabic prose as it had developed in the time of the Bāyids in the hands of such masters of the risāla as Ibn ‘Abbād [q.v.] and al-Hamadānī [q.v.], very much affected the style of elegant Persian prose. A clear instance of this influence is the introduction of the genre of the maḥāma [q.v.] into Persian literature by the Ǧāḏil Ḥamīd al-Dīn of Bālḵ or Ḥamīdī [q.v.] (d. 559/1164). One of the best examples of the sophisticated style of pre-Mongol times, still very much appreciated in present-day Iran, is the version of Kašīl wa Dimna by Naṣr Allāh b. Mūhammad [q.v.], a secretary to the late Ghāznavīd Sultan Bahārāmshāh. Other specimens of the style current among secretaries, theologians and men of learning and letters include pieces of official or personal correspondence preserved by several prominent men (e.g. the Faḍāʾil al-Anām by Mūhammad al-Ghazālī, the correspondence between his brother ʿAlīmd al-Ghazālī and ʿAyn al-Kudāt al-Hamadānī, and further the letters handed down from poets such as Sanāʾi, Khandānī and Rashīd-dī Wāfī). The characteristic traits of artistic prose are not confined to those works that can be classified as belles lettres in the strict sense of the term but occur in many works of a more “utilitarian” purpose as well. The same can be said of the art of narrative, whether of pointed anecdotes or of short stories. They are especially abundant in works of history and biography. It need not surprise, therefore, if a work like the Taʾrīḥ of Bayhaḵī [q.v.] is reckoned among the masterpieces of early Persian prose. Even a listing of all the writings that in some way or the other are interesting from the aesthetic point of view would by far exceed the limits of this article. Only one group of prose works cannot be left unmentioned here. In spite of great individual differences, these works share a common feature in that, as a kind of Fürstenspiegel, they have been written for the instruction of those in power and they abundantly make use of anecdotes and tales functioning both as illustrative examples and as a means to enliven the theoretical exposition. To this group belong the Kāhsānāma by ʿUṣar al-Khāḏlī of Būyān [d. 470/1079-80], the Čahār Maḥāla by Niẓām ʿArūḍī [q.v.] (d. 560/1164-5), the Siyāsāt-nāma by Niẓām al-Mulk [q.v. (d. 485/1092) and the Naṣḥat al-Mālūk by al-Ghazālī [q.v.] (d. 505/1111). All these works were written in a comparatively sober style. Mainly on account of the relevance of its subject-matter to the study of certain themes of lyric poetry, mention should also be made of the Naurūz-nāma, a treatise on the origins and customs of the ancient Iranian New Year’s festival. It contains, among other things, a reference to the ceremonial use of poetry at the Sāsānian court and an account of the legendary origins of the cult of wine. The authorship of ʿUmar-i Khayyām [q.v.] is denied by most scholars. Apart from the wealth of narratives contained in such works as the commentaries on the Kūrān, the biographies of prophets and Sūfī saints, and mystical treatises, there is little information concerning the prose literature of the pre-Mongol period that needs to be mentioned on account of its great artistic value. An exception, however, should be made for the allegorical tales, describing the spiritual journey of the gnostic, by Ǧīhāḏ al-Dīn Yabāḏ Suhrawardī [q.v.] (d. 582/1181). Another famous mystic, ʿAlīmd al-Ghazālī [q.v.] (d. 520/1126), examined the psychology of love in a string of concise and subtle aphorisms entitled Sawānīḥ. As it is presented in this work, the theory of love can be applied both to the earthly and to the mystical beloved. c. From the Mongol period to the rise of the Ǧāḥīsid (7th/13th-9th/15th centuries). The successive invasions of the Mongols, resulting in the founding of the empire of the Ǧāḥīsid, did not fail to affect the course of literary history just as it affected all other sections of Iranian society. The destruction of the great cities of Transoxania and Ǧūrāshā, the enormous loss of life, the sharp decline of the economy, the disappearance of dynastic centres, all brought to an end the predominance of the north-eastern provinces in the Islamic civilization of Iran that had lasted for so many centuries. Not before the 9th/15th century could these areas for a short while regain some of their old cultural importance under the reign of the Timūrids. The shift of literary activity from the east to the western parts of the country, already in process from the middle of the 6th/12th century onwards, became definite as a result of these events, but it was no longer the north-western part that profited from this development. The Mongol Ǧāḥīsid, who established the centre of their rule in this area, assimilated far less easily to Persian culture than their Turkish predecessors. They were willing to accept and support those products of Islamic civilization that they regarded as useful, such as historiography and the natural sciences, but never developed any taste for the aesthetic achievements of its literature. The few instances of patronage to poetry known from the court of the Ǧāḥīsid did not emanate from the rulers themselves but from erudite high officials of Persian descent in their service, like the Dīwānī [q.v.]. While the vocabulary of the great historians of this period was very much influenced by Mongol and Turkish (cf. G. Doerter, Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, 4 vols., Wiesbaden 1963-71 and H. H. Zerinezade, Farsi dilinde Aserbaydzjan səsəlini, Baku 1962) the language or artistic literature shows hardly any trace of this. The bašda on an earthquake in Nīḥāpūr of Pūr-i Bāhāʾ Dījānī, a deliberate attempt to introduce loanwords from the language of the conquerors into the poetical idiom, is an isolated phenomenon (cf. V. M. Morgenstern, Persische Ornamentik ..., Ioannis Kyppa ... hoc volumen sacram, Prague 1956, 186-201; BSOAS, xvii/2 (1956), 262-78). In spite of all this, some of the greatest works of Persian literature were produced during these centuries. Favourable conditions for a continuation of the literary tradition were present in those parts of the country that had escaped from the devastations of Mongol warfare. For the first time, southern Iran, more specifically Ǧīrān, began to take part in the history of Persian poetry. A strong impulse was given by the arrival of many refugees, among whom the prominent theoretician of literature Shams-i Ǧāyṣ [q.v.] should be mentioned. New centres also arose outside the boundaries of Iran. The capital of the Sādūjūs of Rūm, Konya, became the seat of a major school of mystical literature established there by immigrants. The cultivation of Persian letters on the Indian subcontinent became more and more independent after the foundation of the Sultanate of Dīhī in 602/1206. In those days, however, poetry was no longer exclusively dependent on the economic and social support provided by patronage. From the 5th/11th century onwards, Ǧūfīlīsm penetrated Persian literature just as it gradually permeated Persian society as a whole. As a social phenomenon, this meant that a new
public and a new environment had come into being which created a wider range of functions for the poet and his art. Poetry could serve to express the ineffable experiences of the mystic through an ever more refined use of its symbolic language, or illuminate the subtleties of mystical doctrines from its vast resources of narrative material and techniques. It could also be used as a liturgical element in the "musical sessions" (samā', [q.v.]) of the Sūfī circles. The traditional place of the mawlid (d. 661/1262) was taken over by the spiritual leader (pir) or by a human manifestation of "witness" (shāhid) of the Eternal Beloved. For the poet who wanted to devote himself entirely to mysticism without any attachment to secular patronage, this new environment was provided by the communities of mystics, out of which the Sūfī fraternities (fartās) developed in the course of this period. The first notable example of this withdrawal of poetry from the world is Farid al-Din of Shiraz (d. 691/1292) cultivated the ghazal, of which no relation to any maecenas is known.

The most striking result of these developments to be noticed in literature is the sharp decline of the *bāsīda* as the main form of lyric poetry. To some extent this can be explained by the lack of interest in panegyric shown by the chief court of the times. But the same trend can be observed at those courts where the traditions of courtly lyricism were continued on similar lines as before. In many instances the *ghazal*, which had now become the favourite poetic form, seems to have taken over the panegyric functions of the *bāsīda*.

The ubiquity of the *ghazal* in Persian literature between the 7th/13th and 12th/18th centuries tends to obscure the fact that the *bāsīda* never quite disappeared from the scene. At the beginning of this period a "dīl" ([q.v.] of Ghazal(d. 691/1292) cultivated the ode, which he largely used for religious and moral admonition on the lines of Nāsr-i Khusraw and Sanā'ī. Apart from Salāmīn Sāwadī* ([q.v.] (d. 778/1376), who glorified the Djal'īrids of Baghdād, in the 9th/15th century Djāmī should also be mentioned in this connection as a prominent poet of the *bāsīda*. Most other poets also wrote at least some poetry in this form, although it is true that the poet's calligraphy during this period lags far behind that of the *ghazal*.

In the main line of the history of lyric poetry two strains, which seem to be distinguished by the different demands put upon the poets by their social environment, became visible. One of these strains is the purely mystical *ghazal* which leaves no room for any ambiguity concerning its fundamental meaning. Its model was provided by the *dīwān* of 'Aṭṭār (see, for an analysis of his *ghazals* in comparison to those of the earlier Sanā'ī and the later Hāfiz: H. Ritter, Oriens, xii (1959), 1-88). The foremost representative of this type of the *ghazal* after 'Aṭṭār is Djalāl al-Dīn ([q.v.] Rūmī (d. 672/1273), in Iran usually known as Mawlāwī. His life as a spiritual leader and a poet in the community of mystics at Konya is the best documented instance of the entourage in which an uncompromisingly mystical literature could flourish. His immense collection of ghāzals, the *Kulliyāt-i Shams*, is attributed by the poet himself to Shams al-Dīn al-Tabrīzī as an act of identification with the person regarded as the *shāhid*. These poems are either expressions of mystical love, formulated under emotional stress without much care for formal perfection, or they serve to illuminate essential topics of mystical doctrine by means of a rich and sometimes very original imagery. In spite of this idiosyncrasy of Mawlāwī's poetry, it became in its turn a model for the literary tradition of the fraternity of the Mawlawīyya ([q.v.]), which was formed out of the spiritual community of Konya after his death. This is especially noticeable in the lyrical poetry of his son Sultan Walad ([q.v.] (d. 712/1312) and his grand son Ulū 'Arīf Celebi (d. 719/1320). Another poet who cultivated this type of *ghazal*, though with a greater technical sophistication, was 'Irāqī ([q.v.] (d. 688/1289). In the course of his eventful life he practised the way of life of the *balandar darwishes*, the traces of which could be taken either by the spiritual leader (pir) or by a human manifestation of "witness" (shāhid) of the Eternal Beloved. For the poet who wanted to devote himself entirely to mysticism without any attachment to secular patronage, this new environment was provided by the communities of mystics, out of which the Sūfī fraternities (fartās) developed in the course of this period. The first notable example of this withdrawal of poetry from the world is Farid al-Din of Shiraz (d. 691/1292) cultivated the ghazal, of which no relation to any maecenas is known.

The second type of *ghazal* was cultivated by those poets who did not abstain from the established conventions of courtly poetry even if their works display the all-pervasive influence of Sufism. The double character of the *ghazal*-style, referred to above, is characteristic of this type. Although there are great differences in the intensity of mystical influence, some overtones of a transcendental connotation can be noticed in nearly all erotic poetry written in this period. The Shı'rażī school is particularly famous on account of the full development of this kind of *ghazal*. The oldest of the two great poets of the *ghazal* who flourished in this city was Sa'dī. His lifetime covered most of the 7th/13th century when Shı'raż was ruled by the Salghurid Atabeks. Nearly all his *ghazals* are contained in three large collections, the *Tabrīz*, the *Baddāv*, and the *Khawāṣim*. They show Sa'dī's perfect mastery of all the themes connected with the *ghazal* as a genre as well as of their associative interplay. Mystical notes can be observed, but they are harmoniously fused with secular themes. His graceful style, which also pervades the other literary works of this very versatile author, influenced the idiom of Persian more than the work of any other writer. Among his contemporaries, the name should be mentioned of İmām (d. 661/1262) or 676/1277-8) who attended the court of Kirmān, Maḏīl al-Dīn Hamgar (d. 686/1287), a citizen of Shirāz, and Humām al-Dīn ([q.v.] of Tabrīz (d. 714/1314), who glorified the members of the Djiwān family.

During the 8th/14th century, Shı'raż was in turn ruled by the Indgūs and by the Muẓafārīds. The names of these two dynasties are forever connected with that of Hāfīz ([q.v.] (d. 792/1390), often nicknamed Kh'nādja or Līsān al-Ghayb. He was much more a specialist of the *ghazal* than Sa'dī, as his very extensive *dīwān* contains only a few poems in other forms. Of these, the short *mathnawī* piece *Šāhīnā* has acquired some celebrity. According to A. J. Arberry, Hāfīz developed in the course of his career the refined art of the *ghazal*, as he inherited it from Sa'dī, by introducing the device of contrapuntal interaction of several themes within one single poem. Very often no more than a short allusion in one or two lines was applied to evoke, in the mind of the hearer who was familiar with the literary tradition, associations with a whole thematic complex. This technique was the essential novelty of Hāfīz's art (d. 699/1399), whose works were collected as he inherited it from Sa'dī, by introducing the device of contrapuntal interaction of several themes within one single poem. Very often no more than a short allusion in one or two lines was applied to evoke, in the mind of the hearer who was familiar with the literary tradition, associations with a whole thematic complex. This technique was the essential novelty of Hāfīz's art (d. 699/1399), whose works were collected as
dilection for mystical subjects, several of his ghazals have proved to be designed as panegyric poems.

There were several other prominent poets of the ghazal in the time of Hāfiz: 'Ubaydi Zākāni [q.v.] (d. 772/1371), more renowned as a satirist, left a small but exquisite collection of lyrics. He shows a preference for short poems usually of seven lines, a trait also observable with Kamāl-i Khudandī [q.v.] (d. probably 803/1400-1). The ghazals of Khwāja 'Isā-i Kirmānī [q.v.] (d. 753/1352 or 762/1361) and Salmān-i Sāwadghāzi are of particular importance on account of the influence they have exerted on Hāfiz, as acknowledged by the poet himself.

In the early 9th/15th century, the unambiguously mystical ghazal is cultivated again by Muḥammad Shīrīn Maghribī [q.v.] (d. 809/1406-7). By this time the poetical symbolism of the genre had been reduced to a system of fixed elements denoting the pantheistic philosophy of Ibn al-'Arabī [q.v.].

They lend themselves quite easily to a more or less mechanical interpretation, as often applied in commentaries or other essays on the allegorical language of ḥāfizī poetry. Of a quite similar nature is the poetry of Shāh Nīmat Allāh [q.v.] of Kirmān (d. 834/1421), the founder of one of the most important ḥāfizī orders of Iran, and of Shāh Kāsim al-Anwār [q.v.] (d. 837/1433), who also wrote some poetry in Turkish and in a quite similar Gilaki dialect.

One first sign of a revival of Persian letters in Khorāsān was the literary activity at the local courts that asserted themselves during the interval between the decline of the Ilkhānī empire and the rise of Timūr: the Shīrīte Sarbadārs of Sāzbāwār and the Kūrs of Harāt. This short period produced a notable poet in Ibn-i Yāmnī [q.v.] (d. 769/1368), who, together with Anwārī, is reckoned among the best writers of the fragmentary poem (ḥīrāt). The old traditions of courtly poetry were more completely restored in the times of the Timūrids of the 9th/15th century. This period, as well as the active interest shown by several princes of the Timūrid house, are very re-
imissive of the European renaissance. As far as literature is concerned, the flowering of all the visual arts connected with the production of manuscripts (calligraphy, miniature-painting, bookbinding) and philological projects such as the redaction of the Shakhāma, usually attributed to the prince Bāyson-
ghor [q.v.], should be mentioned in this connection. The main trait of literature itself is its classicist attitude. The Timūrid writers apply themselves to an ever more refined use of the transmitted forms and genres without adding much new to it. Some amount of novelty may, however, be granted to a genre of a rather bizarre kind introduced by Būshāhī [q.v.] (first half of the 9th/15th century) of Shīrāz, who wrote a number of literary parodies on famous poets using culinary themes in his Diwān-i Af'tima. On the same lines Kāri of Yazd (prob. 2nd. half of the 9th/15th century) composed a series of parodies based on the musical and scents of the Shakhāma, and topical verses such as the chronogram (ta'īrīk) enjoyed a great popular-

The most splendid centre of Timūrid culture was Harāt during the reign of Sultan Hūsain [q.v.] Baykara (873/1469-911/1506). Two great personalities dominated the literary scene of this court. 'All-Shīr Nawā'ī [q.v.] (d. 906/1501), counsellor of the sultan and himself a patron of literature, wrote some Persian poetry under the pen-name Fānsī but his main significance lies in the many works he composed in the eastern-Turkish literary language, known as Oghuz-
tay. In addition to a great number of non-artisan writings, they comprehended the complete range of literary forms current in Persian poetry. In this way Nawā'ī created a series of classical models for the Turkic literature of subsequent ages, both in Central Asia and in the Ottoman empire [see further Turks-
literature].

Closely associated with Nawā'ī was the Persian poet and Sufi şeyh Diwānī [q.v.] (d. 899/1492), whose productivity and versatility were even greater than those of his patron. He has often been called the last classical poet of Persian literature, a qualification based on the presumption that with the rise of the Safawids a period of decadence began, lasting for nearly three centuries. But it is true that the works of Diwānī can be regarded as a vast summary of all the known imitators of the

In the mathnawi-literature of the post-Mongol period, the five poems of Niẓāmī, joined by a later tradition into an artificial unity known as the Khamsa [q.v.], had become a conventional model that constituted an irresistible challenge to numerous poets both in Persian and in Turkish literature. The first of the long line of imitators was Amir Khusraw. He kept himself strictly to the scheme of Niẓāmī, reproducing most of its structural features, but showed his originality by laying special emphasis on certain elements of the stories or by choosing new subsidiary tales in Haft Bihisht, his imitation of Haft Paykar. The Khamsa of Khwāja Kirmānī deviates much further from the original pattern. It comprises two romantic epics with new stories (Humdu u Humdyun, Layla u Madjīn). Diwānī deviates much as well as three didactical poems of a mystical and ethical nature. Diwānī enlarged the scheme to seven poems in his Haft Avarang. Most celebrated of these is his version of Yūsfū u Zalīthā in which the Kūrānī story has been elaborated into an extensive allegory. Another of his new subjects is the philosophical novel Sālāmān u Abūdāl. Many poets readapted only single poems of the Niẓāmīan canon. The Layla u Madjīnān of Maktābī of Shīrāz, written in 859/1458-90, one of the most successful instances among the works of this kind. (A full list of the known imitators of the Khamsa has been compiled by H. Ethé, Gr. I. Ph., ii, 245-8; see also the following works on the tradition of the individual poems, usually dealing with the Turkish versions as well: (1) on Maškhan al-Asār—E. E. Bertel's, Ifa"3r miałi ve i Fawwāl, Moskow 204-14. (2) on Layla u Madīnān—H. Arasli, Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yılıtı, Belleten 1958, 17-39; A. S. Levend, Arab, Fars ve Türk Edebiyatlardında Leylā ve Mev纽n hikayesi, Ankara 1959; E. E. Bertel's, op. cit., 275-313. (3) on Khosrau u Shīrīn—H. W. Duda, Ferhad u Shirin. Die literarische Ge-
schichte eines persischen Sagenstoffes, Prague 1933; G. Y. Aliyev, Legenda o Khosrove i Shīrīn u litera-
tura También narodov Vostoka, Moscow 1960. (4) on Haft
Among these poems the Waladnāma is the most celebrated. In the *Ustād nāma of 'Iraqī, characterized by the insertion of mystical themes, the love story is elaborated. The topic of the *Mishāh al-arwād is the visionary journey of the mystic through the cosmos. The authorship of this interesting work is uncertain. Old manuscripts attribute it either to the well-known Shīfā shaykh, Awbād al-Dīn Kirmānī, or to a certain Shāns al-Dīn Muhammad Bādsīr Kirmānī (cf. the edition by Badī‘ al-Zamān Purūzānār, Tehran 1349 šī). A pupil of the former, Awbādī (q.v.) (d. 738/1337-8), wrote his own version, the *Dāmtūrī nāma, the last of the great *Dāmtūrī nāma: a love-story, Azhar u Ma$kār, the masterwork of the didactic *mathnawī, the Bustān of Sa‘dī. Written almost simultaneously with Rūmī's *Mathnawī, with all the brilliance and clarity of the style of Sa‘dī, the Bustān certainly surpassed the latter's celebrity, but nowhere does it even approach Rūmī's depth of thought. Although some of its chapters deal with mystical topics on the whole the work seems to be designed for little more than elegantly presented moral admonition. From the 8th/14th century three other writers of mystical *mathnawīs are worthy of note: Husaynī Sādāt (q.v.) (d. after 729/1328), ‘Imād al-Dīn Fa’ākhī, a contemporary of Ḥāfīz, (d. 773/1371), and Maḥmūdī *Ghabistāri (q.v.) (d. about 720/1320-1). The last mentioned wrote *Gulghānī i Rāz, which among other things contains an explanation of the symbolic language of Sūfī poetry.

An interesting personality, standing more or less aside from the trodden paths of Persian literature, is Nizārī (q.v.) (d. 720/1321). Being an Ismā‘īlī, he incurred the condemnation of orthodox critics which the vehement sarcasm often displayed in his works did nothing to prevent. He wrote three *mathnawīs: a love-story, Ā’hār u Ma$har, a short but highly original parody on the customary didacticism, *Dastārnāma, and a versified book of travel, *Safarnāma.

Among the prose-works produced in these centuries, again a work by Sa‘dī, *Gułstān, stands out as the most perfect example of classical Persian style for which it serves as a textbook up to the present day. It treats of much the same subjects as the Bustān even more real, but presents them in a more entertaining form. The anecdotes are told in a terse, rhythmic prose sometimes approaching the metrical patterns of poetry. The poet's moralising reflections upon the narratives are mostly put into the form of Persian or Arabic poetical fragments. Like so many other great works of Persian literature, it very soon became a model that was copied by a long row of imitators. One of these was Dāmtūrī, in whose Bahārīstān even more room is given to poetry than in Sa‘dī's work. The stylistic type of the Gułstān was the target of parody in some of the best works of ‘Ubayd-ī Zákānī, by far the greatest satirist Iran has ever produced (Akh-āt al-Āshrafī, *Khidimnāma); see also *Hidjā, ii).

The tendency towards an ever more prolix rhetorical embellishment of Persian prose came to its full strength in Mongol times and continued to dominate the style of prose-writing for several centuries to come. It gave most works on history, the sciences, ethics, religion and other scholarly subjects the appearance of artistic writings. The Ta‘riḥ of Wāṣṣāfī (q.v.) (d. 735/1334), the last of the great historians of the Ilkhānī, has become proverbial for this extremely florid style. Another work that set the pace in the use of a literary idiom inflated with Arabic words was the *Amad-i Subayī{{https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hikmet_T._Ilay%
version of the *Kalila wa Dimna* written by Husayn Wâlî-i Kâshî [see Kâshî, Šah; KÂSHÎ] (d. 910/1504-5), a very prolific and versatile author attending the Timûrid court of Harat.

d. *From the rise of the Šafawids to the late Kâfûrī period (beginning 10th-10th to 13th/13th centuries).*

The establishment of the Šafawid state in Iran was not merely a political event. Through the introduction of Imâmi Shi‘ism [see ITHNA] [q.v.] (d. 910/1504-5), a kind of Shi‘ite literature both in poetry and prose emerged which was not very favourable to the flourishing of literature. Especially during the 10th/16th century neither the theological nor the powerful Shi‘ite clergy, which had acquired a great influence on official policy, were particularly interested in the traditional court literature. The cultivation of religious poetry was, on the other hand, greatly encouraged. The founder of the dynasty, Shâh Ismâ‘îl [q.v.], was himself a writer of Turkish poems, in which he expressed ideas related to the doctrines of extreme Shi‘ite sects. As soon as religious policy was firmly in the hands of the Imâmi *šâlam*, deviations of this kind were no longer possible. The themes of Šafawid religious poetry were mainly taken from the stories about the martyrdom of the *imâms*. Devotion to the Shi‘ite family is very often expressed in pre-Šafawid literature as well. It can even be found with authors whose Sunni persuasion is beyond doubt. At least from the Bûyid period onwards, the Shi‘ite communities in Iran tried to win more support by sending around the bazaars popular reciters of poems on the ‘virtues’ of ‘All (manâkibbikhwând, *manâkib biyâyân*) who made use of the works of Shi‘ite poets like Kiwâni of Rayy (6th/12th century). These texts were mainly *ḫâṣâdas* [cf. Dh. Sa‘a, *Ta‘rîh*, ii, 192 ff.]: A. Shi‘ite epic, modelled on the style of the *Shâhnamâh*, was introduced by Mu‘âammad b. Hûsân (d. 875/1470) with his *mâshwâr*, *khwârârân* (or *khwâwar*-nâmâ) [see further *hâmsa*, iil]. Another work of the Timûrid period, the collection of tales about the holy martyrs, *Râwâdat al-Shuhâhâd*, written in artistic prose by Mu‘âammad Wâlî-i Kâshî [q.v.], was used as a textbook for the Mu‘âhar-ram celebrations and even lent its name to the function of a reciter of religious poetry, the *râwâdâkhwâr*. The most important poet of this genre was Mu‘âšâsh [q.v.] of Kâshân (d. 996/1587-8). He is especially famous on account of a *mâshwâr* on the holy martyrs known as the *haft-band*, i.e., a poem consisting of twelve seven-line stanzas. The *ḫâṣâda* was also used for this kind of elegy. Mathnawâris on the *imâms* were composed by Hayratî (d. 961/ 1553-4; or 970/1562-3) and by Fârîgh of Gîlân who wrote his work in 1050/1543-4 to celebrate the conquest of Gîlân by Shâh ‘Abbâs I. There was, in fact, a subtle connexion between the praise of the *Altîd* family and the glorification of the dynasty, as the Šafawids regarded themselves as descendants of the *imâms*. Shi‘ite literature both in poetry and prose continued to be extremely popular till the present day. It has a solid base in religious sentiment as well as in the demand for liturgical texts to be used on various occasions.

The perpetuation of Shi‘ite traditions and doctrines among the population of Iran could not be achieved by means of poetry alone. While the learned theological works continued to be written in Arabic, there was a growing need for works of a more popular kind in Persian on the different branches of religious science. A number of theologians set themselves this task. The comparatively simple style they used favourably contrasts with the verbosity still current in the literary prose of this period. Notable among these writers were Mu‘âammad Bahâ‘ al-Dîn al-‘Amâlî or Shaykh-i Bahâ‘ [see AL-‘AMâLî] (d. 1031/1622), who should also be mentioned on account of his Persian poetry, and Mu‘âammad Bâkîr al-Madjlîsî [q.v.] (d. 1111/1699-1700).

*Šūfism* as a form of religious life was declining in Šafawid times as a result of the enmity of the religious leaders, which sometimes took the form of actual persecution. As mysticism and poetry had become very closely connected during the preceding centuries, this could not but unfavourably affect literary production. Yet the mystical strain could never be deleted entirely from Persian poetry. It is particularly evident in the poetical works of the members of the flourishing school of philosophy founded by Mullâ Şadrâ of Şîrâz, e.g., Mullûnî Fâyd of Kâshân (d. 1090/1679), Mir Abu ‘l-‘Âsâm Findarîski (d. ca. 1050/1640-1) and the teacher of Mullû Şadrâ, Mir Mu‘âammad Bâkîr-i Dâmâd [see AL-DAMÂN] (d. 1040/1630). The poet Saâdî of Astârâbâd (d. 1010/1601-2), who spent most of his life at the holy shrine of Nadîjâf, expressed pantheistic mysticism in a *diwan* which consisted almost entirely of quatrains.

Secular poetry suffered not only from the changes in the intellectual atmosphere but also from political changes. The disappearance of local courts reduced the market for the professional poet to one dynastic centre. Apart from the successive residences of the Šafawids, only Şîrâz remained as an important literary centre. Yet there was a great deal of continuity with the preceding Timûrid period. Just like the painters of the school of Bhâzîd [q.v.], the poets travelled to the west as soon as the new power had established itself there. That the royal family was not completely averse to court poetry is shown by Sâmî Mîrzâ (d. 974/1566-7), a son of Shâh Ismâ‘îl I, who described the history of poetry during the first half-century of Šafawid rule in his *taqâkıhira*, *Tûhfa-i Sâmî*. Even the court of Shâh Ismâ‘îl had its eunuch in Umîdî (d. 935/1529). The genre of ghârah-šâb poems on the young artisans of a particular city was revived by Lîsânî (d. 940/1533-4). It became a great fashion both with the Persian poets of his time and with the contemporary Ottoman poets (e.g. Medîhî[q.v.]). The historical connection between these two schools is still uncertain. Another favourite topic was short poems on a single dramatic incident, under the heading “*badâ‘ u kâdar*”. Some scholars have interpreted these genres as indications of a growing tendency towards realism in poetry (cf. J. Rypka, History, 296).

During the long reign of Ta‘hâshî I (930/1524-984/1576) courtly poetry gradually regained more ground. Wâshî[q.v.] of Bâlk (d. 991/1583) excelled in the didactic and romantic *mathnawî* as well as in strophe poems. Even Muţâshâsh did not shun panegyrism and Hayratî combined his religious art with satire. To the most ambitious young talents, however, Iran did not offer sufficient opportunities for a literary career. Far better prospects offered themselves on the Indian subcontinent where the Moghul emperors resumed the splendid cultural traditions of their Timûrid ancestors. From the second half of the 10th/16th century onwards, an increasing number of Persian poets went to India and gave there a new impulse to the tradition of Indo-Persian letters. The most decisive literary development of the Šafawid period is connected with this migration of poets: the emergence of a new poetical style which in modern criticism has received the name *Sâbâ-i Hindi* [q.v.].
This Indian style, the main characteristics of which have been sketched above in the section on the periodization of Persian literature, distinguishes itself markedly from the earlier poetic styles. The causes of this greater amount of independence from the established literary canons have been sought in changes in the social conditions (A. Mirzoeev) or in a relaxation of critical attention to the work of the poets especially in Safavid Iran (A. Bausani). Under the influence of the negative verdict given almost unanimously by neoclassicist literary critics since the pre-Mongol period. The ḩāṣīda was restored to its former prominence as a poetic form. This movement very soon dominated the literary scene and its aesthetic ideals have governed traditional poetry in Iran up to the present day. (See further M. T. Bahār, Bāsagāšt-i adabī, in Armaghān, xiii-xiv (1311-2 sh.), passim; idem, Sabkshīndast, iii, 318 f.; J. Rypka, History, 306-8).

To the first generation of neo-classicist poets belonged Muhammad Ṭāḥṣīk (d. 1181/1767-8), Ḥāṭīf (q.v.) (d. 1178/1573), Shāhāb of Turbāz (d. 1215/1800-1) and Lutf ‘All Beq Āḏār (d. 1195/1780-1), the author of the tadhkīr āl-ḥakākh, a first-hand source on the bāsagāšt-movement. After the founding of the Kāḏīr ār, Fāṭḥ ‘All Shāh (reigned 1218/1779-1250/1834) tried to revive the ancient traditions of the royal maecenate at his court in Tehran. The centre of the circle of poets gathered here, who all emulated the classics, was Sabā (q.v.) (d. 1238/1823-4). He was highly appreciated in his own days on account of his panegyrical ḩāṣīdas and of his mathnawīs, Shāhāns̲hāhn̲ūmān, picturing the contemporary wars with Russia in the style of the old heroic epic. Worth of note are also Saba’ī Bidpil (d. 1218/1803), Sāḥīb (d. 1222/1807-8), Miǧmār (d. 1225/1809-10) and Nashāt (d. 1243/1822-3). A peculiarity of this period was the formation of small literary societies (āndijumān). Under the rule of Nādir the cultivation of classicism reached its richest development in the work of Kānānī (q.v. 1270/1854), a virtuoso of the poetical language. He showed, however, his awareness of the reality of his time in satirical poems and in his prose-work, Kūdāb-i parshān. Kānānī was the first Persian poet who had some knowledge of European languages. The tradition of the mystical ḡaṣṣāl was resumed by Furuḡī (q.v. d. 1277/1858-9) of Bistām, who also used the pen-name Miškīn. A remarkable personality was Yaḥyāmī (q.v.) (d. 1276/1859) of Djangak. He lived both as a darwīš and as a panegyrist of the Kāḏīr ār court while he was at the same time a redoubted satirist. His independent frame of mind showed itself in the invention of a new type of religious elegance in a style related to popular songs, known as naḥa-ka Ṯūnān. An interesting trait of his use of the language is the puristic effort to replace Arabic words by Iranian equivalents. Several poets of this century founded literary dynasties as their sons continued to work on the same lines as their fathers. Besides Sabā and Yaḥyāmī, a famous instance of this is the family of Wījāl (q.v.) (d. 1262/1846), a learned poet living in Shirāz.

During the last period of the unchallenged rule of classical poetry, the long reign of Nāṣīr al-Din Shāh
The ancient structure of Persian literature was at-
did not leave its solid literary tradition untouched. The
ancient structure of Persian literature was attacked by
the forces of change from several sides. Political
developments put an end to the system of
court poetry and caused a fundamental change in
the attitude of the poet towards his art. The modern
poet, whether he continued to work on traditional
ing a much more progressive attitude could be observed
towards poetry. He had become, in a certain sense, an amateur
who composed his poems on his own account. This
led, on the one hand, to a much greater involvement of
literature in the political and social vicissitudes
of the nation, on the other, to a more individual form
of poetical expression, the models of which were
provided by European literature. New concepts like
nationalism, democracy and social justice demanded
the attention of the modern intellectual. The earliest
poets of the modern period who, during the struggle
for the Iranian constitution [see IRAN, HISTORY,]
had to express these ideas with some urgency, could
only make use of the classical forms of poetry, which
proved to possess a remarkable adaptability. Eventu-
ally, however, the formal system could not remain
unchallenged. Especially in poetry a long battle was
waged on the question whether it was permissible to
evolve a new type of poetry, which would be
perceived with novelty, or even to use entirely free
verse (šahr-i āddā), or not. In this struggle the
classical style of poetry was shown to have deep roots
in Iranian culture. Perhaps the most important
formal innovation was the emergence of a genuine
prose literature based on the forms of the novel and
the short story, which were borrowed from modern
European literature.

While the actual birth of the modern literature of Iran took place during the turbulent years between
1890 and the beginning of the First World War, the process leading up to fundamental changes started early in the Kādjār period. Simultaneously with the classicist renaissance at the court of Fath Ṣāliḥ Shah, a much more progressive attitude could be observed in the entourage of Abbās Mirzā [q.v.], the heir-ap-
parent and governor of the Kādjār court. Confronted with the necessity of military reform on account of
successive defeats in the wars with Russia, several
measures were taken which proved to be of great consequence to the future course of cultural life in Iran. For the first time students were sent to Russia and Western Europe. One of their tasks was to study
typographical techniques. A printing-press was found-
ed in Tabriz in 1816-7. Very soon typography (Đāpi-
surūḥ) was replaced by lithography (Đāpi-i sangī),
which remained the principal form of printing during most of the 19th century. In 1834 the first Iranian
newspaper was published in Tehran, the Rānāmā-i
ākhbār-i awādiyāt, which had only a limited circulation.
A more direct influence on literature was exerted by
the efforts to simplify the style of official correspon-
dence, a good example of which was given by Abu
Ṣāliḥ Kāsīm Farahānī (1799-1835), better known by his
title Kāsīm-makām [q.v.], i.e., deputy-minister of
Abbās Mirzā. A second episode of cultural modernization was the short term of office of Mirzā Taki Khān [q.v.],
also known as Amir-i Kabīr or Amir-i Nizām, as
prime-minister of the young Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh. It
ended abruptly with the execution of the Amir-i
Kabīr in 1852. The publishing of a newspaper was
resumed in 1851 (Rānāmā-i awādiyāt-i ittifākīyā, in
1860 renamed Rānāmā-i dawlat-i ittifākīyā-i Iran). In
the following decades the number of periodicals
rapidly increased. Although they were all more or
less mouthpieces of the government, they helped to
spread new ideas through the information they provi-
dated about the world outside Iran. During the last few
decades of the century political emigrants spread
pan-Islamic or liberal ideas in a number of papers
published in Istanbul, Cairo, Calcutta and London.
[See MAHMUD N. I., with further references].

Another initiative of the Amir-i Kabīr was the
founding of a polytechnic school (Dār al-Funūn) in
Tehran (1852), which provided a modern education in
technical and natural sciences with some attention to
the humanities as well. The staff of the school, di-
rected by Rīdā Kull Kān, consisted mostly of Eu-
ropean teachers. The Dār al-Funūn formed the
beginning of modern academic education in Iran [see
dār al-funūn]. An immediate effect was an increased
demand for the translation of books from European
languages, among which French was by far the best
known in Iran. The list of the earliest translations
contains, besides textbooks and scientific works, also
belles lettres, e.g. works by Al. Dumas, Daniel Defoe and
Bernardin de Saint-Pierre (cf. E. G. Browne,
The press and poetry of modern Persia, Cambridge
1914, 134-66). Many translations are attributed to
Muhammad Ḥasan Khān [q.v.], who used the titles
Sānī al-Dawla and Iʿtimād al-Saltana, but they were chiefly made by a corps of
translators working under his direction in the govern-
ment's printing office (Dār al-Tibāʿa) and the bureau
of translators (Dār al-Tārjama).

Among the preliminaries to the modern period men-
tion should also be made of the religious move-
ment of the Bābīs. Among the earliest Bābīs
were Muhammad Bākīr Bawānī (d. 1854) who
published a book attacking the imperialist polici-
es of Britain and Russia, and Akā Khān Kirmānī
(d. 1869), a prominent political exile in Istanbul and
a follower of Djamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī [q.v.]. The
latter contrasted the decadence of Iran in the late
Kādjār period with its ancient splendour in his histori-
ical maṭbāwir, Sālārnāma or Nāma-i bāstān. An
interesting feature of this work was the attack launched
on classical literature (with the single exception of Firdawsi whose Shāhnāma stood as a model for the poem), which was considered as a principal source of degeneration in the Islamic history of Iran. The political movement against the despotism and misrule of the Kādjar and the foreign forces that supported it brought quite different groups of the population together. Several eminent erudites of the old cultural tradition contributed to the creation of a patriotic poetry: e.g. Sayyid Ahmad Adib-i Pishawari (ca. 1845-1930), A. Ab' al-Jawwad Adib-i Nishapuri (1864-5—1935) and especially, Mirzā Sādik Khusm, better known by his pen-name Amīrl or his honorific Adib-al-Mamālīk (1860-1917), who abandoned a successful career as a court-poet in 1898 to become a journalist. In the first decade of the 20th century the proliferating press became the chief medium for the publication of poetry. One of the best periodicals was the Nasīm al-Shāhlī edited in Rasht by ʿAṣḥāf-i Gilānil (1871-about 1930), a writer of satirical poems (fukhl-i kiyādī) criticizing in particular the conservative Shiʿite ʿulamā in a simple language full of colloquial expressions. ʿAlī Akbar Dīḥāḥwūd (about 1880-1936) published his poems under the name Dakhaw in the Sār-i Isfāhil. Besides his great merits in other fields of literature and scholarship, he was the first to try some formal experiments. Muhammad Takī Bahār (q.v.) (1886-1951), a master of the classical forms who already in his early years had earned the title mālīk al-ghawrānī as a panegyrist, put his great talents entirely at the service of the constitutional movement, successfully applying the old forms to the expression of new contents. Throughout the first half of this century Bahār was the leading modern poet of Iran. Forms of popular poetry like the folk-song (surād) and the ballad (lāsmī), usually recited to the accompaniment of music, became favourites with the political poets. A famous composer, as well as an impressive performer of insafsī, was Abū ʿl-Kāsim ʿArif of Kāznīn (about 1880-1934).

The core of the new nationalist ideology was Iranism, i.e., the glorification of the pre-Islamic past of Iran, of which the Iranian intelligentsia had become conscious mainly through the results of western philological, historical and archaeological research. Zoroastrianism very often appeared as the enlightened counterpart of the old religion that was felt to be fostered by traditional Islam. Those works of the classical literature that seemed to express a similar feeling of nostalgia for the glorious past, like the Shāhnāma and the kashīda on the ruins of al-Madā’in (Ctesiphon) by ʿRabīḥ, enjoyed a great popularity. The foremost philo-Iranian poet was Ibrāhīm Pūr-i Dāwūd (1886-1968), who later in his life became a distinguished student and translator of the Avesta.

To Abū ʿl-Kāsim Lāḥūfī (1887-8—1957) a revolutionary change of social conditions was the main goal of the political struggle in which he took a most active part until he was forced to flee to the Soviet Union in 1922. There he wrote the long poem (manṣūma), Kirimī, as a tribute to communism. After his return, he became the leading poet of the Soviet Republic of Tadžikistan (q.v.). Farūkhī Yazdī (1889-1939) continued to fight for his socialist ideals in Iran. His best poetry is to be found among his ghasals, written in a conventional style in spite of their quite modern contents.

Although his short life was filled with radical political action, Muhammad Rīdā `Īṣākhtī (q.v.) (1894-5—1924) is more significant in the history of literature on account of his formal and thematic innovations. He has been styled the first romantic poet of Iran, because of the strong influence of French romantic and symbolist poetry on his work. This is particularly noticeable in his greater poems, Kafan-i šīyāh, ʿĪsāil and ʿĪsākkīz. His experiments with prosody were chiefly concerned with the strophe-poem (musaṣṣaṭ). Many other poets endeavoured to extend the possibilities of the šīrād system, but, until the period after the Second World War, few dared to follow the example of a complete rupture from traditional forms given by Muhammad Isfandiyārī, better known as Nīmah Yūshīdī (q.v.) (1897-1960). His Afṣānā (1921) marks his attempt to create a type of free verse that was no longer bound by the old rules of metre and rhyme but was based directly on the rhythm and music of the language.

During the period between the wars contemporary politics almost completely disappeared as a theme of literature. All the same, many poets displayed a concern with individual social problems, most prominent among which was the position of women in Iranian society. This was the main topic of Tāджī Mirzā (1874-5—1925), a prince of the Kādjar house, whose simple yet graceful style made him one of the most beloved poets of modern times. The talented female poet Parwīn-i Tājahī (1906-7 or 1910-1941) showed a deep concern with the miseries of the poor. Satirical verse was still very popular but had to respect the bounds set by official censorship. Especially renowned for their satirical poems were Kulzūm (b. 1897), Rūhānī (b. 1896) and Muhammad ʿAlī Nashīf (b. 1898).

The mainstream of Persian poetry still consisted of the poets who applied in varying degrees modern elements in their works but remained essentially faithful to tradition. A point of focus of literary life was the andijumān-i adabī-ī Irān founded by Wahīd-i Dastgārī (1880-1942), who, since 1919, edited the authoritative literary periodical of this period, Armagān (cf. F. Machalski, Wahīd Dastgardī and his "Armagān", in Folia Orientalia, iv (1963), 81-103). M. T. Bahār established a circle of poets of his own as well as the journal Naw-Bahār (1921-51). Wāfāt (1923-5) was edited by the popular poet Nizām-i Wafāt (b. 1887-8). The progressive writers expressed themselves in Ayandā (1925-40). The most brilliant poet among the many who first appeared on the literary stage between 1920 and 1945 was Muhammad ʿAbd-Allāh Shahrīvār (b. 1906-7). In his ghasals inspired by Ḥāfīz he displays a remarkable ability to blend the old poetical idiom with a modern sentiment.

From 1941 till about 1950 there was a great increase in political and literary activities. In 1946 the first congress of Iranian writers was held in Tehran (cf. Nāḥaṣūn Khāngī-ī nawīsandāngī-ī Irān, Tehran 1951). Several new periodicals were started, e.g. Sukẖān (1943), the organ of the progressive poets and prose writers, edited by Parviz Nāṭīl Khānālī (b. 1913), and Yaghmā (1948), edited by the poet Ḥabīb-i Yaghmā (b. 1901). Among the scholarly journals which pay much attention to the study of literature mention should be made of Yāḏeḏar (1944-9), Farhang-i Irān-samīn (since 1953), and of the periodicals of the Faculties of Arts of the Iranian universities e.g. Magdāla-i Dānimakāh-ī Tabrīz (since 1948), Magdāla-i Dānimakāh-ī adabiyyāt-ī Tabrīz (since 1948), Magdāla-i Dānimakāh-ī adabiyyāt-ī, Isfahān (since 1964), and Magdāla-i Dānimakāh-ī adabiyyāt-ī, Māshhād (since 1965).

The most conspicuous feature of the poetry of the post-war period is the acceptance by an expanding groups of poets and literary critics of the ideas on free verse as they had been put forward by Nīmah
The debate between modernists and the defenders of the classical tradition was resumed with great intensity in the literary journals. The leading advocates of a modernized prosody were Faridun Tawalli, who published a manifesto as an introduction to his volume of verse Rahid (1951), P. N. Khanlari and Nadir-i Nadirpur. They also belong to the most prominent poets of the new style. The critics of the classicists are not only directed against deviations from the traditional forms but equally against the unusual metaphors applied by these poets. See further on the latest developments of Persian fiction and poetry: V. B. Klyaghtorina, Sovremennaya persids-kaya poeziya, Ocherki, Moscow 1962; B. Alawi, Geschichte und Entwicklung, 225-35; Fr. Machalski, New Poetry in Iran, in, New Orient, iv (1965/4), 33-6; Mansour Shaki, Modern Persian Poetry, in Yaddname-ye Fan Rypka, Prague-The Hague 1907, 187-94; Daruysh Shahn, Khiyami-i shari'-i imrau. Zungu az naawarad-i shari'-i imrau, Tehran 1349 sh.({2})

The first genre of fictional prose to become fully developed and achieve a great popularity was the historical novel. The earliest was Shams u Tughra of Muhammad Bakiir Khurawri, the first part of a trilogy situated at the time of the Mongol rulers of Iran, published in 1390. It was followed in 1391 by 'Tagh u Salmanai of Shakhay Mosâ Naqri, an original novel about Cyrus the Great. The same period was treated by Hasan Badi in Dastan-i bastan (1391-2). The ruin of the Sâsâns and the Arab conquest provided the background to Dâmâgustanayân i-ndikâm khâsh-i Mazâd, which in 1391 opened a long series of novels by 'Abd al-Husayn San'atâzâda. The best writers of this genre took pains to base their works on historical research. Sometimes they even supplied notes with references to their sources. The choice of the subjects, taken either from pre-Islamic or Islamic history, was dictated by nationalistic sentiments. Occasionally, contemporary history provided the material, e.g. in Dâlîrân-i Tangishtân of Husayn Ruknzâda Adamiyat, which is situated in southern Iran during the First World War. Quite often, these works show the influence of European novels of the romantic period. (See further on the latest developments of Persian fiction and poetry: E. E. Bertell's Persidskiy istori'etskiy roman XX veka, in Problemi literaturVostoka, Trudl Moskovskogo Instituta vostokovedeniya, i (1932), 111-26; B. Nikitine, Le roman historique dans la littérature persane moderne, in JA, ccii (1933), 297-313; Fr. Machalski, Historyczna powieść perska, Krakow 1952 (in Polish with a French summary); H. Kamshad, op. cit., 41-53.)

From 1392 onwards the range of fictional prose became considerably wider. Many novelists began to pay attention to the social problems which were either caused or brought to the moral consciousness by the accelerated process of westernization. Themes like the inferior position of women in Iranian society, the disorientation and immorality of modern youth, prostitution and forbidden love were taken as subjects for a long series of novels most of which had very little artistic value. Among the best works of this kind is Tihrân-i makâhî (1922) of Murtadâ Meshik Kâzimî, giving a gloomy picture of modern life in the capital. Worthy of note are also Man ham girya harda-am (1931) of Dâhângir Dâlîî (1909-38) and Tafrikât-i shab (1932) of Muhammad Mas'tîd (1947), whose pen-name was Dîhânt. The latter was much criticized on account of his nationalism. In
1942 he started to publish a series of autobiographical novels of great interest, beginning with Gulhā-i khitab (1952). Dar jamālzāda mardāyad, which was left unfinished. The most popular writer of the period between the wars was Muḥammad Hidāyat (b. 1899). His novel Zīdā (1933) is distinguished by the clever description of a corrupt bureaucracy. He also published many short stories and essays with a strong element of didacticism. Muḥammad ʿAll Ḍaghī opened his career as a writer with Ayyāmāt ādab (1921), a collection of sketches and essays written in prison, which was later on enlarged with recollections of his life as a politician during the reign of Rezā Shāh Pahlavī. In recent years Ḍaghī has become a successful novelist as well as an important critic of the classical poets (e.g., Nakši as Ḩafīz, 1957).

The most significant contemporary writers have shown a distinct preference for the short story and the novelette. These forms were developed to a much higher level of artistic perfection than the longer novel. An event of major importance in the history of modern Persian prose was the appearance in 1921 of Yākī bād yakī nabād, a volume of satirical stories by Sayyid Muḥammad ʿAll Jamālzāda (b. 1891-2). It was the first completely successful attempt to apply the narrative technique of European literature. The first edition was accompanied by a manifesto advocating the right of existence of a realistic literature, the value of which as a means of public education is particularly stressed. In order to be able to reach the broad masses of the people, the literary language should not only be simplified but also made more democratic by the assimilation of elements from living speech which were not regarded as correct forms according to the prevailing standards of literary culture. In spite of the fact that he has lived in Europe during most of his life, Jamālzdā is never lost his interest in the exploration of the resources of colloquial Persian, which eventually resulted in the compilation of a special dictionary of colloquial words (Farhang-i lugāt-i ʿamālīyā, edited by M. Ḍl. Maḥdī, Tehran 1341 sh.). His later novels and short stories were not published before 1941. The autobiographical work Sār u takā yak khrāb (1956) is of popular interest. The principles laid down by Jamālzdā were applied with great talent by Šādīk Hidāyat (q.v.) (1903-51) in his early stories collected in the volumes Zinda bi-gār (1930), Sī bātra khān (1932) and Sayā-ruṣegan (1933), as well as in the novelette ʿAlavīyyā Kānum (1957). This can be observed especially in the stories which portray the life of the middle and lower classes of Iranian society. The most celebrated aspect of his work is the analysis of mental suffering for which Hidāyat made use of the literary technique of surrealism. The novelette Bāṭ-i kār (1937) received international attention when a French translation was published in 1953. The short novel Hādījī ʿĀk (which was published in 1945), is his best satirical work.

To the same school of writers belongs Buzurg Ṭahmāb (b. 1907). He is, however, much more involved in politics than the preceding authors, which the collection Camadān (1934) earned him an early recognition as an important writer. His Čahākhāvān (1952) is one of the best modern Persian novels. Among the writers who made their debut after the Second World War the outstanding writer of the short story is Šādīk Ḍarbak (b. 1916) whose first collection Khayma gīhātāt was published in 1945. His latest works are the novels Tangīr (1963) and Sang-i sabūr (1966). Other notable writers of the last few decades are Muhammad ʿImāmzāda (Bībāhdin), who is especially known on account of his novel Dastār khwāna (1952), Dastār Āḥ-ī Ahmad (1923-60) and Taḵī Ṣadr. The extensive novel ʿAšār-i Ṣāḥīb (1961) of ʿAlī-Muḥammad Afgānī (b. 1925) was received with great enthusiasm both by the public and the critics in spite of its technical defects. (See on the latest development of modern prose: B. Alawi, in Yādnam-ye Jan Rypha, Prague-The Hague 1967, 167-72; M. Zavarzadeh, in MW, lviii (1968), 308-16.)

Drama (numāyīḵ) has never been a part of the classical tradition but has existed on the level of folk literature for a long time in many different forms (cf. J. Cejpek, Dramatic Folk-literature in Iran, in J. Rypha et al., History, 682-93). Much attention has been given to the Iranian passion plays (laʿīniya [q.v.]), the development of which culminated in the Kāḏār period. Modern playwriting in Iran is entirely derived from European literature. The oldest specimens are translations of some of the most famous comedies of Molière. Of greater importance were the modern comedies of Aḵhūndzāda [q.v.], written in Azeri Turkish and adequately translated into Persian by Muḥammad ʿAbbār Kārākādāghī. They were published for the first time in 1874 (reprinted Tehran 1349 sh.). The plays of Aḵhūndzāda inspired the first original dramatic works; a series of comedies said to have been written by Muḥammad Khān [q.v.], although his authorship of at least some of these has been denied recently (cf. Central Asian Review, xv (1969), 21-6). Interesting features of these early comedies are the element of social criticism they contain and the use of colloquial expressions in the dialogues. From the First World War onwards playwriting became a great fashion in Iran. From the vast production of plays only the historical dramas Farawī ʿalāẓīrār-i Ṣāʿān (1930) and Māzīyar (1933) of Šādīk Hidāyat are named here because of their importance for the history of literature (See further masrahvāyā).

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text, only works of a general character can be mentioned here. For monographs, editions of texts and translations see especially the bibliographies in H. Ettehādi's contribution to Gr. I. Pt. 3, passim and, for works published after 1900, in J. Rypha, History, 757-808. The articles in Iranian periodicals have been recorded in İrādī Afḡār, Fīrōrī-i makhātāt-i Ṣafī, 1: 1328 k.-1338 sh., Tehran 1340 sh., II: 1339-1345 sh., Tehran 1348 sh., Tehran 1348 sh., Tehran 1337-42 sh., supplemented by Karāmat Raʿān Husaynī, Fīrōz-i khābātā tākht-i Fārsī, Dhwā-yi Fīrōz-i Māzār, Tehran 1349, sh.; cf. also I. Afḡār and H. Band-ʿĀdam, Khābāshīnāt-i dahšāa-i (1333-1342) khābātā-i Irān, Tehran 1346 sh. The current production of books can be followed in the periodical Rāhmūd-i khābā (since 1337 sh.), as well as in the annual surveys Khābāh-i Irān, edited by J. Afḡār, and Khābāshīnāt-i mīūn-i inšāqātāt-i Irān, a publication of the Wizarat Farang wa hūsnār wa inšāqātāt. A di-bibliographical survey of the classical literature exists, reference to the catalogues of Persian manuscripts is still indispensable. A bibliography of catalogues has been compiled by I. Afḡār in Khābāshīnāt-i fīrōzī-khābāhā-ḵhāfī-i Fārsī, Tehran 1337 sh., which has been supplemented by O. Afḡar, Khābāshīnāt-i fīrōzī-khāhāhā-khāfī-i Fārsī, Tehran 1337 sh., and by O. Afḡar, Khābāshīnāt-i fīrōzī-khāhāhā-khāfī-i Fārsī, Tehran 1337 sh.
IRAN — IRBID
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erature, in J. Ryplka et al., History, 609-709, bib-

liography 839-54.

On the literature of Persian Jews see judaeo-
persian literature.

(J. T. P. de Brujin)

viii.—ART AND ARCHITECTURE, [see Supplement].

IRÂN [see Mughals].

IRATEN (Ayt > Aït Yiratn; Ar. Banû Ratan), a Berber tribal group of Great Kabylia, whose territory is bounded on the north by the Sebaw, in the west by the Wâdî Alissi (Wâdî Aysîl), which separates them from the Ayt Yenni, in the south by the Ayt Vâyâ and in the east by the Ayt Fravsen. It is a hilly country from 3000 to 3500 feet in height, producing olives and figs and some cereals. The inhabitants are settled in several villages, of which the most important are Adni, Tawrirt Amekhân, Usammer and Aqemmân. The Iraten numbered some ten thousand, belonging to the commune mixte of Forth-National.

We know little about the history of the Iraten. Ibn Kâhidûn (Bâthbès, tr. de Slane, i, 256) mentions them as inhabitants of “the mountain between Bigîjya [Bougie] and Tedelys [Dellys]”. They were nominally under the governor of Bougie and were on the list of tribes liable to hândâ, while being in fact independent. At the time when the Iraten undertook his campaign in Ifrikiya, they were subject to a woman called Shamsî, of the family of the ʿAbd al-Šamad, from whom their chiefs came.

Throughout the Turkish period, the Iraten main-
tained their independence, secure behind their mountains. They formed one of the most powerful federations in Kabylia, which comprised five ʿârîf: Ayt Yiratn, Akerma, Usammer, Aqweghên and Umalu, and could put in the field a force of 2800 men.

They kept their independence until in 1854 the French, under Marshal Randon, for the first time penetrated into the Kabylian mountains. To prevent an invasion of their territory the Iraten agreed to give hostages and to pay tribute. Nevertheless, their land remained a hotbed of intrigues against French rule, so that Randon in 1857 decided to subdue them completely. The French troops, leaving Tizi-Ouzou on 24 May, conquered all the Kabyl villages in succession and on 20 May defeated the army of the Iraten and their allies on the plateau of Sûk al-রবã. To keep them in check Random at once began to build Fort-Napoléon (later Fort-

National) in the heart of their country and thus placed “a thorn in the eye of Kabylia”. The Iraten were then quiet for 14 years, but in 1871 they again took to arms and participated in the siege of Fort-

National, which however the rebels did not succeed in capturing. (For subsequent events, see ALGERIA).

Bibliography: See references given in art. KABYLIA; for the Iraten, especially: S. Bouli-

fa, Le K'ânodu d'Ad'ni, in Recueil de mémoires et de textes publié en l'honneur du XIVe Congrès inter-


IRIBD, the name of two places: I: (Irbid/Arbad), the centre of the hadâ of ʿAdlûn [q.v.] in Transjordania (32° 33' N., 35° E.). According to al-Tabari, the Umayyad caliph Yazîd II died at Irbid which, the chronicler states, at that time formed part of the region of the Balkã [q.v.].
Severe traditions place the residence of Yazid II at Bayt Ras [a.g.], situated about 3 km. to the north of Irbil. In the middle period, Irbil was a halting-place of the barid [a.g.]. Today it is a small town of about 3000 inhabitants with basalt houses.

II: (Khurbat Irbid, Arbad, Erbed), vestiges of the ancient Arbea, west of Lake Tiberias, in the ravine formed by the Wadi 'l-Hamam. The most noteworthy of the ruins is a synagogue which dominates the ravine. On the sides of the ravine some caves are situated, connected by steps cut from the rock. It is in one of these caves that tradition places the tomb of the mother of Moses (Masah b. 'Imran), and also those of four sons of Jacob (Ya'qubb)—Dân, Isäkhâr, Zabdûn and Gâd.

Bibliography: I: Tabarl, li, 1463; J. Sauvaget, Poste aux chevaux, Paris 1941, 72-6. II: Yâqût, s.v.; Harawi, Zidârî, ed. J. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus 1953, 19-20; Le Strange, Palestine, 457; Marmardji, Textes géographiques, Paris 1951, 43-5; Le Strange M. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine, Paris 1933-8, i, 410, ii, 249; Clermont-Ganneau, in RAO, i, 324; ZDPV, xix (1896), 222-3, xxviii (1905), 22-4. (S. Orv)

IRBIL, a town in Upper Mesopotamia, situated about 80 km. east-south-east of al-Mawsil (36° 1' N., 42° 2' E.), in the centre of a region known as Adiabene, bounded by the north by the course of the Great Zâb and on the south by that of the little Zâb. Irbil is a site which has been inhabited since very early times, being referred to in cuneiform inscriptions under the name Arballu; the religious centre of the kingdom of Assyria with a sanctuary of the goddess Ishtar, it was also a centre of communications and a point of intersection of caravan routes. It was near to this spot, later known as Arbeles, that in 331 B.C. Darius III was defeated by Alexander. In dispute between the Parthians and the Romans, the town, then known as Arbira, became Christian at an early date, though it is not possible to determine to what extent Christianity penetrated the region. The seat of a governor in the Sasanid period, Irbil was the scene of persecutions of the Christians, who by an edict of 340 were subjected to a capitulation tax and various other tribulations; the rest of the Christians of the region left the town, and some years later, in 358, the governor Karâdî suffered martyrdom when he became a convert to Christianity.

The conquest of the town by the Muslims, apparently achieved without serious resistance, did not prevent its remaining an active Christian centre, the seat of a bishopric which was held by several outstanding figures. However, for reasons that elude the historian, Irbil was successively eclipsed by al-Mawsil, to which the metropolitan moved in the 3rd/9th century. At that time, Irbil was referred to by the Arab geographers merely as a leading town of the district of Hulwân. Irbil again became a town of some importance when, in 563/1167, it was the capital of the Khurjân amir Zayn al-Dîn 'All Külli Bektîn, the former lord of Siddîrî, Harrân and Takrit, who was soon replaced by his son. The most famous sovereign of this dynasty was MuSaafar al-Dîn Kökbîrî, who became amir-in-law of Salâh al-Dîn, who ruled Irbil from 586/1190 until 630/1232 and made his capital a place of some importance, in particular by the creation of new districts at the foot of the upper town. This lower town was embellished with various public buildings, hospitals, a madrasa known as al-Mu'asjarriyya, and a ribât for the use of the Şîfs. It was there, every year, that Kökbîrî had the masjid celebrated with particular solemnity, in commemoration of the Prophet's birth. On the death of Kökbîrî, the seat of Irbil passed into the hands of the caliph al-Mustansîr, to whom Kökbîrî had bequeathed it, but he was compelled to lay siege to the town to gain possession of it.

In 633/1235, the town was attacked and partly pillaged by the Mongols, who succeeded in capturing the citadel only in 656/1258, after the fall of Baghdad, and with the help of Kökbîrî's old rival, Bâdr al-Dîn Lu'lu', upon whom the town was conferred. For some years, despite a massacre which took place on the occasion of the unsuccessful revolt of al-Malik al-Sâlîb Ismaîl, son of Lu'lu', in 659/1261, the Christian community of Irbil experienced a period of relative prosperity, and was strengthened by the arrival of new elements. In fact, the town was given a Christian governor, Tâḏî al-Dîn Muştâs, who encouraged some Jacobite country-people to move to Irbil and, with the agreement of the Nestorian metropolitan Denha, allowed them to build a church there. The new Jacobite community succeeded, some years later, in being granted their own bishop.

Denha, for his part, was appointed catholics in Baghdad in 663/1265, but he had to leave that town in 666/1266 and take refuge in Irbil, from which he also fled in 669/1271, this time settling in As nú-bâdîn, as a result of a dispute with the governor. In 687/1289 the recall and torture of Tâḏî al-Dîn marked the beginning of a period of persecution and harassment for the Christians of Irbil. In 693/1295, three churches were destroyed on the orders of the Mongols and, in 708/1310, following some incidents provoked by Christian mercenaries, the Christian population of the lower town, and later that of the upper town also, were in part exterminated and several churches sacked. From that time the Christian community of Irbil lost all its importance and the few survivors gradually emigrated. Under Ottoman rule Irbil, which belonged to the paghâlî of Baghdad, had to endure the campaign of Nâdîr Shâh into Turkey in 1156/1743. In 1892 the town possessed only 3,200 inhabitants, of whom 457 were Jews, but this estimate was considered too low by some years later, in the 19th century it was a commercial centre, and still dominated by its upper town. A little way outside the lower town there still stands a minaret with a cylindrical shaft and octagonal base which may be attributed to the end of the 6th/12th century and which probably belonged to the Musafarriyya madrasa.

criptions, the following may be consulted: C. Niebuhr, Reiseberichte nach Arabien, ii, Copenhagen 1778, 342-5; C. Ritter, Erdkunde, iv, 691-4; V. Cuijff, La Turquie d’Asie, ii, Paris, 1892, 849-8, 856-8. For archaeological remains: F. Sarre and L. Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet, Berlin 1920, ii, 313-8.

(D. Sourdrel)

1'ird (pl. a'rāḏ), Arabic term corresponding approximately to the idea of 'āraḍ of the nomads; as such it is ambiguous and imprecise, as the terminologies of the lexicographers testify. It does not appear in the 'āraḍo, and the context, in which it figures in hadīth, does nothing to clarify its precise meaning. Al-İḍībī does not seem to have attempted to analyse the idea of 'īrd, while Ibn Kutayba sees it in a reference sometimes to the soul, sometimes to the body, an interpretation attacked by al-Kullī, Amāli, Cairo 1323, i, 118. In fact, apart from such material meanings as "strong army", "valley covered with palm trees", etc., (see TA, s.v., LA, s.v.), 'īrd seems to imply also, in hadīth and in poetry, the body of a man, or even of men; the parts of the body which have been laid across (ta'arratfa, īmaratja, *-ard) are synonyms of *-ārda, and a 'īrd is a cloud which obstructs the horizon. Since the Arabs used the expression hatāb al-īrd "to tear the 'īrd" as one tears a veil, and since hatība, from the same root, meant "dishonour", it is legitimate to consider 'īrd as a sort of partition or curtain separating the individual from the rest of mankind; behind this veil were concealed personal nobility (hasāb, s.v.); good character (khālaṣ maḥmūda) or soul (nafs). Now the expressions, very common in Arabic, relating to the protection (ṣāna and its synonyms) or the insulting (shatama and its synonyms) of 'īrd obviously cannot apply either to the soul, considered as a metaphysical entity, or to good character, which can claim only praise; hence, whereas the identification of 'īrd with hasāb is correct in itself, yet the first implies more than the second, which is merely one of its manifestations.

From the semantic point of view, the radical letters of 'īrd can give useful guidance. Several derivates from this root imply the notion of something "laid across" (ta'arrada, īmarada), and a 'īrd is a cloud which obstructs the horizon. Since the Arabs used the expression hatāb al-īrd "to tear the 'īrd" as one tears a veil, and since hatība, from the same root, meant "dishonour", it is legitimate to consider 'īrd as a sort of partition or curtain separating the individual from the rest of mankind; behind this veil were concealed personal nobility (hasāb, s.v.); good character (khālaṣ maḥmūda) or soul (nafs). Now the expressions, very common in Arabic, relating to the protection (ṣāna and its synonyms) or the insulting (shatama and its synonyms) of 'īrd obviously cannot apply either to the soul, considered as a metaphysical entity, or to good character, which can claim only praise; hence, whereas the identification of 'īrd with hasāb is correct in itself, yet the first implies more than the second, which is merely one of its manifestations.

The elements of 'īrd may be classed under three headings: the tribal group, the family and the individual. Under the heading of the group come the number of its members, the qualities of the poet and the orator, victories and independence; under the head of the family: the sons; of the individual: the group. Other elements like rebellion, courage, liberty, vendetta, chastity of the wife, liberality, faithfulness to one's word, hasāb, protection of the weak, hospitality, invulnerability of the abode, belong sometimes to the group and the individual, sometimes to the family and the individual, sometimes to the group, family and individual.

We find the explanation of the various elements of 'īrd in the warlike life led by the ancient Arabs. Indeed any sign of failure in fighting or of loss of independence humiliated the Arab and dishonoured him. Now humiliation (dhilla) is the opposite of power (ṣīrah) simply because it implies weakness; hence weakness is the condition of dishonour, while power is the foundation of honour or 'īrd. In other words, everything that contributes to power is an element of honour, while all that causes weakness is an element of dishonour. It is evident then that 'īrd was in its origin associated with power. 'Īrd moreover had an important social function; it was the guiding motive in the acts and deeds of all the Arabs except those of the Yaman, and so took the place of religion at the gatherings held for contests of honour called muĎāfara and muNDāfara (s.v.), and 'īrd, on account of its sacred nature, was entitled thus to take the place of religion, since the Arab put it in the highest place and defended it arms in hand.

The consequences to be drawn from the above are the following: being subjected in their everyday life to the controlling influence of an ethical principle, namely honour (ʿīrd), the Arabs were not an anarchic or truly individualist, nor primitive people, nor one at heart materialist; on the contrary, 'īrd, regarded as an ethical principle, was found to be at the root of various aspects of the moral life, of manners and even of ʿīraḍ institutions. It was the basis of the social hierarchy or of the non-egalitarian social structure; the poet, the orator, and, in a certain sense, the sayyid, enjoyed a special respect. In the abstract, the lexicographers accept the following notions: distinction of one's ancestors or personal nobility (hasāb, s.v.), good character (khālaṣ maḥmūda) or soul (nafs). Now the expressions, very common in Arabic, relating to the protection (ṣāna and its synonyms) or the insulting (shatama and its synonyms) of ʿīrd obviously cannot apply either to the soul, considered as a metaphysical entity, or to good character, which can claim only praise; hence, whereas the identification of ʿīrd with hasāb is correct in itself, yet the first implies more than the second, which is merely one of its manifestations.

From the semantic point of view, the radical letters of ʿīrd can give useful guidance. Several derivates from this root imply the notion of something "laid across" (ta'arrada, īmarada), and a ʿīrd is a cloud which obstructs the horizon. Since the Arabs used the expression hatāb al-ʿīrd "to tear the ʿīrd" as one tears a veil, and since hatība, from the same root, meant "dishonour", it is legitimate to consider ʿīrd as a sort of partition or curtain separating the individual from the rest of mankind; behind this veil were concealed personal nobility (hasāb, s.v.); good character (khālaṣ maḥmūda) or soul (nafs). Now the expressions, very common in Arabic, relating to the protection (ṣāna and its synonyms) or the insulting (shatama and its synonyms) of ʿīrd obviously cannot apply either to the soul, considered as a metaphysical entity, or to good character, which can claim only praise; hence, whereas the identification of ʿīrd with hasāb is correct in itself, yet the first implies more than the second, which is merely one of its manifestations.

The 'īrd which we have analysed refers to the ʿāraḍiyya. Yet Muḥammad still regarded ʿāraḍ as sacred; it even ranks as equal to religion. Islam maintained many of its elements, which found a place in it in the form of obligations: protection, largesse, courage, etc., form part of Muslim practice. These elements lost their original character: they are no longer capable of being the cause of boastfulness (Islam opposing ṭakwa to ḥamīyya); they are rather connected with religion or with a moral principle emanating from religion. Other elements have been rejected by Islam (like hasāb and ʿāraḍ) because they were incompatible with its spirit. Some of them, on the other hand, still survive and sometimes are intensified. Among the modern Bedouins we still find ʿīrd with almost all its pre-Islamic force (the ḥubāb of the Arabs of Transjordania and Moab).

At a later date these elements underwent more than one transformation, or even became extinct, especially in the cities, and sometimes the characteristic of use of the term ʿīrd in its traditional sense, though less rich in meaning, continued, especially in the Umayyad period, keeping its sacred character and its relation with insult (cf. Ibn Durayd, Ḫamhara, Būlāk ed., 166; Aḥāḏi, xi, 49; Ibn Kutayba, ʿUyūn al- ʿaḥbār, i, 293; al-Thaʿlabīl, Mīrāḏ al-murawwda, Cairo 1898, 22, 31; Abū Tamām, Djund, Cairo 1875, 93; al-Bubṭuri, Djund, Beirut 1921, 443, 444, 449, 623; al-Mutanabbi, Djund, ed. Dieterici, 416; Muḥyār al-Dāylamī, Djund, Cairo 1929, ii, 4). Its place has been partly taken by the term ʿāraḍ, which has received the simple meaning of honour, without the complicated shades of the ʿāraḍiyya attached to this idea (Yaʿkūbī, Historiae, ii, 314; Ibn Kutayba, ʿUyūn al-ʿaḥbār, i, 246; al-Mutanabbi, Djund, 342; Ibn Khālidn, Mubadda, Beirut ed. 1900, 396; cf. al-Ḥusayn, Zakr, ed. Zaki Mubārak, i, 435 and the lexicon).

At the present day, the meaning of the word ʿīrd has become restricted, relating particularly to women: in Transjordania it is associated with the virtue of a woman or even with her beauty. In Egypt the ʿīrd of a man depends in general on his wife's reputation and that of all his female relatives. In Syria the reputation of every member of a tribe reflects on a man's ʿīrd.
Chambers: B. Fares, L'honneur chez les Ardbes avant l'Islam, Paris 1932, where the subject is fully treated; see also B. Fares, Djabal, in RO, XXVII (1962), 99-101; Shammakh, Kiab al-Siyar, Cairo 1301.

'IRK, an Arabic word which, etymologically, has the basic meaning of "root", but other acceptations have been grafted on to this original meaning so that it eventually approximates to the idea of race. It is clear, as far as can be judged from the rare documents which can be collected, that such a concept is nowhere clearly attested, and it would be more correct, in this respect, to speak of a stock: "I trace my origins ('urak) to the ('irk) of the land" said Imru'l-Kays (LA s.v. 'irk). But the idea of a group which seems to be present in outline behind this substantive which also designates blood, understood as a factor of heredity.

'irk is nowhere used in the Kur'ân. In hadîth it is not unknown but is only used sporadically. There, first of all, the general sense of root is to be noted: "whoever brings back to life uncultivated land becomes the owner of it; but a root which unjustly grows there does not give any right to this land" (al-Buhkârî, K. al-Wahabî, Cairo 1376, iii, 93). Besides the idea of a nerve which strikes man in his head, there is also to be found in hadîth the indiscriminate sense of artery and vein: "When he finished massacring them, his "artery" burst and he died" (see Wensinck, Concordance). It also designates the blood: "his soul left with the 'urak" (see Wensinck), alluding to the liquid soul, al-nafs al-sâ'îla; regarding a woman whose period is unusually long, it is said: "it is not a question of menstruation, but of blood ('irk')" (Buhkârî, vii, 46). Finally, and it is this acceptation which especially interests us here, an 'irk, the function of which is imprecise, seems to be at the origin of certain anomalies of birth. A man came to the Prophet and said to him "Oh Messenger of God, I have had a black child".—"Do you have any dromedaries?", Muhammed asked him. "Yes."—"What colour are they?"—"Red."—"Are there no grey ones among them?"—"Indeed yes."—"How did that happen?"—"Perhaps an 'irk attracted it towards him."—"Then for your son too, perhaps an 'irk attracted him." (Buhkârî, vii, 46). Thus the concept is made to relate to descent and birth. The hadîth in question ('irk) could not avoid becoming involved, that, in 310/922-3, there occurred the invasion of the Djabal Nafusa by Fâtimid troops. According to Ibn 'Idhârî, these troops were under the command of the general 'All b. Salmân al-Dâ'î, and, according to the Ibâdî chronicles, they consisted of Kutâma warriors, the bravest and most loyal supporters of the Fâtimid dynasty. The Fâtimid troops attacked al-Dajâla, the main stronghold of the Djabal Nafusa, but they were defeated by the Ibâdîs. In the course of a second battle between the Nafusa and the troops of 'All b. Salmân, which took place near Tirakât (apparently on the territory which is now al-Rudjebân in the east of the Djabal Nafusa), Abû Yahyâ was killed by an Ibâdî soldier in vengeance for some act of injustice.

In Ibn 'Idhârî, the chief of the Nafusa who fought against 'All b. Salmân al-Dâ'î is called Abû Baṭṭa. There is no doubt that this was one of the by-names of Abû Yahyâ Zakariyyâ al-Irdjânî.

Muhammad struck a blow at the old preoccupations concerning race. But, nevertheless, these survived among the bedouins. The same concern is shown among the sharifs and the sayyids, both because of the nobility of their stock and the baraba which they have received from their illustrious ancestor Muhammad.

While the dispatch of the Remittance, whether by caravan through Syria or by sea, was always the occasion for a lavish ceremony, only a small part of the irdâliyye was actually sent to Istanbul. The remainder was kept in Egypt and used as a permanent deposit, applied to meet special obligations of the sultans, such as provisioning Ottoman naval units at Alexandria, Damietta and in the Red Sea, supplying Ottoman pilgrims and troops passing through Egypt on their way to southern Arabia, and paying for the purchase of Egyptian commodities and supplies used in the Sultan's palace kitchen in Istanbul and in the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina. Starting in the late 17th century, the Mamlûk factions in Egypt assumed control of the Ottoman administrative structure in the country, including the Treasury, and managed to divert an ever-increasing proportion of the irdâliyye sums to their own accounts in addition to collecting much of the Treasury's tax revenues, thus further lowering the amount left for the irdâliyye. Periodic efforts were made to correct this situation and restore the irdâliyye, with the administrative reforms introduced in 1081/1670, 1106/1695, 1127/1716, 1150/1734, and 1180/1769, and 1200/1786 being most important, but their effects were short-lived due to the continued Mamlûk power. During most of the 12th/18th century, however, the Ottoman governors were largely able to replace the lost irdâliyye funds by using Mamlûk revenues, supporting those parties which agreed to allow the Treasury to confiscate and sell the properties of their defeated rivals and to use the resulting revenue, called mâl-i hulûlin, to pay for the expenditures formerly provided by the irdâliyye.

Irdâliyye payments were completely suspended during the reign of the Mamlûk rebel 'Ali Bey al-Kabîr [q.v.], 1170/1769-1785, 1180/1770-1786 and 1193/1780-1797, and the French Expedition to Egypt (1798-1801), but they were resumed, on a reduced scale, upon the restoration of the Ottoman power and were retained by Muḥammad Ṭall, not only for Egypt but also for his Syrian possessions, except during the time of his two wars with the Porte.


Irtidjâl [see ra'dîyya].

Irtidjâl, improvising, extemporizing a poem or a speech. Ibn Rashîq ("Umda, i, 131), followed by Azdî (Bâda'î, p. 5 of the Bûlûk ed.) connects the term with the meaning "to be easy", "to flow down" implied in the expression šârî ra'dîjâl, "lank hair", or with irtidjal al-bîr, "descending into a well on one's feet", i.e., without the help of a rope, and the synonym of bâdâ, "to begin", substituting hâ for hama. According to these two authors, the difference between irdâlîjâl and bâdâha is that whereas in the case of irtidjâl the poet does not prepare his poem in advance, in the case of bâdîha he allows himself a few moments of thought. Of the other synonyms of irtidjâl mentioned in the dictionaries only the term irdâlîdâ is used occasionally. For an explanation of the etymology of this last term see Abû Ḥâfiz al-Askari, K. al-Sinâ'ayn, 39-40 (cf. also the expression kalâm bâdîh, "unprepared, unpolished speech", as used by the poet Bahî' and in a famous saying by the Khârijî leader 'Abd Allâh b. Wahh al-Râsibî in Djihib, Baydîn, ed. 'Abd al-Salâm Mub. Hârûn, Cairo 1367/1948, 204-5).

According to R. Blachère (Litt., 87-8, 364, 369-73), the metre used for improvisations in pre-Islamic and early Islamic times was mostly, though not exclusively, the radâjâs. In addition to songs by camel drivers (hidâl), cradle songs, etc. which in the nature of things are often improvised, there were improvisations on solemn occasions: curses or satires directed against the enemy, war songs, and dirges (see also the catalogue of radâjâs themes in M. Ullmann, Untersuchungen zur Radajsepoesie, Wiesbaden 1966, 18-24). The corresponding verbs radâjaza and irâdâjaza are therefore often used in the sense of "to improvise in radâjâs" (often also with the secondary meaning "to deride"), "to sneer", see I. Goldziher, Abhand. zur arabischen Philologie, Leiden 1896, i, 79-81). For an explanation of the etymology of this word see E. van der Donk, "radiazi" see I. Goldziher, Abhand. zur arabischen Philologie, Leiden 1896, i, 79-81. For a detailed discussion of various types of the idâzâ [q.v.] which, since metre and rhyme are suggested by someone else, is the only form of improvisation which does not allow the poet to compose any part of his poem in advance. Some of these anecdotes may well be authentic (e.g., the anecdote on pp. 90-2 of the Bûlûk ed.) as is shown by the fact that individuals capable of improvising compositions of some length are found in the Arab countries to this day.

For improvisation in Persian and Turkish, [see Supplement].

IRTISH [see FALAK, 'ILM AL-HAYA‘A].

IRTISH [see Supplement].

'ISÂ, Kur‘anic name for Jesus; the Kur‘an refers to him in 15 suras and devotes to him 93 verses which are the foundation for Muslim Christology. Various traditions, containing additions drawn from the apocryphal gospels of the childhood of Jesus, or from mystic Christian literature, have enriched this Christology and, in certain respects, brought it nearer to the Christian Christology. Islamo-Christian polemic has tended through the years to harden the positions; most of these positions have become classic and are to be found unchanged in present day Muslim writers.

I. Etymology of the word 'ISÂ: Certain western writers (Marracci, ii, 39; cf. Landauer and Nöldke in ZDMG, xlvi, 720) consider that the Jews induced Muhammad to use the form 'Isa and he did so in good faith. In fact the Jews, in hatred, referred to Jesus as Esau (Isa) maintaining that the spirit of Esau passed into him (cf. Lammens, in Machriq, xviii, 126; Frankel, in REJ, xviii, 352; Nestle, in ZDMG, xlvi, 720) state that Yâsoû‘ derives, by a phonetic change, from the Syriac Yeshu‘ (Yshu‘), itself coming from the Hebrew Yeshu‘a, with harmonization with Mûsâ. But it should be pointed out that it is used only five times with Mûsâ, while it is mentioned 25 times altogether (cf. Parminter, Jesus in the Qur‘an, London 1965, 16-7; Henninger, Spuren christlicher Glaubenszweisamkeiten im Koran, Freiburg 1951, 32-3). Finally some modern scholars have seen it as a reference to an 'Isa mentioned in the pre-Islamic inscriptions, yâ‘: a dialectical variant of hys, a theory which has been strongly rejected by G. Ryckmans who disputes the reading in Analecta Bollandiana, lvii (1949), 62 and in Les religions arabes présislamiques, 1951, 48. For the Muslim writers, see al-Baydawi on III, 45 (ed. Fleischer, i, 156, l. 2).

II. The various names of Jesus in the Kur‘an (see below for a study of the terms):—a) al-Masîlî (eleven times).—b) Na‘îf, prophet (XXIX, 30).—c) Rasûl, "envoy, messenger" (IV, 157, 171, V, 75).—d) Ibn Maryam, "son of Mary" (33 times): 16 times 'Isa Ibn Maryam, 17 times Ibn Maryam alone or with another title, while in the Gospels the expression appears only once; cf. E. F. F. Bishop, The Son of Mary, in Moslem World, 1934, who considers that the name came from the Church of Ethiopia after the return of the second group of emigrants. The expression appears five times in the Arabic Gospel of the Childhood, and fifteen times in the Syriac version of this Gospel. —g) Min al-mubârabîn, "among those who are close to God" (III, 45), later explained by the fact of his "ascension" (su‘âd, raf).—e) Wâqîth, "worthy of esteem in this world and the next" (IV, 45); al-Baydawi explains this: on earth as a prophet and in Heaven as an intercessor.—g) Mubâra, "blessed" (XIX, 31): "a source of benefit for others" (al-Baydawi), probably the "bringer of baraka" (Kâmil al-Hakîm, Kawl al-tiafîk, 30), "sure word", an obscure expression which is perhaps not a title but refers to the preceding statement; cf. al-Baydawi, i, 580, l. 25.—i) 'Abd Allâh, "Servant of God" (see below).

III. The annunciation, conception and birth of Jesus. There are in the Kur‘an certain features which, more or less directly, reflect the Gospels. Some writers, for example P. Hayek (Le Christ de l’Islam, Paris 1959, 65) go so far as to state that apart from the dogma that Mary is the mother of God, rejected by the Muslims since they formally deny the divinity of Jesus, "all the other dogmas defined by the Church or transmitted by its traditions of worship, find a support in the Kur‘an, rather weak it is true, but certainly real: the Immaculate Conception, the Presentation in the Temple, the Annunciation, the Virgin Birth, Christmas and even the Assumption" (cf. Maryam).

The Annunciation made to Mary is related with a touching freshness and recalls the scene in the Gospels. Mary, withdrawn into the Temple, receives the visit from the "Spirit of God" (see Rûh Allâh), "then We sent unto her Our Spirit that presented himself to her a man without fault" (XIX, 17), which tradition identifies with the Archangel Gabriel. He announces to her the miraculous birth of Jesus; miraculous because Mary has vowed her virginity to God and intends to retain it (LXVI, 22; XXI, 91). The Angel reassures her: this is easy for the Lord, who wishes to make of her a sign (dya) for men and a mercy (rahma) from Him (XIX, 21). "So she conceived him, and withdrew with him to a distant place".

It seems that in the Kur‘an the distinction between the Annunciation and the Conception is not precisely made. According to Luke i, 26-38, the angel of the Lord who appears to Mary is distinct from the Holy Spirit who performs the miracle. The Kur‘an seems to unite these two ideas. In fact, while in XIX, 17, there is mentioned an angel who appears to Mary in the form of an actual mortal, in two other texts (LXVI, 12 and XXI, 9) where God mentions the Spirit ("Our Spirit"), there is no reference to the angel. The confusion between the annunciation and the conception led to the Angel Gabriel’s being considered as the father of Jesus, a thesis supported by Gereck, Versuch einer Darstellung der Christologie des Koran,amburg-Gotha 1839, 36-46; cf. Michaud, Jésus selon le Coran, Neuchatel 1960, 26, a thesis based on the interpretation of certain Muslim exegists stating that the angel breathed into a slit in Mary’s cloak which she had taken off; when she put it on again, she conceived Jesus (cf. al-Thâlâbî, Kişas, 381).

In fact, the conception of Jesus was the result of a creative decree made by God: the creation of Jesus by God was after the example of that of Adam. The creation of Adam was at least as marvellous as that of Jesus, conceived by a virgin (cf. III, 52). Mary was overtaken by the pangs of childbirth be-
side the trunk of the palm tree. To reassure Mary's fears of a scandal, the child addressed her from the cradle. She shows the child to her family. In order to silence their reproaches he declares: "Lo, I am God's servant; God has given me the Book, and made me a Prophet. Blessed he has made me, wherever I may be; and He has enjoined me to pray, and to give alms, so long as I live, and likewise to cherish my mother" (XIX, 16-35).

It is known that Islam does not admit the idea of an "original sin" transmitted to the descendants of Adam (cf. G. Anawati, Islam and the Immaculate Conception, in The dogma of the Immaculate Conception, ed. E. D. O'Connor, University of Notre Dame Press, 1958, 447-61). Concerning Mary and her son however, there is a tradition, accepted by al-Buhkharî and Muslim, which states that they were granted an extraordinary privilege: that of both having been preserved from any contact with the devil at the instant of their birth. "Every son of Adam when newly born", says the hadith, "is touched (or probably squeezed) by Satan, except for the Son of Mary and her mother; it is at this contact that the child utters his first cry".

IV. The mission of Jesus: Jesus is a Prophet (nabi; XIX, 31) and the Envoy (rasûl; IV, 156, 169, LXI, 6). Like all prophets, he has a mission to fulfill, for to each separate people God has sent a special prophet. Of the son of Mary and of his mother He has made a sign, "and He has given them refuge on a quiet and dewy hill" which the commentators have identified with Jerusalem or Damascus. On the different interpretations concerning this topography (the influence of Byzantine iconography [Ledit], reference to the Assumption of Mary [Rudolph, Ahrens, Henninger], Srinagar [Ahmadiyya]), cf. Michaud, 29, n. 3.

The "miraculous sign" shown by Jesus and his mother is apparently his miraculous birth. But he himself was to perform "signs", proving through miracles his prophetic mission. Among these "proofs" (bāyyindāt; cf. II, 254 and 81, III, 43, V, 110, XLIII, 63, LXI, 6), should be mentioned the following:—1. Jesus spoke even in the cradle (XIX, 30) and already with the authority of a grown man (III, 47).—2. He made small clay models of birds, breathed life into them and they "it will be a bird" (III, 43). The modelling of birds is found in the apocryphal gospels: the Gospel of Thomas, ch. 2, the Gospel of the Childhood in Arabic, ch. 36, 46, i; the Armenian book of the childhood, 18, 2. The Abmadiyâya give a symbolic interpretation to this miracle: it signifies the spiritual flight of the Galilean peasants under the influence of Jesus (cf. Parrinder, Jesus in the Qur'an, 6).—3. Jesus cured the man blind from birth and the leper (V, 110).—4. He raised the dead, always "with God's permission" (III, 43; V, 110).—5. At the request of the Apostles (ka wdîsirîyyân, [g.v.]), he made to come down from the sky a "Table prepared" (mâdiâ); for them it was a feast (îdî), a meal and a proof (âyâ) of his mission (V, 111-14); cf. Baydâwî, i, 260; Hayek, 220-2; Gerock (46), followed by Rudolph, thought that this was either a reminiscence of the Last Supper or of the vision of Peter related in the Acts of the Apostles, X, 9). According to the traditional material collected by al-Tabârî, 86 (Hayek, 220-2) this is an echo of the miracle of the loaves and fishes (Matthew, XIV, 17 f.; XV, 32 f.). Michaud (56-7), following Masson (328-9), produces texts from the Old and the New Testament in favour of interpreting it as referring to the Last Supper. On the sources of the commentaries on this passage cf. Sidersky, 328-9. It is possible that the Kur'anic passage was influenced by some apocryphal tradition of which nothing has survived. (cf. G. Rosch, Die Jesuverselben, 447).

Jesus comes to declare the truth of what has already been given before him in the Torah (III, 44). The Scripture which belongs to Jesus is the Gospel (cf. nîkat), which is judged favourably because it fills the hearts of those who follow it with meekness and pity (V, 82). Jesus covers with his prophetic authority not only the Gospel and the Torah but also the earlier writings, all of them taught by God to the Son of Mary (III, 43, V, 110).

V. Jesus the Messiah: We must here define certain terms applied to Jesus which, in Christianity, have a fundamental value: the terms Messiah and Servant of God. Concerning the first, in the structure of the New Testament the revelation was gradual and Jesus did not reveal himself to the disciples as the promised Messiah until after a long psychological preparation. This historical perspective is not found in the Kur'ân: the term Messiah is given to Jesus from the time of his birth, though in a narrow sense which in no way corresponds to the Christian concept. Jesus the Messiah in the Kur'ân is only one in a series of prophets which ends with Muhammad. Like all the prophets he is only an ordinary man; the Kur'ân is entirely opposed to any doctrine of Jesus the Messiah the Son of God (IX, 30-1). It reproaches Christians for having taken "their scholars and their monks as lords apart from God, and the Messiah, Mary's son" (IX, 31). The uncompromising dogma of the unity of God removes any Christian overtones from the word Messiah.

The word Masîb is used eleven times in the Kur'ân, in passages all of which are Medinan (III, 40, IV, 156, 159, 170, V, 19 (twice), 76 (twice), 79, IX, 30, 31). The word is of Jewish origin, transmitted through Syriac. It seems to have been known in the north and the south of Arabia in the pre-Islamic period. The Hebrew maqâiz was used of the kings and the patriarchs and especially for the awaited Saviour. The Septuagint translates it by Christos. Al-Zamaqshari and al-Baydawî admit that the word is foreign and al-Firuzabadî states that there are fifty explanations for this word [see Maâfî]. In the Kur'ân the word is used only to the prophets, and Jesus.

The Arabic writers found two roots for it: 1. the verb masâha, to rub with the hand, to anoint; in the passive sense Jesus is Messiah, a) because he was anointed by means of blessings and honours (XIX, 32), b) because he was covered, from birth, by the wing of Gabriel to shield him from the bite of Satan, c) because he was anointed in Adam, like all men, but in a particularly way in order to be implanted in Mary. In the active sense, Jesus is Messiah, a) because he anointed the eyes of those born blind in order to cure them (III, 43), b) because he rubbed sick people with his hand, c) because he anointed with a holy oil. 2. The second root is the verb sâka, to travel, go on a pilgrimage, to wander. Jesus became for the Muslim mystic writers "the model of the pilgrims", "the imâm of the wanderers", the example of the mystics. Cf. Abd El-Jalil, Marie et l'Islam, 59, based on the Commentary of al-Âlîsî, iii, 142.

VI. Jesus the Servant of God: 'Abîd, literally "slave", means in theological terms, "the creature". Man is not only the "servant" of God but also his "property". Cf. 'ebedâ in the Old Testament (Isaiah, XLII, 1, LII, 13-LIII, 12, the fourth song of the Servant of Yahweh) and 8ô̄sâqî in the New Testament (Phil., II, 7). In the Kur'ân IV, 170, the angels
are also called 'abd. The basic meaning of adoration is found, with various nuances, in all the derived meanings (cf. Jeffery, Foreign vocabulary of the Qur’ān, 209). What must be remembered is that the Qur’ān insists on the status of Jesus as no more than that of a created being (XLIII, 59); it reacts against any belief in the divinity of Jesus. “Thus the first word he uttered was to recognize his character as a servant, to make more decisive the argument against any who might claim that he was God” (Hayek, 84; cf. Ibn al-ʿAlighi, i, 220; al-Tabarî, i/3, 73-4; al-Thabrâ, Riṣāl, 386). Thus it would be wrong to exaggerate the meaning of this term (as does Ledit, Makomet, Israel et le Christ, 145) and to interpret it in the Judeo-Christian sense: everywhere in the Qur’ān the word means a being created by God and subject to Him (cf. III, 52, 73).

VII. Jesus and Muḥammad: According to the Muslim commentators, who base themselves on LXI, 6, Jesus announced the coming of one who would come after him. According to the recension of Ubayy, this was “the seal of the Prophets” and of the messengers; in the Vulgate, it is “a Messenger” named Ahmad. On the meaning of the variant of Ubayy, cf. Blachère, tr. 909. Islam recognizes Muḥammad in Ahmad, both names deriving from the root h.m.d. In St. John’s Gospel Jesus announces the sending of the Paraclete (XIV, 16; XIV, 26; XVI, 7). The main early versions of the Gospels have merely transcribed the term without translating it: paraoklētos has given fārābīli.

Sale, in his Preliminary Discourse, 1877, iv, 53 (quoted by H. A. Walter, The Ahmadiyya Movement, 30), following up a suggestion of Marracci, suggests that the Gospel text on which these are based had something like ṣerākūṭōs, meaning famed, illustrious, and rendered in Arabic by Ahmad. The same explanation is found in C. F. Gerock, 109 and Zwemer, The Moslem Christ, 139, n. 1: the Muslim commentators accuse the Christians of having substituted ṣerākūṭūtōs for ṣerākūṭōs which stood in the original. Cf. Michaud, 36-7; Henninger, 313; Par- rinder, 96-100; L. Bevan-Jones in Muslim World, x, 112 ff.; A. Guthrie and E. F. F. Bishop, ibid., xii, 251 ff.; M. Watt, His Name is Ahmad, ibid., xiii, 118 ff.; M. Schacht, ibid., 1, 171, Ahmad.


As to the Muslim exegesis of the Kurʾānic texts referring to the “Word” coming from God to Jesus, four possible exegeses may be distinguished (cf. Abd El-Jalil, 39, using al-ʿAlisi, iii, 141):—1. Jesus is the fulfillment of the creating word of God, uttered at the moment of his conception (IV, 169, XIX, 30, III, 42);—2. Jesus is the word of God, received and preached by the earlier messengers.—3. Jesus is the word of God because he speaks on behalf of God and thus leads men in the right way.—4. Jesus is a word of God because Jesus is, in his own person, “good tidings”.

IX. Jesus and the Spirit of God: In order to accomplish his mission, Jesus was fortified by the Holy Spirit (Rūh al-kudus) (V, 199, XIX, 30-3), first at his birth, and then during his adult ministry among the Jews (II, 81, 254). The complete formula: “we have . . . confirmed him with the Holy Spirit” is used in the Kurʾān only for Jesus. However the Kurʾān uses an almost identical formula in connection with the believers whom God confirms “with a Spirit from Himself” (LVIII, 22). On the Holy Spirit in the Kurʾān, cf. Henninger, 4-6, which is based, among others, on the article by Macdonald in Moslem World, xxii (1932).

X. Jesus and the Trinity: In the passage III, 40, Jesus is mentioned as being among those “close” to the Lord (min al-mukarrabin). Jesus will be glorious, honoured both in the present world and in the world to come. This privilege of being close to God is shared by Jesus with the angels (IV, 170). But, however sublime they may be, both they and he remain created beings. The unity of God is stated in III, 52-5 in a passage dealing with the person of Jesus. The reference is probably to the reply made to the Christian delegates of Najdrān in 631 (cf. Blachère, 865). In spite of his great veneration for the Son of Mary, Muhammad is quite clear that he is in no sense divine. The Christians who insist on this divinity are “Liars”.

From the same period is the passage V, 19-21, in which Muḥammad once again insists on the entirely human condition of Jesus: “They are unbelievers who say, ‘God is the Messiah, Mary’s son’”. And the Christians are no more the sons of God than is Jesus himself.

It will be clear that with such a perspective, the Kurʾān formally rejects any doctrine of the Trinity. It should however be pointed out that the Trinity as understood and rejected is not the same as that which is taught by Christian dogma, and defined by the councils which were held before the revelation of the Kurʾān. The Kurʾānic Trinity seems to be a triad composed of Allāh, of Mary his consort and of Jesus their child (cf. V, 116); a concept which is reminiscent on the one hand of the stellar triads of the pre-Islamic Pantheon (cf. T. Fahd, Le panthéon de l’Arabe centrale à la veille de l’Hégire, Paris 1968), and on the other hand of the cult of Mary verging on idolatry practised by certain Christian sects of Arabia, the Mariamites and the Collyridians.

It is important to note that the formal denials of the Kurʾān are directed towards these views, which are “heretical” from the point of view of Christian orthodoxy itself. Certain modern Muslim writers, taking note of the explanations provided by their Christian informants, are inclined to recognize the basic monotheism of the Christian religion, without however admitting its revealed nature, (cf. J. Joumier, Le commentaire coranique du Manâr, 308). For all this section, cf. Michaud, 77-83.

XI. Jesus and the problem of the crucifixion. On the subject of the death of Jesus, two questions require to be answered: (1) was Jesus really crucified and did he therefore die on the cross? (2) supposing that this was not the case, did he die a natural death?

Concerning the first question, the Kurʾān states its position categorically: against the Jews who claimed “we slew the Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, the Messenger of God”, it states “yet they did not slay him, neither crucified him, only a likeness of that was shown to them (waalikin ḥubbība lāhum). Those who are at variance concerning him surely are in doubt regarding him; they have no knowledge of him except the following of surmise; and they slew him not of a certainty (yaakhīn)—no indeed; God raised him up to Him” (IV, 156-7). Muslim tradition com-
pletes the statements of the Kur'ân. According to some, Christ was replaced by a double, according to others it was Simon of Cyrene or one of the Apostles (Judas).

On the different modern explanations of the wa'lâkîn shubbîha lahum, cf. Michaud, 64-5, who mentions them and himself agrees with Hayek (41) in understanding "it seemed thus to them", which this writer considers to be the most plausible interpretation. Certain wa'lâkîs and some Ismâ'îlî commentators have interpreted this passage thus: the Jews intended to destroy the person of Jesus completely; in fact, they crucified only his násâ', his láhâ' remained alive; cf. L. Massignon, Le Christ dans les Évangiles selon Ghasâlî, in REI, 1932, 523-36, who cites texts of the Rasâ'il Ikhshid al-Safâ'î (ed. Bombay, iv, 115), a passage of Abû Hâtim al-Râzl (about 934), and another of the Ismâ'îlî Mu'ayyad Shîrâzi (1077). But this interpretation was not generally accepted and it may be said that there is unanimous agreement in denying the crucifixion. The denial, furthermore, is in perfect agreement with the logic of the Kur'ân. The Biblical stories reproduced in it (e.g., Job, Moses, Joseph etc.) and the episodes relating to the history of the beginning of Islam demonstrate that it is "God's practice" (sunnat Allâh) to make faith triumph finally over the forces of evil and adversity. "So truly with hardship comes ease", (XCIV, 5, 6). For Jesus to die on the cross would have meant the triumph of his enemies; but the Kur'ân assures that they undoubtedly failed: "Assuredly God will defend those who believe"; (XXII, 49). He confounds the plots of the enemies of Christ (III, 54).

On the origins of the Kur'ânic concept of the crucifixion (gnostic and docetic Christianity, as maintained by H. Gregoire, seeing here a concession to certain docetic Monophysites, in Mlanges Charles Diehl, Paris 1930, i, 107-19; a rejection of Ledit's view in Mahomet, Isrâ' et le Christ, 151-6, where he attempts to find texts of the Kur'ân which refer symbolically to the mystery of the redemption) cf. Michaud, 68-71.

Concerning the second question (the death of Jesus and his ascension to God), an examination of the Kur'ânic texts XIX, 34, III, 48, XXXIX, 43, and in particular the key text IV, 155-7 (which rests in part on the preceding ones and reveals the true Islamic attitude to the death of Jesus), shows (1) that the resurrection referred to in XIX, 84 is the general resurrection which the Kur'ân proclaims for the end of the world; there was a special resurrection for Jesus, since Jesus did not die on the cross. Later tradition (cf. Hayek, 263-8) stated that it would be at the time when Jesus returned again, that he would die the natural death announced in XIX, 34-2. The word tawâuffâ usually means a death which is blessed, a return to God for the final judgement, but it is also used in VI, 60 for God's recalling the souls of those who sleep while they are asleep and returning them when they awake (cf. Fränkel, in ZDMG, lvi, 77). The verb is twice used of Jesus, in III, 48 and V, 119. The first passage could imply an elevation of the living Jesus to God. The second is ambiguous. The question is settled by the passage IV, 155-7, in which it is stated that Jesus was not killed by the Jews but was raised up to heaven. In other words, we have the following succession of events: apparent death, ascension, second coming, natural death, general resurrection. For all this section, cf. Michaud, 60-4.

XII. The return of Jesus: The only authority is the passage XLIII, 61, which contains some variant readings: the first reading, that of the Vulgate: wa-innahu la-'ilmân, "He (Jesus) is truly a knowledge of the Hour"; i.e., he by whose descent the approach of the Hour is known; the second reading, the canonical variant: wa-innahu la-'alamân, "And he (Jesus) is truly a sign for the Hour"; the third reading, in the recension of Ubayy: wa-innahu la-ghâbirân, "And he (Jesus) is truly a warning of the Hour"; fourth reading: wa-innahu: the âu refers to the Kur'ân.

If the second coming of Christ is taken as established, his death is placed after the Hour, as mentioned above, and the verses in LXIX, 159 and XIX, 33 are easily explained. Similarly, the expression kahlân in III, 46 becomes clear, because when he was "raised" he was still âshâb, young, and had not attained kuhûla; cf. al-Baydawî, in loco. On the positions of various commentators, cf. Hayek, 244-51.

On these few facts tradition has succeeded in accumulating a mass of detail (cf. al-Baydawî on XLIII, 61, ed. Fleischer, ii, 241) and in producing books devoted specifically to this subject, among them: at-Tasrîh bi-mâ tawâlara fi musîl al-Masîh, of Muh. Anwar Shâh al-Kashmîrî al-Hindi (published in 1965 in Aleppo by Abu 'l-Fattâb Abû Ghudda). Some of these details are as follows: Jesus, on returning to the earth, will descend on to the white arcade of the eastern gate at Damascus, or, according to another tradition, on to a hill in the Holy Land which is called 'Alik; he will be clothed in two musârrâs; his head will be anointed. He will have in his hand a spear with which he will kill the Antichrist (al-Daddîjâl). Then he will go to Jerusalem at the time when the dawn prayer is being said, led by the imâm. The latter will try to give up his place to him, but Jesus will put him in front of him and will pray behind the imâm following the prescription of Muhammad. Then he will kill all the pigs, will break the cross, destroy the synagogues and the churches, and will kill all the Christians except those who believe in him (following IV, 159). Once he has killed the false Messiah (al-Masîh al-Daddîjâl), all the Peoples of the Book will believe in him, and there will be only one community—that of Islam. Jesus will make justice to reign. Peace will be so complete that it will extend also to the animals among themselves and to man's relationships with the animals. Jesus will live forty years and then will die. The Muslims will arrange his funeral and will bury him at Medina, beside Muhammad in a place left vacant between Abû Bakr and 'Umar.

There has come to be grafted on to the belief in the second coming of Christ, sometimes merging which it, the doctrine of the Mahdi. This term, which at first had a mainly honorific meaning, gradually came to indicate the very person of him who, at the end of time, is to restore the lost faith. On this doctrine, [see MAHDI].

Finally, it may be mentioned that the Ahmadiyya sect holds that Jesus, after his apparent death on the cross and resurrection, emigrated to India, to Kâshmîr, to preach the Gospel there. He lived there until the age of 120. His tomb is at Srinagar. They believe that the Mahdi is an incarnation simultaneously of Jesus, Muhammad and an avatar of Krishna [see AHMADIYYA].

XIII. Jesus and the Last Judgement: At the time of his nocturnal ascension (XVII, 1), Mushuffle met Abraham, Moses and Jesus. Questioned concerning the Final Hour, Jesus announced: "To me has been confided the knowledge of what will precede its occurrence. As to the occurrence itself, only God can determine this". This verse enables us to
understand the passages where Jesus is called "Knowledge of the hour": he knows of its existence, but not the exact time, this being reserved to God alone.

In spite of his ascension to God's side and his purification (III, 48), Jesus will not assist God in the Judgement which will follow the Hour: it is God alone who decides, He is the only Judge. On the day of the universal Resurrection, Jesus will be a witness against the Christians, accusing them of having regarded him and his mother as equal with God, but he will not be their judge (cf. infra, the different position of Ibn 'Arabi).

XIV. Jesus in tradition and in the mystical writers: The Christological elements contained in the Kitāb al-hayawdn, listed systematically above, have been the subject of meditation by ascetics and mystics. There has gradually grown up around the figure of Jesus an abundant hagiographical literature stressing the poverty of the Son of Mary, his detachment from the world, his teaching, his power of performing miracles, his devotion to prayer. These elements, with anecdotes, sermons and advice attributed to Jesus, are found in the classical works of the mystics such as the Hilyat al-auliya of Abū Nuʿaym, the Rawd al-rayāḥīn of al-Yaḥyī, the Kūt al-ulūbī of al-Makki, the Naṣīrīd of al-Tirmidhi, and especially in the works of al-Ghazālī: Iḥyāʾ ilāl il-Dīn, al-Durr al-Ākhbār, Makākhat al-Makākhatī. Furthermore, the "secular" writers like al-Damiri in his Haydkat al-kawādın and Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīn in his Ḥīd, there may be found interesting details on Christological literature. Fifty years ago, Asn Palacios had collected and translated the texts concerning Jesus in the works of al-Ghazālī and had published them under the title of Logia et agrapha Domini Jesu, in Patrologia orientalis (xiii (1919), 335-431; xix (1926), 532-624). In his turn, Father Michel Hayek collected and translated texts about Jesus and classified them systematically in a complete Christology (Le Christ de l'Islam, Paris 1959; Arabic text: Al-Masīḥ fi ʾl-Iṣlām, Beirut 1961). A large part of the work is occupied with Jesus's teaching; it includes logia on poverty, on detachment from the life of the world, denunciation of false wisdom and of the specious sureties of this world, dialogues, pilgrimages, the resurrection and witness against the vanity of the world against which Jesus constantly warned his Companions, his Apostles, the Children of Israel and his listeners in general. His description is based on that of the Christian ascetics and monks: wearing a woollen habit, detachment, a life of solitude, the power of the initiate to perform cures.

When, later, the Sufis came into direct contact with the Gospels, they took from them the elements which corresponded to their ascetic ideas, which they themselves attributed to Jesus: "this explains the gospel background of certain logia and accounts which are here almost always taken out of their original context" (Hayek, 136). Ibn ʿArabi (d. 638/1240) went even further: he stated that it is Jesus who merits "the Seal of universal Holiness" because he possesses the quality of faithfulness in the faith (amān), because he holds in his hands the keys of living breath and because he is at present in a state of deprivation and journeying" (cf. Hayek, 262-3). "And", he adds, "know that without doubt Jesus will descend and will be our judge, according to the law of Muhammad" (ibid.).

XV. Islamo-Christian polemic concerning Jesus: The central place in the Christian religion of the dogma of the Incarnation and the Redemption made inevitable doctrinal conflict between Christian and Muslim theologians. The latter worked out fairly rapidly a system of apologetics which became accepted as classic and the features of which have been repeated without variation until the present time; cf. infra where a substantial bibliography is given. On the most recent Muslim books on Christ see the article by J. Jomier in MIDEO, v (1958), Quatre ouvrages en arabe sur le Christ, 367-86, and G. C. Anawati, Polémique, apologie et dialogue islam-chrétiens, Positions classiques médievales et positions contemporaines, in Encyclopaedia Islamica, Rome 1969.

Two works published in Cairo show a new tendency in the Muslim approach to the problem of Christ. The first (1952) is by the Egyptian essayist ʿAbdāb Mabmūd al-ʿAkkād and is entitled the spirit of the Messiah ('Abhariyyat al-Massih). This work, which enjoyed wide success, may be described thus: the writer approaches Christ with great respect—the Christ of the actual Gospels and not only the ʾĪsā of the Kurʾān; he defends vigorously the historicity of Jesus and the authenticity of the Gospels, the only sources for our knowledge of Christ; he rejects nationalist prejudice against the miracles but, following a method which he has worked out for himself, he does not make use of them in his exposition. Finally, al-ʿAkkād has a clear grasp of certain aspects of Christ's teaching: the insistence on love, the complementary role of the Gospel of St. John, the primarily spiritual character of Christianity: this is essentially a demand for perfection made of the conscience and not a religious law bristling with texts. From the Christian side he has been criticized for announcing arbitrarily when he approaches the account of the Passion and death of Jesus: "This is where history ends and belief begins", whereas the remainder of the book rests on the authenticity of the Gospels, which he defends vigorously. Furthermore, the dogmatic teaching of Christ is left in the background.

The second book (1954), An iniquitous city (Qarya šālima) is by a doctor, Dr. Kāmil Husayn, former rector of the University of ʿAyn Ṣḥams (Cairo). It is presented rather as a work of imagination than a historical biography, being a personal meditation on the trial and condemnation of Christ, a trial considered as the greatest crime in history. The whole thread of the story unwinds on Good Friday, the day on which the movement is conceived in the form of a triptych describing successively, in a style both sober and elegant, the attitudes of the Jews, the Apostles and disciples, and finally of the Romans. Concentrating on this or that scene (Calvary, the meeting of the Apostles), on this or that person (Calaphas, Lazarus, Pilate, Mary Magdalene) the author is able to stress profound psychological details and to discuss great metaphysical or moral problems: liberty, authority, the existence of God, the relations between religion and the state, conscience etc. Without being described anywhere, the face of Christ is present everywhere. The essential part of his mission is to remind men that conscience, which is a participation in the divine light, must be above everything, above even religion if need be. Very skilfully, in order to distress neither Christians nor Muslims, the author leaves the problem of the Crucifixion in the background. Although to a certain extent the whole book converges on this main event (all the characters speak of it, all the movement of the book leads to it, nature herself is covered with darkness on the afternoon of Good Friday), the author does not actually state that Christ was crucified. Nor however does he deny it. He merely repeats a Ḫurṣīnī saying: "God has raised Jesus to Himself", a saying which in the context can receive
an acceptable interpretation from Christian readers. Finally, in one of the last chapters, "Return to the Sermon on the Mount!", the author movingly develops the words of Christ. He summarizes them for the modern world into the three following points: one should reject with all one's might all the false gods of money, the state, religion or the common good; one should truly live according to the precept of brotherly love; finally one should free oneself of any passion which might stiff the voice of conscience.

The book has been translated into English by Kenneth G. Anawati under the title City of Wrong, A Friday in Jerusalem, Djambatan-Amsterdam 1959; and into Spanish by José María Fernández; the Spanish translation has as an introduction the long article on the book by G. C. Anawati in MIDEO, ii (1959), 71-134, entitled Jésus et ses juges d'après "La Cité inique" du Dr. Kamel Hussein.

On a portrait of Jesus by a contemporary Persian writer, Shin Parto, in a short book entitled Haji (hurê (Sept visages), ed. and tr. by P. de Beau-recreuil in MIDEO, ii (1959), 303-2.

Bibliography: A large part of the bibliography has already been given in the article itself and in the article 1959i, where are listed the works of Ahrens, Blachère (tr. of the Kur'ân, Fritsch, Goldziher, Henninger, Horovitz, Jomier, Masson, Steinschneider, Tor Andrae, etc. We give here only the books and articles devoted more especially to Kur'ânic Christology (in chronological order):


For Muslim works in Arabic, see the articles by J. Jomier and G. C. Anawati mentioned in paragraphs XV above.

G. C. Anawati

'Tsâ, NAHR, in full NAHR 'Tsâ, was in the Middle Ages one of the four major canals leading to the general vicinity of Baghdad, the others being Nahr al-Malik, Nahr Şarşar and Nahr al-Şarāt (Mukaddasî, 124). Watering the district of Firuz Abad (Mukaddasî, vi, 111-2; Le Strange, Baghdad, Map III). A tributary of the Euphrates, it was deep enough to allow large boats coming from al-Rakka to deliver foodstuffs from Egypt and Syria (Ya‘qûbî, Buldân, 250). Since the canal emptied into the Tigris, below Kašr 'Tsâ, it connected both these major waterways (Iṣṭakhrî, 84-5; Ibn Hawkal, 164-5). As a result the city was strategically situated amidst the major inland water routes of the empire, as well as on the great highways leading to the East and the Arabian Peninsula. When the construction of dams along the Şarāt made it impossible for large boats to reach the Tigris, the 'Tsâ alone remained open to heavy traffic. The course of Nahr 'Tsâ is reported by al-Khatib al-Baghdâdi (d. 463/1071), whose account is identical with that of Šubrá (Iṣṭakhrî, 123) and is the same as the course published as Baghdad, Description of Mesopotamia and Baghdad, London 1805, 13. The text of Šubrá can be dated on internal evidence to ca. 925 A.D. He lists nine locations along the canal, all of which are apparently identified by masonry bridges (kantara) spanning the water. The course of the canal is also described by Ya‘qûbî (d. 1020/622), whose account is based on that of Dâr al-‘Alâ, writing in the 12th/13th century, reports that Kanatarat Bani Zurayk collapsed into Nahr 'Tsâ in 433/1042. There is no indication that the bridge was repaired then (Muntasam, viii, 108). Furthermore, a century earlier (323/935) Kanatarat al-Usfahân and its environs were reported to have been ravaged by fire. According to al-Šūluq it was not rebuilt in his time (Abhâr, 68). To what extent the destruction of individual bridges...
reflects the decline of the surrounding area bearing the same name is not clear. Nahr Ḵafran in the Middle Ages formed the southern boundary of the suburb of al-Karkh and thus marked the southern limits of Baghdād. No real trace remains of it in modern times.

**Bibliography:** In the text. (J. Lassner)

**ĪṢĀ b. ‘ĀLI [see ʿĀLI b. Ẓaṣa].**

**ĪṢĀ b. DĪNĀR b. WĀFĪD AL-GHĀFRĪ, one of the three major founders of Islamic jurisprudence and theology in Spain, the other two being Yahyā b. Yahyā (d. 234/848) and ʿAbd al-Malik b. Habīb (d. 238/852). Īṣā is considered the most learned and important of the three, and is described as ʿalīm al-Andalus. He was born in Toledo, most probably around 155/771, because when he arrived at Medina to study with Mālik b. Anas he found he had been “recently” died (in 179/795). He went back to Fustāṭ and made all his studies under ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḵāsim (d. 191/806) who was considered the most eminent disciple of Mālik. He attended also the lectures of the other two distinguished Mālikī scholars of Fustāṭ: ʿAbd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 197/812) and Aḥḥāb b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (d. 204/819). While Yahyā b. Yahyā boasted that he had made some of his studies with Mālik and completed them afterwards at Fustāṭ, and while the flamboyant ʿAbd al-Malik b. Habīb was always keen to show that he had obtained his knowledge from the four Medinan disciples of Mālik—namely al-Mughira b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Maghārūl (d. 188/804), Abu ʿl-Muṣṭafā b. al-Zubārī (d. 224/835) and al-Mālikī (d. 212/827) and al-Muṭarrīf b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 220/835)—Īṣā b. Dīnār proved that better results could be achieved by studying with one good professor if the student possessed superior talent and character. Īṣā b. Dīnār was nominated, a short time after his return from Egypt, the Mufti however, was obliged to appoint him Amir al-ʿAdlīn because when he arrived at Medina in 675/1277; and, together with Nur al-Dīn Calī, ndʿib of Aleppo, prevented the sultan however, was obliged to appoint him Amir al-ʿAdlīn because when he arrived at Medina in 675/1277; and, together with Nur al-Dīn Calī, ndʿib of Aleppo, prevented the khādirdīs and the Muʿtazīlīs from being sentenced to death without mercy, īṣā insisted that they should first be given the opportunity to disavow their doctrines and rejoin the mainstream. Here Īṣā b. Dīnār thus was more consistent than Mālik himself, because this last had said in the treatise called Būb al-nakī ʿan al-k̄adar that the Muʿtazīlīs should be accorded the opportunity to disavow ʿīṣālī before any punishment was inflicted on them; but when he was asked about them in the mosque he shouted: “Heretics, infidels, kill them!”

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Faradī, ʿUlamāʾ, Madrid 1890–92, 973; Humaydī, Dīghbaw, Cairo 1952, 678; Ibn al-Kūtiyā, Iḥṣāṣ, Madrid 1926, 15; Dābbī, Bughyā, 389; Safādī, Wāfī, photocop., Cairo Library, V/3, 615; Ibn Saʿīd, Muğhrib, Cairo 1956, ii, 24; Ibn Farḥān, Dībāqī, Cairo 1932, 177; Maḥkārī Naḥf, Cairo 1949, ii, 215, iv, 161–2; ʿĪyād, Shajāʾ, Cairo n.d., ii, 273; idem, Maḍārik, ed. A. Bakīr, Beirut 1967–9, index; José López Ortiz, La recepción de la Escuela Maliki en España, in Anuario de historia del derecho español, vii (1930), 1–166; Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., i, 148, ii, 473; M. A. Makki, Ensayo sobre las aportaciones orientales en la España Musulmana, Madrid 1968, Index. (H. Moret)

**ĪṢĀ b. MUḤANṆĀ, d. 683/1248, appointed Amir al-ʿArab by the Mamlūk sultan, was the chief of the Āl Fāḍl, a Bedouin clan of Bādīyat al-ʿArab. His genealogy is usually given as Īṣā b. Muḥānā b. Māniʿ b. Ḥadīthā b. ʿAbasa (var. ʿUkba) b. Fadl b. Raḥīfa; his tahāb was Ṣharaf al-Dīn al-Tālī. The Āl Fāḍl, connected to the Raḥīfa and hence to the Tayy (for their early history see Ibn Khalīlūn, al-Tābīn, Cairo 1284, v. 436 f.; al-Kākulshandī, ʿṢūḥb, Cairo 1914, iv, 203 f., 260), were very wealthy (see al-Umarī, al-Taʿrīf, Cairo 1912, 79) and ranged from the Ḥijāz to the Maghrib and Mauritania (see al-Tābīn, Cairo 1914, iv, 204 f.; al-Bāhi, al-Muṣīd, al-raʾfī, Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS. 4439, 155). Īṣā himself, with his immediate followers (ʿĀl Īṣā) dwelt in Bādīyat al-ʿArab, occasionally crossing the Euphrates at Raḥība into Irāq.

Īṣā played an important role in the battles between the Mamlūks and the Mongols in the second half of the 7th/13th century. With the other Bedouin, he fought beside Kutuṣ (g. n.) at the battle of Ayn Dālīlah (g. n.) in 658/1260, and he (or his father) was rewarded with the grant of the iθfāt (g. n.) of Salāmīyya (g. n.). Although in general he enjoyed good relations with the neighbouring amirs, especially Dījalī al-Dīn al-Kāllālī of ḫīlī (see Kādī Muḥī al-Dīn b. ʿAbd al-Ṣāḥir, al-Rawd al-sāhir, ed. S. F. Sadeqū, 1936, 112), he was on bad terms with Baybars (g. n.); the sultan however, was obliged to appoint Īṣā as Amir al-ʿArab over all the Bedouin in 665/1264, in succession to his cousin ʿAll b. Ḥudḥāyfa b. Māniʿ, whose bloodthirsty tyranny had reduced the region to chaos (al-Rawd, 123). Contemporary sources report that he did much to restore order, by his good administration and justice (e.g., Ibn al-Furāt, Taʿrīh, Beirut 1939, vii, 12 f.). Īṣā led the way in Baybars’s invasion of Asia Minor in 675/1277; and, together with Nūr al-Dīn ʿĀlī, nābāb of Aleppo, prevented the
Iṣā b. Muḥanna — ʿIṣā b. al-Shaykh

Mongols from infiltrating into Syria (see Baybars lurs, T. tr. S. Yaltkaya, Istanbul 1942). Under Kašwân, however, he allied himself with Sunqûr al-ʿAghkâr, who had rebelled at Damascus taking the title al-Malik al-Kâmil, and entered into contact with ʿAlî al-Dîn ʿAṭâʾ Malik al-Ṭuwaynî, who was governing Baghdad for the Ilkhânî ruler: in 679/1280 he and Sunqûr began a correspondence with Abâkât, to whom, through the intermediary of al-Ṭuwaynî, he sent his son. Abâkât presented the son with a maqâla, and secured the surrender of a like himself, which became the property of the descendants of the Alids Muhammed b. al-Shaykh. It does not appear to be true that Iṣā b. Muḥanna was governor of Damascus in 247/861, as is suggested by Zummany (Manuel de chronologic des Hâmîdî, 1969, 97; cf. M. Canard, Histoire des Hâmîdî en Algérie, i, Oxford 1940, 134 ff., 141). We do not know the exact name of his father, who was called al-Shaykh or Shaykh, and elsewhere Ahmad (Ibn Tâhirî, ii, 46 note, and Defrémery, Recherches . . .) or ʿAbd al-Razzâk (al-Masudi, Murûdî, viii, 134). Iṣā's early history is shrouded in obscurity. He seems to have made his first appearance in 234/848 during the reign of al-Mutanawwîl, in the following circumstances. There was a member of a Rabi'î tribe of ʿAḍârâbâyjân, Muslim b. al-Bâ'îlî (or Bu'ayth), whose father and grandfather had set up for themselves a fief in Marand and around the lake of Urmîya, and who, at certain times as the ally of Bahâk and at other times as his adversary, had been imprisoned in Sâmarra; he had taken flight, and had then returned to Marand and fortified himself there. An army was sent against him, under the command of Bughâ al-Shârâbî. Iṣā b. al-Shaykh was a member of this force. Bughâ used him to negotiate with the besieged, and since these were for the most part of Rabi'â like himself, Iṣā secured the surrender of a certain number of the companions of Ibn al-Bâ'îlî. The latter escaped, but was captured and taken to Marand (see Marand). It does not appear to be true that Iṣâ b. Muhammad b. ʿAlî b. ʿAbd Allâh b. al-ʿAbbâs b. Muhammad b. ʿAlî b. ʿAbd Allâh b. al-ʿAbbâs b. ʿAbd Allâh b. ʿAbd Allâh b. al-ʿAbbâs, ʿAbbâsîd prince, nephew of the first two caliphs of the dynasty. Governor of al-ʿKufa in the reign of al-Saffâh [q.v.], he was then designated as the second heir after Abû ʿAbd Allâh, and it was he who, at al-Anbâr, administered the oath of allegiance on behalf of al-Maṣûrî, who was in Mecca at the time when al-Saffâh died.
the second, Isā b. al-Shaykh requested the caliph al-Musta'in to send him arms and equipment, in order to consolidate his power in the country and to allow him to conduct a campaign against the Byzantines (al-ghārār); furthermore, he asked the caliph to give orders to the commandant of the garrison at Tyre (Ṣūr) to place four armed vessels at his disposal, in addition to those to which he could already count on. This would suggest that Isā at that time held a command in the Syrian frontier region. 

If al-Ya'qūbī is to be believed, when al-Mu'tazz ascended the throne on 7 Muharram 252/29 January 866 and asked the various governors to recognize him, certain of them did so immediately, but others, among them Isā b. al-Shaykh in Palestine, bided their time. This Isā would have been governor of Palestine as early as 251. It was perhaps as a result of this incident that al-Nawshārī, governor of Damascus, marched against Isā b. al-Shaykh, joined battle with him by the Jordan and compelled him to flee, first to Palestine, later to Egypt, while al-Nawshārī entered Ramla. An envoy from al-Mu'tazz came to Egypt and received the oath of loyalty from the governor and his entourage, and also from Isā b. al-Shaykh. It appears that al-Mu'tazz had not given his consent to the occupation of Ramla by al-Nawshārī, since he sent against him into Palestine the 'Abd al-Mu'mann b. al-Muwallad who drove out al-Nawshārī. Isā b. al-Shaykh left Egypt, and then established himself in a āsār between Ramla and Ludd. Muhammad b. al-Muwallad could do nothing against him, and finally both of them returned to 'Irāk, according to al-Ya'qūbī.

According to al-Tabāri, at the end of 253/December 866, Isā b. al-Shaykh was nominated by al-Mu'tazz as governor of Ramla in Palestine. He was said to have obtained this appointment by paying, or guaranteeing, a sum of 40,000 dinars to Bugha al-Sharābī who, in 252, still possessed considerable influence, since it was not until 254/868 that he was imprisoned and put to death. According to al-Masūdī, he was said to have been appointed by al-Mu'tazz as governor of Palestine because he had come from Egypt to Sāmarrā bearing huge sums of money (perhaps the proceeds of taxes) and bringing with him a group of seventy 'Alīds who had fled from the Hīdājū as a result of disturbances there.

The occasion of this nomination marks the appearance of a figure who is later to be found at the side of Isā b. al-Shaykh: this is Abu 'l-Maghra ibn Mūsā b. Zurārā, a family which held an important office in the region of Arzānene. It was this man whom Isā sent to represent him as his deputy in Ramla.

From this time onwards, the career of Isā b. al-Shaykh is described in greater detail. The anarchy then prevailing in 'Irāk allowed him to extend his area of authority by seizing Damascus. The caliph al-Muhtadī, who succeeded at the end of Radjab 255/July 869, granted an amnesty to all those who had taken part in disturbances or had usurped power, and he wrote in this sense to Isā b. al-Shaykh, ordering him to hand over the money which he was keeping in Egypt and other countries. Isā refused, and kept the proceeds from the taxes for himself, thus making himself financially independent. According to al-Kindī (The Governors and Judges of Egypt, ed. Guest, 214), he embezzled a sum of 750,000 dinārūs. No doubt it is to this episode that Ibn al-Mu'tazz was alluding in his hādīqa (uṣūl) in praise of al-Mu'taṣid, when he states (verse 41 ff.) that Isā and his son (that is to say Ahmad, see below) are robbers, that they never give a single coin to the caliph and extort money from their subjects. The caliph al-Mu'tamīd in 256/870 sent emissaries to him, to demand this money. Isā replied that he had used it to pay his troops. He was then offered the governorship of Armenia on condition that he recognised al-Mu'tamīd, which he had not hitherto done. Isā consented, thinking that he would be able to retain Syria while at the same time becoming governor of Armenia. In fact, Isā al-Mu'tamīd did not keep to the new ruler of Egypt, Ahmad b. Tābūn (from September 868), to expel Isā b. al-Shaykh from Syria, he himself sent an army commanded by the Turk Amādūr, who was appointed governor of Damascus. In the battle which he fought outside Damascus, Isā b. al-Shaykh lost his son al-Manṣūr who was killed, and he himself was defeated and fled to Armenia by the coast road (256/870, or, according to al-Ya'qūbī, 257/871).

The governorship of Armenia no doubt also included Diyar Bakr in Džāzira and Aḥdarbāyjān. In Armenia, Isā b. al-Shaykh responded to an appeal from the Arab colonies established in the Lake Van region, the 'Uṯmānīdīs (Uṯmānīkī) and the Kaysīs (Kaisīkīkī), who were threatened by Aḥsūt Argrūnī, prince of Vaspurakan, who was about to besiege Amīwīk, a fortress of the 'Uṯmānīdīs on the shore of the lake. Thanks to his armed intervention, the siege was raised. An agreement was reached, and Isā b. al-Shaykh went to Aḥdarbāyjān where he established one of his officers, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wāḥīd al-Tamīmī al-Yamālī (cf. Yākūt, ii, 58, 740), whom the Armenian historians call Yamānik or Ermēnik. In Armenia, which was partitioned between the Bagratūnīs and the Argrūnīs and which was in fact independent, the authority of Isā b. al-Shaykh diminished constantly, and all the more when his deputy in Aḥdarbāyjān revolted against him, thus involving him in a fruitless struggle for a whole year, probably in 877-8; afterwards, he had to return to "Syria" (according to the Armenian historians), that is to say to Āmid in Diyar Bakr. In fact, in 266/879-80 there is no record of his presence anywhere save in that province. Although the Armenian historians consider that he remained governor of Armenia until his death in 266/882-3.

In 266, he was involved in hostilities with Isāk b. Kūndādžīk (Kūndādžīk: see Markwart, Südarmenien, . . ., 315, n. 4), who was claiming the governorship of the Džāzira and some neighbouring territories and who was established in Mosul. Ibn Kūndādžīk was in conflict with a powerful Kūndādžī movement, one of whose leaders was Isāk b. Ayūbūt of Nasītnī, supported by the Taghībīs Hamdān b. Hamdūn (for incidents see M. Canard, H'amādnīses, 294 ff.). Ibn Kūndādžīk won a victory over them, but Isāk b. Ayūbūt sought the help of Isā b. al-Shaykh of Āmid and of Abu 'l-Maghra ibn Mūsā b. Zurāra of Arzān; defeated by this new coalition, Ibn Kūndādžīk returned to Mosul. There, he received from the caliph the governorship of Mosul, Diyar Rabi'a and Armenia. In view of this strengthening of their adversary's forces, Isā b. al-Shaykh and Abu 'l-Maghra determined to seek peace by offering Ibn Kūndādžīk a tribute of 200,000 dinārūs, on the condition that they retained their possessions. After refusing at first, Ibn Kūndādžīk later accepted, when threatened with a renewal of hostilities. Nevertheless in the following year, 267, a coalition of his various enemies, Kūndādžīs and others, was once again formed.
A battle took place in Ramadan 267; April-May 881: Ibn Kundadjik was the victor and pursued his foes as far as Amid, then returned, leaving a contingent outside Amid to lay siege to Isâ b. al-Shaykh. Some indecisive battles were fought. Isâ b. al-Shaykh died in 268/882-3, and Ibn al-Athir, in placing his death at this date, still described him as governor of Armenia and Diyar Bakr, but we do not know what part he played in Armenia between 267 and 269. It is possible that he may have received some measure of influence, for Ibn Kundajdik seems to have had there and in 269 he is described by al-Tabarî (ii, 2037) merely as governor of Mosul and Diyarza. Moreover, following the attempted flight of al-Mu'tamid which was foiled by Ibn Kundadjik, the latter went to receive the regent, al-Muwaffak, the governorship of Syria which was foiled by Ibn Kundadjik, the latter went to receive the regent, al-Muwaffak, the governorship of Syria and the Tulunid lands, and from then onwards all his efforts were aimed at gaining control of the Syrian possessions of the Tûlûnids. Ahmad b. Isâ b. al-Shaykh succeeded his father as ruler of Diyar Bakr where, like him, he was almost independent and was regarded by the historians, like many other princelings of the time, as exercising power ʿalâ sabîl al-taghallub (through usurpation). Ahmad was never officially governor of Armenia, but nevertheless he played a part in the affairs of the country. His ambition, incidentally, was to extend his possessions to the furthest possible limits and even to make himself master of the whole of Armenia. To this end, he seized the fortress of Mardin, which dominates the plain of Diyarza, from Muhammad b. Ishâk b. Kundadjik, the successor to Isâ b. al-Shaykh (d. 278/891-2) as ruler of Mosul and Diyar Bakr. In about 890, after taking Abu ʿl-Maghraʿ Ibn Mâsâ b. Zurâž prisoner, he occupied Arzanene in Armenia in 895 or 896. The king of Armenia, Sembat Bagratuni (verses 177-80). But it seems doubtful whether, to escape death, he contemplated crossing the Curopalatine the son of David, Ahmad b. Isâ took possession of the whole territory of Taron, in 895 or early in 896. The king of Armenia, Sembat Bagratuni (890-914), requested Ahmad b. Isâ to restore Taron to its lawful possessor, promising Ahmad that he would secure for him his own position as governor of Armenia. When Ahmad refused, Sembat gathered an army, but he was defeated in a battle to the south-west of Lake Van in which Gagik Arzruni, prince of Vaspurakan, who was in league with Ahmad b. Isâ, betrayed Sembat. Thus Ahmad b. Isâ remained in possession of Arzanene and Taron, which were added to Diyar Bakr. Moreover he endeavoured to win the trust of the caliph. When al-Mu'tadid had demonstrated the full extent of his power to the Khâridjîs and rebels, by his expedition in 280/893-4 against the Banû Shaybân and Mosul, Ahmad b. Isâ complied readily with the request made to him by the caliph, on his return to Baghdad, that he should send him all the money he had taken from Ibn Kundadjik, and indeed he included numerous presents, in addition to the money. At the same time he appointed a Khâridjî who had fled to Amid and whom he had taken prisoner. This submissiveness on the part of Ahmad is noted in the kasida of Ibn al-Mu'tazz in praise of Al-Mu'tadid (verses 177-80). But it seems doubtful whether, to escape death, he contemplated crossing into Byzantine territory and becoming a Christian, as Ibn al-Mu'tazz claims in the same passage.

Although he was not a governor of Armenia, it was Ahmad b. Isâ, who, in the time of al-Mu'tamid, was entrusted in 887 with the task of carrying the royal crown to the new king of Armenia, Ashot I, for it was certainly not his father Isâ (d. 882) who was charged with this mission, as might be inferred from the account of the Armenian historian John Catholicos who confused the son with the father (see Vasmer, Chronologie..., 99-100 and Thodpschian, Die inneren Zustände..., 123).

Ahmad b. Isâ b. al-Shaykh died in 285/898. His history formed the subject of a detailed account by Al-Mas'âdî in his lost work Aḫḫâr al-ʾamān (see Muradî, viii, 112).

His successor as ruler of Amid and the other territories he held, still ʿalâ sabîl al-taghallub, was his son Muhammad who built the minaret of the principal mosque of Mayyâfârîkîn. With him was to end this minor Shaybânî dynasty of Diyarza. In 286/899, al-Mu'tadid decided to have Ahmad brought back under his own authority, and for this purpose set out with a large expeditionary force, accompanied by his son the future al-Muktafi. Muhammad shut himself up in the town which was besieged from April-May until June 899. Siege engines were used on both sides. Finally Muhammad surrendered, begging for clemency for himself and his men as well as for the inhabitants of Amid, which was granted. He was treated with consideration by the caliph, who made him a ceremonial gift of clothing, but he was taken away to Baghdad, where he was imprisoned. This imprisonment was not a long sentence and it was for the purpose of sending him as a messenger to his son Al-Muktafi. Muhammad was given the Tāhridîs' palace as his residence in Baghâd. In Muharram 287/January 900, the vizier Ubayd Allâb b. Sulaymân discovered that he was planning to escape. He informed the caliph, who ordered the vizier to have Muhammad arrested. The historians do not record what became of him after his arrest.

In the 4th/10th century a figure appears named Ahmad b. ʿAbbâs b. Isâ b. al-Shaykh, a worthy if somewhat dull-witted fellow who, during the vizirate of Ibn al-Furat, was the victim of a practical joke which had been granted him as something entirely natural. The vizier let the matter rest, and it went no further. It seems that the man in question was a person whom al-Mu'tadid sent to Muhammad to ask him to surrender; in this passage, an aunt of the rebel, a talented poetess, advises her nephew to obey the caliph. She herself wrote a letter to al-Muʿtadid, in verse. The caliph admired her talent, and this influenced his decision to treat his prisoners generously. Muḥammad b. al-Şâbî was given the Tāhridîs' palace as his residence in Baghād. In Muharram 287/January 900, the vizier Ubayd Allâb b. Sulaymân discovered that he was planning to escape. He informed the caliph, who ordered the vizier to have Muhammad arrested. The historians do not record what became of him after his arrest.

In the 4th/10th century a figure appears named Ahmad b. ʿAbbâs b. Isâ b. al-Shaykh, a worthy if somewhat dull-witted fellow who, during the vizirate of Ibn al-Furat, was the victim of a practical joke which had been granted him as something entirely natural. The vizier let the matter rest, and it went no further. It seems that the man in question was a person whom al-Muʿtadid sent to Muhammad to ask him to surrender; in this passage, an aunt of the rebel, a talented poetess, advises her nephew to obey the caliph. She herself wrote a letter to al-Muʿtadid, in verse. The caliph admired her talent, and this influenced his decision to treat his prisoners generously. Muḥammad b. al-Şâbî was given the Tāhridîs' palace as his residence in Baghād. In Muharram 287/January 900, the vizier Ubayd Allâb b. Sulaymân discovered that he was planning to escape. He informed the caliph, who ordered the vizier to have Muhammad arrested. The historians do not record what became of him after his arrest.
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ISA B. AL-SHAYKH — ISAF WA-NA'ILA

Mecca before Islam. Several orientalists of the last century, such as Rudolph Krell and Francois Lenormant, saw in them, not unreasonably, replicas of Ba'alam and Ba'al. Indeed Isaf and Nallia do display the essential characteristics distinguishing this pair of gods from the many avatars known in the various Semitic religions: physical representation by two sacred stones erected close to each other, or by two parallel hills; symbolic representation of the fertility of living beings and of the earth; and the euhemeristic expression of the myth of divine lovers such as those of Hippomenes and Atlanta in Greek mythology who dared to embrace in the temple of Demeter and were changed by her into a pair of lions harnessed to her chariot. Certain details of the legend of Isaf and Nallia recall the myth of the loves of Adonis and Astarte, avatars of Ba'alam and Ba'al.

These characteristics stand out from the material from which the stories about these idols are composed, although these stories are clearly conceived with an edifying aim. Thanks to this laudable aim this pagan legend had come down to us through the early Islamic sources.

Hishām al-Kalbī (d. 204/819 or 206/821), to whom we owe the preservation of numerous traces of pagan Arabia, reporting a saying attributed to Ibn 'Abbas, transmits this legend to us in its most basic form (K. Al-Asndm, ed. and tr. W. Atallah, Paris 1969, 6; cf. Klinke-Rosenberger, Das Göttentuch, Leipzig 1941, 6 and 18): Isaf b. Ya'ālā and Nallīa bint Zayd, both of Djurhum (cf. other genealogies in Aghānī, xiii, 109), originally from the Yemen, were passionately in love. They came on pilgrimage to Mecca and, finding themselves alone for a moment in the Ka'ba hidden from view, committed fornication there (fadjarā bihā); according to another opinion reported in Aghānī, loc. cit., they only embraced (khabalakā). They were immediately changed into stones (fa-musitha—a verb usually meaning metamorphosis of a man into an animal, as in the myth of Hippomenes and Atlanta, but the context requires, and the same author goes further on and other sources add, hadjarayn), and were erected there on the spot. They were worshipped by Khūzā'a, Kuraysh, and all the pilgrims.

It seems that originally these two sacred stones were separated: one adjoined (bi-līsh) the Ka'ba, the other on the site (fi mawdī) of the well of Zamzam. Kuraysh reunited them close to Zamzam and they slaughtered the sacrificial victims nearby. But al-Azraqī (Akbhār Makkā, ed. Wistenfeld, 49) places them at the foot of al-Safā and al-Mārwa, the two parallel hills separated from the Ka'ba by the depression of Mecca.

According to the same author (78), 'Amr b. Lubayy, the Khūzā'a reformer of idol worship in Arabia, also set up two idols on these two hills: Nahik Mudjawīd al-Rib on al-Safā and Mudīm al-Tayr on al-Marwa. These two divine epithegs could have referred to Isaf and Nallīa and to the Ba'alam and Ba'al which they stood for, according to their significance, the first for the winds and the rain, the second to a godess of fertility assuring the birds of the valley of their subsistence (cf. details in Panthōn, 107). If this hypothesis is correct, the agricultural character of this pair of gods, already suggested by their Yemeni origin, will be confirmed. Their relationship with Zamzam and the meanings suggested for their names would reinforce this confirmation. Indeed the Hebrew 'āsf (to store up, to gather) and the Aramaic mawgly (to receive gifts) suggest that Isaf and Nallīa,
positioned at Zamzam where the treasure of the sanctuary was stored, received the offerings and kept guard over them (detail in Pamukkon, 108).


ISAMİİ, the Isagoge of Porphyry (see FURFURIYÜS). According to Şâ'îd al-Andalusî (Tabâbât al-umân, ed. Cheikh, Beirut 1912, 49, tr. Blachère, Paris, 1935, 101), it seems that Ibn al-Mukaffa' [q.v.] was the first person to translate this text: an introduction to logic into Arabic. The Fihrist (i, 244), on the other hand, maintains that it was Ayyûb b. al-Rakkî, who based himself on a Syriac translation. Among the Arabic adaptations of the Isagoge we possess that of Abu 'l-Hasan Ibrâhîm b. 'Umar al-Bikâtî al-Shafi'i (see Brockemühl, S II, 177). With a commentary by al-Sânûsî (ms. Algiers no. 1362) and that of al-Abbarî, which is the best known and most commented upon; al-Abbarî's adaptation of the Isagôgê was put into verse by al-Akhkhari [q.v.]. On the translation by Dimasâkî and the commentary by Ibn al-Taîyyîb, see FURFURIYÜS. (ED.)

ISAIAH [see SHA'YA].

ISAKCA, a place in modern Rumania, the origins of which go back to antiquity, known in the Middle Ages as Obluţica. In the time of the Turks it was a fortress of great strategic importance, serving them as a base from which to attack Moldavia and later, for their campaigns against Poland. As early as 889/1484 Bayezid II with his troops had crossed the Danube by a bridge near Isâkçâ and conquered Kilia (Kili) and Cetatea Alba (Ak Kermân). The Ottoman government gave particular attention to the upkeep of the fortress and the provision of supplies for the garrison. Isâkçâ constituted an important transit centre for cereals and livestock sent from Wallachia and Moldavia to Istanbul, and for merchandise going in the opposite direction.

The centre of a hâlat in the 11th/12th century, Isâkçâ was not very large, with a population, according to Ewliya Celebi, composed of Wallachians, Moldavians, Greeks, Armenians and Bulgars. The port was the centre of a very active river traffic. The local traders and the State Treasury received considerable revenues from the taxes and port dues. There was also some trading in Isâkçâ; the shops were fairly numerous, but there was no bezîstân. The whole market, together with the fortress, the inn, the mosque, the 'îmâret and the baths was the uâ'd of the kaşâvân Hasan Paşa. In the 11th/12th century it was his heirs who were receiving the revenues.

In the course of the Russo-Turkish wars of the 18th and 19th centuries Isâkçâ was occupied more than once by Russian troops advancing, by way of Dobrudja, towards the Ottoman territories in the Balkans.


**ISAR-DĀS** (or IṢḤAWA-DĀS), one of the two Hindu historians of the reign of Awrangzib (q.v.), was a Nāagascar Brahman of Pa tán (Nahrawāl or Ahnala-wa fa (q.v.) of Muslim historians. Born in 1066/1655 he seems to have received a good education in Persian language and belles lettres at his native town. Up to 1068/1658 he was employed, most probably, as letter writer and scribe, with the Ḫādi Sālāshī al-Islām b. Ḫādi ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, who was Ḫādi al-ʿaṣbār from 1086/1675 to 1068/1658. On account of certain differences with the Emperor Awrangzib, Sālāshī al-Islām resigned his post and went on the Pilgrimage to Mecca in Mubarram 1065/December 1658. Isar-Dās having thus been thrown out of employment sought service with Shādīʿat Ḵān, the governor of Gūdarzāt from 1068/1658 to 1113/1701, who employed him as an amin (revenue collector) of certain mahals in the *pargana* of Dīḍōhpūr (q.v.). It was here that he came to develop friendly relations with the Rāthors, who presented some features of the religious and state policies of the emperor, and ultimately procured the submission of Dūrgādās Rāthor, the rebel chieftain of Dīḍōhpūr. He successfully performed the diplomatic mission, with which he was entrusted by Shādīʿat Ḵān, of recovering the young princess ʿṢafyāt al-Nīsa, a daughter of Awrangzib’s son, Muhammad Akbar, from the custody of the Rāthors, with whom her father had left her when he fled to Persia in 1099/1687 following his unsuccessful rebellion in 1092/1681. For this service to the imperial household the emperor raised his rank from 200 to 250 horsemen and also awarded him a robe of honour (ḡīrā). His immediate master Shādīʿat Ḵān, too, conferred upon him the ḡīrā (q.v.) in addition. Some historians (not Meerut, near Delhi, as stated by Storey, i, 587) thereafter nothing is known about him, except that he lived at least to the age of 75.

His only claim to fame rests on his Persian work *Futūḥāt-i Ḵalangar* (still in Ms., Rieu, *CPM*, i, 269 a. (A. S. Bazmi Ansari))

**ISAWA, ʿISA WIIYA, collective name (sing. ʿISAWI) denoting the confraternity or “path” (tarīka) founded at the beginning of the 10th/16th century by Shaykh Muhammad b. Ḥūṣain al-Sufyānī al-Muhītarī (other ethnics—al-Miknāsī, al-Fāhri or al-Fahdī), named “the Perfect Master” (al-shāfiʿī al-Mukhtārī) 1565-7, 1574-9 (A. S. Bazmi Ansari)

The founder.—Stripped of the very abundant growth of hagiographic legend, the biography of Sidi Ibn ʿĪsā consists merely of a number of well-established facts. Born in 842/1447-8 in Sūs or Ḫarb, probably of a family of Idrīsid ḡarīfs (though this connection is disputed by some historians, including al-Salāwī), he applied himself to Qur’ānic studies from a very early age and travelled with his father, a man of great piety and modest circumstances, through the north of Morocco among the Banū Sūfīyan, the Banū Mūkhtār (where he married) and the Banū Ḥasan; he stayed in Fās and then in Miknās where he attached himself to an eminent teacher of mysticism, Shaykh Ahmad al-Hārīthī al-Sufyānī, a šīfī of Shāhīyya (q.v.). *Dīsūlīyya* obedience. After the death of this teacher, to complete his education he went to two other contemporaries of al-Dīzūlī (q.v.), Sidi ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Tabbā of Marrāḵush, and Muhammad al-Saḡīr al-Shīʿī, of Ḵandāḵ al-Zaytūn (a suburb of Fās), who taught him the Dālāʿīl al-khayrāt in detail. Having finally settled at Miknās, he taught in the chief mosque of the town and then, since a constant stream of disciples came to him, attracted by his saintliness, he bought a property which he set up as a ʿakfī for use as a cemetery and where he had the ʿawwāya built which still exists. It was there that he was buried after his death, which took place in 939, 932 or 933/1538-9.

Sidi Ibn ʿĪsā was an accomplished mystic “whose asceticism and devotion were unassailable” (R. Bruneel) and whose love of God was combined with constant practice of the virtues and a charity that communicated itself to others. Gifted with an aptitude for penetrating men’s thoughts, he also possessed remarkable powers of persuasion andutherland, west of Aḏīmā, and modest circumstances, through the north of Morocco among the Banū Sūfīyan, the Banū Mūkhtār (where he married) and the Banū Ḥasan; he stayed in Fās and then in Miknās where he attached himself to an eminent teacher of mysticism, Shaykh Ahmad al-Hārīthī al-Sufyānī, a šīfī of Shāhīyya (q.v.). *Dīsūlīyya* obedient. After the death of this teacher, to complete his education he went to two other contemporaries of al-Dīzūlī (q.v.), Sidi ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Tabbā of Marrāḵush, and Mohammad al-Saḡīr al-Shīʿī, of Ḵandāḵ al-Zaytūn (a suburb of Fās), who taught him the Dālāʿīl al-khayrāt in detail. Having finally settled at Miknās, he taught in the chief mosque of the town and then, since a constant stream of disciples came to him, attracted by his saintliness, he bought a property which he set up as a ʿakfī for use as a cemetery and where he had the ʿawwāya built which still exists. It was there that he was buried after his death, which took place in 939, 932 or 933/1538-9.

Sidi Ibn ʿĪsā was an accomplished mystic “whose asceticism and devotion were unassailable” (R. Bruneel) and whose love of God was combined with constant practice of the virtues and a charity that communicated itself to others. Gifted with an aptitude for penetrating men’s thoughts, he also possessed remarkable powers of persuasion and  }
Dissemination and organization of the *tariqa*. Ibn Ḥusayn īsā had great numbers of disciples, six hundred of whom were said to have achieved the state of perfection; particularly prominent among them is the figure of his immediate successor, Abu ʿl-Rawāʿīn. This man belonged to the class of Sūfis known as “the reprehensibles” (*malāmāt*īyā [q.v.]), who conceal their wisdom beneath an extravagant exterior. He never married and, even today, women avoid approaching his tomb, which is situated alongside that of his master, for fear of a curse. He was given the name al-Muhadhdhib (the Contest) on account of his anti-Sufi; he was a hot-headed and violent man; he used to contrive to sell to some rich or powerful man a town or a whole territory to which he had no claim whatsoever; anyone who refused to pay him this strange tribute found himself struck down with some misfortune; if on the other hand he completed the transaction, God granted him the advantages promised by the Saint, who, indeed himself distributed as alms the sums of money thus acquired. Abu ʿl-Rawāʿīn played an important part in supporting the first Saʿdīs in their struggle against the Portuguese, in preparing the way for their proclamation as sultans in Marrākush (951/1544), and later in stirring up the people of Fās against the Wāṭṣāsids. After his death (963/1556), control of the *tariqa* reverted to the descendants of Ibn Ḥusayn and remained with them by hereditary succession. Thereafter the Īsāwī hardly appeared on the political scene.

During the actual lifetime of the founder, several *zawiyas* were founded outside Miknās, one of them at Figuig (south-eastern Morocco), from which the confraternity spread out towards Algeria and Tunisia. According to various censuses and estimates, the *Tariqa* Īsāwīyya at the present day is said to include about 50,000 active members divided as follows:

Morocco: according to Drague (1939), 21, 592 affiliated members, 3,181 of these being in the region of Miknās; but, in the opinion of Brunel (1926), Miknās alone included "more than ten thousand affiliated members of both sexes"; numerous *zawiyas* in the whole country, particularly in Fās, Tiṭwān, Tangier, in all the towns on the Atlantic seaboard, in Tāzā, in the Rif, the Tafillāt, etc.—Algeria: approximately 4,000 members and about a dozen *zawiyas*, including those at Blida and Uzara (Dépt. of Algiers), Remjal and Tiemcen (Dépt. of Oran), Bōne, Bougie and Constantine.—Tunisia: according to H. R. Idris (Initiation à la Tunisie, Paris 1950), 11,290 members and 87 *zawiyas*—Other *zawiyas*, in Libya, Syria, Cairo and Mecca.

The *Tariqa* Īsāwīyya possesses a fairly homogeneous though decentralised structure. A superintendant (*mazār*), chosen from the founder’s descendants and confirmed by the makkānīs, administers the mother-*zawīya* of Miknās and divides the income from it between the *dāyāk*’s descendants living in Miknās and Fās, but it is in fact the *mukaddam* of the mother-*zawīya* who exercises the spiritual authority and the principal temporal functions in Miknās, while the *awādī al-dāyāk* perform the same functions in their respective *zawiyas*. There is consequently a division of authority, and also very pronounced individual differences in the practices of the order. Every year, however, a meeting is held in Miknās when the Īsāwī of all lands come together at the tomb of their patron saint at the time of the *mawlid*, the anniversary of the Prophet’s birth. It is then that, for three days, one can witness the processions, the ecstatic dances, the blood-stained feasts (*frisā* and *fakīr*-like performances which have fascinated and often shocked observers. (A detailed study of the *mawlid* ceremonies has been made by Brunel; a literary but fairly accurate description appears in the novel of H. Ard, Colette Breyer au Maroc, Paris 1937, 91–101).
The dances often end in displays of fakirism in which the disciples, apparently anaesthetized, walk on glowing coals, take burning brands in their hands and between their lips, swallow fragments of broken bottles or strike themselves with swords.

Particular practices.—The explicitly devotional character of the teaching of Ibn 'Isâ and the dynamics of the ṣâdqa ḳâsîyya (the sessions for invocation and dancing) favoured the spread of the jârîka among the common people—artisans in the towns, Berbers in the country, negro slaves brought back from the Sudan by Sultan Ahmad al-Ḏâhabi at the time of the Timbukto expedition (1591) and grouped together at Miknâs by Mawliy Ismâ'llî after 1672. In the course of this expansion, the confraternity absorbed a certain number of local customs (in particular, borrowings from Berber carnivals) and survivals of ancient pagan or animistic worship which gave it a highly individual aspect. The most characteristic elements of this magico-religious complex are as follows:—a) the horror of black, which is revealed only during festivities and which sometimes incites affiliates to throw themselves on persons wearing clothing of this colour, strip off their garments and tear up the material;—b) the wearing of the gâtîyya, a kind of mat of plaited hair, which is worn very long and grown only from the top of the cranium, the remainder of the head being shaved;—c) the practice of healing by the recitation of formulae, by trampling the sick man under foot, or by placing the patient in contact with snakes;—d) the association with snakes which are regarded as a friendly race, with whom al-Ṣâykh al-Kâmil is said to have concluded a pact; this allows a special category of affiliates, the ḫânâyshâ, to charm these creatures, to heal the bites they inflict and even to grant to others immunity from their venom;—e) the practices of conjuration and exorcism, for which the jâlîyyâ uses a flat basket, the māḏīmâ al-asâydd or "assembly of the Great Masters", on which are placed pebbles, shells, and various other objects representing protective saints and familiar djinns; according to the relative position in which these objects are found, the magician foretells the future or makes a diagnosis; to cure a patient who is nervous or possessed, he can order him to drink the blood of a newly sacrificed animal;—f) representations of animals. In each jâlîyyâ, a certain number of fukârâ' embody some animal species whose behaviour they mimic in a very realistic manner, particularly during feasts and a kind of repentances. The animals thus represented are: lions and lionsesses which, with jackals and panthers, have a part in some ritual feasts (frisâ), during which they lacerate an animal, a sheep or goat, sacrificed earlier, tear it to pieces, smear themselves with the blood of this and eat the raw flesh; wild boars (halâfî) and dogs which come face to face in ferocious fights; cats, which perform thefts and acrobatic feats; camels, which carry enormous burdens and do not hesitate to devour cactuses, thistles and barley; lastly, hyenas, gloomy carnivorous creatures which appear more rarely. If the existence of these animal clans seems to derive from agro totemism (Van Genep, Religion, Mœurs et Légendes, Paris 1908), the elements of communal sacrifice have nonetheless been profoundly changed, particularly in a moderating sense, by Islamic influence. It has also been noted (Brunel) that, for the idea of filiation stemming from an animal ancestor, there has been substituted that of a covenant (fâkîd), on account of the baraka of Sidi Ibn 'Isâ: thanks to his domination (baṣārūf) over created beings, this man succeeded in achieving in his jârîka a kind of fraternity between men, animals and djînn.—g) Finally, many ḳâsîyya meetings have their own, the ʿašâr or mock pharmacist, who amuses everyone with his ridiculous stories and behaviour.

The unusual aspects of the Ṭârîka ḳâsîyya have not failed to arouse the indignation of the anti-mystical 'ulamâ' and to stir up lively criticism. An expression of such views is to be found, for instance, in an order which the 'Alawid sultan Mawliy Sulaymân caused to be read in all mosques in Morocco in 1815 and which stated in particular: "Cast far from you the moussem... and these innovations... Times have been fixed for these practices and considerable sums are thus spent for love of Satan. The people devoted to these innovations, the Alissaoua, the Ħilâla and other confraternities attracted to novelty and error, folly and ignorance, hasten to them."

(quoted by Drague, 89-91). As for the attitude of an elite among the Šâfîis, of a gnostic contemplative tendency, this is well illustrated by the case of the Algerian shâykh Ibn 'Aliwa [q.v.] who was himself an 'Isâwi before becoming an affiliate of the Đârâkâwâ [q.v.]: while recognising the authenticity of the 'Isâwi mystical teaching and the excellence of the masters in the Ṭârîka, Ibn 'Aliwa regrets that affiliates should attach so much importance to the search for prodigies and to the practices of fakirism (cf. M. Ling, A Moslem saint of the twentieth century, London 1961, 50-1). This opinion is corroborated by the works of rientalists who have made a close study of the ḳâsîyyâ. Bibliography: The fundamental work still remains the monograph of R. Brunel, Essai sur la Confrérie religieuse des ḳâsîyya au Maroc, Paris 1926, which takes into account not only all the earlier works, in particular those of Cat, Delphin, de Neveu, Depont and Coppolani, Doutté and above all L. Rinn (whose Maraboutes et Kouhans, Algiers 1884, chap. XXI contains translations of texts not reproduced by Brunel), etc., but also some printed Arabic sources (the Istikîlsa of Salâwi, the Salâwa al-anfâs of Dja'far al-Kittâni, among others) and several unpublished manuscripts. It is only possible here to refer the reader to the bibliography contained in this work (p. vii-x).

Among the more recent studies, that of E. Dermenghem in Le Culte des Saints dans l'islâm maghrébin, Paris 1954, 303-18, is of special interest in that it allows some of Brunel's overzealous criticisms of the Ṭârîka of Algeria to be rectified. The text contains abundant extracts from the liturgical formulæ used at meetings and includes interesting musical notations (from Léo-Louis Barbiès in R. Afr., 1951). Consult also the following works:—P. J. André, Contribution à l'étude des Confréries religieuses musulmanes, Algiers 1956; A. Bernard, La religion musulmane en Berbérie, Paris 1938; G. Drague, Esquisse d'histoire religieuse du Maroc, Paris 1951, passim.

(J. L. Michon)
'ISAWI [see NAŚARA].

AL-'ISAWIYYA, a Jewish sect, the followers of Abū 'Isā al-Isfāhānī (q.v., also known as 'Obḥadya and 'Obḥedel. The sect is also referred to as the 'Iṣḥābiyya.

Abū 'Isā was the leader of a Jewish uprising, which occurred either in the reign of the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, as is reported by the Karaites, or in the reign of the last Umayyad caliph as is stated by al-Shahrastānī (followed on grounds of general probability by I. Friedlaender). On the available evidence no definitive solution can be given to this chronological problem.

Abū 'Isā claimed to be a prophet (nabi: al-Kirḵānī) and, as al-Shahrastānī puts it, one of the five messengers (rusul) of the expected Messiah (al-masīḥ al-munīqār), charged by God with the deliverance of the Children of Israel. Al-Birūnī too refers to his describing himself as a messenger of the Messiah (al-ʿAḏaḥ al-Bāḥiy[a], ed. E. Sachau, 15). Al-Shahrastānī also mentions that Abū 'Isā considered that "the missionary" (al-dāʿi; it may be legitimate to consider that he referred to himself) could be regarded as, in a sense, identical to the Messiah, a conception reminiscent of the doctrines of certain extremist Shiʿī sects. There can be hardly any doubt, however, that Hadadī's statement that he put forward the claim to be the Messiah is due to a misapprehension. In proof of his prophethood, his partisans adduced the fact, that, in spite of being illiterate (ummi, a word used by Muhammad), he produced books and scriptural scrolls (mushaf). At the head of his followers he joined battle with soldiers of the Caliphate and was killed (or as his followers reported, vanished in the cleft of a rock). The number of his followers (who were few to begin with) dwindled constantly. In Kirḵānī's time (4th/10th century) there were approximately twenty in Damascus and possibly also a few in 'Isfahān. Those who were personally known to Ibn Ḥazm were probably not members of the sect in the strict sense of the word.

According to Kirḵānī, Yūḏghān, who was regarded by his followers the Yūḏghāniyya) as the Messiah, was reported to have been a disciple of Abū 'Isā.

Abū 'Isā taught (in common with other Jewish sects, for instance, the Mosŏkhāniyya, said to stem from the Yūḏghāniyya) that Jesus and Muhammad were true prophets, each of whom was delegated to bring a distinctive law to a community of his own—in the case of Muhammad to the Arabs. But in spite of their prophethood, the observance of the Mosaic law continued to be incumbent upon the Jews. In consequence of this thesis Muslim theologians such as al-Bākīllānī and 'Abd al-Kāhir al-Baghdādī discussed the question whether the 'Isawīyya, who believed in the prophethood of Muhammad and whose beliefs authorized them, according to al-Baghdādī, to profess the shahāda, could be regarded as Muslims; their answer was negative. Al-Kirḵānī mentions that Abū 'Isā promulgated a prohibition against drinking wine and eating meat and al-Shahrastānī speaks of his forbidding the eating of any animal's liver. He also prohibited divorce.

Friedlaender finds points of similarity between the 'Isawīyya and Shiʿī sects and to some extent his remarks may be valid (see also above), but they do not account for the strange fact that on the one hand Abū 'Isā showed great regard for the rabbinical interpretation and observance of the law (and in consequence the Rabbanites allowed the members of their community to intermarry with the 'Isawīyya; al-Kirḵānī, i, 52) and that, on the other hand, Abū 'Isā acknowledged the prophethood of Jesus and Muhammad. A possible explanation might be that the 'Isawīyya stemmed from Jewish Christians, i.e., from a community which believed in the validity of Mosaic law and considered Jesus as a prophet. For some members of such a community the acknowledgement of the prophethood of Muhammad after the advent of Islam need not have presented insuperable theological difficulties. The existence of Jewish Christians in Jerusalem at the time of Muḥāmmed is attested by contemporary evidence. In al-Hazm's statement, contradicted by other sources, that the 'Isawīyya believed that Jesus was a prophet sent to the Children of Israel, would, if accepted as correct, reinforce this hypothesis. This hypothesis could account for Abū 'Isā's prohibition of divorce (which is compared by al-Kirḵānī with the similar Christian ordinance) and for the fact that the Yūḏghāniyya, the followers of Yūḏghān, who is reported to have been a disciple of Abū 'Isā, appears to be classified by Muḥšahar al-Maḏdisī as a Christian sect (al-Baghdādī wa 'l-ta'rikh, ed. C. Huart, reprinted Tehran 1942, iv, 42, 46; the reading Yūḏghāniyya necessitates a very slight emendation). Abū 'Isā's description of himself as a rasīl of the masīḥ may be a transposition of the Christian nomenclature referring to Christ and the apostles.


'ISBA' (a.), also 'IṢBA', "finger", as a measurement of length the breadth of the middle joint of the middle finger, conventionally one twenty-fourth of the cubit, dihrāʾ. See dihrāʾ, penultimate paragraph and bibliography. (Eo.)

In Arab navigational texts 'isba' is unit of measurement of star altitude (fīlm al-kiyās). Latitude on the Ocean was indicated by the altitude of certain stars, usually the Pole Star or one of the Bears, above the horizon at certain times. Complete tables of Pole Star, Little Bear and Great Bear altitudes of ports in the Indian Ocean are given by Arab navigational texts and partial tables of altitudes of the Southern Cross and several other stars. The 'isba' was considered to be the angle subtended by the width of a finger held at arm's length against the horizon. Four fingers, i.e., the measurement of one hand (the thumb could not be used) were one qaṣāh, a word of unknown origin. The qaṣāh was the width of the standard measuring instrument, the ḥawqabat al-arabāʾ and a universal standard could be obtained by comparing the stars α and β Aurigae which were 4 'isba' apart. The 'isba' was divided by the navigators into eighths known as zam, which was a "watch" of 3 hours. It is explained in the navigational texts of Ibn Maḏjd and Sulaymān al-Mahrī that a ship sailing one zam due north raised the Pole Star 4 'isba', therefore assuming that the average ship sailed one
isba due north in 24 hours. A tirsfa was the distance sailed on any rhumb to raise the Pole Star's altitude one isba and varied according to the rhumb. A tirsfa due north or south was 1 isba.

The actual value of the isba in terms of European measurements varied somewhat. Originally it varied with the finger of the navigator, but by the time of the surviving Arab navigational texts (1450-1513) the isba had become standardized. There were however variations, which may have been national or regional, and other variations in the stellar altitude of a particular port may have been due to inaccurate observation. The standard measurement used by the Arabs was 224 isba in 360° (i.e., 1 isba = 1°36') but this was a figure of convenience, for it made 7 between each rhumb of the compass rose and 8 to each lunar mansion. Sulaymān al-Mahrī used the fact that the diameter of the circle made by the Pole Star round the Pole was 4 isba (the navigator's usual figure) and showed by astronomical means that this was 69°, degrees. Therefore 1 isba was 1°7/3 degrees (1°43') or 210 in 360°. However for practical purposes he used the figure of 224 in 360°.

European scholars have followed up the equation given that the Pole Star's polar distance is 2 isba and produced values. Prinsep, allowing for precession, gave values for the year 1394 of 1°36' and for 1500 of 1°35'. Ferrand working for 1500 produced the figure of 1°45'. The Arabs however never gave an epoch to their figures—most of their figures were probably inherited from previous centuries and not all from the same time, so that it seems fruitless to speculate too much on actual values of the measurement.

Bibliography: G. Ferrand, Instructions nautiques et routiers arabes et portugais, Paris 1921-8; i and ii contain the texts of Ahmad ibn Maḏjid and Sulaymān al-Mahrī; iii "Introduction à l'astronomie nautique arabe", contains the theory of L. de Saussure and Ferrand. J. Princep, Note of the nautical instruments of the Arabs, in J. Asiatic Soc. of Bengal, 1836, 784-94, attached to Hammer-Purgstall's translation of the work of Sidi Celebi "Extracts from the Moḥišt, that is the Ocean, a Turkish work on navigation in the Indian seas", in J. As. Soc. Bengal (1834-39). G. R. Tibbetts, Arab navigation in the Indian Ocean before the coming of the Portuguese (forthcoming).

IṣFĀHĀN (in Arabic Isbahan), a town and province in Persia, whose name, according to Hamza al-Iṣfahanī, means "the armies" (Māfarrukhi, Kiāb Maḥāsin Iṣfahan, ed. Sayyid Djalāl al-Dīn Tīhrānī, Tehran n.d., 56).

I. HISTORY

The province, whose precise boundaries have varied at different times, is bounded on the north-east and east by the central desert. In the south-east by Yazd and Fārs, in the south and south-west by the Bakhtrīyār mountains, with peaks rising to over 12,000 ft., in the north-west by Luristan, Kazzāz, Kama, and Mahallāt, and in the north by the districts of Dīwāshakān and Natanz, which have an elevation of 5,000 ft., with peaks rising considerably higher. Under the Sassanians it was an important province, holding a central position (Chr. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhagen 1944, 506). Hurnuza, when consulted by 'Umar b. al-Khāṭṭāb on his plans for further conquest, advised him to march on Iṣfahan, which he compared to the head whose fall would be followed by that of the two wings, Aḏharbāyядān and Fārs (Balashūrī, Fīṣāh, Cairo 1957, ii, 371-2; Abū Nuʿaym, Geschicke Iṣbahans, ed. S. Dereden, Leiden 1931, i, 21; Māfarrukhi, 6). Balʿamī likened Fārs and Kūr to the two hands of Iṣfahan and Aḏharbāyядān and Ravy to its two feet (Taṛg̣uṃa-i taʿrīkh-i Taḥbār, ed. Mubammad Djalāl Maḥkūrī, Tehran 1959-60, 326).

After the Arab conquest Iṣfahan formed part of the province of the Dībāl, which corresponded to the earlier Media, and which became known in the 6th/12th century as ʿīrāk-i ʿAqlam (G. Le Strange, The lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 5, 185). According to Hammāz, Iṣfahan extended from Hamadan to Nīḥawān from Ravy and Kūmīs to Fārs and Kuṭahān, and consisted, in pre-Islamic times, of three uštāds, 120 tasājī, 5,000 villages, and 7 cities. Four of these became ruined, the province then comprising two hūras, 27 rustāks, and 3,313 villages. When the Arabs came, two more cities were ruined, leaving only Dijāy (Abū Nuʿaym, 14). In 189/804-5 Hārūn al-Raḍīd separated the hūra of Kūm from Iṣfahan, which consisted of four rustāks, from Iṣfahan together with what he added to it from the rustāks of Hamaḏān and Nīḥawān, after which Iṣfahan consisted of 23 rustāks (Abū Nuʿaym, 14; Hasan b. Muhammad b. Ḥasan Kūmī, Taʿrīkh-i Kūm, translated by Hasan b. Ṭabī b. Ḥasan b. Abū al-Malik Kūmī, ed. Sayyid Djalāl al-Dīn Tīhrānī, Tehran 1935, 24-5, 28 ff., 57, 101). Al-Muʿtaṣim made further changes, constituting Karaj into a kūra, taking four rustāks from Iṣfahan and some estates from Nīḥawān and Hamadan, after which Iṣfahan consisted of 19 rustāks, 1 kūra, and 2,500 villages (Abū Nuʿaym, 14).

Under the Mongols the province of Iṣfahan contained three main cities, Iṣfahan, Fīrānān in the bulūk of Līngān, and Fālīfān in Rūdāsh, and consisted of 8 bulūks, and 400 villages, together with many cultivated lands belonging to these villages. The bulūks were Dijāy (which included the town of Iṣfahan and its environs), with 75 villages, Karajīrī with 23 villages, Kūhāb with 40, both to the south of the town, Barān with 80 villages and Rūdāsh with 60 to the east, Burkhār with 32 to the north, and Mārīn with 58 and Līngān with 20 to the west (Hamd Allāh Mustawfī, Nistung-i Ḥakīm, ed. G. Le Strange, The Eastern Persian Irak, London 1919, 48, 50-1). In the 12th century Iṣfahan formed an extensive province divided into 9 bulūks, the ninth being Karāvan, north of Līngān, 8 makhālī, namely Rār, Kiyār, Mizadār, and Gandūmān (which together formed Cāhār Māhīl), Šīlmīrūm, Dājrāyā, Ardīstān, and Kūhābā (south of Ardīstān, and east of Iṣfahan, on both sides of the Zāyanda-rūd river), two makhām, Nadīṣfābād and Kūmīshā (the modern Shahrīdārī), and 5 makhās, Čądāgūn, Varzak, Tīh-bīḵārī, Gūrūdī, and Gīnūrūdī, which together formed Fīrānān (Muhammad Mīhīd b. Muhammad Riḍā al-Iṣfahanī, Nisf-i ighān fi taʿrīf al-Iṣfahan, ed. Manūcir Sūṭūdā, Tehran 1962-3, 21-2, 296-336; A. Houtum-Schindler, Eastern Persian Irak, London 1898, 125-9). The number of villages in all the bulūks except Karajīrī and Barānān, which had declined, and Rūdāsh, which was unaltered, had increased by the 19th century (Hasan b. Ḥasan b. Ḥasan an Nāṣīrī, Taʿrīkh-i nisf-i ighān va hamān-i īṣbān, lith., n.d., 168 ff.). Under Riḍā Shāh Iṣfahan was reduced to a district or sub-province (ṣahrīsān) and formed part of the Tenth Ustān, which also included, as separate ṣahrīsānāt, Shahr-i Kurd, Shahrīdārī, Fīrānān, Yazd, Ardīstān, and Nān (Hasan b. Ablīdī, Iṣfahan az ighāz-i īṣfrān-i ja va iberīsān, Iṣfahan 1956-7, 6). Its population according to the census of 1319 (A.H.S./1941-2 was 240, 598. By 1956-7 the
population of the shahristān, which comprised the town of Isfahan, Sīdēh, Fālāvarqīān, Nagātalabad, and Kūhpayān (Kūhpāya), was 850,027 (ibid., 53).

Physically and climatically Isfahan is a varied province ranging from the mountain districts of Fīrāydūn and Čahār Mabaill, with their extensive pastures where transhumance is practised, the plateau in the north and north-west where oasit-farming prevails, the immensely fertile riverain plain of Isfahan, and districts in the east and north-east bordering the Kūhān. Rainfall is heaviest in the mountain districts of Fīrāydūn and Čahār Mabaill, where it is c. 10 inches with heavy snowfalls in winter. In the town of Isfahan the annual rainfall is c. 5 inches and falls mainly from November to April. The prevailing winds are north-west in winter and south-east in summer. Temperature varies with altitude. Extremes of heat and cold occur in August and January. In the mountain districts the cold is intense in winter, but the heat is not very great in summer. In the neighbourhood of the town of Isfahan the seasons are extremely regular. The mean monthly maximum temperature in the town in August is 36.1° C. and the mean monthly minimum temperature in January is -2.2° C. Humidity is low. Outbreaks of plague are recorded in 3247 and 810/1407-8 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 290), and 423/1031-2, when 4,000 people died (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 290), and 810/1407-8 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 290), and 810/1407-8 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 290), and 810/1407-8 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 290).

Except in Fīrāydūn and Čahār Mabaill, where dry farming is practised, all cultivation is irrigated by river water, kāndī, or wells. Water in the Isfahan plain is found at a depth of 12-15 ft. (Muhammad Mihdī, 85). In recent years a large number of machine-operated wells have been sunk, which has been a contributory factor in the lowering of the water-table which has taken place. The Zayanda-rūd River, or Zanda-rūd (also called by Ibn Rusta, Māfarrūghī and others the Zārin-rūd), which rises on the eastern slopes of the Zardān Kūh, receives various tributaries from Fīrāydūn and Čahār Mabaill and then flows south-east through the town of Isfahan and finally disappears in the Gāvkhūn marsh (Gāvkhōnī) to the east of the town. Between Linjān, where the Zayanda-rūd enters the Isfahan plain and the Gāvkhūnī, it waters the bukhārī of Linjān, Mārbin Dījar, Kārānjī, Barānī, and Kūhān, by means of 105 canals, known locally as madīrī. The original distribution of the water was attributed by Ibn Rusta to Ardāshīr b. Bābak (155). The modern division of the water goes back, according to tradition, to Shāh ‘Abbās. Between Linjān and the Gāvkhūnī the river was crossed by twelve permanent and two temporary bridges. Below the last of these at Varzana there are three dykes or dams for the purpose of raising the water to irrigate the land on either side. One, the Band-i Marvān, was built in Umayyad times (Ibn Hawkal, ii, 366-7; Muhammad Mihdī, 76-7; 94-104; Hutūm-Schindler, 17-18; Husayn Khān Tabwīstdīr-i Isfahan, Dwergbrājīya-ye Isfahān, ed. Manzīlīr Shuṭūh, Tehran 1964-5, 37 ff.; A. K. S. Lambton, The Regulation of the waters of the Zayanda Rūd in BSOAS, 1(3) (1937-9), 663-73). In 1954 a tunnel connecting the Zayanda-rūd with the Rūdān was opened at Kūhrang, which materially increased the flow of water in the Zayanda-rūd. This plan was first conceived by Shāh Tahmāsp. His successor, Shāh ‘Abbās, began to cut through the mountains near Kūhrang, but the work was abandoned before completion. New plans were made during the reign of Rūdān-Shāh to tunnel through Kūhrang in order to join the two rivers (‘Abbīdī, 74). In 1970 the Shāh ‘Abbās the Great dam was opened in the Kavand district. This dam enables the flow of water to be regulated throughout the year so that surplus water no longer flows into the Gāvkhūn marsh, which was reported to be drying up.

Many of the early Islamic geographers, Māfarrūghī, his Persian translator, Husayn b. Muhammad b. ‘Abī ‘l-Riḍā ‘Āvī (Tājūnīma-i Mahānān-i Isfahan, ed. ‘Abbās Ikbāl, Tehran 1949-50), and numerous other writers speak of the excellent climate, fertility and abundant crops of Isfahan. These included wheat, barley, millet, opium, which became an important export in the 19th century (Curzon, Persia and the Persian question, London 1892, ii, 42; Muhammad Mihdī, 125), rice (in Linjān and Alīnīān), cotton, tobacco, various oils, pulses and legumes, beet, madder, saffron, many kinds of vegetables and herbs, melons, grapes, fruits of various kinds, almonds and nuts (Ibn Hawkal, i, 363-7; Mukaddasī, 386-9; Iskākhī, 198-200; Husayn Khān Tabwīstdīr, 43 ff.; Shaykh Dībarī Ansārī, 168 ff.; Muhammad Mihdī, 19-20, 113-25). The Isfahanī peasant is known for his thrift and good farming (A. K. S. Lambton, The Persian Land Reform, London 1950, 145). Animal manure, sewage and pigeon manure collected in pigeon-towers, a characteristic feature of the landscape of the Isfahan plain, noted by many travellers (see Curzon, ii, 19-20), have traditionally been used in agriculture round Isfahan. Hām Allāh Mustawfī mentions excellent pastures in the neighbourhood of Isfahan (Nuzhat, 49). In many parts of the province flocks are a supplementary source of livelihood, and in Fīrāydūn and Čahār Mabaill the main source. From these two districts abundant meat supplies also were available to Isfahan. Formerly horse-breeding and mule-breeding were important in Čahār Mabaill (Shaykh Dībarī Ansārī, 182-3), and camels were kept in the Ardistan district (ibid., p. 191). Rugs and carpets are woven in different parts of the province. Isfahan was also noted for its textiles (cf. Olearius, The voyages and travels of the ambassadors of the emperor of the Romans, translated from the Latin by E. H. Cubitt and F. A. Jones, Oxford London 1669, 225), armour and brass-work. Small mineral deposits were formerly worked in Kūhistan and Taymara (Abū Nu‘aym, i, 32; Māfarrūghī, 18, 39), but had fallen out of use by the second half of the 19th century (Muhammad Mihdī, 20).

The city of Isfahan, situated on longitude 31°35 east and latitude 32°40 north at an altitude of some 5,200 ft. above sea-level, is an old foundation, originally on the village of Dījar, otherwise called Shahrīstān or Shahrīstānā, two miles to the west of which was Yahudīyya, where Jews are supposed to have been settled by Nebuchadnezzar (Schreiber, Rev. des Études Juives, xii, 259; Ibn al-Fakhrī, 261), and under Yazdīgīr 1 at the request of his Jewish wife Shōshandūkht (E. Blochet, Liste des villes, para. 54 in Recueil des travaux, xvii, 1895; J. Marquet, Érafān, 29). Ancient legends, transmitted by Ibn Rusta, attribute the building of the citadel to Kay Kānūs [q.v.]. Yahudīyya later became the centre of the city while Shahrīstān became a suburb.

The province of Isfahan, in view of its central position, has experienced most of the vicissitudes undergone by Persia since the Arabic conquest. The population is nevertheless remarkably homogeneous, apart from certain well-marked geographical areas, notably Fīrāydūn and Čahār Mabaill, which are inhabited chiefly by Bahāḥīyyāt tribes [q.v.], and small Jewish
and Christian minorities mainly in the town of Isfahan. For the rest the various settlers brought in by different dynasties which successively ruled the province have been absorbed into the local population (cf. Husayn Khan Taluvidar, 91-2). Jews, as stated above, have been settled in Isfahan from ancient times. Benjamin of Tudela, writing in the 6th/12th century, states that there were 15,000 Jews in the town (Elkan Adler, Jewish Travellers, London 1930, 33). By the 9th century their numbers had fallen. Curzon puts them at only some 2,000 Armenians in Djulfa (Curzon, ii, 120). W. J. Fischel, Isfahan, the story of a Jewish community in Persia, in The Joshua Starr Memorial Volume, New York 1953, 111 ff.). Under Shah 'ABBâS Armenians were brought from Djulfa and settled south of Isfahan in a suburb which came to be known as New Djufla. Towards the end of the 11th/17th century their numbers reached 30,000. After the fall of the Safawids, because of oppression and persecution, their numbers were greatly reduced. In 1889 there were only some 2,000 Armenians in Djulfa (Curzon, ii, 51-3). L. Lockhart, The fall of the Safavid dynasty and the Afghan occupation of Persia, Cambridge 1938, 484-5). Small settlements of Armenians and Georgians in Firaydan and Cahar Maâzâb are also said to go back to the time of Shah 'ABBâS (Curzon, ii, 284).

Isfâhâni Jews are noted for their vigour, quickness of intellect and good craftsmanship. Mâfarrukhi states that the best Isfâhânîs were very good but the bad very bad (21). Husayn b. Muhammed b. Abi 'l-Ri<la AvI also mentions their intelligence and skill as craftsmen (78; cf. also Muhammed Mihdi, 126). Al-Kawzânî similarly praises their craftsmanship and learning in fiqh, adaâb, astronomy and medicine (Athdr al-bildd wa-lakhbdr al-'idâb, Beirut 1960, 297). Mâfarrukhi relates that the best Isfâhânî troops, especially those of Firaydan, over all others (42).

The city has produced many scholars, divines, and literary men (for accounts of these see Abu Nuaym; c. 320). They performed their religious duties very exactly (Nuzhat, iii, 108). Curzon, writing in the late 19th century, gives an unflavourable account of the Isfâhânîs. He alleges that they enjoyed an unenviable reputation for cowardice and morals, and were niggardly and close in business matters, and that the lâjfs of Isfâhân were regarded as the biggest blackguards in Persia (ii, 43).

Isfahan in the early Islamic centuries. There are two versions of the capture of Isfahan by the Muslims. According to the Kufan school, it took place in 160/676. On the other hand, 'AbbâS b. 'Ibân marched on Dayr, which was commanded by one of the pâdhâgosân of the Persian empire (see Noldeke, Gesch. der Perser und Araber, etc., 151, no. 2; cf. Christensen, L'empire des Sassanides, 57), who, after several battles, capitulated on condition that âyiya was replaced by an annual tribute. Tâbari gives the date as 21/641-2 (ed. Leiden, i, 2637 ff.). The Baqrân school state that in 23/644 Abî Mûsâ al-Ashârî [q.v.], after Nakhâwand, took Isfahan, or that his lieutenant 'AbbâS b. Bu'ayl received the capitulation of the town on the usual conditions of the establishment of khârîâdi and âyiya (Balaghuri, Futûk al-bulûd, Cairo 1957, ii, 383-4; on these varying versions see Caetani, Annali, v, yr. 23, para. 4-23). Mâfarrukhi states that the âyiya and khârîâdi of Isfahan in the first year of the conquest amounted to 40,000 dirhams. Under the Patriarchi Caliphs and the Umayyads, Isfahan came under the jurisdiction of the governors of Basra and 'Irâk, who usually appointed the governors of Isfahan. It did not entirely escape the disturbances committed by the Khârîjîs. In 68/687-8 the town was besieged by the Azârizka branch, who were defeated by 'Ibâb b. Wârqa and fled to Pârs and Kirman. From 75/694 Khâhâlî b. Yûsuf [q.v.], who had become governor of 'Irâk, appointed governors over Isfahan. During his governorship there appears to have been some settlement by Banû Tanmîn in accounts of these, Banû Kayes in the rustâk of Anâr and Taymara, Banû Ana in Djapalak and Barkûd, and Ashâris in Kumidân, the rustâk bordering Ravy and Kumûs (Ta'rîkh-i Kumûs, 264). Arab settlement in Ardistan also traditionally goes back to early Islamic times, and in the late 9th century the Ardânis still traced back their genealogy to some Arab ancestors (Shâykh 'Abdâr Anâfî, 191).

In 127/744-5 'AbbâS b. Mu'allîyya, the 'Alîid rebel, seized Isfahan and held it for some two years until he was put to flight by 'Amir b. Dâbrû, who recovered Isfahan for the Umayyads. After the 'Abbâsîd revolt broke out in 130/747, Kâfîtaba, Abû Muslim's general, defeated an Umayyad force in the neighbourhood of Isfahan and in 131/748-9 a second and larger force under 'Amir b. Dâbrû was defeated near the town. From 132/749-50 'Abbâsîd governors were appointed over Isfahan. On the whole, the history of Isfahan under the early 'Abbâsâs appears to have been uneventful, apart from its abortive seizure in 138/755-6 by Djumhûr b. al-'Idîlî, who rebelled against al-Manşûr. Under Hârûn al-Râshîd, as stated above, Kumûm was separated from Isfahan in 189/805-6. Its khârîâdi after 90 was amounted to some 12,000,000 dirhams (Ta'rîkh-i Kumûs, 31). After the civil war, Isfahan became part of the government of Hasan b. Sahîl. In 201/816-7 and 202/817-8 there was a severe famine. Whether this had anything to do with an apparent decrease in the revenue or not, it had fallen to 10,500,000 dirhams in the year 204/817 according to Kudâma (von Kremer, Culturgeeschichte, ii, 337). In 221-2/836-7 it was still lower, being only 7,000,000 dirhams according to Ibn Khurra'di'bîb
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This may, perhaps, have been due in part to the fact that about 218/833 the Khurramid movement, which had caused dislocation in Ghur-
bāyđān for many years, spread to Isfahan. An army sent by al-Mu'tašīm put the disturbances down. According to Ya'qūbī, the revenue had again risen towards the end of the century to 10,000,000 dirhams (ibid., 377) while Ibn Rusta puts it at over 30,000,000 dirhams (154).

In 253/867 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Abī Dulāf was appointed vizier of the government of Isfahan, which remained in the hands of the Banū Dulāf until 288/895-6 when al-Mu'taḍīd seized Ibn Abī Dulāf's property (Ibn al-Athīr, vii, 327). In 260/873-4 Yahyā b. Harthama appears to have reassessed Isfahan (Ta'rīkh-i Kūmul, 183). In the following year, Isfahan passed briefly under the control of the Șaffārīd, Ya'qūb b. Layyūm. The Banū Dūlaṭ, who had been reinstated, continued, however, to hold the government of the province, as they did also under 'Amr b. Layyūm, who succeeded in 265/879. In due course, when al-Muwaṭṭāfīk felt strong enough to move against 'Amr, he ordered Abūmād b. 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Abī Dulāf in 271/884-5 to attack 'Amr. The latter was defeated and Isfahan once more came under the control of the caliphate. In 284/897-8 'Abī b. Șīsā was sent to the Qīblābīl and ordered to reassess Isfahan and abrogate the assessment (darāyir) of the previous year. Hārīm of Qīrrāt (Ibn Rusta, 184-5) Ibn Rusta, who lived in Isfahan and probably wrote his account of the town about 290/903, described Diyār as measuring half a league across and covering an area of 2,000 șarībs (ca. 600 acres). It had four gates and 100 towers (152).

'Abū Allāh b. Ibrāhīm al-Mīsmārī, who had been appointed governor in 290/902-3, rebelled in 293/905-7 with the support of Kurds from the mountain regions to the south-west. He was subdued by a force sent by al-Muṭṭadīd under Bādr al-Hammāmī, who became governor of Isfahan (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 9). The latter was succeeded by 'Abī b. Waḥṣūdān, the Daylāmī, who, when he was appointed governor of Fars in 309/922-3, also became governor of Isfahan. In 301/913, Isfahan passed for a brief period under the nominal rule of the Șāmānīs, but in 304/916-7 it was taken under Abūmād al-Șālīk, during whose tenure of office Hamīd, the vizier of al-Muṭṭadīd in 307/919-20, farmed the bahrājīs of Isfahan on a mukāta'ī contract. In 311/923-4 Abūmād rebelled but was defeated and killed.

The Būyīds. A troubled period now began for Isfahan. In 315/927 Mardwāji b. Șīrāzī took the city and appointed Abūmād b. Kayghulūgh governor. In 316/928 the Daylāmī Lashkārī took Isfahan from Abūmād, who subsequently recovered the city and killed Lashkārī (The eclipse of the Abbāsīd Caliphate, ed., tr. and elucidated by H. F. Amedroz, Oxford 1921, iv, 239-40). Muṭṭaffār b. Yaḳūbī, whom al-Muṭṭadīd had appointed governor of Isfahan in the same year, does not appear to have gone there (ibid., 236). Mardwāji also repeatedly returned to the city where he billeted large numbers of troops. Some two years later in 321/933 'Abī b. Būya Ṭimād al-Dūlaṭ, who had been Mardwāji over Kārāj, took Isfahan, but retired when Mardwāji sent his brother Wūṣhmīr against him. In the same year al-Khārīr appointed Muḥammad b. Yaḳūb governor of Isfahan after he had written to Mardwāji bidding him to evacuate the city in return for recognition as ruler of Rayy and the Qīblābīl, and to Wūṣhmīr to retire from Isfahan. Al-Khārīr was deposed shortly afterwards (ibid., 307). Mardwāji retained Isfahan and in the following year, after 'Abī b. Būya had seized Fārs and his brother Abūmād had occupied Kīrman, set out again for Isfahan, where he was assassinated by his Turkish troops. 'Abī b. Būya and his brother Hasān Rūkn al-Dawla then occupied Isfahan, turning out Wūṣhmīr. The latter recovered Isfahan in 327/938-9, but in the following year Ṣanūn retook it and continued to rule it until his death in 366/976, though a Șūrūsī force under Mānṣūr b. Karāṭeqīn temporarily took the city in 359/ 950-1. In 343/954 Isfahan again suffered a Șūrūsī incursion, and was plundered by Bāb al-Caghān.

On the death of Rūkn al-Dawla Isfahan went to his son Muṣfīyīd al-Dawla, who, from 367/977, ruled as 'Abūd al-Dawla's subordinate. He was followed in 372/982-3 by his brother Fakhr al-Dawla. The latter died in 387/997, and was succeeded by his four-year-old son Maḥdī al-Dawla, whose mother became the effective ruler of the kingdom. Maḥdī al-Dawla, resenting her mother's interference, made an abortive attempt in 397/1006 to throw off her control. In the following year ʿAlī al-Dawla Abū ʿDjafar Muḥammad b. Dushānīnīzīr, the maternal uncle of Fakhr al-Dawla's wife, became governor of Isfahan, which he ruled intermittently until his death in 433/1041-2. He was turned out by the Būyīd, Ibn Fūlād, in 407/1016-17 but regained the city in 411/1020-1. In 418/1027-8 he was besieged for four months by 'Abī b. Vakīrīn, the vizier of Fakhr al-Dawla, who, from 416/1025, ruled al-Dawla. In 420/1029 he lost Isfahan to Mas'ūd b. Māḥmūd the Șajnadīst. Having appointed a governor over the city, Mas'ūd went away, but when the Isfahanīs rose and killed the Șajnadīst governor, he returned and massacred a large number of the inhabitants. In the following year ʿAlī al-Dawla recovered the city, but Anṣhārīvān b. Kābūs, with the help of Șajnadīst troops, put him to flight. In 423/1032 he returned to Isfahan and in 424/1032-3 Mas'ūd gave him the government of Isfahan in return for a sum of money. In the following year ʿAlī al-Dawla was again defeated by a Șajnadīst force. He retired to Fīraydān and Khānsār. After collecting reinforcements he retook Isfahan in 427/1035-6.

In spite of repeated disorders in Būyīd times, Isfahan became a flourishing and extensive city, especially during the vizirate of Ismāʿīl b. Muṣfīyīd al-Dawla and Fakhr al-Dawla (Māfarrukhī, 40). The Tabārā or Tabarak quarter was added by the Būyīds, its fortress being built according to tradition by Rūkn al-Dawla or Muṣfīyīd al-Dawla. In 429/1037-8 ʿAlī al-Dawla built a wall round the city, for which purpose he laid heavy impositions on the people (Māfarrukhī, 81, 113). The city under the Būyīds contained splendid private and official residences, stables, baths, gardens, and fine well-stocked bazaars (Māfarrukhī, 83 ff.). Ibn Ḥawkāl mentions the wealth and trade of Isfahan and its export of silks and textiles to other provinces. No other city between ʿIrāk and Șūrūsī except Ṣayyāf had more trade. There was a Friday mosque in Shahristan and Yahūdīyya, which was more than twice the size of the former and bigger than Hamādān (ii, 362-3; Ṣayyāfī, 298-9; Le Strange, 203-4; Șulād al-'Ālam, translated and explained by V. Māfarrukhī, London 1937, 131). Māfarrukhī records that formerly nearly 2,000 sheep and goats and 100 head of cattle were slaughtered daily in Isfahan (86-9). If these figures are at all accurate, even allowing, in view of the high prosperity, for a much heavier meat consumption than in later times, the population, on a conservative estimate, would have been over 100,000.

The Sālidūks. During the reign of Maḥmūd, the Ghuzzīs had begun to move into Persia. They
were active to the north and north-west of Isfahan but do not appear to have penetrated to Isfahan itself, though in 430/1039-8 'Ali b. al-Dawla marched from Isfahan against bodies of Ghuzz who had been operating in the neighbourhood of Dinawar and defeated them (Ibn al-Athir, ix, 217). It was not until some years after the battle of Dindinkan (431/1040) that the Saljuqs took Isfahan. In 434/1042-3 Tughril Beg advanced on the city. Farāmurz, who had succeeded 'Ali b. al-Dawla in the previous year, bought him off and agreed to read the khutba in his name (Ibn al-Athir, ix, 349). Farāmurz later allied himself with the Böyid Abū Kâlîdî and omitted Tughril's name from the khutba. In 438/1046-7 Tughril once more advanced on Isfahan and on this occasion laid siege to the city. Farāmurz submitted, agreeing to pay an annual tribute and to read the khutba in Tughril's name, but once Tughril left the district he again withdrew his allegiance.

In 442/1050 Tughril besieged the city for the second time. It fell after nearly a year, in Muharram 443/1051 (Ibn al-Athir, ix, 385). Tughril appointed a young Nishapûri over the city and ordered that no taxes should be demanded for three years. His conciliatory policy was successful. The city rapidly recovered its prosperity and those who had been scattered abroad during the years of disorders and famine returned to Kâšî-î Khushn, the site of the old wall of Khân Lindjân in 444/1052, wrote that there were secure and at peace and went about their own business. Speaking of Isfahan, he states that it was the most populous and flourishing city that he had seen in Persian-speaking lands. Describing the thriving condition of the town, he states that it had a large Friday mosque and many bazaars, including one occupied by 100000 farsaks of a city in which many merchants were to be found. The town had a strong wall with battlements, said to be 3½ farsaks in circumference; the quarters of the town were divided from each other by gates (Safarînâma, ed. C. Schefer, Paris 1881, Persian text, q2-3).

Tughril Beg is alleged to have been much attached to the city. He moved his capital there from Rayy and made it his chief residence for the last twelve years of his reign. He spent over 500,000 dinârs on public buildings and improvements in the city and its environs (Mâfarûkî, 101). It continued throughout the Great Saljuq period to be one of the main centres of the empire and to be directly administered (whereas much of the empire was alienated from the control of the central government as iqtâ’s). Alp Arslân also treated the people of Isfahan with favour (Mâfarûkî, 101-2). Malikshâh received the caliph's investiture as wâli al-'âdâ there in 454/1061-2 (Ibn al-Athir, x, 48). On the death of Alp Arslân, Kâwurd b. Çâgûrî Beg, in an abortive attempt to assert his claim to the throne, briefly occupied Isfahan. During the reign of Malikshâh, Isfahan reached great heights and became an important Sunni centre (see A. Bausani, Religion in the Saljuq period, in The Cambridge History of Iran, Cambridge 1968, v, 283-302). Both he and his vizier Nizâm al-Mulk exerted themselves in its development. Mâfarûkî relates that it was exempted during the reign of Malikshâh from jizma and takhsîf and extra-ordinary dues. Announcements to this effect were made in the mosques and tablets put up at the gates and on the walls of the bazaars (103-4). The Gulbâr quarter, in which is situated the square now known as the MayẢdârî Kuhna, with government offices and residences was added. New mosques were built and additions made to old ones, notably the old Friday mosque (see A. Godard, Historique du Masjid-i-Jam'â d’Isfahan, in Âjâb-i Irãn, i, ii, and iii, 1936-8; A. Gabriel, Le Masjid-i Djoum’a d’Isfahan, in Ars Islamica, ii, 1933). A fortress was made in Diz Kûh (Shâhûdiz) where Malikshâh kept his armoury and treasury. Nizâm al-Mulk built a Nizâmîyya in the Darâshî quarter. The annual revenue of the property which he constituted into waqf for it was over 10,000 dinârs (Mâfarûkî, 104-5). According to Hûsânî b. Muhammad b. 'Ali, 'Abd al-'Âdâd the madrasa was still in existence in 729/1328-9, but its endowments had been usurped (p. 142).

With the death of Malikshâh in 485/1092, Isfahan ceased to prosper, though as the capital of the empire its possession was of importance to those who contended for power. The townspeople were probably not closely engaged in these struggles, but it is likely that the prevailing insecurity and the coming and going of troops dislocated their lives to some extent and engendered discontent. The balance between order and disorder in the city was always delicate, as the following incident which happened about this time shows. A report was spread that a certain blind man, alleged to be a Bântî, had lured unsuspecting people to their death. The populace rioted and seized and burnt all who were accused of being Bântîs (Ibn al-Athir, x, 214-5). This did not, however, end the activities of the Bântîs. Ala'î b. Nâgî-î Attâsh, the dâ'î, had laid the foundations of the movement carefully during the reign of Malikshâh, and in the disorders following his death the movement spread.

Tâdî al-Mulk and Turkân Kâtûn, Malikshâh's wife, read the khutba in Baghdâd, where Malikshâh had died, in the name of her four-year-old son Mûammad and hastened to Isfahan. Barkyarûk, the son of Zubaydâ Kâtûn, who had been seized by the supporters of Turkân Kâtûn, but later freed by the Nizâm mamlâks, left the city on the approach of Turkân Kâtûn, but subsequently returned and besieged her there (ibid., x, 146-7). In 497/1094, on the sudden death of Turkân Kâtûn, who had meanwhile distributed to her followers all the treasure and stores which had been accumulated in Isfahan, Barkyarûk re-entered the city. He remained in possession for some years, although not always in it, his absent from it for about 500,000 dinârs on rebellions in other parts of his empire. From about 490/1097, however, when the struggle with his half-brother Mûammad began, his position in the city was no longer secure. In 492/1098-9, after numbers of his army had deserted to Mûammad, he was refused entry and forced to retire to Khûzûtân (ibid., x, 153). The struggle between the brothers continued for the next five years or so, during which time the Bâtîns greatly increased their power in Isfahan and the neighbourhood. Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Malik 'Attâsh, who had succeeded his father as dâ'î at Isfahan, obtained entry to the fortress of Shâhûdiz (according to one account as schoolmaster to the garrison), won them over and seized the fortress. By 494/1100 the Bâtîns were collecting taxes in their neighbourhood and had also gained possession of the fortress of Khân Lindjân. Barkyarûk, who had remained loyal, accused of Bâtînî sympathies, now decided to move against the Bâtîns. The Shâhî'î bâdî, Abu 'l-Kâsim Khudjandî, roused the populace, and a large number of persons accused of being Bâtîns were rounded up and burnt (ibid., x, 214-5). The Bâtînîs, however, remained in possession of Shâhûdiz.

In 495/1102, Mûammad, having been defeated near Rayy by Barkyarûk fled to Isfahan, where he was besieged by his brother for some nine months. During this period he was forced twice to ask loans of...
the prominent people of the city to satisfy the demands of his troops (ibid., x, 228). When the city finally became short of food, Muhammad escaped and fled to Adharbaydjan, where he was pursued by Borkyaruk (ibid., x, 227-8). The struggle continued until 497/1103-4 when peace was made and Borkyaruk returned to Isfahan (ibid., x, 253-4). On Borkyaruk’s death in the following year Muhammad re-entered the city (ibid., x, 273). One of his first tasks was to reduce the Batinis in Shiahdiz and the neighbourhood. For some time Ahmad b. A’ta’i negotiated successfully to be chief of the garrison, and it was not until 500/1107 that a capitulation was agreed to. Some of the garrison accepted a safe conduct, but the remainder fought to the end. Abbad was finally captured, paraded through the town and skinned alive (see further M. G. S. Hodgson, The order of the Assassins, The Hague 1955, and idem, The Isma’ili state, in The Cambridge History of Iran, v, 422-82). There does not appear to have been any renewal of Batin activities after this apart from isolated incidents, such as the burning of the Friday mosque and its library in 515/1122-2, which was attributed to them (Ibn al-Athir, x, 420).

From 500/1106-7 until Muhammad’s death in 512/1121-2 Isfahan remained the main centre of the Great Saljuk empire. Thereafter power moved to Khurassan, where Sandjar ruled as the Great Saljuk sultan, while Isfahan and the western provinces were disputed by the Saltjukis of Trak and their atabegs. There were renewals of sectarian strife, notably an outbreak in 560/1164-5 between the Khudis and their atabegs. Isfahan changed hands several times in the subsequent campaigns between the caliph and the Khwarazmshah. In 623/1226 the Mongol armies under Djurmaghun reached the city and countryside (BanakatT, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 183 ff.). When, during Timur’s second expedition to Persia in 786-7/1384-5, the Muzaffarid Zayn al-Abidin b. Shah Shudjuk refused a summons to join him, Timur marched on Isfahan, which he reached in 789/1387. The ‘ulama’ sued for peace. Timur sent mukhassils into the town to collect the money which they had promised. A riot ensued in which the mukhassils were killed, together with many soldiers who had entered the town on their own affairs. Timur in retaliation massacred 70,000 of the inhabitants (Nizam al-Din Shamil, Zaflarnima, ed. F. Tauer, Prague 1937, i, 104-5). Although he was unable to sustain his victory, Isfahan remained one of the main centres, however, in Fars and Kirman, and their rule did not restore Isfahan to its central position. The city was besieged several times and frequently changed hands (Mu’in al-Din Natanz, Muntakhab al-tawdrtkh, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 183 ff.). When, during Timur’s second expedition to Persia in 786-7/1384-5, the Muzaffarid Zayn al-Abidin b. Shah Shudjuk refused a summons to join him, Timur marched on Isfahan, which he reached in 789/1387. The ‘ulama’ sued for peace. Timur sent mukhassils into the town to collect the money which they had promised. A riot ensued in which the mukhassils were killed, together with many soldiers who had entered the town on their own affairs. Timur in retaliation massacred 70,000 of the inhabitants (Nizam al-Din Shamil, Zaflarnima, ed. F. Tauer, Prague 1937, i, 104-5). Although he was unable to sustain his victory, Isfahan remained one of the main centres, however, in Fars and Kirman, and their rule did not restore Isfahan to its central position. The city was besieged several times and frequently changed hands (Mu’in al-Din Natanz, Muntakhab al-tawdrtkh, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 183 ff.). When, during Timur’s second expedition to Persia in 786-7/1384-5, the Muzaffarid Zayn al-Abidin b. Shah Shudjuk refused a summons to join him, Timur marched on Isfahan, which he reached in 789/1387. The ‘ulama’ sued for peace. Timur sent mukhassils into the town to collect the money which they had promised. A riot ensued in which the mukhassils were killed, together with many soldiers who had entered the town on their own affairs. Timur in retaliation massacred 70,000 of the inhabitants (Nizam al-Din Shamil, Zaflarnima, ed. F. Tauer, Prague 1937, i, 104-5). Although he was unable to sustain his victory, Isfahan remains one of the main centres, however, in Fars and Kirman, and their rule did not restore Isfahan to its central position. The city was besieged several times and frequently changed hands (Mu’in al-Din Natanz, Muntakhab al-tawdrtkh, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 183 ff.). When, during Timur’s second expedition to Persia in 786-7/1384-5, the Muzaffarid Zayn al-Abidin b. Shah Shudjuk refused a summons to join him, Timur marched on Isfahan, which he reached in 789/1387. The ‘ulama’ sued for peace. Timur sent mukhassils into the town to collect the money which they had promised. A riot ensued in which the mukhassils were killed, together with many soldiers who had entered the town on their own affairs. Timur in retaliation massacred 70,000 of the inhabitants (Nizam al-Din Shamil, Zaflarnima, ed. F. Tauer, Prague 1937, i, 104-5).
In addition to land and property taxes, dues and tolls, the people were subject to ad hoc levies, while many local officials, such as the mirāb (ibid., xvi, 4, 432), collected dues and fees as the whole or part of their emoluments. Drafts on the revenue were common practice and certain sums, especially for the payment of officials of the central government, were made a charge on different groups of taxpayers.

For example, a large sum was levied on the Armenians of Diawilha (in Djufla) on account of the inšān-i kamaṣā of the amir shirābdshī (ibid., xvi, 1-2, 89). These practices were known under different governments, but were less widespread than under the Safawids.

The craft guilds were assessed by the nakib al-āghrāf (q.v.) in lump sum, which was subsequently allocated among the individual members of the guilds by the wakf dar Ḥasan, subject to the acceptance of the assessment by two-thirds of the members. The nakib al-āghrāf also appointed the elders (ruḥāṣfādān) of the dervishes and certain other guilds (ibid., xvi, 4, 418). Some of the guilds performed corvées for the court and some from time to time were granted exemptions from taxation (Tavernier, 239; Chardin, iv, 95, vi, 119-20; A. K. S. Lambton, The late medieval period, an inaugural lecture, School of Oriental and African Studies, London 1954, 22 ff.; Gandjina, 434-6, for a firman of Shāh ‘Abbās dated 1038/1629 inscribed in the Shāh mosque in Isfahān forbidding the writing of drafts on the barbers for any kind of due). Public order within the city was under the dārāqā (q.v.), who carried out summary punishment for disorders (ibid., ibid., xvi, 5-6, 549). Prices were under the control of the muḥtaṣib al-maḥālāt (ibid., xvi, 4, 418).

Some of the guilds performed corvées for the court and some from time to time were granted exemptions from taxation (Tavernier, 239; Chardin, iv, 95, vi, 119-20; A. K. S. Lambton, The late medieval period, an inaugural lecture, School of Oriental and African Studies, London 1954, 22 ff.; Gandjina, 434-6, for a firman of Shāh ‘Abbās dated 1038/1629 inscribed in the Shāh mosque in Isfahān forbidding the writing of drafts on the barbers for any kind of due). Public order within the city was under the dārāqā (q.v.), who carried out summary punishment for disorders (ibid., ibid., xvi, 5-6, 549). Prices were under the control of the muḥtaṣib al-maḥālāt (ibid., xvi, 4, 418).

The kalāntār (q.v.) was the main link between the population and the government, corresponding in part to the earlier raʾīs. It was his duty to reconcile the interests of the two parties. He was usually recruited from among the notables of the town. He had general oversight of the kadḵūdas of the districts and the craft guilds. Together with the wakf dar Ḥasan, he was appointed the kalāntār (ibid., xvi, 4, 421-2; see also A. K. S. Lambton, The office of kalāntār under the Safavids and Afshars, in Mélanges Massé, Tehran 1963).

Under Shāh ‘Abbās Isfahān again became an important religious centre, with this difference that orthodoxy was now Iskandar Beg (q.v.). Shī‘a divines were brought to Isfahān and taught and disputed there, but there is unfortunately little information on the course of the conversion of its inhabitants. By the middle of the 17th century religious festivals such as the ḍi‘id-i kurān (see Thevenot, ii, 107-8 bis) and the Mubarram ceremonies were performed with passion and vigour. Under Shāh ‘Abbās there was strong supervision of religious affairs as there was over other aspects of the life of the city. The religious classes were organised into corporations under the general oversight of the sadr (Musicandar al-mulūk, xvi, 1-2, 64). Under Shāh ‘Abbās
Sultan Husayn a new office, that of mulld-bdshl was created, and its holder made head of all the religious classes (ibid.). The decision of shar'i cases was in the hands of the shaykh al-islam and the badi (ibid., xv, 1-2, 69). Shih Abbas and his immediate successors treated other religions with toleration, but persecution began under Shih Sulaymnn and in the time of Shih Sultan Husayn was directed, not only against other faiths, but also against Sunnis and ShSfs (see further Lockhart, op. cit., 32-5, 70-9).

The wellbeing of Isfahan, as the capital of the empire, was closely bound up with the fortunes of the Safawid dynasty, as it had been earlier with those of the Saldjuk dynasty, whose capital it had also been. The fall of the Safawids, however, proved far more disastrous for Isfahan than that of the Saldjucks. By the reign of Shih Sultan Husayn, a marked decay in standards of public and private life and administrative competence had taken place (Muhammad Hashim Asif Rustam al-Hukama?, Rustam al-tawdrikh, ed. Muhammad Mushiri, Tehran 1969, 82-3, 90 ff., 98-9, 102 ff; L. Lockhart, op. cit.). Security in the town was also at a low ebb. Rustam al-Hukama? gives a list of bloodthirsty "toughs" (pahla?ndn va zabardstn va gurddn shabraw va 'ayydr), and alleges that the shih was unable to punish them because the "pillars of the state protected and aided them" (tayydr). The 12th/18th and 13th/19th centuries. Eventually the Afghans rebelled and invaded central Persia. In 1134/1722 after the Safawid army had been decisively beaten at Gu?nd?d near Isfahan, the city was besieged (see Lockhart, op. cit., 144 ff. for a detailed account of the siege; and also Rustam al-tawdrikh, 133 ff. on the intrigues and disunity prevailing in Isfahan during the siege). It was reduced to appalling straits and fell after six months. Some 20,000 persons were killed by enemy action and it is estimated that four times as many died from starvation and pestilence. The city was declared to have been conquered by force (sawstead) and orders given for all land to be declared khulisa. Many of those who had escaped in the siege fled to India and the Ottoman empire (Shaykh Djabir Anfsr, 32-3, 113-14) or lived once more, for a brief period, became the official religion.

The Safawid restoration which began when Nndir entered Isfahan in 1141/1729 with Tahms?p after defeating the Afghans near Murcahkart was shortlived. Isfahan was only a shadow of its former self. Many of the inhabitants who had survived the siege perished in the subsequent massacres. Heavy impositions were laid upon those who survived to pay the soldiery, by whom they were treated with great cruelty (Lockhart, Nadir Shih, London 1938, 39 ff.). When Nndir finally assumed the crown in 1148/1736, he moved the capital to Mashhad. Isfahan, like other parts of Nndir's empire, suffered heavy exactions. More land was confiscated for the state, and orders were given for the resumption of awakh. ?Adil Shih on his accession in 1160/1749-8 revived Nndir's land decrees, but some of them continued to exist because there had been many cases of falsification of title deeds, destruction of land registers and usurpation (Shaykh Djabir Anfsr, 35 ff., 122 ff., A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and peasant in Persia, 131-2).

On Nndir's death, the people rose against the government, who took refuge in the fortress of Tabarak, where he was besieged. He was eventually killed by one of his own guards. Ibrahim Shih then sent a new begarbarst to the city in the person of Abu '1-Fath Kdn Bakhtrvst, who on Ibrahim Shih's death shortly afterwards ruled in the name of Abu Turab Mizr?z, the eight-year-old grandson (through the female line) of Shih Sultan Husayn. An abortive attack on the city was made shortly afterwards by ?All Mardan Kdn Bakhtrvst, who retired to Luristan. After collecting reinforcements and allying himself to the Zands, he marched a second time on Isfahan in 1164/1750. Abu '1-Fath Kdn, having failed to raise any money from the townspeople, was unable to muster an army to oppose him. ?All Mardan Kdn entered the city, which was thereupon looted by his troops, (Rustam al-tawdrikh, 244 ff.) For a brief period ?All Mardan Kdn, Karim Kdn Zand and Abu '1-Fath Kdn ruled the city and its neighbourhood jointly. The latter was then killed by ?All Mardan Kdn who was, in turn, dispossessed in 1165/1751-2 by Karim Kdn, who then appointed his brother Sdik Kdn as governor. For the next few years Isfahan was fought over by marauding bands of Zands, Afghans and Kdjar. Its miseries were added to by famine in 1170/1756-7, which carried off 40,000 persons. Finally, in 1172/1758-9 Karim Kdn took the city. A period of peace now began and under the government of Muhammad Rn?n, a local man whom Karim Kdn appointed governor in 1173/1759, the city recovered somewhat from the ravages of the previous years (Shaykh Djabir Anfsr, 127 ff.; Muhammad Mihd?, 270). Isfahan, however, did not regain its former preeminence; Shtrzl became the capital in 1180/1766-7.

On the death of Karim Kdn, anarchy broke out once more. In 1199/1774-5 Isfahan was looted for three days when Bnk Kdn, the kdhndud of Khurjskn, who had made himself governor, lost control on the advance of Mndn Kdn (Rustam al-tawdrikh, 59; Ibn 'Abd al-Karim, Tarb-thi Zandiyya, ed. E. Beer, Leiden 1888, 30). In the following year Ak? Muhammad Kdn Kdjjr appointed his brother Dsflr Kull Kdn governor of Isfahan (Shaykh Djabir Anfsr, 126 ff.). Under the Kdjars the capital was moved to Tehran. Isfahan for a time remained the chief commercial city of the empire (J. Macdonald Kinneir, A geographical memoir of the Persian Empire, 2 vols. London 1813, 113), but gave way to Tabriz in the second half of the 19th century (Curzon, ii, 41). The events of the 18th century had taken a heavy toll on Isfahan. Olivier, who visited the city in 1796, describes its ruined condition and states that its population did not exceed 50,000 (Voyage dans VEmpire Othoman, l'4gypte et la Perse, Paris 1807, iii, 101). Morier in 1811, revising his own earlier estimate, which had been much higher, put the population at probably about 60,000, on the basis of a daily slaughter of 300 sheep (A second journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor, London 1818, 141-2).

After the death of Ak? Muhammad Kdn, an abortive attempt was made in 1212/1797-8 by Muhammad Kdn Zand to seize the city. This was followed by the rebellion of Husayn Kull Kdn Kdjjr, who, however, fled the city in 1213/1800-1 and in the spring of 1804-5 there was a further setback to the wellbeing of the city in the shape of a severe famine caused by the ravages of locusts. About this time (or possible earlier) Muhammad Husayn Kdn N?zm al-Dawla was made governor. He was a native of Isfahan, a self-made man who acquired great riches, largely in land, some of which he constituted into awakh. Under him and his son, Amin al-Dawla, who succeeded him when he became sadr-i a'mam, Isfahan began once more to prosper (Shaykh
2. MONUMENTS

The Islamic monuments of Isfahan today constitute one of the most significant and complete architectural complexes preserved at the heart of a modern city which owes them much of its prestige. Carefully restored, the most important amongst them dominate the developing urban landscape in the midst of which they stand, while the old quarters, both in the built-up area of Isfahan itself and in the many surrounding villages, still harbour numerous modest structures, often partially ruined, which remain insufficiently studied. Some idea of the richness of this complex may be gathered from the fact that more than fifty caravanserais, and 273 baths were enumerated at the end of the 19th century by that trustworthy traveller and observer, Chardin. Some years later Houtum-Schindler considered it had risen, by natural increase and immigration, to close on 100,000 (190-20; Muhammad Mihdi and Shaykh Djabir Ansari, however, give higher estimates). In 1888 when Zill al-Sultan was appointed governor in 1874, and by 1881 had become the virtual ruler of most of southern Persia. His government was severe and authoritarian. Discontent with the government and its policies was meanwhile spreading, and when the Constitutional Revolution came, Isfahan played a prominent part in the revolution of Persia taken from the memoirs of Father Krusinski . . ., London 1729; J. Otter, Voyage en Turquie et en Perse, Paris 1748; A. Arnold, Through Persia by caravan, London 1877, i; R. B. M. Binning, A journal of two years travel in Persia, Ceylon, etc., London 1857; E. L. Bishop, Journeys in Persia and Kurdistan, London 1891, 2 vols., the Hague 1890; H. de Bode, Travels in Luristan and Arabistan, London 1845; Mme. J. Dieulafoy, La Perse, Paris 1887; A. V. Williams Jackson, Persia Past and present, New York 1906; Ker Porter, Travels, London 1821, i; J. Morier, A journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to Constantinople, in the years 1808 and 1809, London 1812; F. Stack, Six months in Persia, London 1882, ii; Gazetteer of Persia, Simla 1938, ii, 239-49. (A. K. S. LAMBERT)

11th/12th century, which saw the installation at Isfahan of the Safavid Shah 'Abbās I, and with the oldest parts not going back beyond that 5th/11th (Saldjuk) century in which the imperial vocation of the city was established by Malikshāh and his ministers, they are insufficient to allow us to retrace on the ground with any degree of certainty the stages of the city's development, which began soon after the Arab conquest and for which the literary sources provide most of the evidence. The general outline both of the plan of the twin cities of Džay and al-Yahidiyya, between which from the beginning of the 'Abbāsīd period the population of an already prosperous trading centre was divided, and of the locality used as a residence by the Buwayhid princes, can be seen only in such indications as the permanence of the site of the great mosque and a mud-walled citadel, itself completely rebuilt several times, and recent discoveries of a doorway which probably belonged to the mosque of al-Sāhib ibn 'Abbās. The evidence is almost as vague regarding the organisation of a Saldjuk capital, in which we can locate with difficulty, apart from the great mosque and citadel already mentioned, the situation of a few sanctuaries still marked by minarets, and the probable site of the great maydān, by which, in earlier times, the royal palace and the Nišāmiyya madrasa stood. The situation, so unsatisfactory to any methodical approach to the architectural school of Isfahan, is in fact attributed to the very conditions in which the town has survived, partially ruined more than once, and then rebuilt according to the unchanged techniques of an impermanent method of building in mud- or baked brick, or even in puddled clay, which was traditional in that area, and dictated by geography. Thus either side by side or the one above the other, urban nuclei replaced each other, comparable in their evolution to the large villages also situated in the oasis, which were themselves from time to time the object of intense architectural activity. And similar difficulties of identification, due both to the paucity and the frailty of archaeological landmarks, hinder the study of the older districts of present-dav Isfahan, as well as that of the settlements, thriving or in ruins, around the city, such as ashja, Bar- sylan, Gār, Sin, Ziyār, Lindijan/Pir-i Baken— or Ashťardān, to mention but a few among the best known, where significant remains dating from the Saldjuk and Ilkhanid periods survived until recently and in some cases are still preserved.

In the centre as a whole, we must give particular attention to the Great Mosque, which by its antiquity and extent provides us with an archaeological document of exceptional value: the Masdjid-i Djum’a where authentic traces of the period of Malikshāh between 465/1072 and 485/1092 have survived in the midst of later constructions or modifications no less worthy of interest. Here are abundant inscriptions from the 5th/11th century onwards, and noteworthy decorative elements such as the brick ornamentation in the interior of two Saldjuk domed halls, or the stucco relief of the Mongol ruler Öljeytu, are preserved behind the İnderen and façades entirely covered in fāgele which give the courtyard its Safavid appearance. But the very variety of the pieces of evidence found together in this venerable yet disparate building, where the necessary sondages and investigations have never been carried out, prevents us from reconstructing its history with any degree of certainty. For this history contradictory hypotheses suggest widely differing interpretations, and there have even been produced more general theories, such as that of the "kiosk-mosque," resting on assumptions as impossible to prove as to refute.

In effect then it is the Safavid achievements, either in isolation or taken in conjunction with earlier buildings of secondary importance reworked in the Safavid period (numerous small more or less disguised Saldjuk or Ilkhan sanctuaries are in this position), which make up the architectural landscape of the monuments in Isfahan today. This landscape, whose uniformity so well conceals the achievements of earlier periods, gives but an inadequate impression of the totality of the grandiose design for an imperial city once conceived by Şah 'Abbās I. However, it retains enough of the earlier features to enable one still to distinguish the overall plan which made the Maydan-i Şah—the royal square in front of the ruler's palace—into the majestic centre of the city; this centre led on one side to the older thoroughfare linking the Great Mosque both with the Citadel and the Pūl-i Khādży, or at least with the bridge which had preceded the present bridge-barrage built by Şah 'Abbās II; it was completed on the other side of the royal palace and gardens by the new Čahār Bāgh avenue which led from these gardens to the Allāhwārdī Şah bridge, which like the Čahār Bāgh itself dates from the monarch's first series of architectural undertakings in 106/1656.

The Maydan-i Şah itself is, still at 510 metres long by 165 metres wide, framed by a wall of blind arcades concealing a trading street full of shops, was a monumental work of art, splendidly complemented by the imposing perspective of the tree-lined Čahār Bāgh bordered with canals of running water over more than one and a half kilometres. But the buildings which surrounded this square towards the end of the reign of Şah 'Abbās I, to the south the most majestic royal mosque of Masdjid-i Şah (probably begun in 1021/1612-13), to the east the Masdjid-i Shaykh Lutf Allāh (begun 1012/1603), to the north of the royal bazaar with its monumental gateway (built in 1029/1620), could be seen above all as worthy companions to the Čahār Bāgh palace which had been constructed by Şah 'Abbās I on the basis of a Timūrid pavilion, and which gave the name to the Bahana, Bar- sylan, Gār, Sin, Ziyār, Lindijan/Pir-i Baken—or Ashťardān, to mention but a few among the best known, where significant remains dating from the Saldjuk and Ilkhanid periods survived until recently and in some cases are still preserved.

Moreover, the importance of this "royal city" situated between the Maydan-i Şah and the Čahār Bāgh continued to be strengthened under succeeding monarchs by the building of other sumptuous pavilions. But one last Safavid building for religious purposes from the 12th/18th century remains to be noted with the construction between 1118/1706 and 1120/1714 of the Mader-i Şah madrasa and the adjoining caravanserai, which has also survived until today. Mention must be made too of those Armenian churches of the New Djiufa district, in which can still be seen the fundamental characteristics of the imperial style dominant at the time when they were founded by an emigre colony.

The various buildings briefly listed here in order to recreate a panorama of Safavid Isfahan all possess as their prime quality the ability to serve as living testimony to a refined art form which caused the city to be described, as the expression of Gobineau's admiring critical appreciation, as "a triumph of
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ISFARAYN, a district, and in earlier Islamic times a town, in northwestern Khurāsān. It lies on the northern edge of the long plain which extends from Bistām and Shahrūd in the west almost to Nishāpur in the east and whose central section is drained by the Kīlū Shīr river before it turns southwards into the Dāsh-e Kavir. In mediaeval Islamic times, the route from Nishāpur to Gurgān ran across this plain, and the geographers place Isfārāyin at roughly the midpoint, five stages from Nishāpur and five from Gurgān.

Though allegedly founded by Isfandiyār, little is known of Isfārāyin's pre-Islamic past except that it was under a dākān (Tha'ālibī, Ghurār al-siyar, ed. Zotenberg, 591). A popular etymology, given e.g. by Yākūt, derives its name from isfā-rāyin "shield-like", and this may have influenced the Ḥudūd al-Šām's spelling as Siyārīyin. It is also said that it used earlier to be called Mihrān, a name surviving in later times as a village in the rustāk of Isfārāyin.

The 4th/10th century geographers describe Isfārāyin as being administratively one of the rustāks of Nishāpur, its town being, according to Mukaddasī, the most prominent of the towns of these rustāks. It had fīrās, markets and a well-citified called "the golden castle", ḫala'ī-yī sar. The inhabitants were Shī'īs; Isfārāyin was one of the remaining pockets in Khurāsān of Shī'ism, which was then

receiving under the advance of the Ḥanafī madh'īkhan. The surrounding district contained 40 or 50 villages, and cereals, rice, grapes and other fruit were grown there. Samānī and Yākūt name a large number of scholars from Isfārāyin, of whom the most notable were the theologian and jurist dealt with in the next article and Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Tāhir b. Muḥammad al-Isfārāyinī (d. 471/1078-9), a protégé of Nīzām al-Mulk and author of a Kur'ān commentary in Persian, the Tādī al-taṣāqīm. The Taj jāyi tā'ārīf, the description of the Persian adaptation of Tābārī's commentary, cf. G. Lazard, La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane, Paris 1963, 94-6. Another famous son of Isfārāyin was Māmūd of Ghazna's vizier Abu 'l-'Abbās Faḍl b. Ahmad al-Isfārāyinī (d. 404/1013-14), to whose excursions in Khorāsān the historian Ṭūṭī attributes much economic distress (cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 287).

During the Mongol invasions of Persia, the commander Sibetey came from Nishāpur in 617/1220 and sacked Isfārāyin; but the northwestern region of Khorāsān, including Diwāwān, Diwājām and Arghīyān, seems to have suffered less than the province in general, and was in 630/1233 placed under the rule of a local mālib subordinate to the Mongol governor of Khorāsān, Cn-Temur (Diwāwān-Boyle, i, 146, ii, 497). In Mustawfī's time a century later, there was still a flourishing town and agricultural hinterland at Isfārāyin, with the town itself getting water from an adjacent river and the villages dependent on Ḥanābād; we hear, too, of coins being minted there under the Ilkhānids, as later under the Safavids.

In Safavid times, Isfārāyin was only just within the northern frontier of the province of Maghād, and suffered repeatedly from raids incursions, with a particularly severe devastation just before 1066/1557; during the 12th/18th century there was a further destruction by the Afghans. The site of the mediaeval town is probably now represented by the ruins called Shahr-i Bilkīs (cf. Yate, Khorasan and Sistan, 378-9). Today, the region of Isfārāyin is prosperous and fertile, being famed for its fruit; since 1958 it has formed a separate district or shāhristān in the province of Khorāsān. The main town of the district is Miyānābād.

Bibliography: Scattered references in the 4th/10th century geographers (Yaḥyābī, Ibn Hawqāl, Mukaddasī, Hudūd al-Šām), see indices; Yākūt, Buldān, i, 246; Samānī, Ansāb, ii, 338-94, 545; Mustawfī, Nuzha, tr. 148; Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire géographique, historique et littéraire de la Perse, Paris 1861, 344, 552; C. E. Yate, Khorasan and Sistan, Edinburgh 1900, 383 ff.; Le Strange, 393; B. R. Spooner, Arghīyān. The area of Jājarm in western Khorāsān, in Iran, J. of the British Institute of Persian Studies, iii (1965), 97-108.

(C. E. Bosworth)
1. Friday-mosque: Interior of northern dome.

2. Friday-mosque: mihrāb of Uldjaytu

mihrāb and minbars.

4. Shahristān Bridge: facing downstream.
5. Masjidi Shâh: seen from the Kapi palace.

7 Ala Kapi palace: reception room, 1st floor.

8 Madrasa Mader-i Shah: dome seen from the inner court.
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of Ghazna. From 411/1020 he also held sessions teaching hadith in the congregational mosque of Nishāpūr. After his death in Muharram 418/February 1027, his body was brought to Isfara'īnī. His tomb continued to attract pious visitors in the 6th/12th century.

None of his works on Shāfi'i law, principles of law (usūl al-fiqh), and theology is extant, but the numerous references to his doctrine in later works attest their popularity for several generations after his death. He played a leading role in the elaboration of Ash'arī doctrine in his generation, which, in several areas covered new ground not touched by the founder of the school. In the struggle against the anthropomorphism of the Karrāmiyya he, like Ibn Fūrāk, supported a more abstract view of God closer to Mu'tazillī doctrine as compared with al-Ash'arī doctrine. On this genealogy cf. that of Isma'īl Bey, in the Huluwiyyītd-i Sulṭānī Rieu, Catal. of Turkish MSS.

The name is taken from that of the best known ruler of this dynasty, Isfendiyār Bey; in the 10th/16th century we find the name Kızl Ahmedlu, from Kızıl Ahmed. The Byzantines called the Isfendiyar Oğlu "the sons of Amurias" or of Omur. The founder of the dynasty appears to have been Şams al-Dīn b. Tāmān (Timur?) Dī ān-dār, who held a grant of the district of Affānī; he went to war with Mas'ūd II (682/1282-697/1298), captured the town of Kastamonu and in 690/1291 (Munēdjihmābğī) was appointed governor of the districts seized by him by the Ilkhan prince Gāykhātū. He seems to be identical with Sunqur Bey Şams Pasha, who conquered Bōlu according to Ewliya, ii, 173. His son, Şuhādā al-Dīn Sulaymān Pasha (200/1301-740/1340), at first acknowledged the suzerainty of the Ilkhanī, but afterwards made himself independent and conquered Sinope, which was still in possession of a daughter of Mas'ūd II. He is mentioned in Ibn Battūta (li, 343 ff.), Şihāb al-Dīn (Not. et Extr., xii, 340 and 361 f.) and Abūl-Fīdā‘ī (Geographie, ed. Reinaud, ii, 1, p. 35; 2, p. 142, 145); Pachymeres, ii, p. 364, and Kal)v al-Dīn b. Ṣuhādā by the name Şolāmā'zānī. His successors were: his son ʿĪbrāhīm Pasha; ʿĀdil Bey, son of the Emir Yaḥyāb and grandson of Şams al-Dīn (about 746/1345); ʿĪlāl al-Dīn Bāyázīd, son of ʿĀdil Bey, called Kötürüm by the Ottomans, died 787/1385; Sulaymān Bāyá, son of Bāyázīd, from 787/1385-793/1393; Sultan Bāyázīd I killed him and seized the land (according to Rev. Hist., iii, 369; the Ottoman chronicles make no mention of Sulaymān Bāyā and make Bāyázīd Kötürüm reign till 795/1393). ʿMūbāriz al-Dīn Isfendiyār, son of Bāyázīd, was restored by Timūr in 805/1402-3. He died on 22 Ramaḍān 843/26 Feb. 1440. About 820/1417 he had to cede the towns of Tosya, Çankırı and Kafedik and the district of Djamk to Mehemmed III; Shemṣi Pasha in particular had great personal influence as the confidant of Murad III. He fabricated a genealogy of the "Kızıl Ahmedlu" family, which was allotted to him as a residence by the sultan. He wrote a widely circulated book, Ḥulawwiyyītd-i Sulṭānī, on the ritual precepts of Islam. His brother Kızıl Ahmed married to Ulu Hasan after the confiscation of Kastamonu, returned to Constantinople after the death of Mehmed II, and was honourably received by Bāyázīd II; his son Mīrzā Meḥemmēd was married to a daughter of the sultan and his grandsons Şams and Muṣṭafā Pasha filled high offices under Selīm II and Murād III; Şems Pasha in particular had great personal influence as the confidant (muṣḥih) of Murād III. He fabricated a genealogy of the "Kızıl Ahmedlu Isfendiyar Oğlu" which went back to Kālid b. al-Wālid, and invented the name Kızıl Ahmedlu for the dynasty of Isfendiyar-Oğlu. Descendants of this family still exist and, when at the beginning of the 11th/17th century it was feared that the Ottoman ruling house might become extinct, the Kızıl Ahmedlu were considered amongst others as possible claimants to the throne on account of their frequent marriages with relatives of the sultans.

On this genealogy cf. that of Isma'il Bey, in the Hulawwīyyītd-i Sulṭānī in Rieu, Catal. of Turkish MSS,
GENEALOGY OF THE ISFENDIYAR-OGHLU

1. Yaman Djandar (for Yaman b. Djandar?)
2. Shams al-Din (= Sungur Shamsh Pasha?)
3. Shudja al-Din Sulayman Pasha
4. Emir Ya‘kub
5. Ibrahim Pasha
6. Ali Bey
7. Nastratis (= Nasir al-Din ?)
8. ‘Ali Bey (‘Ali)
9. Bâyazîd Kötürüm (Valî)
10. Sulayman Pasha
11. Mubâriz al-Din Isfendiyar (reg. 795-843 A.H.)
12. Iskandar
13. (daughter)
14. daughter, married to Murad I.
15. Kara Yabya
16. Ibrahim, reg. 843-847/1439-43
17. Kawâm al-Din Kâsim Bey, married (828/1425) a sister of Murad II.
18. Khîdir Bey
19. Murad
20. Hallîma, married 828/1425 Sultan Murad II
22. Klîlî Ahmed
23. Khadîja
24. Iskandar, called Mirzâ Bey
25. Hasan, killed 855/1451
26. Hasan
27. Mehmedîmmed, called Mirzâ, married a daughter of Bâyazîd II.
28. Shamsî Pasha
29. Muṣṭafâ Pasha

in the British Museum, II, and that of Shamsî Pasha in Petewi, ii, 10 ff.; 4 perhaps the brother of Sulayman Pasha; called Efendî by Ibn Battûta; the sons of Sulayman Pasha, 5-7, in Ibn Battûta, ii, 340, 348, Shihâb al-Dîn, and Pachymeres, ii, 327 ff., 611; 8 according to Münedjimbâşî, son of Sulayman Pasha; 13 according to Sa’d al-Dîn, i, 192; another sister of Isfendiyar and her son is mentioned by Clavîjo, 92, but without giving her name; 14 according to Ta’rîh-i Şâfî, i, 39 f.; on 17 see Sa’d al-Dîn, i, 277 f., 318 f.; Hamîd Wahbî, 1350 f.; on 18 Sa’d al-Dîn, i, 287; on 19 Sa’d al-Dîn, i, 318 f.; 21, the epithet in Ferîdûn, i, 250; on his marriage with a daughter of Murad II: Dukas 243; Sa’d al-Dîn, i, 343; on 23 cf. Rev. Hist., 390 f.; on 24 Hamîd Wahbî, 1354; on 26 Sa’d al-Dîn, i, 474, 476.

Bibliography: Münedjîmbâşî, Şâhî’î al-Abdâr, iii, 29 f.; Hamîd Wahbî, Mevâtî-h-i Islâm, no. 43 (= p. 1329-1338 of the whole series); Revue Historique publiée par l’Institut d’Histoire Ottomane, 382-392 (monograph by Ahmed Tewhîd); the Byzantine historians Pachymeres, Dukas, Chalkokondyles, Phrantzes; Clavîjo. On the coins of the Isfendîyâr-Oghlû: Ismâ’îl Ghalîb, Ta’rîh-i Mevâtî-h-i Seydîhârîe, 120-1; Ahmed Tewhîd, Mevâtî-h-i badîme-i Islâmîyâ, iv, 400 ff. (J. H. Mordtmann*)

ISFID DIZ [see KALÂ’I YI SARÎN].
ISFIDJÂB [see Supplement].
‘ISHA [see ŞAÎT].
ISHÂK, the Biblical Isaac, mentioned in fifteen passages of the Qur’ân. God gives Abraham “good tidings of Isaac, a prophet, of the righteous”, and blesses them both (XXXVII 112 f.). In a fuller description, when messengers concerning Lot come to Abraham; his wife “laughed, and we gave her good tidings of Isaac, and after Isaac of Jacob” (XI, 71/74); and it is explained that this will happen despite their age. Several verses speak of Isaac and Jacob being given to Abraham (VI, 8; XIX, 49/50; XXI 72), and XXIX, 27/26 adds that God “made prophethood and the Book to be among his offspring” (cf. XXXVIII, 45 f.). Ishmael is joined to Isaac in XIV, 39/41, where Abraham prays God for giving him the two although he was old. Elsewhere the name only occurs in lists: Joseph follows the creed of his fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (XXI, 38), and speaks of God’s favour to them (XXII, 6); Jacob’s sons serve the God of his fathers, Abraham, Ishmael and Isaac (II, 133/127); and revelations are given Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob and the Patriarchs (II, 136/130, 140/134; III, 84/78; IV, 163/161). In the account of Abraham’s would-be sacrifice of his son (XXXVII, 102/100-107), the name of the son is not mentioned; and there was a fierce controversy among Muslim scholars over the identity of the son. At first most Muslims probably considered the “sacrifice” (dhabâh) was Isaac (cf. Goldziher, Koranauslegung, 79-81). This is explicitly stated of ‘Umar and ‘Ali by Kutb al-Dîn (Wustenfeld, Chron. Mekka, ii, 37). A story is told of how a convert told ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz that the Jews had substituted Isaac (their ancestor) for Ishmael (the Arabs). Actually the controversy came to be more concerned with Persian than with
ISHAK — ISHAK B. IBRAHIM AL-MAWSLI

Jewish rivalry for the Arabs (Goldziher, Mhkh. St., i, 144 f., tr., i, 135, since the Persians claimed descent from Isaac; Al- Mas'udi (Maraghi, ii, 146 f.) quotes a Persian poet in 290/902 who boasted that his descent from Isaac the ḫudbīḥ is superior to that of the Arabs. Later representatives of the Isac-party were Ibn Kūtayba (Ma'arif, 18 f. ed. Ukhāṭa, Cairo 1969, 30 f) and al-Ṭabarānī (Ta'rif on XII, 6 and XXXVII, 107; vol. xii, 86; xxiii, 40-9); they argued that God's perfecting his mercy on Abraham and his making Abraham his friend and saving him from the burning bush and to his rescuing Isaac. The other party held that the promise to Sarah of Isaac followed by Jacob (XI, 71/74) excluded the possibility of a sacrifice of Isaac. Although Ibn Kūtayba, for example, had seen Isaac mentioned in the Old Testament, Muslim opinion eventually gave full endorsement to the view that the son in question was Iaḥmael, the ancestor of the Arabs (cf. al-Bayḍawī on XXXVII, 102/101). In the works entitled Kitāb al-anbīyaʿ by al-Ṭabarānī (Cairo 1231, 48-50) and al-Kisāʿī (Leiden 1922, 150-3) the story of Isaac is elaborated along lines reflecting extra-Biblical Jewish tradition. Bibliography: there are a number of further references in the works of I. Goldziher cited, and also in ZDMG, xxxii, 359, n. 5 (Schriften, ii, 101) cf. also commentaries on the verse quoted: C. H. Becker, Islamstudien, i, 437 (= ZA, xxvi, 182). (W. Montgomery Watt)

ISHAK b. HUNAYN b. ISHAK AL-ṬIBĀDI, ABU YAKŪB, like his father Hunayn b. Isḥak [q.v.] an eminent translator of ancient science and philosophy, well versed in the Greek, Syriac, Arabic, and Persian languages. Some authors, such as Ibn al-Nadīm and Ibn al-Maṭrān, assert that his Arabic style is superior to that of his father, and like other well educated persons of his surroundings he even indulged in writing poetry. He followed the medical profession of his father, who dedicated to him some of his translations of Galen. It is interesting to note that these were made into Syriac and not into Arabic. A talk between Hunayn and Isḥak about pre-Socratic philosophy was included in Abū Sulaymān's Siwdn al-frīkma (Orientalia, xiii/i; L. Cheikho, Introduction to the beginnings of medicine in connexion with the history of philosophy and religion).

Bibliography: Ibn Isḥak was familiar with the notions of several translators of Galen. It is interesting to note that these were made into Syriac and not into Arabic. A talk between Hunayn and Isḥak about pre-Socratic philosophy was included in Abū Sulaymān's Siwdn al-frīkma (Orientalia, xiii/i; L. Cheikho, Introduction to the beginnings of medicine in connexion with the history of philosophy and religion).

[see AL-ISKANDAR AL-APRUDĪSĪ], Porphyry [see FURQĪYĪS], Themistius, Nemesis of Eumes (see F. Soarth, Bibliothèque de mathématiques, i, 146 f.). Moreover he translated many standard works on mathematics and astronomy, e.g., those of Euclid (cf. G. P. Matviievskaia, Učenie o čisle na srednevekovom blizšem i srednem vostoke, Tashkent 1967, 100 f.), Autolycus of Pitane, Archimedes, Theodosius of Bithynia, Menelaus of Alexandria (cf. Max Krause, Abb. G. W. Günther, al-Kiṣāʾī, K. S., Dritte Folge, no. 17, 1936, 21, 23) and Ptolemy (see BATLAMIYUS). Some of these translations were revised by Thābit b. Qurra. Curra [q.v.] (cf. M. Bouyges, in Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph, ix (1923-4), 77-81); there exists also another fragment of a letter on astronomical matters sent to him by Thābit (see F. J. Carmody, The astronomical works of Thābit b. Qurra, Berkeley, Los Angeles 1960, 20, 45 f., 229).

Isḥak's own writings were mainly on medical and pharmacological subjects. In 290/903 he composed at the request of al-Kāsim (see above) his Taʾrk̲h̲ al-ʿaṭibb̲āʾ (ed. F. Rosenthal, in Oriens, vii (1954), 55-80; cf. JAOS, lxxxi (1961), 10 f). This book is the first known attempt to write about the beginnings of medicine in connexion with the history of philosophy and religion. (Bibliography: see references in the verse quoted.)


ISHAK b. IBRAHIM AL-MAWSLI, the son of IBRAHIM AL-MAWSLI [q.v.], and like him the greatest musician of his time, was born in 150/767 in Rasy and died in Ramdān 233/850 in Baghdad. He received an excellent musical education under Hushaym b. Bāṣar, al-Kisāʾī.
ISHAK B. IBRAHIM AL-MAWSILI — ISHAK, ADIB

He was a very learned man and took many books with him when travelling; he paid the philologist Ibn al-Afrabā an annual stipend. Many of his own works deal with music and musicians. Already his father, together with Ibn Djāmī and Fulayh b. Abī 'l-Āwārī had selected for Hārūn al-Rashīd 100 songs (cf. Agh. 3, i, 4–5, 7). Later on Ishābī, by order of al-Wāḥiqī, made a new edition of the one hundred selected melodies, keeping the finest of them and replacing those of minor quality by better ones (Aghānī, i, 8 ff.). This is the Ikhtiyār min al-Aghānī li-l-Wāḥiqī (Fihrīst, 141, 4; Yākūt, Udabāri, ii, 223, 9). He also composed books on the biographies and compositions either of a single musician or a group of them, e.g., akhbār 'Azza (Fihrīst, 141), akhbār al-Hudhayfīyya (see Aghānī, iv, 132 ff.), al-Mahbikīyyīn (see Yākūt, l.c. ii, 223, 7), al-Kīyān. These monographs are directly or indirectly source for the corresponding sections in the Aghānī. There existed also a book of songs containing Ishābī’s own compositions; but it had been compiled without Ishābī’s permission by one of his copyists. Most of our information about Ishābī goes back to his son Hāmām, who also published the genuine book of Ishābī’s songs. A book about Ishābī was written by his pupil ‘All b. Yaḥyā Ibn al-Munaqaddīm (Fihrīst, 143, 22), while the latter’s son Yaḥyā b. ‘All devoted to Ishābī a chapter in his anthology al-Bāhir (Fihrīst, 143, 27). His death was mourned in many elegies (Aghānī, v, 256 and 431-4). Ishābī had many pupils and his fame has lasted up to this day. He is mentioned in the “Assemblies” of al-Harīfī and in the Arabian Nights.


ISHAK B. MURĀD, Turkish physician who lived in Gerede in Anatolia in the time of Sultan Bayezid I. Little is known of his life: he practised medicine and also wrote on the subject. His chief work is Kitāb Edwiye-i müfriđe, “The book of simple remedies”, which he completed in 752/1350. In the first section he deals with the medicinal plants of his native land (giving the Arabic and Persian names of each beside the Turkish name) and, at the end, gives prescriptions for various illnesses. The second section describes the illnesses in detail. The work, surviving in various manuscripts in Turkey, is also of linguistic interest, in that it presents many early features of orthography, grammar and vocabulary.


ISHAK B. SULAYMĀN AL-ISRĀ‘ILLI, Ani Yā’kūb (ca. 243/855 - ca. 343/955), physician, medical writer and philosopher, was born in Egypt and appointed court physician by Ubayd Allah al-Mahdi after his emigration to Kāyrawān at about the age of fifty. His high reputation among his fellow-Jews is attested by Sa‘īd (Se‘ada) al-Fayyūmī’s letters consulting him on philosophical and scientific matters. His medical works were translated into Latin by Constantine the African (1087) and enjoyed great esteem in the Middle Ages (printed in Omnia opera Ysac, Lyons 1575). Of his philosophical writings the Kitāb al-Hudūd wa-l-rusūm was popular among the Latin schoolmen, who know it in two versions (edited by J. T. Mucke in Archives d’histoire doctrinale et litteraire du moyen age, xi-xiii (1961), 58-120). The most extensive treatise is the Kitāb al-Uṣūkūs (Fihrist, 143, 27), extant in a Latin version (contained in Omnia opera Ysac) and in two Hebrew ones by Abraham ibn Hasdāy (ed. by S. Fried, 1900) and by Moses ibn Tibbon (9) respectively. The “Chapter on the Elements” preserved in a Hebrew Ms (Sha’ar ha-yesodot) has been shown by A. Altmann, following a suggestion by Gershom G. Scholem, to be another work of al-Iṣrā‘illī’s (Journal of Jewish Studies, vii (1956), 31-57). Al-Iṣrā‘illī, the father of Jewish Neoplatonism, is largely influenced by al-Kindī and by a pseudo-Aristotelian neoplatonic source which Altmann discovered in the “Chapter on the Elements” and which Stern has identified as underlying also such works as the Long Version of the Theology of Aristotle (discovered by Borisov) and Ibn Hasdāy’s Prince and Ascetic (see Oriens, xiii-xiv (1961), 58-120).

was taking place at that time. They were impressed by his lively mind and his remarkable knowledge of classical Arabic, which contributed to his appointment as editor of the periodical al-Tabaddum. From this time on, Adlb Isbak devoted himself entirely to his work as a writer, poet and essayist; in this field mention should be made of his Nuzhat al-صادخ fi masā'ī al-عذابkh and of several articles in ʿĀthār al-صادخ, edited by Salim Ḏubrāʾī al-Khūrī and Salim Mīkhāl al-Shāli. In 1876, during the reign of the Khaḍīv al-Istānbalī[q.v.], he settled in Alexandria at the suggestion of Salma al-Nakākhī[q.v.] from Beirut, the creator of the modern Arabic theatre, who was anxious to escape from the pressure of the Ottoman authorities in the countries of the Middle East, and had come to Egypt in order to pursue his theatrical activity in a more sympathetic political and literary climate. The two contemporaries collaborated in the work of the development of Arabic drama, which was then beginning, and to which Adlb Isbak had already contributed with his Arabic adaptation of Racine's Andromaque, which he had written at the suggestion of the French consul in Beirut, and with the translation from French of an historical play called Charlemagne.

But the event which marked the beginning of a new phase in Adlb Isbak's Egyptian career was his contact with the famous Afghānī, Djamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī[q.v.], whose lectures at al-ʿAzhar he attended and who proposed the foundation, in 1877, of the political weekly Miṣr, which Adlb Isbak published at first in Cairo and later in Alexandria. Around this periodical there very soon gathered the best writers and the most able politicians of the time; among them should be mentioned al-Afghānī himself and Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Razzāq, his most famous pupil. But this publication, and also the daily paper al-Tīdārīa, to which Adlb Isbak had given a financial and commercial, and later a political character, were suppressed in 1880, and their editor was banished from Egypt because of his extremist revolutionary ideas and his opposition to the government.

Adlb Isbak then went to Paris, where, in order to continue his patriotic action on behalf of his adopted country and its companions, he founded the periodical Miṣr al-Khārija (known also as Miṣr or al-Khāria), formed contacts with the literary and political circles, and published a series of articles in the Paris press. Nine months later, he returned to Beirut for a year, during which he agreed to resume the editorship of al-Tabaddum, and at the end of 1881, encouraged by the improvement in the political situation, he returned to Egypt, where he was appointed suṭūr (“supervisor”) in the Editorial and Translation section of the Ministry of Education; he was later made second secretary of the Chamber of Deputies, and at the same time obtained permission to resume the publication of his journal Miṣr, which he entrusted to his brother. But, as a result of the revolution of “Urūbi Paṣa[q.v.] in 1881, he fled to Beirut and did not return to Egypt until after the British occupation in 1882; but being unable to resume his government post, he went back to Beirut, where he accepted for the third time the editorship of al-Tabaddum and published in 1884 the translation of La belle parisiennne, al-Bārisiyya al-basna2 by Comtesse Dash, of which he had produced an Arabic version in his youth. Adlb Isbak died at al-Hadāṣh (Lebanon), after a last stay of some weeks in Cairo and Alexandria, in 1885.

It is stated in al-Durar (extracts from his poems, articles, lectures, tracts, Arabic adaptations of plays, etc., Beirut 1909, collected by his brother, ‘Awn Isbak) that he is also the author of the play entitled Ghārid al-ṣadīq (which was several times performed in Alexandria), and of the collection of biographies made during his stay in Paris, Tārāzīm Miṣr fi hādhā l-ṭarīq, but the first of the two manuscripts was stolen from him and the other is lost.


KHODJA ISBAK EFENDI, Anatolian mathematician and engineer in Mahmūd II's reign.

He was born at Arta in the province of Janina (Yanya) in 1774 (?), the son of a Jew converted to Islam (Faik Reşit Unat's thesis in Başçoca Isbak Efendi (Bell., xxviii (1964), 89-115) that Khodja Isbak Efendi and Şültan-zade Isbak Bey, the favourite of Selim III, were the same person is far from convincing). After the death of his father he came to Istanbul, where he studied mathematics privately and learned various Oriental and Western languages. Appointed instructor (khodja) of mathematics at the Military School of Engineering (Mühendîshîhâne-i Berri-i Humâyûn) in 1816, he became interpreter of the Divân-i Humâyûn[q.v.] in Dhu'l-Ka'da 1239/ July 1824, in addition to his position at the Mühendîshîhâne. He was dismissed from his post at the Divân in 1245/1828-9 and sent to the Balkans to supervise the construction of fortresses there. It seems that his dismissal was due to Pertev Efendi (later Paşa)[q.v.], the reis al-kütâb of the time, who saw in him a potential rival. Isbak Efendi continued his teaching at the Mühendîshîhâne, where he became Chief Instructor (Bahş-koşşı) in Ragjab 1246/ December 1830-January 1831. He succeeded in re-forming the curriculum and improving the teaching staff at the Mühendîshîhâne; but his predecessor, Seyyid 'All Efendi (later Paşa), was influential enough to have him removed and sent to Medina to supervise the restoration of various sacred buildings. While on his way back to Istanbul, he died at Suez in 1251/1835 and was buried there.

Isbak Efendi's main work, entitled Maǧmûʿa-i ʿālam-i riyyâyiye (4 vols., Istanbul 1247-50/1829-34), consists largely of translations from French books on mathematics, physics, chemistry, geology and their applications. Although a school manual of no great scientific value, it is the first work in Turkish on the modern physical and natural sciences (see Tansimat I, Istanbul 1940, 479 f., 492 f., 554 f.). Furthermore the scientific terminology, based on Arabic, which was used in Turkey up to the 1930s and in some Arab countries still later, was mainly Isbak Efendi's creation. Through his teaching and publications, he contributed much to the introduction of Western sciences to Turkey and the Arab countries.

Bibliography: Siddiki, Kima-i al-ālam, Istanbul 1306-16, ii, 899; Siddiki-i ʿOṭmâni, i, 328; Mehmed Es'e'd, Miḥār-i mühendîshîhâne-i berri-i humâyûn, Istanbul 1312, 34-42, 49, 58-61; Osman Ergin, Tūrkiyetî maṭârî farsî, Istanbul 1359-43, ii, 277 l.; A. Adnan-Advar, Osmanlı Tâkiiirinde ʿilm, Istanbul 1943, 196 f.; B. Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, London 1968, 86-8; N. Berkes,
The development of secularism in Turkey, Montreal 1954, index. For a contemporary account see [J. de Kay], Sketches of Turkey in 1831 and 1832, New York 1833, 138-44. For the list of his publications see O’Gorman M’Elielliferi, iii, 255. See also Ibrahim Alléttin Gövsa, Türk meşhurları, Istanbul 1946, 191; Çağatay Ülçay and Enver Kartekin, Yüksel Mühendis Öoku, Istanbul 1958, index.

(Ed.)

ISHA'K PAŞA [see Supplement].

ISHA'K SÜKÜT, a Young Turk leader, was born in 1868, probably of Kurdish extraction. As a student at the Military Medical School in Istanbul, he was in May 1889 one of the original group of founders of the Secret Committee, which eventually developed into the Committee of Union and Progress [see İTİBAŞ WE-TERAKİ ŞEYH NİLAN]. Later, in 1895, he was exiled to Rhodes but managed to escape and went to Paris, where he associated with the Young Turk émigrés. In 1897, with others, he founded the anti-government journal Osmanlı (‘Uthmânî), which was published in Geneva. In 1899, under combined pressure and blandishments from the Sultan, the journal ceased publication and several of its sponsors received official appointments.

İşlık Sükütt became medical officer to the Ottoman Embassy in Rome. He did not, however, sever his connection with the Young Turks and when a group of them moved to London to continue the publication of Osmanlı there, he underwrote the expenses of publication and continued to do so until his death in San Remo in 1903. In 1909, after the revolution in Turkey, his friend Dr. Rûdâ Nûr [q.v.] brought his remains to Istanbul and had them buried in the garden adjoining the tomb of Sultan Mahmûd.


ISHAKIYYA [see KAZA'RNI].

ISHAKOVICH [see OSKUB].

ISHAN. 3rd pers. plur. of the Persian personal pronoun. The word, which has always had an honorific significance, was formerly used in Central Asia (i.e., what is now Soviet Central Asia and the Sinkiang-Uyghur Autonomous Region of China) in the sense of ışan or mürkût (teacher or guide) in contrast to mürdî (disciple or pupil). It has still to be established when the term first appeared in this sense. It certainly existed in the middle ages; the celebrated Kha'dja Abûrár (died 855/1450 in Samarqand) is always referred to as ışan in his biography. The rank of ışan was frequently hereditary. An ışan lived with his followers in a dervish monastery (Mûmînî), and sometimes at the tomb of a saint. Most ışanın made journeys from time to time into the Kazakh steppe where they had more adherents and received richer presents than in the settled districts. Greater attention was drawn to the ışanın by a revolt started at Andizhan in 1858 by a certain Dukchi ışanın. Literature on the subject is scanty and, since the very existence of ışanın is strongly disapproved of by the Soviet and Chinese authorities, the term is now obsolete, if not obsolete.

Bibliography: J. Gejter, Materiál k zušenýmu hlavného terti musulmanského náležetí Turkremenstva krajny. I. ışanın (Sborník materiálov diya statistickí Sír-Dar’inské oblasty, vol. i); Sborník materiálov po musul’mansku, St. Petersburg 1899; Sattar-Chan, Musul’manské ışanın (Pravoslavný Sobesednik, Sept. 1895, and later N. P. Ostrovounov, Sartl, izd. 3r, Tashkent 1908, 206 ff.); Prince V. Masal’skiy, Turkestanskiy kray, St. Petersburg 1913, 355 ff.; Fr. v. Schwartz, Turkistan, Freiburg im Breisgau 1900, 198.

(Edward B. Barthold—[G. E. Wheeler])

ISHARA (A.), "gesture, sign, indication", has acquired in rhetoric [see BADI] the technical meaning of "allusion" but, in its early connotation, a gesture of the hand, a sign of the head, of the elbow, the eyes, the eyebrows etc., is considered by al-Dâbîqî (Bayân, i, 80; Hüyâyânî, i, 33), together with speech, writing, nûsba and computation on the fingers [see HİSAB AL-‘ÂKÐ where other gestures to indicate numbers are also dealt with], as one of the five methods by which a man may express his thoughts [see BAYÂN]. Whether combined with words or not, a gesture (ışhara and also imâ?) allows a man to make his meaning clear without revealing his thoughts entirely (Bayân, i, 77 ff.) and may even be necessary in order to explain the meaning of a concrete idea which is unknown to the listener; it is sometimes more expressive than words, and carries further than the voice; a gracious movement of the hand or the head (hûn al-ışhara) elegantly emphasises the expression of one’s thought; the eye may express [see HİSAB] that absolute immobility is necessary for dignity (khîm [q.v.]). Love poetry often refers to the language of the eyes, which express intimate feelings better, and less dangerously than words; lovers have a code, the scope of which is summarised by Ibn Hazm (Tawq, ch. ix, bâb al-ışhara bi-l’ayn) thus: [a sign made with the eye] “cuts off and brings together, it promises, it threatens, refuses harshly, fills with contentment, commands, and forbids, strikes the servants, warns against the watcher, makes laugh and causes grief, asks and answers, holds back and grants generously” (tr. A. R. Nykl, 44); he describes some of these signs and gives their meaning ("to close the eyelid in a wink signifies consent", etc.), but admits that the majority of them cannot be described, though he implies that everyone should be able to grasp their meaning.

In fact the Arabs considered anyone who did not understand the language of gestures and obliged his interlocutor to express his thoughts in words to be a fool (cf. the proverb: inna man lâ ya’rif al-wakhtî ahmak, waâyîhuwuqi also meaning sign; see al-Maydânî, i, 15; Lâ, s.v. WHY). They had a collection of signs with their own meaning: agreement, refusal, indifference, etc., which were used in everyday life, and according to contemporary witnesses, the Prophet used to accompany his words with gestures whose meaning was not always clear. There existed also ritual or symbolic gestures made when a contract or an alliance was concluded, when an oath of allegiance was sworn or act of allegiance made, etc., [see BAYÂ’; HILF AL-FUDÜL; SÂFAŠA; YAMÎN, etc.]. With the question of the gesture with the uncovered hand is connected that with a staff, the symbol of undertakers [see ‘ANAZA] held by orators and preachers; al-Dâbîqî devoted in his Bayân a long section to the manifold ways of using the baton, which also served, together with the whip or the sword, to express threats.

More research needs to be done on the ritual or symbolic gestures, which with the Arabs go back to remote antiquity, to complete and amplify the observations of I. Goldzher and to verify the opinions he has advanced in a number of publications: Orient. St. ... Th. Noëlsche, Giessen 1908, 1, 203 ff.; ZDMG, 1, 495 ff.; Abhand. zur arab. philologie, i, 55, 7, ii, p. cv

The magic value of certain gestures can be detected behind some *kadibah*, in particular the prohibition of using the hand to indicate a flash of lightning (Ibn al-Anbīy, *Usd al-ghaba*, v, 266) or of greeting a person with one finger only (al-Dabhā, Mīdān, ii, 162), in the same way that it survives for example in the gestures to protect against the evil eye [see *a'īn*].

As for *fuhāh* [q.v.], I. Goldziher points out the importance of preserving the meaning of the index finger pointing at an enemy, and the importance of this finger in Islamic ritual [see *tasahhud*] where it has acquired the characteristic names of *sudābā, musabībā, muhallilā*, *da'da*...; it was thus that the Prophet's habit of extending the index finger during prayer, after having been interpreted as a magic survival, became the symbol of the unity of God [see *shahādah*]; in *al-ñah* [q.v.] the act of raising the hands with the palms turned towards the face was the subject of long discussions by the *fukhah* whereas, in invocation (*dus* [q.v.]), the palm turned towards the sky may have had originally a magic force [on the North African *fāba*, of a different type, see *fatihah*].

Many other gestures have still to be studied, but it is enough to mention here those given above plus a brief reference to the game of "mora" (see G. Le Morant, *Les anciens précédes de calcul sur les doigts* in *REJ*, 1931, 4-8); in this game the partners, facing each other, at a given signal open the fist (or fists), raising whatever number of fingers they choose and speaking at the same time the number indicated by the total number of fingers raised (or else saying simply "odd" or "even"), the winner is the one who has guessed correctly. This process can be used to arrange different types of sharing out, which are known by various names: *mušir*, *muḥārida*, *muḥāra*...; *muḥāhara*, *muḥāhama* [see *muḥāradda*]. For *ism al-iskhara* "demonstrative", [see *ism*].

*Bibliography*: in the text. (Ed.)

The Sufis frequently use the word *iskhara* in a very technical sense, but when one attempts to define its meaning exactly, one finds that they give few satisfactory definitions or explanations. "Allusion" or "allusive language" would be a literal translation. But whereas these English words refer to a symbolical language which brings the object to mind by suggestion rather than by direct reference (Mallarmé), the Arabic word does not necessarily have this meaning which the Sufis prefer to render by the term *ramāz* [pl. *rumāz*] (see *Luma* of al-Tūsî, 338). When the Sufis call themselves the *ahl al-iskhara* (the allusionist school) or when they say that their science consists of *ilm al-iskhara*, they are attempting to define not only the way in which they express themselves, but also the content of an experience which can only be evoked by this method. *Iskhara* is in this sense the opposite of *ibāra*, not in the way that symbolical language is opposed to "realistic" language or in the way that a parable cannot be translated into abstract language, but in the way that something incomunicable is opposed to something communicable. All knowledge acquired by natural means falls within the domain of the *'ibāra* in that it can be "expressed" and communicated to others in their language. In mystical experience, however, the bonds of natural knowledge are burst, and man reaches a new world to which his concepts and words cannot be applied. He can only talk about it by "allusion" (*iskhara*), that is to say not symbolically, but by approximation, always aware that his language can only really be understood by those who have experienced that of which he talks (al-Kalbādî, *Ta'āruf*, Cairo ed., 87-9). And thus it is, that by the very nature of the experience, the language of the *iskhara* tends, on the one hand, to become an esoteric language not understood by the uninitiated or deliberately made incomprehensive to them, and on the other hand, tends to destroy itself as inadequate and as a veil between the *Sufi* and the object of his experience: God. The novice, remarked Djiunay, must find God at the same time as his allusion, but he who has attained the highest of mystical states (ahwāl) must find God in the abolition of the allusion (*Luma*, 224). And al-Hallādī: "As long as you attempt an *iskhara*, you are not yet a *muwahhid*,—not until the moment when God takes over your allusion by annihilating your self-consciousness. Then He leaves neither the subject of the allusion (mughir) nor the allusion itself" (*Essai*, 361, no. 11).

*Iskhara*, which we have just described as the esoteric language of the inexpressible mystical experience, acquired this full and complex meaning about the 3rd/9th century, in the Baghdad and Khurāsān schools. Previous texts use it differently, in a way related to Kur'ānic exegesis. Thus when the *Tafsīr* attributed to Dīnār al-Ṣādiq (died 148/765) says that the Kurān is at once expression (*'ibāra*) and allusion (*iskhara*), that the first is for the vulgar believers and the second for the practical men (khawāṣis), *iskhara* and *'ibāra* refer to the *zāhir* and the *bātin* of the Book: the vulgar believer stops at the external beauty of the text, while the privileged goes beyond it towards the interiority of the text, towards the allusion which the heart discovers (see P. Nwyia, *Exégèse coranique*, 167). The definition of *iskhara* given by Ibn 'Arabī should also be noted. Replying to Mākīm Tirmīthī's question: "What is revelation (wahy)?", he writes: "It is that in which is born the allusion which replaces the expression (*'ibāra*) without expression. In the *'ibāra*, one "passes" from it to the sense which it aims at; and this is why it is called *'ibāra*, passage, while the allusion which is revelation is the very essence of that which is alluded to" (*dhāt al-mushār* ilayhi; *Khaīm al-awliyā*, ed. O. Yahya, 220). The *iskhara* is thus the language which affects the maximum reduction of the saying and what is said. This is why al-Shībīl could declare that the true allusion to God is God Himself, and this allusion eludes the mystic (see *Luma*, 223).

*Bibliography*: in the article. (P. Nwyia)

**ISHBILIA**: the name used by the Arabo-Muslim authors to denote Seville, the ancient Romano-Visigothic Hispalis, situated 97 km. from the coast on the Guadalquivir.

1. — HISTORY

The Muslim geographers locate Ishbiliya at a distance of 60 miles from the sea, and describe it as a *madīna* and capital of the kūra which bore the same name or was sometimes known as Hims, from the Syrian *gund* established there in 1257/742-3. The boundaries of the kūra are fixed fairly precisely by al-'Aqīb, who said that the dependencies (ahunds) of Ishbiliya were contiguous 30 miles to the west with the kūra of Niebla, 25 miles to the south and southeast with that of Shadhūnā, 40 miles to the east with the territories of Córdoba, the capital of which was 90 miles away, and that they extended for 50 miles to the north as far as the kūra of Mérida. The richness of its lands was particularly noted by al-'Aqīb, Ibn Ghālib, al-Idrisī and al-Himyarī, who called attention to the excellence and fertility of the soil, both for plantations and orchards and also for irrigated land
and pasturages. The name Aljarafe (al-Sharaf) applies to the natural region, both the district and the mountain (iskim and qibal al-Sharaf), and it recurs constantly in descriptions of Ishbiliya; bordering on the iskim of Shadhūnā, it extends in all for 40 miles, according to al-Idrīsī, starting about three miles to the north of Ishbiliya and including the prosperous, densely inhabited territories situated between Ishbiliya, Niebla and the sea. The economy of Ishbiliya was based essentially on vast plantations of olive and fig trees, mainly in Aljarāfa, and in particular on the production of oil of high quality, used throughout al-Andalus and also exported to the East. Of similar importance economically was the cultivation of cotton, here again of excellent quality, which was sent to other parts of al-Andalus and to Ifrījīya. Safflower (Carthamus tinctorius) was a product that was exported and also widely distributed within the country. Coresals, an abundance of fruit of varied kinds, herds of cattle and horses, game and fish of high quality, sugar cane, honey, medicinal plants and other vegetable produce, especially the kirmis (Quercus cocifera), constituted other natural riches of the kūra of Ishbiliya, which included 12 ṣikīms or agricultural districts; the names of these are enumerated by al-ʿUḏrī and al-Bakri, who record that the total figure of the ḡībāna at the time of the amir al-Ḥakam b. Ḥājīm amounted to 33,100 dinārs.

In the spring of 94/713, after occupying Medina Sidonia, Alcalá de Guadaira and Carmona, Mūsā b. Nuṣayr (q.v.) annexed Ishbiliya to the other possessions of Islam, entrusting it to the protection and supervision of the Jews and of an Arab detachment. Shortly afterwards, the populace rebelled and had to be put down with severity by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Mūsā, who established his residence there as udhir; the town was the seat of the Arabo-Muslim government of al-Andalus until the time when the sādi al-Hurr transferred it to Córdoba in 99/717-8. During the period preceding the establishment of the Umayyad dynasty, Ishbiliya witnessed a modification of its social structure as a result of Arabo-Berber ethnic and religious influence, particularly after the Syrian ḡīrād of Ḥimṣ had been installed there. The original Visigothic nobility was replaced by an Arab nobility or military caste, mainly Yemeni, which began to dominate the town and countryside to and exploit the indigenous population and the agricultural wealth of the province. In his Diāmara, Ibn Ḥazm has left a very clear eye-witness account of the Arab families established in Ishbiliya and the region (Elías Terés, Linajes árabes en al-Andalus, in al-And., xii (1957), index, 276).

The history of Ishbiliya under the amirate is characterized by constant rebellions. The chronicles, and above all the account of al-ʿUḏrī, make particular reference to all those, whether Arab or mulādī, who revolted in the kūra of Ishbiliya. Under the administration of governors nominated by Córdoba, Ishbiliya had to endure revolts by members of the ḡīrād and of the “noble” families, which were oppressed with severity by the amir’s troops. One revolt, which broke out in 149/766 under the leadership of Saʿd al-Yaḥūṣī al-MAṣārī in the Niebla district and then spread to Ishbiliya, is noteworthy, as is also the rebellion of the former governor of the town, Abu ʿl-Sabbāḥ ibn Yabyā al-Yaḥūṣī, who had been disgraced. In 154/771 according to al-ʿUḏrī, or in 156/773 according to Ibn ʿIṯlāḥī and others, Ḥaywa or Ḥaybī b. Mūlāmīs al-Ḥaḍrāni, aided by the Yemenis of Ishbiliya and acting in concert or at least simultaneously with ʿAbd al-Qasīf al-Qaṭmī (who started his activities to the north-west of Ishbiliya and in the neighbourhood of Córdoba), with other rebels overran the south-western districts of al-Andalus, claiming to enjoy complete autonomy in Ishbiliya and the adjacent territories. It seems that, until the amirate of ʿAbd Allāh, no other serious subversive movement occurred in Ishbiliya. After the revolts just referred to and those recorded by al-ʿUḏrī, Ishbiliya was to experience several decades of peaceful existence, disturbed only in 230/844 by the invasions of the Vikings (Madcūs [q.v.], concerning which new information is provided by the manuscript of the Muḥtabis of Ibn Ḥayyān utilized by E. Lévi-Provençal (Hist. Esp. Mus., i, 218-25), and also by al-ʿUḏrī, whose statements have been collected by A. A. El-Hajji in his article The Andalusian diplomatic relations with the Vikings during the Umayyad Period, in Hesperis-Tamuda, viii (1967), 67-105. During the amirate of ʿAbd Allāh, from the start rebellion proved to be the keynote of the time, both in Ishbiliya and throughout al-Andalus. Apart from the early rebellions at the time of the nomination of Muhammad, son of ʿAbd Allāh, as governor of Ishbiliya, the disturbances which most gravely threatened the peace of this kūra were those provoked by the ambitions of two powerful Arab families, the Banū Ḥadīdā and the Banū ʿAbd Allāh, who owned vast estates between Carmona and Ishbiliya in and Aljarāfa and who were the instigators of the conflict between Arabs and mulādī, which for several years brought bloodshed to the south-western territories of al-Andalus. From 276 to 301/891-913, the dynasty of the Banū Ḥadīdā set up a small independent state in Seville and Carmona, nominally subject to the amir of Córdoba. It is probable that complementary information on Muhammad b. ʿĪbrāhīm b. Ḥadīdā is to be found in volume v of the Muḥtabis of Ibn Ḥayyān, relating to ʿAbd al-Rahmān III (cf. on the contents of this vol. M. A. ʿInān in RIEI, xiii (1965-6), 127-38).

Under the caliphate, Ishbiliya, which had been conquered by ʿAbd al-Rahmān III in 301/913, enjoyed some years of peace and prosperity, broken only in 363/974 by the revolt of a group in which some members of the provengal and the Hispanic ṣindī were involved and during its course the prison was attacked. Then, at the time of the fitna, the nomination of the son of al-Kāsim b. ʿHammūd, Muḥammad, as the personal delegate of the caliph to the government of Ishbiliya, led the townsfolk, on hearing of the rising of the people of Córdoba against the Ḥammūdīd caliph, to revolt in their turn against Muḥammad and besiege him in the Alcázar.

But the period of greatest prosperity for Ishbiliya, in the political, economic and cultural spheres alike, was that of the dynasty of the Banū ʿAbbād [see ʿABBĀDDĪS] after the rising of the Ḫādī ʿAbū l-Kāsim Muḥammad b. ʿAbbād in the middle of Shaʿbān 414/early November 1023 (al-ʿUḏrī gives some particulars regarding his activities which Lévi-Provençal was unable to utilize in his article on the ʿAbbādīd). After the death of Muḥammad b. Ṣibāḥ in Din mādī I 431/January or February 1042, his son ʿAbbād al-Muʿtadīd undertook a vigorous policy of expansion which resulted in the annexation of Niebla, Huelva-Saltés, Carmona, Arcos, Ronda and other adjacent territories and in the considerable enlargement of his kingdom. On the death of al-Muʿtadīd (461/1068-9), his son Muḥammad al-Muʿtammīd, in face of the mounting military and economic pressure exerted by King Alfonso VI of...
Castile, with the onerous system of parias, decided to seek the aid and intervention of the Almoravid amir Yusuf b. Tashfin; the latter finally dispossessed al-Mutamid of his kingdom, as a result of the military action of Sir b. Abi Bakr, who captured Ishbiliya by storm on 20 or 22 Rajab 484/9 September 1091, and remained there as governor until his death in Dhu'l-Ka'ba 507/April-May 1114. Under Almoravid rule for 55 years and four months, Ishbiliya became crowded with new inhabitants who wore the veil—a foreign element in the social context—and the town developed a special atmosphere which is vividly described by Ibn 'Abdun in his treatise on hisba. Seville had fourteen governors, perhaps more, who were related to the Tashfin family, one of whom, Abû Hašf 'Umar b. al-Hādhī, tried to halt the invading force which, in the time of Alfonso VII, sacked the whole Ishbiliya region and killed the Almoravid governor in Rajab 526/May-June 1132. Ishbiliya was a place of assembly for troops arriving from the Maghrib and for Andalusian soldiers recruited by the jahāba and 'ulama' of Córdoba and Seville, until the time when Barrāz b. Muḥammad al-Masūfī, acting in the name of 'Abd al-Mu'min, annexed the town to the Almohad empire (13 Ša'ba 541/18 January 1143). The Sevillians sent a delegation headed by the ḥāfi Ibn al-'Arabi to express their gratitude to 'Abd al-Mu'min. Abû Ya'qūb Yusuf, who was governor of Ishbiliya from 551 to 556/1156-57, from the time when he became caliph and above all from 566/1171-2, made the town the second capital of his empire and the administrative centre of al-Andalus. He strengthened the city's fortifications and completed many other important undertakings; the population increased considerably, prosperity was enjoyed for several years, and the town took on a new appearance. However, Ishbiliya was destined to suffer various attacks, particularly in 575/1180, by forces from Avila under Ibn Mardanish [q.v.] and Ibn Hamushk. These were a source of anxiety for the Almohad governor of Ishbiliya for two or three years. In the last quarter of the 6th/12th century, the town was subjected to raids by Alfonso Enriquez and the Infante Sancho of Portugal, and also by Alfonso VIII of Castile, which caused considerable damage to Aljarafe and the Vega. At the beginning of the 7th/13th century there were serious floods, an endemic danger from which Ishbiliya suffered frequently, as a result of the Guadalquivir overflowing its banks (Diumādā II 597/February-March 1200), and a great number of houses was destroyed by the inundations. This catastrophe, the pressure from the Christians and the political crisis in the Almohad empire brought about the start of a decline from which Abû 'l-'Ula' Idrīs, the son of Yusuf I, succeeded in temporarily rescuing Ishbiliya in 617/1220-1. The last years of Muslim life in Ishbiliya are full of sad incidents, in particular the attack by forces from Léon in 622/1225, when heavy losses were inflicted on the Sevillians, the siege of the town by al-Bayyāsf, who held the castles of Tajada and Azañacazar, and the rising of al-Ma'amūn, son of Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr. All these happenings coincided with the increasing military and economic pressure exerted by Ferdinand III, which compelled al-Ma'amūn to conclude honourable truces, and with the insurrection of Ibn Hūd against the Almohads. On 11 Dhu'l-Hijja 626/31 October 1229 the people of Seville renounced their obedience to the Almohad empire and accepted the authority of Ibn Hūd. Ferdinand III harassed Ishbiliya increasingly and kept the town under siege for 17 months, from Diumādā I 643/September 1247, according to the Almohad Bayān, until the moment when it fell into his hands on 1 Sha'ba 649/19 November 1248 or more probably, according to the Crónica general, on 25 November 1248 (for all these events, see J. González, Las conquistas de Fernando III en Andalucía, in Hispania, xxv (1946), 98-121). The attempts made by the Marīnid sultans to restore Ishbiliya to Islam failed, though their devastations in the region caused much damage, especially in 674/ 1275, the year of the siege of the town by al-Jārafi, when Aljarafe was pillaged. After this unhappy chapter, Seville remained in Christian hands, never again to be placed in danger or even threatened. It had been in the possession of the Muslims for 535 years.


2.—Historic Buildings

From its long Muslim history, Seville has retained only a few historic buildings; nevertheless, it was one of the greatest art cities in al-Andalus. But the prosperity it has enjoyed during the modern period when, from the 16th century, it came to be the great port and commercial centre safeguarding the links between Spain and her empire in the New World, has endowed Seville with new buildings which have replaced those which adorned the city at the time of the Christian reconquest.

1). Fortifications.—a) The town wall. For Seville, situated in a plain on the banks of a large navigable river, a fortified enceinte was indispensable. The Arabic texts refer to this at a very early date: after the Norman invasion of 230/844, the wall had to be repaired, at the command of ʿAbd al-Rahmân II who appointed one of his Syrian mawāfīl, ʿAbd Allâh b. Sinān, to direct the works. On several occasions the waters of the Guadalquivir damaged the south face of this wall, at the edge of the river. Moreover, after the deposition of ʿAbd Allâh, the Zirid amir of Granada, al-Muʾtāmîd had the ramparts strengthened, in view of the imminence of an Almoravid attack. But this enceinte seems to have been repaired or completely reconstructed under the second Almohad sultan ʿAll b. Yūsuf. The geographer al-Idrīsī, who was writing between 541 and 548/1147-54 and who had seen Andalusia before the Almohad conquest, said that the town wall of Seville was very strong. It survived the Christian reconquest. After having surrounded the city for seven centuries, it was demolished between 1861 and 1869. It measured six kilometres in circumference and was flanked by 116 towers. One small section of the wall still survives, between Córdoba and the Macarena gates. The lofty curtain wall of solid concrete is constructed in courses 83 cm. high. Seven towers have been preserved, one of which is polygonal, the Torre Blanca, the other six being rectangular. All of them are decorated on their outer faces with bands of brickwork in one of which is polygonal, the Torre Blanca, the other six being rectangular. All of them are decorated on their outer faces with bands of brickwork in another handsome facade of cut stone. The Almohads must have contented themselves with restoring the whole structure and repairing the upper part of the towers.

b). The Alcazar. Like all large towns in al-Andalus, Seville had its citadel, the Alcazar, the residence of the sovereign or governor. Its rectangular towers, ornamented with a double band in relief at the top, led to the belief that this fortification was the work of the Almohads. But recent restoration work of the south face has revealed that, beneath their outer covering, the curtain wall and towers were built of cut stone, following the characteristic technique of the 3rd/9th century. In its oldest form, the Alcazar thus dates back to the construction works ordered by ʿAbd al-Rahmân II. In the 4th/10th century, an alteration was made with a gate in this rampart, with a handsome facade of cut stone. The Almohads must have contented themselves with restoring the whole structure and repairing the upper part of the towers.

c). Palaces.—Of the Muslim palaces contained in the Alcazar, and particularly the one adorned by the ʿAbbādīds, nothing remains from before the 6th/12th century. From the Almohads’ buildings there only survive one section of the arches and interlaced lattice-work panels which surrounded the Patio de Yeso, and a ribbed vault in the Patio de Banderas. All the rest of the Alcazar was rebuilt and altered in the Christian period: today, as a whole, it represents a great monument of mudéjar art. However, in the Hall of the Ambassadors, the triple semicircular horseshoe-shaped archway, under a large arch of the same form, may represent an architectural arrangement dating from the caliphal period.

2). Mosques.—a) The first chief mosque. Although all that survives is a section of the minaret, which now forms the base of the clock-tower in the old collegiate church of S. Salvador, we are fairly well informed regarding the first chief mosque in Seville. The foundation inscription which was carved on a pillar has been discovered; the mosque was built in 244/859 under the direction of the kādī of the town, Ibn ʿAdabbi, with a width of 48.5 metres, it contained eleven aisles, at right angles to the wall of the kibār. Arches of brick-work rested on stone pillars. In 472/1079, the upper part of the minaret was repaired by al-Muṭāmīd.

Despite its handsome size, the mosque has become too small. In another quarter of the town, near the Alcazar, the second Almohad caliph, Abū Yaḥyā Yūsuf, had a new sanctuary built. Nevertheless, in 592/1195 his son Abū Yūsuf Yaḥyā ordered the renovation of the former chief mosque which, at the reconquest, was transferred into a church. In 797/1395, an earthquake undermined the top of the tower. Shortly afterwards, a bell-tower of cut stone
was erected, and this still forms the second section of the present bell-tower. The mosque underwent various alterations and was demolished in 1671.

The base of the minaret—the oldest Muslim building in Spain, after the mosque of 'Abd al-Rahmān I at Córdoba—measures 5.8 m. in width. It is built of rough stone, of large size. In the interior, a spiral staircase mounts round a cylindrical central shaft. This arrangement, unknown in the Muslim East, occurs again in two ancient minarets in Córdoba. This peculiarly Andalusian feature is perhaps of Roman origin.

b). The Almohad chief mosque. The Almohad caliph Abū Yusuf Ya'qūb wished to endow his favourite town with an immense and beautiful chief mosque. The oratory and the sahn would appear to have been built during this sovereign's long visit to Andalusia, from 556 to 571/1156-6. It was a large building, measuring approximately 150 m. by 100 m. The prayer court had 17 aisles, in the shape of a T, and probably there were 5 domes in the bay along the wall of the kibla. In length, there were 14 bays. In its plan, it conformed with the earliest Almohad mosques, though the dimensions were increased.

The sahn, which extended for a distance of eight bays, has been preserved in part. It was surrounded by lofty arcades of brick-work. Rectangular buttresses occurred at intervals along the outside walls, their summits crowned with toothed merlons, as in the great mosque of Córdoba. Two of the doorways of this sahn have survived, the Puerta del Perdón, in the main axis of the building, and the Puerta de Oriente, on one side of the courtyard.

Although nothing now survives from one of the most immense prayer courts built by the Muslim West, the minaret of this Almohad chief mosque, now known as the Giralda, still dominates the town. This minaret was started in 551/1156 by the overseer B. Basso, who built the foundations and the base of the tower with cut stone which had been used before. The death of the caliph for a time suspended the work, which was resumed on the orders of Abu Yusuf Ya'qub al-Mansur by the architect al-'Afi of Gomara. The qa'on, the work of Abu Layth al-Sikili, was erected in 569/1178. This great Almohad minaret, second only to the Kutubiyya of Marrakush, measures 16.1 m. in width, while the height of the tower is 50.85 m. It was built of brick; around a central block, occupied by seven rooms placed one above the other, the ramp—not a staircase—mounted at a gentle angle, giving access to the upper part of the tower. The lantern was remodelled and surrounded by a gallery for the bells, between 1520 and 1568. Each of the faces of the tower is divided vertically into three sections. In the centre, panels of blind arcades with floral spandrels frame the twin apertures which give light to the ramp. On each side, the wall, which is left plain at its base, is decorated for two storeys with a mesh design in brickwork. All this ornamentation is of great richness and rare subtlety of design.

Reminders of Marrakush, more distant echoes of Córdoba, the natural richness and the light colour of Seville—these were the features that were noted in the Almohad chief mosque. Today, the minaret still bears witness to Seville as a great centre of art, second only to Córdoba.

4. Mudéjar art in Seville. Further testimony, indirect but convincing, is provided by mudéjar art in Seville. The churches erected in the town until the end of the 15th century largely employed Muslim forms and techniques. They were almost always built of brick; the doorways are in the form of large projecting blocks, often decorated with Muslim motifs, and the naves are roofed with artesonados. In design and form, their bell-towers are so close to minarets that it has sometimes been thought that they dated back to the Muslim period. Their panels of blind arcades and their floral decoration reproduce, in a simpler style, the motifs of the Giralda.

The palaces of the Alcazar are almost mudéjar: but with the local traditions is mingled the influence of the art of Granada. It is in the mudéjar churches and in the Giralda that the richness of the tradition of Seville is best appreciated.

Bibliography: H. Terrasse, L'art hispano mauresque des origines au XIIIe siècle, Paris 1932; L. Torres Balbás, Arte almohade, arte nasari, arte mudéjar, in Ars Hispaniae, iv, Madrid 1949; idem, La primitiva mezquita de Sevilla, in Al-And., 1946, 425-39; idem, El arte de Al-Andalus bajo los Almohávides, in Al-And., 1952, 403-23; H. Terrasse, La grande mosquée almohade de Séville, in Mémorial Henri Basset, 1928, 249-66; L. Torres Balbás, Reproducciones de la Giralda anteriores a su reforma en el siglo XVI, in Al-And., 1941, 216-29; idem, La Torre del Oro en Sevilla, in Al-And., 1934, 272-3.

H. Terrasse

ISHIK-ĀKASI, Safavid administrative term = "usher". The tālık-ākāšīs were minor court officials who operated in two different branches of the administrative system, namely, the diwân [q.v.] and the haram [q.v.]. The officers in charge of the two sections were known as tālık-ākāś-ī bāghi-yi diwân-i a’lā and tālık-ākāś-ī bāghi-yi haram respectively. Both officers had categories of officials other than tālık-ākāšīs under their command. There was a great difference between the status and power of these two officers:

(1) tālık-ākāś-ī bāghi-yi diwân-i a’lā. This officer, called by Kaempfer supremus aulae Mareschallus, is not listed among the officers of the early Safavid state. The office is first recorded (985/1577-8) during the reign of Isma’īl II (Iskandar Beg Munshi, Tadhkirat al-muluk (p. 47), written ca. 1138/1726, among the high-ranking (‘ulūl-dīkāh) amirs.

Under Ismā‘īl II (1052/1642—1077/1666), he was a powerful official indeed, and, although his position declined thereafter and his duties became largely ceremonial, he is still listed by the Tadhkirat al-mulâk (p. 47), and passim. (R. M. Savory)

(2) tālık-ākāś-ī bāghi-yi haram. An officer of lesser rank, who was in charge of that category of officials known as muḥarrab al-hadrat, that is to say, those officials whose duties lay at the entrance to, or outside the haram.

Bibliography: Tadhkirat al-mulâk, translated and explained by V. Minorsky, London 1943, index, s.t., and passim. (R. M. Savory)

ISHK (A.), love—passion. Although non-kur'ānic, this word attained a considerable importance in Arabic literature in the broad sense. In analysing it, we come to recognize the conditions in which Arabic-Islamic sensibility and thought evolved. As al-Daylamī says (‘Aff, §§ 5, 87 ff.), all kinds of minds have their opinions (maḥālāt) on love (maḥba-
ISHK — ISHRĀK

ba] and on ʿishk, which is its most dynamic form. Desert Arabs, men of letters, great intellectuals (al-fudūl), theologians, sages, mystics, etc., have all made statements on the causes, the manifestations, the degrees and the aims of love. One of the earliest attempts to define ʿishk is the Risāla fi l-ʿishk of al-Dībātī (11 Rūd, 1619; Rasāʿlīl, ed. Sandūbī, 266-75), and the question so preoccupied men's minds that a discussion on this theme had already been held in the presence of Yābūb b. Ḥalāl, the Barmakī; thirteen representatives of various religious tendencies, of whom al-Masʿūdī, who produces their definitions in the Murūdj (vi, 368-86), giving in addition quotations from Galen, Hippocrates and others; al-Daylamī repeats some of them.

In its most general acceptance, ʿishk describes the irresistible desire (gauk, ṣaḥāwawān) to obtain possession of a loved object or being (mawāšik). It betrays, therefore, in one who experiences it (the ʿishkī), a deficiency, a want, which he must supply at any cost in order to reach perfection (hamālī). That is why it admits of hierarchical degrees (marātib), like the perfections aspiring to by the soul and the body. Its apparently multiple motivations, however, all come down to one ideality, or consistency of meaning (maʿnā), which haunts all beings more or less distinctly and clearly. Greek in the aspiration (lawākān) towards the Beauty (al-kawn) for the intellect freed from the (al-sadd) illusions of knowledge transmitted through the whole of the universe, is the universal love. (ʿakliyya) which are secured through the (ladhdha al-mutlaka), the more the wise man advances in his passionate quest for the One True One (al-wāḥid al-ḥakīm), the more he feels growing within him the ineffable joy (iḥbādī), the absolute pleasure (al-ḥadhā al-mulāka), which are secured through the contemplation (muṣhāhada) of the perfection and beauty of the necessary Being (wadābī al-wudūjīd).

With the Śūfīs the amorous ardour of ʿishk, in spite of some resistance, becomes a part of the life as a natural development of the mysterious perfection (mahabba) mentioned in the Qurʿān (III, 31, XX, 39, etc.). The substitution of ʿishk for mahabba to describe the “essential Desire” for God and the love of God as an essential attribute, which fills the heart of the mystic, seems to have been due to al-Ḥallājī al-Daylamī, ʿAṣf, §§ 163-5). Love is no longer merely an expression of gratitude for the blessings of God; it is no longer content with rigorous asceticism and meticulous ritual observance. It becomes an absolute necessity, entailing neither enjoyment nor alleviation, but intensifying as the reciprocity of perspectives between the lover and the Loved comes into effect. This evolution of the pair ʿishk/mahabba is not without echoes of that ʿerṣ/ṣagḥ, but in Islam the relationship between the two ideas is complicated by the concurrent development of the “courtly” and mystical tenets with Greek texts. When it came to an end, there was a return to a legalistic conception of love in the works of, for example, al-Ghazālī or Ibn Taymiyya, or to the exaltation of a perfect and pure Idea in, for example, al-Suhrawardī or even Ibn ʿArabī. Whatever the differences of opinion about its content, ʿishk is one of the characteristics of mediaeval self awareness, obsessed with the quest for the eternal, the transcendent and the sacred.


(Μ. ΑΡΚΟΥΝ)

ISHKĀ SHIM [see BADAKHSHĀN]...

ISHKODRA [see Supplement]...

ISHRĀK, the name given to illuminative Wisdom, advocated by Šīhāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī (d. 592/1191) who himself indicated its sources (cf. table). By “sources” should be understood not so much the historical circles of influence as the springing forth of a Wisdom which, in the field of mysticism, has inspired lines of initiates comparable with the initiatory insāds of the Śūfīs, though without the explicit granting of any “delegation” by the Masters to the disciples. However that may be, one can discern Western, Greek elements, as well as Eastern elements deriving from the traditions of classical Persia and ancient Egypt. As a result of this observation, H. Corbin has been enabled to resolve a
problem: we know that Ibn Sīnā had conceived the project of an “Eastern” philosophy, a very incomplete testimony to which has survived in his book on the “Logic of the Easterners” (Manāḥ al-Maṣṭoniyyīn), and that Fāṭḥī al-Dīn al-Rāzī had written the Mabhāḥ al-Maṣṭoniyya. Some read this as muṣḥ̱rīk and thought that it was concerned with an illuminating philosophy. Nallino has criticised this reading and shown that it was necessary to make a distinction between a Western philosophy and an Eastern philosophy. Nostoratism was already charged with Eastern ideas, in contrast with pure Aristotelianism which was far more attached to rationalism. H. Corbin admits this criticism, but gives it a quite different interpretation. If this philosophy is “Eastern”, this is so not merely because it is that of the peoples of the East, but primarily because it regards Being and Knowledge as irradiations of the Pure Light which rises in the East. “One may say that it is a question of a Knowledge which is Eastern because it is to the East of thought”. There is thus a close link between illumination (iṣhār) and Eastern Wisdom (Ḥikmat al-iṣhāri). Here is a clear indication of the value of iṣhār: it is not reduced to the general notion of illumination which confers upon the spirit a Truth inaccessible to the abstract concepts of reason; it is, more fundamentally, a delight in the source of all light, whence proceed all being and all authentic knowledge.

It is through Plato that one can best approach this philosophy which, by its nature, eludes any didactic exposition. In the Republic, the Good is presented under the symbol of the Sun, without which nothing which is would exist. This source of all being and all thought is ἐπιλέγεται ἐκτός ἀπὸ τούτου beyond the essence, beyond the Ideas themselves. To it, man should turn ἐν τῷ ἐκτός ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ with his entire soul. It seems that the Wisdom of iṣhār is a meditation upon these two propositions. Being, in the sense of existence, is there presented in effect as the source of all reality. If it is not conceptuallisable, and if it is not reduced to a purely equivocal denomination, as Aristotle saw clearly, it does not thereby follow that the solution necessarily lies in an analogical theory which would make substance the first analogue of being. To recognise the rational experience of existence, that one cannot define it as a concept, is not to imply that it can be grasped only when it is engaged in relations with the different categories of beings (in an analogy of proportionality), and that it is devoid of a for-self and an in-self. This is to recognise that there is a knowledge superior to reason, set apart from all the activities of definition and reasoning. It is here that the symbol of light comes into the question. On the physical plane, what is more universally present than light? But what is more indefinite, since in light all is clarity, and effulgence, without any shadow to trace recognisable contours upon it? Thus one is led to think of existence as a spiritual light, the Light of Light from which, by irradiation, emanate the Amād al-khidrā, the “victorious” or “archangelical” lights. This rendering is by H. Corbin, who writes: “By this epiphany, the whole hierarchy of the ṣūrat al-khidrā (from degree to degree, illumines the presence of each lower degree”) Authentic Knowledge too renders its object present while irradiating it, after being itself revealed, when every material veil has fallen away, as a Light-being. There is here an “illumination of presence” (iṣhār ḫudār) which makes a clear distinction between knowledge by representation of the object (ʿilm ṣawār) and unitive knowledge (ʿulliṣāʿ) of intuitive experiences vision (gūhāsī), that is to say ʿilm ḫudārī. In this connection, one thinks of the part played by Existenterhellung in the philosophy of Karl Jaspers, and of the very current ideal of knowledge through engagement experienced not merely by dry reason alone, but by “the entire soul”. It is the Spirit (rāḥ), the Angel Gabriel, which illuminates—while dissipating the insoluble antinomies of reason which Suhrawardi, in his Ḥikmat al-iṣhār, is pleased to develop while criticising the Peripatetics, in a condensed style which recalls the opening of the Parmenides. Thus rational knowledge is not a preparation for illuminative knowledge, although negatively it can convey through teaching that the insoluble difficulties which it contains within itself melt away in iṣhār: the problems raised by conceptual thought remain ceaselessly and indefinitely (tasāwī) without ever finding a solution, or fall hopelessly into a vicious circle (dauru). But man cannot by himself emerge from this inextricable situation: he must have a revelation, a call, for “the Spirit proceeds from the Command of my Lord” (Kūrān, XVII, 85).

Such seems to be the fundamental intuition of iṣhār. An exposition of the details of this Wisdom would be tantamount to an exposition of the details of Suhrawardi’s thinking. The play of Light and shadow, the conception of baraṣṣā (screen, separation, which is utter darkness), the modes of proceeding of the production of the world, all these together form a whole which can be expounded, as by Suhrawardi himself, in the terminology of the Plotinian or Avicennian philosophy of emanation, Intellects and spheres. But in that there is merely a barren, discursive expression which remains divorced from Reality and which only becomes valid if it is gathered up into a higher unitive vision which makes it “cohere”, when the ūḥl is assumed by the Spirit, in which it receives the sakīna, “the placing in the direct presence on the threshold of the transcendental Being” (H. Corbin). (R. Arnaldes)

Iṣhārīyyūn, adepts of illuminative Wisdom. The question arises whether this term can be applied to the representatives of the spiritual family to which Suhrawardī belonged, who preceded him in time. If that family can indeed claim the “Sethists” who, from the 4th century in Egypt, saw in Seth (Ṣīth) the first ūriyā (from the Hebrew or - light), the sages of Persia, disciples of Zaraḥustra, and the Manichaean would already be iṣhārīyyūn. H. Corbin has recorded a text of Ibn Wābšihiyya, relating to Hermes-Thoth of ancient Egypt, in which the word figures. The discovery is interesting, but it must be seen in the context of the author’s preoccupation with alchemy. Here is a summary of the whole of this text:—the successors of Hermes form four groups; the first two, direct descendants of Hermes and his brother, have not mixed with any strangers and have preserved the pure secret doctrine so well that no one apart from themselves knows it. The third is that of the sons of the sister of Hermes; they have had contacts with strangers, and certain men are familiar with their ṣūrat al-khidrā and can interpret their symbols (ṭawṣīya). Finally, the fourth group is composed of strangers who have mingled with the Harāmīs. To these last two groups, Ibn Wābšihiyya gives respectively the names iṣhārīyyūn (and ʿīṣārīyyūn) and maṣāḥaṭyya (Peripatetics). These are the only ones to have come down to us. It seems that all that can be deduced from this text is that, in alchemical circles in the 4th/10th century, emphasis was placed upon a hermetic
**TABLE**

| Western part: | Empedocles, Pythagoras, Plato / in Islam: Dhu 'l-Nun, Tustarl |
| Eastern part: | Gayōmarīh, Farđūn, Kay-Khusraw / in Islam: Bīṣṭāmī, Hālālīdī |
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Tradition whose holders, while not claiming to have a perfect knowledge of the Great Work, had received some illumination which had placed their works above those of the Peripatetics, "worshippers of the astral forms", says the text. It therefore seems doubtful if Suhrawardi can be placed among the ihšākīyyūn of Ibn Wahshiyya. Moreover, the ḥālāsīfā for their part had spoken of the irradiation of light and illumination. But in its technical sense, the term ihšākī can be applied with exactness only to the Master of ihšāk and his spiritual posterity. However numerous the sources upon which he has drawn materially, his conception of ihšāk is so personal that it seems it was first illustrated in him by the fact that he received it directly from that being of light which, for each man, constitutes his "Perfect Nature".

In addition, some thinkers may have undergone Suhrawardian influences, although one cannot properly speaking rank them as ihšākīyyūn. Thus, in Ibn 'Arabi, illumination seems to be reduced, as in Plotinus, to the symbol of the mode of procession of the beings forming the ḥālāk, while the theory itself of Being is markedly dialectical. Ṭūsī was able to take inspiration from Suhrawardi to interpret Ibn Sinā, though without thereby being ihšākī. To sum up, H. Corbin writes very justly: "It remains to discover the influence which the theories of ihšāk exerted for example on Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, Ibn 'Arabi and the Iranian Shi'i commentators on the last-named writer".

On the other hand, the term ihšākīyyūn will be applied without hesitation to all Suhrawardi's Iranian followers, whose numbers were very great until the 18th century and who still exist in Iran today. Two great names are outstanding, Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrūzī (d. 1243) who, in his History of the Philosophers, gave the biography of his Master, commented on two of his treatises and wrote a personal work, and Mollā Sadrā Shirāzī (d. 1840) who stated: "I have followed the doctrine of ihšāk of Suhrawardi, until God made me see its foundations clearly". It will be understood from these words that his fidelity to ibshak can be applied with exactness only to the Master of ibshak, until the original work.


(ISHTIB) (Ṣtip), a town situated to the south-east of Skopje, in Macedonia, Yugoslavia. In antiquity, it was an important town in Paeonia, on the Roman road from Serdica to the Danube, known as Astibo; by the Byzantines it was called Stipion, by the southern Slavs Stip and by the Turks Ish tip. In the 14th century it was a fortress and district in the principality of Constantine Dejanovitch (Dragaš), in northern Macedonia (between the Vardar and the Strouma). After the battle of Ćirmen (1371), the principality became tributary to the Ottomans. On the death of Constantine in 1394, at the side of the Turks at the battle of Rovine, the principality became a sandjak (Kostand-ili = Küstendil). In the 15th/16th century it was the centre of a vilâyêt, in the 10th/16th the centre of a kazâ, attached to the ḥās of the sanjakbey and administered by his voivoda. In Ştip and its environs, Turkish colonization was not very extensive. Some yurâs of the "ovče pole" group were established there—81 oğlaqs in the kazâ of Ştip in 1566. The population was principally Christian. In 1489-91 the non-Muslim families in the kazâ of Ştip and Novkerić numbered 8,434. In the 11th/17th century there were 24 Muslim mahalles in the town. Traces of Islamization were insignificant.

A centre of commerce and craft-work, the town was famous for the manufacture of penknives and knives. Sheep-rearing was highly developed in the region, while in the town artisans devoted themselves to the preparation of the wool and to dairy and meat products. In the market there were local traders, as well as Jewish merchants and others from Dubrovnik. According to Evliya Celebi, there were 450 shops in the Carah. The town's trading and craftwork activity was also served by a bazaar, caravanserais and seven inns (khammān).

The town had acquired a Muslim appearance owing to the public buildings—the numerous mosques, among them that of Sultan Murâd (Fethiyye), the former Christian church of the Archangel Michael, transformed into a mosque, as was the case with the church of St. Elias; two public baths, and, in the 11th/17th century, a palace belonging to a local Turkish dignitary. There were also some Christian churches; Ştip formed part of the diocese of the bishopric of Kolassia. In the 19th century the town was attached to the Bulgarian eparchy of Küstendil.

During the war of 1863-99, Austrian troops reached Ştip. In the 19th century, Amy Boud found Ştip to be a flourishing centre of commerce and craft-work, with 15,20,000 Turks and Bulgarians and a Jewish community. In about 1894 the population of Ştip included 10,900 Bulgarians, 8,700 Turks, 800 Jews and 500 gypsies—in all, 29,900.
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(Bistra Cvetkova)

ISHTIKAK, a technical term in Arabic grammar, translated approximately as "etymology"; ishtakka l'išghy "he split the thing", ishtakka l'išghyy "he took the šيخ, half of the [split] thing" (Lane, Lex., 1572a): ishtikak, inf. of ishtakka, in the general sense, in fact, signifies: ishtafcka. In ishtikak, the object of these examples is to show how a form is taken or formed, the first example, is not more than "taking one word from another", under certain defined conditions (al-Djurđji, Ta'rifâ, 17).

Many ancient authors wrote special studies of ishtikak; al-Suyûti (Mushtarih, i, 351, l. 4-6) lists twelve: al-Muład al-Dablî (d. 170/786), Kutrub (d. 206/821), al-Asma (d. 215/830), Abu Nasr al-Bahill (d. 231/846), al-Munšîf (d. 384/994), Ibn al-Nahhas (d. 338/949), Ibn Khalawayh (d. 370/980), al-Ru'mam (d. 384/994), Ibn Durayd (d. 325/937), Ibn al-Nahhas (d. 338/949), Ibn Khalawayh (d. 370/980), al-Rummani (d. 384/994). Since all these examples are lost, it is certain that Ibn Durayd (who but which contains examples of ishtikak), we are obliged to have recourse to the data that are given in passing in various works: a chapter of the Mushtarih of al-Suyûti (i, 345-54), quoting Ibn Dihya (d. 637/1240), the presentation of Ibn al-Munšîf (al-Muład al-Tasrîf, lit. Mâzini, i, 3-4), the Khâtima of the editors (Cairo 1373/1954, iii, 278-9): also the definitions of al-Djurđjian (Ta'rifâ, 17) and in the account of the Diet. of Technical Terms (i, 766-70).

In ishtikak, "etymology"; it must, however, be understood how the Arab grammarians practised this etymology. According to Ibn Djinîn, tasrîf occupies a position intermediate between lugha and nahw (yaladâh, al-šârîf). There is considerable affinity (nasab harîb) and connexion (itiṣâl qaḍîdî) between ishtikak and tasrîf, but ishtikak has more to do with lugha (abâd fi l-lugha min al-tasrîf, Munṣîf, i, 3, line 17-4, line 10). Lugha is concerned with vocabulary itself; nahw deals with šurâb: it studies the variations of the šurâb at the end of the words of the lugha and the morphological formations of the tasrîf (as inacc. of the verb), in its turn it is concerned with the troponym, troponym (tafnaša; see below). Taṣrîf analyses the great number of forms (called wâm, pl. wa'amîn, or bâmîn, pl. abnîya, or šîga, pl. šiyâg) found in the words of the lugha and in the morphological formations mentioned above. Ishtikak deals with the same material as tasrîf, but considers it from the point of view of its origin: wâmîn min ... "it is taken from ..." is the information that it gives.

To understand the great affinity and connexion that Ibn Djinîn saw between ishtikak and tasrîf, it is necessary first to be introduced to tasrîf. Tasrîf was practised in two ways. The first, the Sulaymani and the ancients, was concerned only with masâ'il al-tamrin "training questions", and its object was al-riyda wa'l-tadarrub "practice and habituation". An imaginary word was formed on the pattern of an existing Arabic word, and the peculiarities of the form (bind) of the existing word were exactly reproduced in the imaginary word; see Sibawayhi, title of ch. 51 (li, 436-42). In order to carry out this operation it was necessary to know the morphological data, set out, interspersed with nasb, in the Kitdb. The exercises in question were a means of remembering these and making oneself familiar with them.

The second method thought of tasrîf as a discipline to be studied in its own right and made an independent science of it; this is done in the K. al-Tasrîf of al-Mânîn (d. 247/861). This tasrîf takes as its object existing Arabic words and studies their forms. It regroups the necessary data in this way; Ibn Djinîn, in the Muhhadsar al-tasrîf al-mulâkî (ed. G. Hoberg, 8, l. 9-10), systematizes them according to the following divisions: šiyâda, badal, hadaf, tashrih bi-harakat ai-su$m, idâhîm [see TASRIF].

The affinity and connexion of ishtikak with tasrîf. We have seen above that Ibn Djinîn asserts that there is a great affinity and connexion between ishtikak and tasrîf. The method that he adopts to demonstrate the functioning of ishtikak with respect to tasrîf is instructive here; Ibn Djinîn considers then tasrîf as did Sibawayhi and the ancients, working with imaginary words, and he uses for this conception of ishtikak exactly the same examples as for the account of tasrîf (see Munṣîf, editors, iii, 278, l. 15-379). In tasrîf, the object of these examples is to demonstrate the accidents that occur to hurarf al-wâsîl (the radical consonants) in order to constitute the forms: šiyâda, badal, etc. In ishtikak, the object of these examples is to show how a form is taken from another and they presuppose a knowledge (and a use) of the accidents referred to and the processes of tasrîf. In these circumstances, Ibn Djinîn takes as his subject what he bases his treatment on: the origin of the verb, darb, and he lists all that can be taken and formed from this masdar: madda (daraba), muḍârî (yadrabu), active participle (darîb), etc. This is a good illustration of the affinity and the connexion that Ibn Djinîn sees between ishtikak and tasrîf. Ishtikak, however, is less general than tasrîf (see below).

Ishtikak and lugha. Ibn Djinîn says, besides, that ishtikak is based more than tasrîf on lugha. A chapter of the Muḥtasab of al-Mubarrad (Cairo 1386, iii, 185) helps us to understand this; al-Mubarrad distinguishes first of all the nouns (asma') that are ghayr (non-) mushâhk, such as hadar "stone", ġḏâb al-mountain". Ishtikak is silent concerning these, for no original form is found from which their form can be taken; they are simply common nouns (asma') al-aqīnâs. As far as the Tasrîf is concerned, it places them in the form našî (qualifying); these are adjectives that are connected with a verb where their meaning is found again: saqāš "small" with saqārah, ġiḏiš "ignorant" with ḍiḏîla, amāka "stupid, foolish" with ġiba; thus the mushâhk nouns that are not used as našî (qualifying); the examples given are proper names:
hanifa, mudar, 'ayldn. Their ishtikâk varies according to the semantic links to be found between these nouns and others from the same root; hanifa is said simply to come from 'anf (the word is explained), mudar from madara 'l-laban "the milk became sour" and 'ayldn from 'ayla, the inf. of 'ala "to be poor," form fa'lân. Thus ishtikâk deals with vocabulary, seeking for the point of departure, the mukhabbat minhâ dru, while remaining, according to the rule, within one single root and its infinities of meaning, whereas isrrif does not go beyond the word whose wâzin it has to determine.—Other examples of ishtikâk are to be found in the indices to the Mu'kadab, iv, 149-50, in the discussion on the ishtikâk of the ism and the verb taken from the msdâr (Ibn al-Anbâri K. al-Insâf, ed. Well, disputed questions 1 and 28). Ibn Durayd devoted his K. al-ishtikâk (ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1854) to the names of the Arab tribes (but without any preliminaries about methodology).

The Arab grammarians practised ishtikâk only for Arabic words; see Ibn al-Sarrâdî's warning as reported by al-Djawalikl (K. al-Mu'arrab, ed. Sachau, 3, l. 10-4, l. 3) and al-Suyûtî (Muzhirî, i, 351, l. 7-9). This Arabic ishtikâk introduces no historical perspective into the study of the language. The relations or origins that are detected form merely part of the revealed language and are given with it (cf. Dîct. of Technical Terms, i, 766, l. 15-6). The explicative value of this ishtikâk is meagre; first, depending exclusively as it does on the Arabic grammatical system, it suffers from the deficiencies of this (e.g., the two disputed Questions mentioned above); then, the derivation of one term from another is stated merely when the conditions are satisfied. Thus al-Djurjâni gives the definition of ishtikâk: nasîf 'laaf min akbar bi-âwâlî, and in Girshî's (Wâzirî, 17) "talking one word from another, on condition that they are related in sense and in composition [of the radical consonants] and that they differ in form." There is no concern to demonstrate the linguistic processes that legitimate this derivation; al-Mubarrad says that saqhir comes from the verb saqhura (see above). Why does he do this? The mind must be continuously alert to notice the cases in which this ishtikâk gives acceptable information. It is particularly useful, too, by reason of the studies on vocabulary that it has involved, as in the K. al-ishtikâk of Ibn Durayd.

Ishikâk is called: a) al-sâghir "the small," when, for the tarkih of al-Djurjâni's for-going definition, the order of succession of the same radical consonants remains identical in the two terms; this is the normal ishtikâk. b) al-kabîr "the large," when the wâzin, the actual sense of the root, is preserved, but not the order of succession for the tarkih, e.g.: dijâbâka [metathesis of dijakbâa], taken from the msdâr: dijakbâ. c) al-akbar "the largest," when neither the actual sense of the root nor the order of succession are preserved. This ishtikâk was invented by Ibn Djinnî and set out in the Khâsî'a (Cairo 1372/1955, i, 5-17 and Cairo 1374/1955, ii, 133-9); he considered all the relative positions of the three consonants of a root, e.g., for bu:w: bâw, w bâ, b w, b, bâw, w, bâw, combinations existing in the language, with their special meanings, and he extracted from them a sense common to all: al-khufûf wa-l-harakah "haste and movement." The Arab world admired his force and ingenuity of mind but did not follow him in normal studies of the language (see Ibn Dîhyâ, Mushîrî, i, 347, l. 3-348, l. 2).

Remarks: a) al-Djurjâni sees al-ishtikâk al-akbar in the case in which the identity of the radical consonants in the two terms is reduced to that of their mâyârad, as with na'sa, derived from the msdâr: naâd (cf. Dîct. of Tecun, i, 767, l. 6-8). b) For the difference between al-ishtikâk al-sâghir and al-adi, see ibid. 767, l. 2 ff.

Bibliography: in the text. 'Abd Allâh Amlîn, al-İshîkâk, Cairo 1376/1956, a personal study, in order to regroup under one concept of ishtikâk the three divisions just mentioned, whereas isrrif does not go beyond the word whose wâzin it has to determine. Other examples of ishtikâk are to be found in the indices to the Mu'kadab, iv, 149-50, in the discussion on the ishtikâk of the ism and the verb taken from the msdâr (Ibn al-Anbâri K. al-Insâf, ed. Well, disputed questions 1 and 28). Ibn Durayd devoted his K. al-ishtikâk (ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1854) to the names of the Arab tribes (but without any preliminaries about methodology).

The Arab grammarians practised ishtikâk only for Arabic words; see Ibn al-Sarrâdî's warning as reported by al-Djawalikl (K. al-Mu'arrab, ed. Sachau, 3, l. 10-4, l. 3) and al-Suyûtî (Muzhirî, i, 351, l. 7-9). This Arabic ishtikâk introduces no historical perspective into the study of the language. The relations or origins that are detected form merely part of the revealed language and are given with it (cf. Dîct. of Technical Terms, i, 766, l. 15-6). The explicative value of this ishtikâk is meagre; first, depending exclusively as it does on the Arabic grammatical system, it suffers from the deficiencies of this (e.g., the two disputed Questions mentioned above); then, the derivation of one term from another is stated merely when the conditions are satisfied. Thus al-Djurjâni gives the definition of ishtikâk: nasîf 'laaf min akbar bi-âwâlî, and in Girshî's (Wâzirî, 17) "talking one word from another, on condition that they are related in sense and in composition [of the radical consonants] and that they differ in form." There is no concern to demonstrate the linguistic processes that legitimate this derivation; al-Mubarrad says that saqhir comes from the verb saqhura (see above). Why does he do this? The mind must be continuously alert to notice the cases in which this ishtikâk gives acceptable information. It is particularly useful, too, by reason of the studies on vocabulary that it has involved, as in the K. al-ishtikâk of Ibn Durayd.

Ishikâk is called: a) al-sâghir "the small," when, for the tarkih of al-Djurjâni's for-going definition, the order of succession of the same radical consonants remains identical in the two terms; this is the normal ishtikâk. b) al-kabîr "the large," when, the wâzin, the actual sense of the root, is preserved, but not the order of succession for the tarkih, e.g.: dijâbâka [metathesis of dijakbâa], taken from the msdâr: dijakbâ. c) al-akbar "the largest," when neither the actual sense of the root nor the order of succession are preserved. This ishtikâk was invented by Ibn Djinnî and set out in the Khâsî'a (Cairo 1372/1955, i, 5-17 and Cairo 1374/1955, ii, 133-9); he considered all the relative positions of the three consonants of a root, e.g., for bu:w: bâw, w bâ, b w, b, bâw, w, bâw, combinations existing in the language, with their special meanings, and he extracted from them a sense common to all: al-khufûf wa-l-harakah "haste and movement." The Arab world admired his force and ingenuity of mind but did not follow him in normal studies of the language (see Ibn Dîhyâ, Mushîrî, i, 347, l. 3-348, l. 2).

Remarks: a) al-Djurjâni sees al-ishtikâk al-akbar
Flrkası set up in September 1919 as the continuation of a similarly named organization formed by Turkish students in Germany. Initially this party had far more in common with French radical socialism than with Bolshevism, and it drew much of its inspiration from Henri Barbusse's Clarté movement. But with the end of the Allied occupation of Istanbul in 1923, it fell under the direct influence of Moscow. The party published a monthly theoretical journal (until March 1922, Flrkası) and, from 1923, Aylınlık, which soon became the rallying point for elements who were later to play a major role in Turkey's ideological development. Dr. Sheffk Hüsnü [Deymer], a founding member of the Istanbul organization, was the acknowledged leader of the Turkish communist movement until his death in 1959. In 1923 the Turkish Worker and Peasant Socialist Party leaders were tried on charges of treason, but were soon acquitted. After the Law for the Maintenance of Order (Tabirî-i Sukuân) was enacted in 1925, Atatürk closed Aylınlık and prosecuted a number of the party's leaders for carrying on subversive activity.

The Turkish Communist Party (Türkiye Komunist Partisi) proper emerged from several diverse sources: the communists clustered around the Turkish Worker and Peasant Socialist Party, the émigré movement of Mustafâ Subhi, and the Ankara communists from the first came into conflict with Atatürk, who had formed his own "Official" Communist Party in October 1920 in an effort to bring the burgeoning communist movement under his control. In February 1921 the People's Communist Party suspended its activity, though as a result of Soviet pressure it was permitted to revive. From March until October 1922 this party published the weekly Yeni Hayat, a periodical that became increasingly critical of the government. But with victory over the Greeks, Atatürk no longer felt the need to tolerate this opposition, and in October 1922 he suppressed the Ankara party. The remnants of this organization followed Subhi's supporters in joining the Turkish Communist Party, that was apparently organized clandestinely in Istanbul in the fall of 1920 by Deymer and Şadreddin Dhelâl [Antel]. This party was in contact with communists among the non-Turkish communities in Istanbul and sent representatives to gatherings of the Third International in Moscow. It attempted to organize youth groups and trade unions, but without much success. Since its leaders were arrested or forced to flee abroad in 1925, it carried on only underground activity inside Turkey. Deymer convened a party congress in Vienna in 1926; another seems to have been held in 1933 somewhere outside Turkey. The party's main overt activities consist of publishing pronouncements in Soviet and other communist publications, and since the mid-1950s in broadcasting its views over "Bismir Radyo" located in Eastern Europe. From 1932 to 1935 a group of former communists made important contributions to Kemalist ideology through debate in the monthly Kadro, which sought to adapt Marxist ideas to serve Turkish nationalism. Even though the government closed Kadro in 1935 at the urging of more conservative Turkish nationalists, the ideas espoused by Kadro undergirded the famous "Six Arrows" of the Republican People's Party ([Qiumbâriyyet Khâlîk Flrkasl [q.v.]), which were enshrined in the constitution in 1937.

With the relaxation of political restrictions after the Second World War came new efforts to form socialist and communist-oriented parties. The Turkish Socialist Worker and Peasant Party ( Türkiye Sosyalist Emekçi ve Köylü Partisi) that Deymer set up in 1946 and the Turkish Socialist Party ( Türkiye Sosyalist Partisi) of Esat Adî Mustacaploğu were closed within the year by the government, however, on charges of promoting communism. In this atmosphere of suspicion, even moderate socialists met a chilly reception; until the end of the Demokrat Parti [q.v.] regime in 1960 socialism was generally regarded as virtually illegal by the Turkish elite.

The military revolt in 1960 stimulated ferment that gave socialism and communism new relevance in party formation. In the new constitution of 1961 a more favourable climate toward socialism was apparent. Also, for example, central planning by the government was ordained as the remedy for the excesses of the Demokrat Parti era; labour unions received the right to strike. Under these circumstances, the periodical Yön, which began in December 1961, attracted much attention in intellectual circles with its increasingly anti-(Western)imperialist pronouncements in favour of state-directed development. Books and pamphlets on socialism flooded the market and were read especially by students, who were attracted by the emphasis on social justice. A Socialist Cultural Association (Sosyalist Kültûr Dernêcî) was formed in Ankara in 1963 to propagate these views.

This activity saw the emergence on the political scene in February 1961 of the Turkish Labour Party (Türkiye İşçi Partisi) as the culmination of efforts in train even before the government closed Kadro in 1935. When the small group of labour officials who dominated this organization were unable to arouse enough popular support to qualify to take part in the 1961 elections, they sought the co-operation of some prominent leftist intellectuals. In 1962 Mehmet Ali Aybar became President General of the party. By 1965 the Turkish Labour Party was able to run candidates in 51 provinces and received some 275,000 votes in electing 15 deputies to the lower house that year. While the party increased somewhat its percentage of the vote cast in the senatorial elections in 24 provinces in June 1968, it failed to elect a single senator.

The Turkish Labour Party promotes an essentially Marxist line, but seeks to come to power by exclusively parliamentary means. From the first it has been rent by factionalism. At its congress in February 1964 there was dispute over the balance between workers and intellectuals in the ruling organs of the party. This problem was intensified when the party leaders selected a preponderance of intellectuals as deputies in the 1965 elections. Differences within the party led to a revolt against Aybar's leadership at the party congress in November 1968, necessitating an extraordinary conclave at the end of December of the same year. This did not completely heal the rift. Moreover, the party is challenged on the left by individuals advocating a more revolutionary line.

Arab Socialism as expounded by the Ba'th Party or other so-called Arab revolutionary leaders and regimes has little in common with European or Marxist Socialism. Its principles are rather linked to those of pre-nationalist and radical nationalist ideologies, and particularly an interpretation of the ethical and moral teachings of Islam. Its emphasis is on social justice in a traditional Islamic sense, and on economic and social reform. It rejects both the materialist philosophy and historical determinism of Marxist Socialism. It is opposed to the class struggle and the dictatorship of the working class or the proletariat. Instead it proclaims the eradication of class divisions with a view to achieving a harmonious “democratic, cooperative society”, in which classes cooperate with, not oppose or antagonise, one another. It does not share socialism’s opposition to private property, even though it accepts and, in certain cases, practices state ownership of the major means of production and state control of the economy. Because the economies of many of these countries are mainly agricultural their socialists pay greater lip service to the impoverished masses of peasants and less to the urban working classes or proletariat. The latter group on the whole is still a small one in these countries, where industrial development is in its early stages. Finally, Arab Socialism rejects Marxist Socialism because the latter is theoretically opposed to nationalism.

It can be argued that Arab Socialism as articulated by the regime of 'Abd al-Nasir and that of his successor in Egypt, or by the Ba'th in the Fertile Crescent, is a primitive socialism: it is for the confiscation of wealth by its expropriation from the small wealthy landed and old official or governing classes, but not for its abolition. It wishes to eradicate poverty by the nationalisation of capital and other productive wealth and by its redistribution in order to level society; but so far it has only managed to further generalise poverty. Basically it claims that it wishes to share out property, not to abolish it. And as property in most Arab countries implies the ownership of land, there have been several, not very successful, agrarian reform measures in Egypt, 'Irk, Syria and Algeria.

If one examines the utterances and policies of President 'Abd al-Nasir of Egypt (the nationalisation decrees of July-November 1961, his National Charter of 1962, and the Expropriation measures of 1963-4), or those of the Ba'th (for example, 'Aflak's writings, and the proceedings and resolutions of the Party Congresses, especially those of the Sixth Congress), one observes that Arab Socialism is the “radical” expression of Arab nationalism. It is also the justification of radical state economic policies, characterised by central planning and greater centralised state control over all aspects of national economic activity and life. Any structural social changes introduced by the so-called socialist measures of Arab rulers have not so far also envisaged changes in the power structure. Nor does the Arab Socialism of these states envisage any uniform regulation of the consumption of material goods on the basis of strict equality.

Arab Socialism is useful when one wishes to indicate and identify the domestic, regional or international policies of individual Arab states. In Egypt, for example, Arab Socialism became a term applied to President 'Abd al-Nasir's domestic economic, Arab and international policies after 1955, and more so after 1961. By 1962, Arab Socialism in Egypt, as well as in other Arab states
which identified or associated their regimes with it, came to be an amalgam of nationalism, of involvement in inter-Arab state conflict, state political control by the military, state ownership and control of the economy, and an orientation in international politics towards the Soviet Union. Beginning as a protest movement against the concentration of political and economic power in the hands of a small governing class in ancien régime Egypt, 'Irk and Syria for instance, Arab Socialism under military regimes and in the conditions of inter-Arab and international events moved towards an association with the new influential superpower in the Middle East, the Soviet Union. At home, and in practice, it became a bureaucratic, police socialism in the service of the regimes in power, without a firm basis either in a working class proletariat, or its more populist aspiration for a base among the agrarian peasant masses. Socialist parties were proscribed, and local, or native, socialists were persecuted and politically neutralised. Single parties, such as the Arab Socialist Unions in Egypt and 'Irk or the Ba'th parties in Syria and 'Irk, and the FLN in Algeria were also at variance with socialism properly defined and understood. These single parties never controlled government; rather government controlled the parties which served the security and other purposes of the state.

It is difficult for example to adduce anything about the meaning of Arab Socialism from the voluminous writings of 'Allaq or the proceedings and resolutions of the Ba'th Party Congresses beyond the suggestion that the Party considered economics important and relevant to politics; or that one of the Party's goals is the expansion of the economic opportunities for the lower classes of society and the enhancement of their social status.

Domestically then Arab Socialism has meant the opposition by military regimes and those who aspire to overthrow regimes in their respective countries to the dynastic or other governing and official classes, which are often identified as "feudalist". Arab Socialists link the interests of these classes to those of outside powers (mainly those they refer to as Imperialist, i.e., the Western powers), so that their overthrow and dispossession are justified on the grounds that they are the agents of Imperialism. In the context of inter-Arab politics Arab Socialism also serves as the slogan of so-called radical rulers and regimes in their conflicts with so-called conservative and reactionary rulers and regimes for influence, primacy, prestige or domination in the Arab Middle East. Generally, therefore, on the level of international politics, Arab Socialism has been associated with the opposition of Arab states to what remained of Western influence in their area and with radical Arab nationalism and its manifestation in heightened inter-Arab struggle. This coincided with the entry of the Soviet Union into the Middle East in 1955 and its offers of massive economic and military assistance to several Arab states. Inevitably, the orientation of Arab Socialist regimes towards the Soviet bloc followed, gradually at first (1955-62), and rapidly after 1962.

The story is generally agreed both by Muslim commentators and modern occidental scholars that Dhu 'l-Karnayn, "the two-horned", in Sura XVIII, 83/82-98 is to be identified with Alexander the Great. The text is told in reply to questioners, often said to be Jews. Dhu 'l-Karnayn was given power on earth, and made his way to the furthest west and furthest east; and in response to an appeal from oppressed peoples, a wall or rampart of iron and brass against the incursions of Yajjiid and Mardi (q.v.). The origin and precise significance here of the name Dhu 'l-Karnayn has been much discussed (cf. al-Baydawi, ad loc.; Nödelke-Schwally, i, 140, note 5). The name had been previously applied to the Lakhmid al-Mundhir al-Akbar (III) ibn Mā' al-Samā' (cf. Imru' al-Kays, 60.3; Ibn Ḥabīb, Munaḥmah, 340; J. Horovitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, 111-3, with further references). Dhu 'l-Karnayn was accepted as a believer or Muslim since he spoke to the people of the west about God's punishment of wrongdoers and his reward for the upright; but it was disputed whether he was a prophet. Al-Wāṣihk is said to have sent a man to explore the wall (BGA, vi.627; quoted by G. von Grunebaum, Mas'ūlī Islām, 26, note 63). Bibliography: (in addition to works cited): commentaries on Kur'ān, XVIII, 83/82 ff.; Ibn Bahb, Muhābb, 359, 365, 391; Ibn Kutayba, Māṣāfīr, 26; al-Masūdi, Murūdī, al-Thalāfī, Kīsās al-Anbīyā', (Cairo, 1310), 226; (Singapore, 1932) 483-99. (W. Montgomery Watt)

ISKANDAR NAMA, the Alexander Romance. i. Arabic. Sura XVIII (59 ff.) shows that the Arabs have known of the Alexander Romance (pseudo-Callisthenes) from early times, since what is said about Mūsā in this Kur'ānic passage is in fact derived from this romance. On the earlier history of the Romance, see Nödelke, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alexanderromans, in Denkschriften der Kais. Akad. d. Wiss., Vienna, xxxii. According to this scholar, the source of the Syriac and Arabic stories is to be found in a primitive Pahlavi version, the author of which, according to Fraenkel (ZDMG, xlv, 319), may have been a Syriac Christian who wrote in Pahlavi. The oldest Arabic versions, provided by the hadith, have been collected by Friedländer in Die Chadhrlegende und der Alexanderroman, 67 ff. (see AL-KHĀDIR). On more recent versions in Arabic, see Friedländer's article and also E. García Gómez, Un texto arabe occidental de la leyenda de Alejandro, Madrid 1929.

(Ed.)
model ruler who through the constancy of his meditation deserves to be invested with a true prophetic mission. (For the Arab tradition, Iskandar—Dhu 'l-Karnayn already combines [see above] the characteristics of the warlike hero with those of the prophet of universality).

For Iranian tradition, he is essentially "the wretched Mar, inspired by the Druj (the spirit of discord)", guilty of the destruction of the good religion, its altars and its books (M. M. L. M., ibid.), and it is the religion the Copt and her authentic conception of speculative ethics which was to be that of the Iskandar

The Iskandar Nama is a hymn to wisdom—that of the Greeks, that which Iskandar would have derived from the old Iran—to that also which the hero, dedicated to Prophecy, was to elaborate, before his death in the company of the wise, and in regard to which Niẓāmī, after reviewing the final solutions of the old sages, was to recall the primordial role of celestial reason, Khrāt, already sung by Firdawsī before him.

The encyclopaedic character of the Iskandar Nama, far more than the treatment of the legendary subject, is perhaps what most strikes the reader: the passion for and justification of asceticism, for which on several occasions Iskandar emphasises his respect; the geographical and historical recollections relating particularly to the Byzantines; the pronounced taste for the mysterious sciences, where the episode of Mary the Copt and her authentic conception of speculative alchemy administers a corrective to the episodes where the hero creates a magic mirror or takes pleasure in conversations with the semi-legendary Bānlān (Apollonius).

Study of the Iskandar Nama is not yet wholly complete, and it holds in store rich and important discoveries, not only for historians of literature but also for those engaged in comparative studies, for historians of the history of religious ethics in Iran, and for students of the religious and political consciousness of their destiny that the poet makes evident in his hero. As a learned Iranian poet, Niẓāmī, who demonstrates his eclecticism in the information he gives (he says, "I have taken from everything just what suited me and I have borrowed from recent histories, Christian, Pahlavi and Jewish ... and of them I have made a whole"), locates the story of his hero principally in Iran. He makes him the image of the Iranian "knight", peaceful and moderate, courtier for any noble action. Like all Niẓāmī's heroes, he conquers the passions of the flesh, and devotes his attention to his undertakings and his friendships. These features appear in the account, which follows ancient tradition, of his conduct towards the women of the family of Darius, in his brotherly attitude on the death of that ruler, in his behaviour towards queen Nushāba (the Kayd of Firdawsī, the Kandake of the pseudo-Callisthenes) whom he defends against the Russians. And if he subdues the king of China, the Khākan, and the Indian king Kayd (Porus), it is to establish a deep and lasting friendship with them.

In the Sharaf Nama particularly, the itineraries of his expeditions are Iranian and Muslim. It is in Egypt that he introduces the rule of justice, after delivering the country from the threat of the Zand, and it is the religion of the One God of Abraham that, in the Sharaf Nama, he makes it his mission to spread, and for which he was to eliminate from Mecca the family of Khuţā'ā, who had distorted the religious tradition of the Ka'ba. And it is through Armenia that he starts his march to the East, on the way founding Tiflis and Barda in, occupying the legendary castle of Dar Band, and finding in the castle of Saklr, occupying the legendary house of Kay Khusraw. He traverses Rayy, Khorāsān and central Asia, to reach India and then China. He was to return to Barda in, in the same Adharbāyjān, the homeland of Niẓāmī, to rescue Queen Nushāba when she was attacked by the Russians (there was in fact an invasion in 946-7).

Niẓāmī did not fail, afterwards, to crown the Sharaf Nama with the theme of the vain quest for the source of life, in which may be seen a foreshadowing of the nihilist philosophy which was to be that of the Iskandar Nama.

Biography: Bertels, Selected works: Niẓāmī and Fudūl, (in Russian) Moscow 1962 (C. vi, Iskandar Nama, 342-93); Kuliyyat Diwān-hā 'Hakim Niẓāmī Diandia'y, Tehran 1937 (Sharaf-nama, 838-1162, İkhbal-nama, 1164-1338); Bausani, Letteratura neoperisiana, Milan 1960, 675-95 (bibliogr. note, 696 and 888); A. Abel, Dī'āt Qarnayn, prophète de l'Universalité, Brussels, Annales de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Or. et Slaves, xi (1951), 6-18; idem, Le Roman d'Alexandre, légendaire médiéval, Brussels 1955, 82-9; ibid., La figure d'Alexandre en Iran, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Convegno sul tema La Persia e il mondo greco-romano, Rome 1966, 120-34.

ii. In classical Ottoman literature the Alexander legend was used relatively rarely, perhaps (as E. J. W. Gibb suggested, HOP, i, 284) because its subject-matter gave little scope for the allegorical treatment of the theme of love. The one famous and very popular poem on the subject is the Iskendername of Abmad [q.v.] (d. 815/1412-3) (the story as related by Abmad is summarized by Gibb, HOP, i, 270-84; for its character, as a kind of encyclopaedia, see Fr. Taeschner, in Hb. der Orientalistik, 1. Abt, v/i, 1963, 276; for the most up-to-date list of Mss., see B. Flemming, Verzeichnis der or. Handschriften in Deutschland, xi1/1, Wiesbaden 1968, p. 36). Some Mss. are half in verse, half in prose (see, e.g., Nihad Sami Banarch, in TM, vi (1936-9), 110). There are also prose versions, some anonymous, some attributed to Abmad's "brother" Hamzevī (HOP, i, 255; cf. Iskandername, ii, 1327; see also F. E. Karatay, Topkapsı Sarayi: Türkçe yazarlar hattı, nos. 2744-69, some or all of which are presumably Hamzevī's prose version); their connection, if any,
SKANDAR NAMA — AL-ISKANDAR AL-AFRODISI

with Abu'l-Fazl's poem remains to be investigated. A certain Fighani of Karaman (flor. ca. 906/1900) is reported to have composed a verse Iskenderdeme (Latifi, 266-7), but it does not seem to have survived. An Iskenderdeme composed by Ahmed Ridwan (Sehl, p. 36; Latifi, p. 88), i.e., the defterdar "Tutunusz" Ahmed Beg (flor. under Bayezid II) and closely following Abu'l-Fazl, survives in a single Ms. in Ankara (see Agah Sarr Levend, Ahmed Rıdvan'ın Iskenderdeme, in Türk Dili, no. 3 (Dec., 1951), 23-31, where (p. 24) the author mentions another verse Iskenderdeme in his private library, by a certain Hayati). His contemporary Bihisi (q.v.) completed an Iskenderdeme in 909/1503-4 (Ushaw College MX). In Çağhatay Turkish literature the Alexander-legend provided the theme for the fifth poem in the Rhamas (q.v.) of Nava (q.v.), on which see J. Löckmann, in Philologicae Turcicae Fundamenta, ii, 346-8 and (bibliography) 355-7.

Bibliography: Th. Seif, Vom Alexander-roman nach orientalischen Beständen der Nationalbibliothek, in Festschrift der Nationalbibliothek in Wien, Vienna 1926, 745-70; Kenan, İslâm edebiyattta Iskenderdeme mesnevisi, Istanbul Un. Lib., Tez no. 187 (1933-4); E. Berte's, Roman van Alexandre i ego glavne versii na Vostoka, Moscow-Leningrad 1947, 18 f. (with additions by Orhan Şak Gökaya); A. Bombaci, Storia della letteratura turca, Milan 1969, index, s.v. Alessandro Magno (Fr. tr., i. Melikoff, Paris 1968).

AL-ISKANDAR AL-AFRODISI, Alexander of Aphrodisias (about 200 A.D.), Peripatetic philosopher. In mediaeval Europe and at the time of the Renaissance he was regarded as the most authoritative of the ancient commentators of Aristotle. He had the same influence in Islamic countries. A certain illuminism, his concept of the active intellect coming from outside to the human soul, fitted in with the Neoplatonic trend prevailing in Arabic philosophy. On the other hand his materialistic arguments against the immortality of the human soul gave rise to wide discussions which spread from Islam to Christian circles; the difference between Aristotle and Alexander over this question is a major theme in the correspondence between Emperor Frederick II Hohenstaufen and the Şfi Ibn Sab'in (q.v.) (see JA, 7th série, xiv (1879), 404-49). Little being known about Alexander's life, the Arabic biographical tradition considerably exceeds what can be derived from the Greek sources. It calls him al-Iskandar al-Afrodisî al-Dimashki, thus identifying him with a certain Alexander of Damascus, who quarrelled in Rome with Galen (see PIRALNOS5) and was afterwards appointed professor of Peripatetic philosophy at Athens (see Galen xiv, 627-9 and ii, 218, ed. Kuhn). Just the same honour was awarded to Alexander of Aphrodisias, and we do not know whether the identification is due to some erroneous remaining or is based on better information than we nowadays possess. Chronological considerations are of no value here: Alexander of Aphrodisias was called to Athens in or after 180 A. D., and though Galen wrote the chapter of De anatomieis administra- tionibus where the relevant remark on Alexander of Damascus is found before 180 A. D., he may have inserted this statement later, at the end of his life, for he often used to complete his earlier works with new references (cf. K. Bardong, in Nachrichten von der Akad. d. Wissensch. in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., 1942, 604, 631, 653). Besides Galen's account of his quarrel with Alexander of Damascus, the Greek sources reveal nothing about any such strife with Alexander of Aphrodisias; the Arab authors, however, even now the nickname "inule's head", which their Iskandar al-Afrodisî al-Dimashki bestowed on the philosophizing physician (for some literary refutations of Galen as extant in Arabic see below). In this context it is interesting that the Arabic tradition gives Galen the same teacher of Peripatetic philosophy as Alexander of Aphrodisias, viz. Hermenus, and this statement can certainly be accepted as correct (cf. Heinrich Schmidt, De Hermino Peripatetico, Phil. Diss. Marburg 1907, 6; F. Rosenthal, in Oriens, vii (1954), 69, 79; S. Pines, in Isis, lii (1961), 23).

The works of Alexander were made accessible to the Arabs by various translators, such as Hunayn b. Isâk (q.v.), Isâk b. Hunayn (q.v.), Abû 'Uqäm Sa'id al-Dimashkî, Abû Bishr Mattâ b. Yûnus, Yâhû b. 'Adl, and others. The Arab bibliographers refer to most of his expanded commentaries on the writings of Aristotle, but only some quotations of them are still extant in Arabic translation (cf., e.g., A. Dietrich, Medicinalia Arabica, Abhandlungen der Akad. d. Wissensch. in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., Dritte Folge, no. 66, 1966, 181 f.), the most voluminous being those preserved by Ibn Rusâd (q.v.) (see J. Freudenthal, in Abh. Pr. Ak. W., 1884, iv, 185; M. Bougyes, in Recherches, iv (1948), 280). On the other hand over 35 small treatises on various subjects are found in Arabic manuscripts the edition and study of which has begun only in the last decades. About 15 can be identified with the Greek text of the so-called quaestiones (ed. Bruns, ii/2) or parts of them (see Dietrich, Differentia specifica, 94-9; van Ess, 153; Gattje, Überlieferung, 161-74, 274-8). Three other tracts are found in the collection De Anima Libri Montisca (Fi 'l-sâ'î Salâ râ'î Ariysûflis, ed. Finnegan; Fi kâyafa yakûnu 'l-îbîrâr 'alî madâghab Ariysûflis, see Gattje, Überlieferung, 267-70, 272 f.; Fi 'r-radd 'alâ man yakûtu inna 'l-îbîrâr yakûnu bi-'l-ghu'î 'dâlî al-khârjîda min al-basâr, Ms. Tashkent 2385, lxxxv = Bruns ii/1, 127, 28-130, 12). The titles of these Arabic treatises are certainly not original; they also differ sometimes in the lists of the bibliographers and in the various manuscripts, where they may even be left out, the result being a confusion with the preceding tracts (see Gattje, Überlieferung, 261 f.—the same coherent text in Ms. Tashkent 2385, lxxxiv). A number of these secondary headings indicate a polemic against Galen (cf. J. Ch. Bürgel, in Nachrichten der Akad. d. Wissensch. in Göttingen, I. phil.-hist. Kl., 1967, 282 f., 387), but it remains for further investigation to decide whether these refutations are really directed against him in each case.

Sometimes the Arabic version appears to be merely a shortened paraphrase of the Greek with occasional additions. In one case two Arabic tracts on the differentia specifica (ed. Dietrich) are so similar, that one of them seems to be the paraphrase of the other (cf. van Ess, 154-9). It is difficult if not impossible to get an idea what all these alterations were introduced, whether by Alexander himself or in which stage of the Greek-(Syriac-) Arabic tradition. A similarly puzzling problem is posed by the second part of the commentary to Aristotle's Metaphysics, as extant in Greek and commonly regarded as a forgery, and its relation to the quotations made by Ibn Rusâd (cf. Moraux, Alexandre d'Aphrodisie, 14-9). It should further be noted, that in the Arabic tradition passages of Aristotle's Elements of theology (see BURUKLUS) appear among Alexander's genuine writings and under his name
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(see van Ess, 159-68). The bibliographers give also the titles of two medical tracts ascribed to Alexander (Fi 'l-mádiháliyya and Fi 'l-íyála mi'ílah tábáhú fí fám al-mídá) [q.v.] in his al-ládi (cf. Th. Puschmann, Alexander von Tralles, i, Vienna 1878, 94 f.).


ISKANDAR BEG — AL-ISKANDARIYYA

retariat, and rose rapidly to the rank of munshi-yi cāʿīm. From 1001/1592-3 onwards, ... by the poor description
given by Yakut, “a small town between Aleppo
(R. M. Savory)

ISKANDAR BEG [see iskender beg].

ISKANDAR KHĀN [see Supplement].

- Al-iskandariyya: a. the title of a great number of towns of which Alexander (al-iskandar) was the founder, real or legendary, or for which he was chosen as eponymous protector when they were
built after his death. The relevant ancient texts are
listed in the Real-Encyclopädie of Pauly-Wissowa
(i, 1377-98 and Suppl., i, 54) and, in less detail,
by M. Besnier, Lexique de géographie ancienne,
Paris 1914, 32-4. These towns are:

1. Alexandria in Egypt [see following article].
3. Alexandria in Margiana, in the region of Mraw.
4. Alexandria Eschate: Khodijand; in this region, the permanence of the legendary memory of
Alexander finds expression also in the name of the
town of Iskandar, 50 km. north-east of Tashkent
43. - 5. Alexandria of the Paropamisades: Chera en, or, more probably, Begrâm, to the north of Kābul. - 6. Alexandria Opiane, on the east bank of the Indus (Besnier appears to confuse this with the last-named locality).
7. Alexandria apud Oritas, on the coast of
Gedrosia, near Cocala: Sonmiani, at the mouth
of the Pourali. - 8. Alexandria in Macarene, in the
region of Gedrosia, near Cocala: Sonmiani, at the mouth
of the Pourali. - 9. Alexandria in Carmania:
known to the Arab geographers as Ḥalāb al-ʿālam which was founded “almost everywhere” and to which
he gave his name, a name “which was later to be
changed”. In fact, Yaḵūt’s text enumerates
twelve towns mentioned by Ibn al-Fakhl, to which he adds
three others. The whole of this information is re-
peted by Muhammad Murtaḍā (Ṭāqū al-ṣarās, iii, 276).

These Alexandrias are: - A. An Alexandria “on the bank of the great river” (TA defines this—“name-
ly, the Dījābūn”) = 29. - B. An Alexandria “in the country of Babylon (Bābīl)”: this is Iskandariyya, a
township 68 km. South of Baghdād, according to
popular tradition founded by Alexander; the same
name is also borne, in the same region, by a canal
(cf. Guide bleu, 626; 1930, 294). - C. An Alexandria “in the region of Sogdiana (Sughd): this is Samarkand”
(TA: “in the Sughd of Samarkand”) = 4. - D. An
Alexandria which “is called Marghabulus: this is
Marw” (TA: “at Marw”). No doubt, in the name
Marghabulus we may detect the association of two
traces, referring respectively to Margus (the river of
Margus: Marghab and polis = 3. E. An Alexan-
dria “called Kūsh, and which is Bactra (Balḵ)”
(TA: “this is the name borne by Balkh, for it was
Alexander who founded it”) = 28. - F. An Alexan-
dria “in the basin of the rivers, in India” (TA adds:
“which are five in number and known by the name
Pundjāb”) = 6, 23 or 24. - G. An Alexandria (TA
gives the name al-Iskandara and adds: “large”)
“in the country of India”, with no further details =
6 or 23-27. This onomastic tradition has remained
strong in India (see the many occurrences of the name
Sikandara in northern India: Times Atlas of the
world, s.v. and map 30). - H. Alexandria in Egypt,
known as “the Great”. - I. Alexandria, if this is
deed the town denoted by the poor description
given by Yaḵūt, “a small town between Aleppo
and Ḥamāt”. TA, on the other hand, leaves no
doubt on the subject. - J. An Alexandria, "which is a small town on the Tigris, opposite al-Djamida, 15 parasangs from Wasi', the home of the Sha'ir' Abu 'Abd al-Iskandari al-Mufcassana (for whom see Kahbâla, Mu'gham al-mu'allifin, ii, 98) = 11. - K. An Alexandria which is a small town between Mecca and Medina, mentioned by the ḥabīf Abu 'Abd Allâh b. al-Nadîjâr in his dictionary" (Kahbâla, op. cit., xi, 317).

The Tâdji al-arus adds, without further details, that five other Alexandrias also exist, to make up the total figure mentioned at the beginning of the passage, of sixteen towns "commemorating the name of Alexander". In fact, this figure takes into account the mistake made by Yâkût over the number of cities given by Ibn al-Fâfîh (twelve, not thirteen); the true total is therefore fifteen, the same as that of Yâkût.

The four towns which figure in Yâkût, and whose names disappear in Ta'î, for the evident reason that they are not difficult to locate, are: - A. A town which Alexander founded fi Bâeinâdâ; at first sight indecipherable, this name may be read as Bârânâdâs, a possible corruption of Paro(p)anisos, the land of the Paropanisades = 5. - B. A town called the Fortified (al-Mu'âṣṣana): cf. 26, where Diodorus says: ekiste polis Alexandriam (Latin, oppidum condidit Alexandriam). - C. An Alexandria fi Dasthâk; the epithet Gallicus may here refer (cf. Propertius, ii, 15, 46) to the Gallus, a river of Phrygia or Galatia, or to the Glauclus, a small river in the North of Armenia or the gulf between Lycia and Caria (Strabo, xiv, 1, 2), to the Gallus, a river of Phrygia or Galatia, or to the Glauclus, a small river in the North of Armenia or the gulf between Lycia and Caria (Strabo, xiv, 2, 2) = 10 or 16. - D. An Alexandria "in the country of al-Sâ'iyâlîs"; in this name it is possible to detect a corruption of Sutuolos (Satnios, Saphnios: Strabo, vii, 2, xiii, 1, 50 and 3, 1), a river which flows to the South of Alexandria of Troas = 12.

Bibliography: In the text. (A. Miquel) al-Iskandariyya (also al-Askandariyya), the principal seaport of Egypt, in Ptolemaic times the second city of the world. One of the few important seaports on the African shore of the Mediterranean, Alexandria enjoys a particularly important position. With a population of about 1,576,234 (in 1960), the city lies at the Western angle of the Delta in latitude 30°11'N. and longitude 29°51'E. It was founded in 332 B.C. by Alexander /20 or 16. - Amr b. al-As met with resolute resistance to his siege of the city, after the invasion of Manuel in 1264, he swore to destroy the city's walls after its reconquest. The authenticity of such reports, however, may well be doubted despite their widespread repetition. A soldier with the circumspection of 'Amr b. al-As could scarcely, seriously, have wished to leave a frontier city as important strategically as Alexandria without the protection of a wall. We learn, moreover, that the 'Abbasid Caliph al-Mutawakkil (254/868-270/884), Saladin (557/1152-589/1193), al-Zâhir Baybars (659/1260-674/1277), al-Ashraf Sha'bân (764/1363-776/1376) and others after them. Hence we may well question the assertion that 'Amr b. al-As had the city walls razed and assume that al-Mutawakkil, Ibn Tûlûn and the other rulers gradually added improvements to them. At the same time, the view that the walls were built in pre-Islamic times gains credence. It is particularly important for the history of the city that the new walls, supposedly erected by al-Mutawakkil, included about half the area of those which dated from the Hellenistic-Roman period. About a hundred towers were built along the walls in the Middle Ages and fitted out with suitable equipment including cannon. In addition, the city was protected by a moat in front of the walls.

The medieval seaport of Alexandria consisted of an eastern and a western harbour. The original island of Pharos was flanked by these harbours and joined to the mainland by a causeway seven stadia in length, and hence known as the Heptastadium, which separated the harbours. On the north-eastern point of the island stood the Pharos, the great lighthouse begun in the time of Ptolemy Soter. This famous building, the prototype of all our lighthouses and one of the wonders of the ancient world, survived the Arab conquests by several centuries. The Arab writers call it the manâra, manâr or fanâr and we are indebted to al-Balâwî for a precise
That the imperial anchorage on the eastern side of the eastern harbour, previously renowned in ancient times, was not used in the Middle Ages. For closer supervision of the eastern harbour, a second lighthouse was built. Construction began in the time of Sultan Kalâwûn or in that of his son, al-Nâṣîr Muḥammad b. Kalâwûn, and was completed in 767/1365.

The eastern harbour was strengthened by this addition. The western harbour, on the other hand, was protected by an iron chain. On grounds of security, the eastern harbour was reserved for Christian shipping and that from the dâr al-harb, while the western harbour was for Muslim vessels. Entering the eastern harbour required particularly careful navigation. To reach the anchorage protected from wind and rough sea, ships had to sail close by the Pharos and hold hard to the western bank of the eastern harbour lest they plunge into the danger zone. It was impossible to avoid these rocks by sailing around the eastern side because of the shallow water. The harbour authorities had pilots and launches to accompany the great Frankish ships to their anchorage. A wooden landing-station connected the anchorage to the shore, by means of which the vessels could be loaded and unloaded. Anchoring in the western harbour raised no technical difficulties.

Apart from al-Abdâr's book of travel (7th/13th century), none of the known oriental sources provides a detailed description of the city gates of Alexandria. Impressed by the achievement of the pre-Islamic period, al-Abdâr describes them as follows: "Their uprights and lintels, despite the extraordinary size of the gates, are made of hewn stone of wonderful beauty and solidity. Every door-post is formed of a single stone as is every lintel and step. There is nothing more astonishing than the collection of these stones in view of their immense size. The passage of time has not affected them or left any trace on them; they remain still in all their freshness and beauty. As for the panels of the gates, they are tremendously strong, clad inside and out with iron of the most delicate, most beautiful and most solid workmanship possible."

The city had four main gates: Bâb al-Bahr led to the Heptastadium and the eastern harbour while Bâb Rashîd (the Rosetta gate) was the eastern gate with the road leading to Rosetta and Fuwwa. The southern gate was called Bâb Sidrâ (also called Ṣâdîr in the late Middle Ages), known to the western sources as Port du Midi or Meridionale, also as the Gate of Spices, Bâb al-Bahar, or Gate of St. Mark. The caravans from the Maghrib and the Egyptian hinterland came and went through this gate. The fourth, Bâb al-Aḫdâr or Bâb al-Khidr, in the northern section of the wall led to one of the city's three large cemeteries and was opened only once a week for visitors, on Fridays. There were to be found innumerable places of pilgrimage (mazdrdt) and the graves of scholars and pious men. In the western area of the city lay the royal buildings like the Dâr al-Sultan (a magnificent complex going back to antiquity), Dâr al-ʿAdl, Dâr al-Imâra, Kašr al-Silâh and Dâr al-Ṭîrâz. Near the Dâr al-Ṭîrâz and opposite Bâb al-Bahr lay the famous Arsenal of Alexandria which, however, in the later Middle Ages, no longer played any important part in the history of warfare. By this time it was used simply as a customs house.

Alexandria was at some distance from the Rosetta branch of the Nile and governments were faced with the difficult problem of linking the city with the river, of securing the supply of Nile water, and of maintaining traffic with the Nile valley. In 331 B.C. a canal was dug between Alexandria and Schidia (present day al-Nâṣîr al-Bahrî) and, indeed, by using the Kanope branch of the Nile, joined Alexandria to the next branch of the Nile at the same time. Since the Kanope branch dried up, as a result, and could no longer supply the canal of Alexandria with water, the bolbitine branch took over this function. This means that this development was complete some time before the Arab conquest of Egypt. The mouth of the canal which opened into the Nile became silted up from time to time. The duty of the Muslim administration to keep the canal in good order was fulfilled only to a limited extent, and at times the people of Alexandria had to rely on their cisterns for their water supply as they had done in ancient times. In the 3rd/9th century, the canal was only twice wide enough for ships to go through, information about the canal of Alexandria during the Fatimid period is very scarce. We are rather better informed about the canal in the period of Ayyûbid rule. In this period too, however, no decisive steps were taken for the utilization of the canal throughout the year for irrigation and transport. The Sultan al-Zâhir Baybars, and, to a greater extent, Sultan al-Nâṣîr Muḥammad b. Kalâwûn, gave special consideration to the significance of the canal for Alexandria and for state trade as well as for the fertility of the surrounding area. In the reign of al-Nâṣîr Muḥammad, from 710/1310 until 770/1368, the waters of the Nile flowed to Alexandria all the year round. Sultan al-ʾAšraf Barsbay, too, took care to keep the canal in good condition and make it navigable throughout the year, partly with an eye to his own policy of trade monopolies. In the second half of the 9th/15th century, however, once again less attention was paid to the upkeep of the canal.

The journey by Nile from Cairo to Alexandria usually took seven days. During the flood season, the Nile boats plied between Alexandria and the other towns of the Nile valley, especially Cairo and Kūf the assembly points for goods from the Orient. It is difficult to give an estimate of the population of Alexandria. When the Arabs invaded the city some 40,000, or, according to other reports, 70,000, Jews were living there. Ibn ʾAbd al-Hakam puts the number of Greeks living there, after the conquest, at some 600,000 men (women and children not included), although he gave the total number of Greeks, without counting women and children, as 200,000, at the time of the conquest. Both these figures are unreliable. Bishop Arculf, who visited the city some 25 years after the beginning of Arab rule, wrote of the numerous people living within the city, without giving any estimate as to its size. More reliable figures have come down to us from later times. The Jewish travellers, particularly, show a keen interest in establishing the number of their co-religionists in Alexandria. Benjamin of Tudela (5th/12th century) puts the number of Jewish residents, at this time, at 3,000, while E. Ashor notes that this figure includes only those
from whom taxes were levied and assumes that the total number of Jews may be estimated at about 5,000. According to the writings of another traveller, dating from 886/1481, their number seems to have diminished to some sixty families. A few years later, another Jewish traveller put the number of the Jewish community at about 25 families (cf. E. Ashtor, The number of Jews in mediaeval Egypt, in Journal of Jewish Studies, xix (1968) 8-12).

In the 13th century, the total population of the city was estimated at 65,000, which, however, decreased sharply in the middle of the 8th/14th century. In the years between 748/1347 and 751/1350, on several days people died at the rate of one to two hundred a day and the number rose to seven hundred at the height of the plague. The Dār al-Tirāz and Dār al-Wikālā were closed because of the city was estimated at 65,000, which, however, diminished to some sixty families. A few years later, another Jewish traveller put the number of the Jewish community at about 25 families (cf. E. Ashtor, The number of Jews in mediaeval Egypt, in Journal of Jewish Studies, xix (1968) 8-12).

In the 13th century, the total population of the city was estimated at 65,000, which, however, decreased sharply in the middle of the 8th/14th century. In the years between 748/1347 and 751/1350, on several days people died at the rate of one to two hundred a day and the number rose to seven hundred at the height of the plague. The Dār al-Tirāz and Dār al-Wikālā were closed because of the lack of manpower and the absence of commercial traffic. The markets and customs houses, too, ceased to function. The city, however, was able to survive this catastrophe and the population, once more, rapidly increased. Frescobaldi put its number at 60,000 (786/1384), while in the same year Simon Sigoll estimated the population at about 50,000. These figures, despite their variations show that the population was again on the increase. It is important to remember that the growth of the population of Alexandria was dependent, in the first place, on the development of the city's trade and was greater than that of any other city or region of Egypt, with the exception of Cairo where most of the army was stationed. As early as 788/1386, then, Alexandria was returning to prosperity after the plague.

In the medieval city, the central government, whose powers had accumulated in the course of time, was the source of authority. In the earlier Middle Ages, Alexandria had enjoyed a special position, as it had in former times before the Arab invasion. Henceforward, however, its governors were appointed by the central administration. Nevertheless, in these circumstances, the city remained either a polis, a self-contained administrative area, or was included in the western Egyptian coastal area (to which Libya also sometimes belonged). The governor of Egypt soon came to reside, for some of the time at least, in Alexandria. As a polis or provincial centre Alexandria had only in 737/1337 been administered by a Muslim. Not infrequently at this time, however, the financial and civil administration was given over to Copts. From the documents which date from the first century of Arab rule, it is apparent that Copts were also nominated as governors of Alexandria; thus, for example, the Christian Theodosius was appointed to this office by the Caliph Yazid b. Muʿawiya.

During the governorship of Ahmad b. Tūlūn (from 256/870), Alexandria was "independent". The special position of Alexandria lasted from that time until the 3rd/10th century and Grohmann rightly recognizes in this some reflection of the position in Roman law whereby Alexandria, as a polis, lay outside the kārā of Egypt. It is in this light that we must understand the division of the ʿAbbāsid budget for Egypt in 337/958 into Mīr and Alexandria, as reported by K. Reckendorf.

Under the Fāṭimids, the governor of Alexandria went even further towards taking on the role of the erstwhile Augustals by extending his authority over the province of Bubayya. On this point, Grohmann's observations are at one with the historical development of the city. His view that the Crusades served to diminish the importance of the city that an appointment as governor there should be understood as an indication of royal disfavour, is not, on the other hand, consonant with the facts. Certainly the city continued to lose its independent position after the fall of the Fāṭimids but from the commercial and strategic point of view it regained its earlier importance. Through the international transit trade the city became a market for East and West.

Some demonstration of all this is provided by the fact that up to about the 3rd/10th century a kind of public meeting was occasionally held in Alexandria concerning the acceptance by the government prelates or to choose a Coptic Patriarch. In the first half of the 4th/11th century the Coptic Patriarch had to transfer his seat from Alexandria to Cairo. In the later medieval period it was not unusual for the city to be given as an ḫādiʿ (q.v.).

The governor was a military official while the ḫādiʿ was both a civil official and a judge in the religious sphere. He is sometimes referred to in the chronicles as raʾīs al-madīna (town chief) and in times of crisis sometimes appointed for the city and established an amīr maʿā there; i.e., the governor of Alexandria had the same rank as those of Tripoli, Safad and Hamāt in Syria.

In Alexandria, the Mālikī school was prevalent. This resulted from the proximity to North Africa and the activity of the Maghribis and Spanish Muslims who settled in Alexandria in the later Middle Ages, driven before the Reconquista in Spain and the upheavals in North Africa. In the later Middle Ages, the ḫādiʿ 'l-ḥādiʿī was almost always a Mālikī. In a few instances the government choice fell on a Shāfiʿī. Nevertheless, the three schools, Mālikī, Shāfiʿī and Hanafī were all represented in the administration of justice. Several sultans saw to it, in addition, that foreign as well as native merchants had legal protection as far as their persons and goods were concerned. Thus, for example, it was said of the Sultan al-Nāṣir Muhammad b. Kalāwūn, with regard to the judge of Alexandria, Ibn Miskīn, that he supported a bạnūna in 757/1354 in opposition to his own official. Sometimes the diplomas of appointment for ḥādsīs give prominence to these responsibilities in respect of the merchants as well as the usual stipulations about the just treatment of citizens. The muḥtasib was ranged alongside the governor and ḫādiʿ with responsibility for the supervision of the market and those concerned in it, producers as well as retailers, though his powers were, de facto, restricted to the sphere of smaller transactions.

Alexandria was an important source of revenue for the state or rather for those in power. Besides the high duties paid by the Kārimīs and the foreign merchants, the state authorities made money from almost every transaction and every shop in the city. The state profited too from the mint, Dār al-Darb, where native and foreigner alike had their metal coined. Particular groups of participants in trade, such as money-changers, sailors, brokers, interpreters, auctioneers and donkey-drivers made good profits in this city and paid high taxes. Camel-drivers, or rather the leaders of caravans, had to pay their tax, the so-called Maks al-Manāḥī, outside the city where their camels were halted. As we have no statistics regarding this tax, we must be content
with a single example. According to the Kādī al-Fādil, the annual revenue of the city from duties came to 28,613 dinārs, not an exaggerated claim in view of other reports from the 14th and 15th centuries. The sultan’s divān levied some 50,000 dinārs in tolls, duties, etc. from ships entering Alexandria in 721/1321 and this, according to the text, did not even include all the ships that arrived. Fidenzo of Padua’s observation (dating from the 8th/14th century) in fact was given by a governor of Alexandria in the 9th/15th, that Alexandria was worth 1,000 frinti or dinārs a day to the sultan in the 8th/14th century. This, of course, was during the trading season. Al-Maqrīzī writes of a Frankish vessel which paid 40,000 dinārs duty on its cargo, in Alexandria, in 703/1303, an incredible sum when one thinks of the total naval fleet of a single Frankish merchant republic. It seems no exaggeration to estimate the total duties brought to Alexandria, for the state, by the foreign trade, at about 100,000 dinārs a year.

Alexandria was always an important centre for cloth manufacture. Its products reached as far as India. It is believed that much of the fabric donated by the popes to Italian churches in the 8th and 9th centuries was produced by workers in Alexandria. Besides the looms (for linen, silk, wool and cotton), buyūṭ al-ṣalt, there were also workshops for raw silk, buyūṭ al-kantsāzīn. The city housed a large public workshop for brocade, Dār al-Tirāz, which produced primarily for the luxury requirements of Friendly nations, which stood under Egyptian protection. Venice, as the leading commercial power, gained a second fundūk in the course of the 13th century. In addition, the merchants were able to rent a fundūk of their own, whenever a particular fundūk was assigned to them; otherwise, he might find accommodation in a private fundūk or khān. The western merchant was restricted to the fundūk designated for his country and to which he could bring his merchandise. After the establishment of these fundūks for foreign states, the trade of Alexandria was no longer simply a commerce of the coast. The foreign merchants enjoyed extraterritorial privileges [see Paris 1427]. As a result, these fundūks were administered by officials or consuls of the friendly nations which stood under Egyptian protection. Alexandria Muslims from Spain, North Africa, Mesopotamia, Syria and the neighbourhood of Egypt. Al-Nuwayrī, who lived in Alexandria in the 7th/14th century, has left us the longest account of the city that has yet come to light. But he was not as concerned with the trade of this cosmopolitan city as was al-Maqrīzī with that of Cairo. The short accounts which have come down to us, however, give us a clear and detailed picture of the markets of...
the city. First of all, it must be noted that the customs house with its 30 storerooms was not simply concerned with the imposition of duties and with harbour control but was also used for public auctions. The Dār al-Wikāla, too, served business in a special capacity. Notices of this Dār in Alexandria can be traced back as far as the 4th/10th century. It is the Dār Wikālat Bayt al-Māl which is meant, a public administration which ensured the imposition and collection of taxes for the head of state, supported state trade and took a decisive role as an intermediary, selling only, in principle, merchandise to the Muslim entrepreneurs. As in every major Islamic city, in Alexandria each essential trade had its own market. Among the most important markets in the city were the Sūk al-ʿAṭṭārīn and al-Bahār, the pepper and spice market, probably the centre of the Kārimī merchants in Alexandria. The Sūk al-Murdjāniya, the market of the coral-workers and of the dealers in coral, was one of the most important coral markets in the whole of the Mediterranean area. The coral was worked in Alexandria: in its home port, a pound of coral cost 3 silver dirhams; after being worked in Alexandria its price rose to three or four times this amount. The chief outlets in the south were Aden and Kallūt. The coral brought from Alexandria found good markets in the Ḥijāz, in Yemen, in India, and, particularly, in the Far East.

The linen trade had its own special sūk, the Wikālat al-Kittān, where dealers handled large transactions. The slave market of Alexandria was no less important than that of Cairo. The money-changers, fruit-merchants, druggists (perfumers), sellers of sugared almonds or nuts, confectionary, dried fruits etc. always found a ready market. Alexandria had, in addition, like Cairo, a Sūk al-Kashshāshīn (flea-market = bric à brac bazaar), like the so-called Funduq al-Djawkandar and Funduq al-Damāmni, which were private funduq undertakings. The city’s requirements of grain were met by imports supplementing home-grown supplies, as can now be shown from the documents. The bazaars of the candle and wax-dealers, like those of the dealers in wood, were especially important. Individual markets and bazaars were designated according to the race or nationality of the merchants. Thus, for example, the Sūk al-Aʿādīm was that of the Iranian merchants concerned, notably, with the import of silk fabrics and costly goods to Alexandria. Alongside these important and specialized markets and funduqs, Alexandria was provided with a number of lesser, more general markets where peddlers with their tables and stalls, tea-cooking vessels and saucepans sold their comestibles to the passers-by. Some dealers had old-established businesses on the Pharos peninsula and along the canal of Alexandria, where the ships entered, as well as in the town.

We should not overlook the fact that big business in the city was not completely monopolized by the state, nor confined to men; women too participated in commerce. We know of a woman of such standing among the merchants of Alexandria that she was known, as a result, by the nickname of Sitt al-Tudjādīr (lady of the merchants). She died of plague in 749/1348.

In Islamic history, political office and participation in business were by no means mutually exclusive. Leading members and high officials of the governments of Egypt were closely involved in big business. The organization of the Madījar al-Sulāṃī (state trade), supposed to have been founded in the time of the famine which occurred under the reign of the Fātimid Caliph al-Mustansīr, had in fact already existed and played a particularly important part during the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk periods. Besides slaves and wood, the Madījar imported iron and sheet metal, tin, silver and copper (later gold as well), and offered in return monopoly goods such as alum, natron, corn, flax, and later spices, sugar and soap. Egyptian mummies, too, found a ready market in Alexandria. Still, the principal line of business was the pepper trade. Frederick C. Lane has established that, before the rounding of the Cape of Good Hope, Venetian vessels loaded, on average, about 1,500,000 pounds of pepper a year.

The merchant always made a good living. No less a person than the renowned faṣīḥ and ascetic, al-ʿUrtūṣī, came to Alexandria to protest against the money-lenders. It was not just by chance that the Alexandrian moneychangers were in a position to lend the Sultan al-Nāṣir Muhammad b. Kalāwīn the sum of 10,000 dinār in the year 737/1337; sufficient proof, in itself, of the profitable nature of the business conducted by these brokers whose operations were not restricted to the changing of money.

Lively trade and flourishing crafts allowed the city to amass wealth. The “guilds”, or, more exactly, the social groups involved in trade, did not function as independent entities with certain rights, which would have permitted them to defend their rights against the aggression of the city governor or the central authority. In fact, it was the central government which kept the power of decision and solved their problems while promulgating the laws and the regulations according to the juridical principles of Islam. Although the form of government and religious ideology hemmed in the dynamic development of Alexandria, it was commerce, with its traditions, its methods and its “code of honour”, which determined the rhythm of city life. It is possible to construct a picture of attitudes prevalent among foreigner and native in the city and in regard to the city, not simply from the chronicles and treaties but from references in the most belligerent forms of literature like, for example, The Thousand and One Nights and Boccaccio’s Decameron, and hence to draw inferences as to forms of government, methods of taxation, and the sort of risks involved in business.

In Alexandria the state was the primary ruler and rule was exercised in the interest of the state rather than that of the community. There is no clearer demonstration of this than the revolt of 727/1326 and the events leading up to it. Heavy tax burdens led to a rebellion which was put down with the utmost severity. It is worth noting the penalties which the government inflicted on the Kārimī merchants (among them the sons of al-Kuwaik or al-Kawbak, a respected Kārimī merchant), as well as on the silk dealers and producers. In addition to the fines and confiscations which were exacted, totalling about 260,000 dinārs, the leaders of the revolt were crucified.

The diminishing power of the ruler and the weakness of the army in the city, nevertheless, came to be felt to the disadvantage of business and the execution of trade for, in troubled times, soldiers and mercenaries had extended their protection, ḍīmū, to those involved in business, for large sums of money. Alexandria came to concentrate primarily on long-distance trade. Those who conducted this trade, the government officials, the long-distance dealers or big businessmen, were far removed from the retail dealer with his shop in the bazaar supervised by the muḥāṣṣīb.
The early and later Middle Ages formed two clearly distinct periods in the religious and scholarly life of Alexandria. In the early Middle Ages, the Christian and Jewish elements were supreme. When the Arab conquest the Greek Patriarch was forced to leave the city, the Coptic Patriarch entered and the Copts supported the Arabs in their later struggle with the Byzantine Empire and fell in with their plans for expansion. This period prepared the ground for a new beginning, for the development of Islamic science —here a centre was established for the translation of the cultural works of antiquity which were of immense value, providing a basis for Islamic culture and its spiritual achievements. In respect of purely Islamic science, which, as al-Sakhawi maintained, began first with al-Silafl, Alexandria was dependent on Fustat and Cairo. At that time, men journeyed to the capital of Egypt to study the Koran and hadith. The waizir Rildän b. al-Walakhshī founded a Sunna madrasa in Alexandria in 531/1137 (before the end of the Fatimid period) in which the fakih Abū Tahir b. ʿAwi taught hadith. Scarcely fifteen years later al-ʿAdil b. al-Sallār founded a second Sunna madrasa in Alexandria for the famous al-Haftī al-Sakārī. As is well known, Saladin himself, after his assumption of power, had a school, a hospital and a hostel built for the Maghrībīs, where they could find free lodging, teachers of various subjects, medical care and financial support.

The sources refer repeatedly to the names of various rūbāt in the city, while the fadāʾil literature on Alexandria expounds the strategic importance for Islam of this border harbour. It was not only statesmen and warriors, however, who contributed to Islamic culture, the merchant too played a part. Several wealthy merchants of Alexandria were famous by virtue of their generosity and donations. They built mosques, schools and other religious foundations and encouraged Muslim learning. From the circle of famous Muslim Kārim merchants of Alexandria we may take as an example Abū al-Hāfiẓ al-Rudfī on the bank of the coast Dār al-Hadith al-Takritiyya, a place of learning for hadith and Shāfiʿī fikhr (the school is known today as the Masjidī Abī ʿAlī). The contemporary sources write with delight of the Kārim merchant family of Kuwayk who could provide the cost of building a mosque or school with the profits of a single day's business.


Of the famous mosques of Alexandria, mention should be made of the Masjidī al-ʿUmār or Dīlamī al-Gharbī (the former Theonas Church) and the Masjidī al-Djuyyūsī or al-ʿAṭṭārin (formerly the Church of St. Athanasius). Various details are known too about the rūbāt of the city such as the Rūbat al-Wāṣifī (d. 672/1274), to the east of the mosque of Abu Ḥāgitī. Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-Hakkārī (d. 683/1284), built a rūbāt which was called after him. He was also buried nearby. Towards the end of the 7th/13th century the Khānsāk, Blīf al-Muḥsinī, was built by the dāruṣšāf of the city.
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ISKANDARON, ALEXANDRETTA, a port in the eastern Mediterranean, the ancient 'Ἀλεξανδρεία κατὰ Ἰσσόν, the Ἀλεξάνδρεια ἢ μικρὰ in Malalas (ed. Bonn, 297), known to the Arabs as al-Iskandariyya or Iskandaruna (diminutive Aramaic form); from this last form came the Ἀλεξανδρεία of Skylitzes (ii, 679) which in its turn gave rise to Ἀλεξάνδρεια (Michael Attali, 120; Zonaras, iii, 691; Georgius Cyprius and the list of bishops in Byz. Zeitschr., i, 248). The diminutive Romanised form Alexandretta was already in use among western pilgrims during the Middle Ages. Iskandaruna (which must not be confused with another place of the same name, situated between Tyre and Saint-John of Acre) formed part of the diwān of Kinnasrin; the castle is said to have been built under the caliph al-Wāhid (Abu `l-Fā'id, ed. Reinaud, ii, 233). During the wars between the Byzantines and the Arabs, the town was captured by the former on several occasions (Muralt, Chronogr. Byz., a. 1068; Ibn Hawkal, index) and in the time of Abu `l-Fā'id it was deserted. Later it regained some importance as a port for the then flourishing city of Aleppo, though it was unable to develop on a very large scale. It was the centre of a bādā' and at the beginning of the 20th century it contained from 10 to 15,000 inhabitants. The population of Alexandretta (descendants of the Turks of Antioch) passed under the exclusive domination of Syria. Negotiations between France and Turkey were then started, and the matter was brought before the Council of the League of Nations; a status for the Sandjak was laid down in the Geneva Agreement of 29 May 1939 and brought into force on 20 November, although the Syrian Chamber had rejected it, and the Turkish flag was hoisted in Alexandretta. After some disturbances, a Turkish notable was elected president of the Sandjak, which from then on took the name Hatay, and new Franco-Turkish negotiations finally led, on 23 June 1939, to the cession of the Hatay to Turkey.


ISKENDER BEG, Ottoman name for GEORGE (Gjergj) KASTROTI (b. 808/1405, d. 872/1468), in Western sources Scanderbeg, etc., hero of the Albanian "resistance" to the Turks in the mid-15th century.

By the first half of the 15th century the Kastroti family, with their centre at Matia, had supplemented the Bashas as the most influential power of Northern Albania. They had acknowledged Ottoman suzerainty since 787/1385; Iskender's father John/Ivan (in Ottoman sources Yovan) had been a buffer between the Venetians installed in Scutari (Hochodra [q.v.]) and the Ottomans, ready to flee to Venetian protection in the event of an Ottoman attack and
dependent upon Venetian goodwill for the crucial import of salt. A document in the archives of Topkapı Sarayi (E 6665) shows that he had attempted to seize Kruje/Croia (T. Akçahisar) to the south of his territories, which, for a time under Bâyêzîd I and continuously since 818/1415, had been the centre of an Ottoman subaşılık.

The statement of Barletius that his son George Karriota had been sent to the Ottoman palace as a hostage at the age of nine is confirmed by Ottoman historians (Tursun Bey, Idrîsî). During the war with Venice of 826/1423-833/1430 Ottoman pressure was increasingly put upon his father John (N. Iorga, Notes et extraits...), who, in Radjab 831/April 1428, informed Venice of his growing anxiety that his Muslim son would be ordered by the sultan to occupy his territory. The son, raised in the palace as an iç-çânhâ was, by the normal procedure of ilhama [see Glülâm], granted a timâr near to his father's territories of "Yuvan-êli" (Topkapı Sarayi Archives, E 6665), and in 824/1423 he was appointed Subaşı of Akçahisar (H. Inalcîk, ed., Suret-i defter-i sancah-i Arvanid, timâr no. 314). In the same year nine villages of his in Yuvan-êli were made over to Andre Karlo (ibid., no. 335). His father's centre of Mus (Mysia) was made a zîmât, and Iskender asked for it to be granted to (Topkapı Sarayi Archives, E 6655, undated), but a sanджâb-begi (? of Okhri) objected to the granting of this important district, adjacent to the sea, to John's son. This refusal may have been one of the reasons for Iskender's throwing off his allegiance to the sultan. The extension to areas of Albania of the Ottoman timâr-system had induced various prominent seigneurs in the south—Ghin Thopia and, especially, George Araniti—to revolt (from 833/1431), and Iskender joined them in Shâwwâl 847/December 1444. After Ottoman authority was weakened by the battle of Izdâlî (Zlatîca) (3 Ramadan 847/25 December 1443), members of the former ruling families were encouraged to attempt to recover their lost lands and independence (Chalcocondyles, ed. Lorga, ii, 145). The story that Iskender, fleeing Buni, with a beglerbegi (? of Rûmî) who had been defeated near Niš, seized Akçahisar (Gegaj, 45-6) is probably true (cf. Ghasavînîname-i Sultan Murâd); he certainly threw off İslâm and reembraced Christianity (see especially the contemporary historian Tursun Bey, ed. in TOEM p. 136), to be known henceforth to the Ottomans as "İskender" (treacherous) Iskender". On 11 Dhî l-Ka'da 847/1 March 1444, under the patronage of Venice, he summoned the Albanian leaders to a meeting at Alessio (a typical Kuvend in accordance with Albanian tribal custom, see M. Hasluck, The unwritten law in Albania, Cambridge 1954, 148), and was there recognized as the leader of the struggle against the Ottomans. The pope later recognized him as a crusading hero; in the 19th century Albanian nationalists depicted him as a national hero working for the unification and independence of his homeland; and Venice regarded him as a valuable condottiero. In reality, he was a combination of Albanian tribal chief and medieval feudal lord, the other Albanian leaders being bound to him primarily by links of kinship. The importance which he attached to his own family is revealed in the terms of the alliance with the King of Aragon, made with "Georgio Caristiotti, Sd dela dita citate de Croya e de soi parenti, baruni in Albania" (Radonić, no. 38). Hence it is not surprising to find other Albanian lords frequently allied with Venice or with the Ottomans against him. Since 818/1415 the introduction of the Ottoman timâr-system and tax-structure had caused widespread discontent among both the feudal families and the mountain tribesfolk; Iskender was merely taking over, in Northern Albania, the leadership of this movement of revolt, favoured, however, unlike his predecessors, by the support of the pope, the King of Naples, and Venice. He was able to muster a following of perhaps 8-10,000 men. His own numbering no more than 2,000 (Gegaj, p. 125); he owed his success to guerrilla tactics, based on a few fortresses in remote mountain regions (Stelush, Letterella, and especially Kruje, his capital), these fortresses being held for him by troops, trained in the use of firearms, who were provided by his foreign allies, although he could rely on some revenue from his flocks of sheep and the trade in salt.

His long struggle with the Ottomans—maintained over a quarter of a century—falls into several phases.

Until 852/1448, the Ottomans were content to ignore him. In this period he fought against Venice over the possession of Dagno (851/1447), and indeed there are indications that he co-operated with local Ottoman forces (the sultan also claiming this territory) (Iorga, op. cit., ii, 277; Venice, it should be noted, still regarded him as a vassal of the sultan: op. cit., ii, 226). He abandoned his claim to Dagno by the treaty signed on 4 October 1448. In the summer of 852/1448 Murâd II's army took Svetigrad (Kodiadil Hisâr) ('Aşkîpaspazhâzâde 119 and the chroniclers dependent on him erroneously relate these events to Akçahisar), and so opened the way into northern Albania. Murâd then laid siege to Kruje, but was obliged to withdraw to Sofya by Hunyadî's invasion of Ottoman territory.

In 853/1449 an attempt by Iskender and Môs Dibra to re-take Kodiadîk was repulsed, and in the following summer Murâd again besieged Kruje. The fortess held out, and Iskender, retreating to the mountains, harried the besieging troops. The abandon-ment of the 4th month siege made Iskender the hero of all Christendom, and Pope Nicholas V called to the Christian camp at Kâsim, the son of Iskender and other Albanian leaders were also receiving money subsidies from Alfonso, Iskender's share being 1500 ducats). This arrangement weakened Iskender's authority in Albania, and Alfonso's rival Venice and the Ottomans were able to induce some of the Albanian chieftains to come over to them; thus Pavlo Dukagin, who in 853/1449 had been proclaimed a rebel and deprived of his timâr, recovered it in Safar 855/March 1451 (see Sâret... Arvanid, no. 154), and other members of this family threw in their lot with Venice. Môs Dibra, Gjergj Balsha and Iskender's nephew Hamza went over to the Ottoman side. In 857/1453 Iskender visited Alfonso in Italy. In the summer of 859/1455, assisted by about 2000 Neapolitan troops, Iskender besieged Berat (Belgrade), but a relieving force under Evrenos-oglu İsa Beg defeated them,
the Neapolitans being killed almost to a man (to Sha'bān 859/26 July 1455). Although Iskender's biographers speak of a great victory in the next year (the Ottomans losing 10,000? men), Mois Dibra and Hamza once more went over to the Ottomans and the fortress of Modrīć (in the Dibra region) was sold to the Ottomans. This defection probably arose from Iskender's attempts to win control of the territory of the eastern Albanian chieftains and to extend his authority over them. When in 865/1465 a certain Jâz Beg (probably the son of Ibars Beg of Ūsküp) marched against Kruja, Iskender attacked his camp at Albule-
na near Mount Tumenish and took Hamza prisoner; this success was celebrated in Italy as a great vic-
tory: the pope proclaimed him the "Captain-General of the Holy See" (Radinčić, no. 163) and presented
him with 500 ducats.

The death of Alfonso in 862/1458, however, de-
prived Iskender for a time of foreign support (the new king Ferdinand wanted him to come to Italy to aid him against rebels), so that in 864/1460 he and the other Albanian leaders were obliged to recognize Ottoman suzerainty. By his treaty with the sultan (which he called "treuga per tre anni", see V. Ma-
kul, Monumenta Hist. Slav. Merid., ii, Warsaw 1874, p. 123) he agreed to send troops to join Otta-
man campaigns, to pay an annual tribute (in sheep) and to supply lads for the Janissaries (Critoboulos, Eng. tr. by C. T. Riggs, Princeton 1954, p. 147, where the date given is 1459; cf. Neghrli, ed. Tae-
schner, i, 201). In 865/1461 Iskender, as the loyal vassal of Ferdinand, went to aid him against the rebels, returning to Albania on 11 February 1462. His truce with the sultan was renewed on 7 Sha'bān 867/8 April 1463 (see Gegaš, p. 174), but that sum-
mer, with the outbreak of the Ottoman- Venetian war, Iskender found a new patron and ally (for the text of his pact with Venice, of 20 August 1463, see Radinčić, no. 248). The Ottoman sources (Tursun, p. 123; cf. Critoboulos, 147) emphasize Iskender's "breaking of faith" as the reason for the Ottoman operations against him from 868/1464 onwards. By permitting Venetian troops to garrison Kruje he had created a real threat to the Ottoman forces in Albania. In 868/1464 and 869/1465 the neighbouring sandjak-
begiš, and especially the governor of Gjiroka, Balaban, launched swift attacks; Iskender seems to have counteracted them by guerilla raids launched from the mountains, although the leading Albanian chieftains, including Mois Dibra, were taken. Mehmed II, who since 867/1463 had been intending to march against Iskender (Tursun, p. 122), finally moved in the spring of 871/1467 in the fethiye which he sent to his son Bāyezīd (N. Luqal and A. Erzi, Münzed Memaus, Istanbul 1956, 65-4), he announced that the campaign had been undertaken because of the Albanians' "breach of faith", that he had taken six important "breach of faith", that he had taken six important

Bibliography: 1. Bibliographical works: G. T. Pétrovitch, Scanderbeg (Georges Cas-

(2) Collections of documents: L. Thal-
cozy, C. Jireček and M. Sufflay, Alba-

2. Collections of documents: L. Thal-
cozy, C. Jireček and M. Sufflay, Alba-

3. Biographies and chronicles: M. Bar-
letius (Barlezeio), Historia de vita et gestis Scanderbeg Epicrioteran prinicipis, Rome (?) 1510 (for translations see Pétrovitch, op. cit. above; for the character of the work see F. Pall, Marino Barletius uno storico umanista, in Mladene d'his-

toire générale, ii (Cluj 1958), 135-319). References in the Ottoman chronicles are assiduous, for Ex-


(2) Collections of documents: L. Thal-
cozy, C. Jireček and M. Sufflay, Alba-

3. Biographies and chronicles: M. Bar-
letius (Barlezeio), Historia de vita et gestis Scanderbeg Epicrioteran prinicipis, Rome (?) 1510 (for translations see Pétrovitch, op. cit. above; for the character of the work see F. Pall, Marino Barletius uno storico umanista, in Mladene d'histoire générale, ii (Cluj 1958), 135-319). References in the Ottoman chronicles are assiduous, for Ex-


(2) Collections of documents: L. Thal-
cozy, C. Jireček and M. Sufflay, Alba-

3. Biographies and chronicles: M. Bar-
letius (Barlezeio), Historia de vita et gestis Scanderbeg Epicrioteran prinicipis, Rome (?) 1510 (for translations see Pétrovitch, op. cit. above; for the character of the work see F. Pall, Marino Barletius uno storico umanista, in Mladene d'histoire générale, ii (Cluj 1958), 135-319). References in the Ottoman chronicles are assiduous, for Ex-


(2) Collections of documents: L. Thal-
cozy, C. Jireček and M. Sufflay, Alba-

3. Biographies and chronicles: M. Bar-
letius (Barlezeio), Historia de vita et gestis Scanderbeg Epicrioteran prinicipis, Rome (?) 1510 (for translations see Pétrovitch, op. cit. above; for the character of the work see F. Pall, Marino Barletius uno storico umanista, in Mladene d'histoire générale, ii (Cluj 1958), 135-319). References in the Ottoman chronicles are assiduous, for Ex-


(2) Collections of documents: L. Thal-
cozy, C. Jireček and M. Sufflay, Alba-

3. Biographies and chronicles: M. Bar-
letius (Barlezeio), Historia de vita et gestis Scanderbeg Epicrioteran prinicipis, Rome (?) 1510 (for translations see Pétrovitch, op. cit. above; for the character of the work see F. Pall, Marino Barletius uno storico umanista, in Mladene d'histoire générale, ii (Cluj 1958), 135-319). References in the Ottoman chronicles are assiduous, for Ex-
ISLĀH (A.), reform, reformation,
1. THE ARAB WORLD
In modern Arabic, the term *islāh* is used for "reform" (cf.: *RALA*, xxi (1386/1966), 351, no. 15) in the general sense: in contemporary Islamic literature it denotes more specifically orthodox reformism of the type that emerges in the doctrinal teachings of Muḥammad ʿAbdūh, in his *writings of Raḥīl Riḍā*, and in the numerous Muslim authors who are influenced by these two masters and, like them, consider themselves disciples of the Salafiyah (see below). *Islāh* will be examined under the following general headings: A. Historical; B. Fundamental principles; C. The principal doctrinal positions; D. *Islāh* in the contemporary Arab world.

A. HISTORICAL. — Background. — The idea of *islāh*, so widespread in modern Islamic culture, is also very common in the vocabulary of the *Kūrān*, where the radicals *ṣ-l-b* cover a very wide semantic field. Amongst the derivatives of this root employed in the *Kūrān* are: a) The verb *Islāba* and the corresponding infinitive, *islāh*, used sometimes in the sense of "to work towards peace (*ṣālīḥ*)", "to bring about harmony", "to urge people to be reconciled with one another" and "to agree" (cf.: II, 228, IV, 35, 114, XVI, 9), and at others in the sense of "to perform a pious act (*ṭāmal al-ṣālīḥ*)", "to perform a virtuous act (*ṣalāh*)", "to behave like a holy man (*ṣālīḥ*, plur. *ṣālīḥīn-ṣālīḥīd*)" (cf. II, 220, IV, 128, VII, 56, 85, 142, XI, 46, 90); b) The substantive *musāliḥ*, plur. *musāliḥān*: those who perform pious acts, who are saintly in spirit, who preach peace and harmony, who are concerned with the moral perfection of their neighbours, and strive to make men better. It is precisely in this sense that the modern Muslim reformists can be defined, reformists who proudly claim the title of *musāliḥān*, upon which Revelation confers a certain prestige (cf. *Kūrān*, VII, 170, XI, 117, XXVIII, 19).

The adherents of *islāh* consider themselves in the direct line of the reformer-prophets whose lives are quoted as examples in the *Kūrān* (cf. especially *sūras* VII, X, XI, XX); but they claim to be influenced above all by the mission of the Prophet Muḥammad, whom they consider to be the Reformer par excellence (cf. al-Ṣāhīḥ, May 1939, 183: *Muḥammad, al-musāliḥ al-aṣ'ām*). Thus *islāh* is deeply rooted in the basic soil of Islam, and cannot therefore be viewed solely in relation to the intellectual trends that appeared in the Muslim world at the beginning of the modern period.

2. THE HISTORICAL CONTINUITY OF ISLĀH.— In so far as it is on the one hand an individual or collective effort to define Islam solely in relation to its authentic sources (i.e., the *Kūrān* and the *Sunna* [q.v. of the Prophet]) and on the other an attempt to work towards a situation in which the lives of Muslims, in personal and social terms, really would conform to the norms and values of their religion, *islāh* is a permanent feature in the religious and cultural history of Islam. This two-fold approach characterizing *islāh* is quite justified from a *kūrānīc* point of view. For a) Islam is simply that which Revelation contains, as it is transmitted and explained by the Prophet (see below: *The return to first principles*). b) To work for the Good, and aspire to improve (*ajlabah*), is simply to attempt to restore Islamic values in modern Muslim society. From this point of view, *islāh* can be seen as an intellectual, and frequently practical, response to the injunction of "commanding what is good and prohibiting what is evil" (see on this subject the two fundamental references, *Kūrān* III, 104, 110). This canonic obligation (ṣarāṣ, farāṣ) — a major obligation on the head of the Community (imām) — is continuously invoked by the reformers, both as a justification for their action, and as an appeal to the faithful, who are also bound, each according to his social standing and means, to play his part in "commanding the good". (On this important question of Muslim ethics please the classic text of *al-Ghazālī* in *Iṣlāh al-dīn* chap.: *Kitāb al-amr bi 'l-ma'rūf wa 'l-nabīya an al-munkar* trans. L. Bercher, *De l'obligation d'ordonner le Bien et d'interdire le Mal selon al-Ghazālī*, in *ILBA*, 1st and 3rd trim. 1955; the neo-Ḥanbalite doctrine (so illuminating for reformist teaching) in H. Laoust, *Essais sur les doctrines... d'Ibn Taymiyya*, 601-5; the position of Muḥ. ʿAbduh in: *Risālat al-tauhid*, 113 (Fr. trans., 121), and *Tafsir al-Mandār*, ix, 36; and a complete account of the question by Raḥīl Riḍā: *bid. iv*, 25-47 on *sūra* III, 104, and 57-64, on *sūra* III, 110; L. Gardet, *Dieu et la destinée de l'homme*, Paris 1967, 445 ff.).

Like all Muslims who cherish an ideal of the pious and virtuous life (*ṣālīḥ*), the reformists like to refer to the many *kūrānīc* verses which praise "those who do works of *islāh*" (VI, 45, VII, 170, XXVIII, 19) and particularly to XI, 90, which they hold to be the perfect motto of Muslim reformism: "Mon perfide... Mon unique désir est de vous rendre meilleurs" (trans. Savary)—"Je ne veux que réformer" (trans. Blachère)—"I desire only to set things right" (trans. Arberry). These scriptural statements are illustrated by the tradition that the Prophet intimated that Islam would need to be revitalized periodically and that in each century Providence would raise up men capable of accomplishing this necessary mission of moral and religious regeneration. (On this tradition, cf. Wensinck, *Handbook*, 204 b: "At the end... ").

The Community has never lacked men willing to assume precisely this prophetic mission. In its early stages and also in its later developments, *islāh* has been identified with the service of the *Sunna*, which is thought to provide the best model for the Islamic way of life (cf. *Kūrān*, XX, XII, 22), as well as supplying the essential elements which lie at the base of the earliest orthodoxy of Islam. The *Kūrān* is without doubt the most important point of reference for modern *islāh*; yet, in its earliest manifestations, it appears to be above all the expression of a total allegiance to the Prophet's Tradition. This active, sometimes militant, allegiance is best expressed in its defence of the *Sunna* against "blameworthy innovations" (*bidaʿ* [q.v.]) which are judged incompatible with the objective facts of the Book, the unquestionable teachings of the Prophet, and the testimony of the "pious forefathers" (*al-salaf al-ṣālīḥi*). Upholders of strict primitive orthodoxy were particularly aware of the increase of *bidaʿ*: a) at the dogmatic level: cf. the speculation nurtured by the dawning rationalist theology (*ḥalām* [q.v.]); *kūrānīc* excesses of Bāṭrīn tendency: the preachings of extremist Shiʿism; and b) in the sphere of worship: asceticism, excessive piety, paraliturgical practices inspired by Sūfism (*taṣawwuf* [q.v.]), all of which they believed indicated a spirit of exaggeration (*ghulāva*) contrary to the essence of Islamic spirituality. Such innovations were held to be blameworthy because they were looked upon as sources of error and seeds of heresy; they therefore seemed to constitute a serious threat to the confessionally unity and moral and political cohesion of the *Umma*.

The historical development of *islāh* must, it seems,
be related to that new spirit which gave rise to ḏiḏa‘ throughout the cultural evolution of the Community. The following are a few milestones:—1. The political and moral crisis following the battles of Ṣiffin (77/695 [g.v.] and Nahrawan (38/658 [g.v.]) engendered ardent political and religious polemics between the Khawārīdī [g.v.] and the Shī‘a [g.v.] on the one hand and the supporters of the established authority on the other. In this climate of schism the doctrinal tendencies which classical Sunnism deprecated as heretical to a greater or lesser extent began to grow (cf. al-Ṣāhārastānī, Mīlā‘ī, i, 27). The period of the Prophet’s companions was hardly over (ca. 90/708) when the theologico-philosophical speculations which were to disturb the Muslim conscience for many years began to appear.—2. At the end of the 1st/7th century, the general evolution of the Muslim community was sufficiently advanced for the unity of faith and the community’s cohesion to their original purity and cultivated a sort of idealization of the primitive Islamic social organization (cf. his Ẓawā‘il, etc.). Despite its dominant position (at least in theory), official Sunnism was neither dynamic nor homogeneous enough to condition effectively the moral and political behaviour of the new generations. Many factors (especially sociocultural and political ones) gradually weakened the religious and cultural impact of the Sunna, whose sociological base was anyway being diluted among the diverse populations of the vast empire. It is worth noting in this respect the geographical dispersion and gradual extinction of the main tendencies which classical Sunnism denounced as heretical to a greater or lesser extent began to grow (cf. the ḥudūdī: “Islam was born alone, and will become alone again, as at its beginning. Happy the solitary men. Those are they who will come to reform that which will be debased after me” (cf. Wensinck, Handbook, 114 A. “Originated”).—4. Ahmad b. Ṭāmbal (d. 344/955 [g.v.]) represents a strongly entrenched millenarian group of pious forefathers (1ābī‘ūna‘) and in tune with the defenders of the Sunna and its community’s cohesion, that modern Muslim reformers who will come to reform that which will be debased by a combination of internal and external factors; most decisive of these were:

3—islāh in modern Islam—Viewed as part of the historico-cultural process outlined above, the modern reformism of the Salafīyya is an exceptionally fruitful period. In the breadth of its first manifestations, the diversity and stature of the talents it employed, the energy of its apostolate, and the relative speed of its diffusion in the Arab world and even far beyond, modern Muslim personalities living in the second half of the 19th century. It is a result of the cultural movement born of the renaissance ( wnā‘a [g.v.]) which marked the reawakening of the Arab East (along with that of the Muslim world in general) as a consequence of the influence of Western ideas and civilization. This awakening has been interpreted as a direct result of the actions of several forceful Muslim personalities living in the second half of the 19th century. Those most frequently mentioned are Ẓāmīl al-Dīn al-Aḥfānī (1859-97 [g.v.]), Muhammad ʿAbduh (1849-1905 [g.v.]) and Abd al-ʿRāhmān al-Kawākībī (1854?-1902 [g.v.]). However, the awakening of Arabo-Muslim consciousness was preceded by a period of gestation which was encouraged by a combination of internal and external factors; most decisive of these were:

a) The pressure of Wahhābīsm [g.v.], which aimed (initially in Arabia) at restoring Islamic piety and ethics to their original purity and cultivated a sort of idealization of the primitive Islamic social organization, that of the “pious forefathers” al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ (hence the tendency called Salafīyya). Despite their zeal (which sometimes seemed excessive) in defence of their conception of the Sunna, their intransigence and their occasionally intolerant strictness, the Wahhābīs never lost sight of the need for a moral and political renewal of modern Islam. While
appealing to their co-religionists to recognize only the authority of the Qur'an and the Sunna in matters of religion (din), they urged them to abandon superstitions inherited from the Middle Ages and countered the general tendency to fatalistic resignation, reacting against the spirit of tabâhû [q.v.] which predominated at that time (end of the 18th-beginning of the 20th century). Through these efforts and their attempt to modernize the values of primitive Islam, the Wahhâbîs played an important role in the evolution of modern Islam, thus deserving a place among "the first of those who worked together towards the Arab renaissance" (L. Massignon, in RMM, xxxvi (1918-19), 325).

b) The development of the printed word through the press and publishing, principally in the Arabic language. In this respect the remarkable role played by the Egyptian printing house at Būlāk [see مَطْرِبَة] must be stressed. From 1822 onwards, this became one of the most important tools of the Arab intellectual renaissance. The Egyptians and Syro-Lebanese contributed to the growth of a serious and informative press which reflected the political and cultural aspirations of the nationalist and pro-reformist sectors of the population. (Cf. 'Abd al-Lâhī Khâbâw, American interests in Syria 1890-1902, Oxford 1966, 247-53; Ph. K. Hitti, Lebanon in History, New York 1967, 452-64).

c) The influence of Western culture. European penetration into the Arab world was the first important turn of the 19th century soon made itself felt, especially at an intellectual level. Cf. H. Pèrès, Les premières manifestations de la renaissance littéraire arabe en Orient au xixe siècle, in AIEO Algiers (1934-5), 233-56; A. Hourani, Arabic thought (Bibl.); the succinct statement of the problem by Husayn Mu‘nis in La renaissance culturelle arabe, in Orient, nos xlii-xliii (1967), 16-27; J. Heyworth-Dunne, An introd. to the hist. of education in modern Egypt, London 1939, reprinted 1968, 96-287.

d) The liberal evolution of the Ottoman regime. This first occurred under the sultan 'Abd al-Majîd I [q.v.] who inaugurated an era of the evils that the era of reforms (tanṣimat [q.v.] with the Khâfî-i sherîf of Nov. 3 1839 which granted his peoples the first imperial charter guaranteeing civil liberties. Despite the opposition of the traditionalists, these Western-inspired reforms were progressively put into effect, particularly after the Khâfî-i hûmmîyân of Feb. 1 1856, which finally opened the Near East to the ideas and influences of the modern world. Cf. Tâzîmîyat; F. M. Pareja, Islamologie, 339 ff., 583.

e) The structural renovation of the Eastern churches and their awakening to Western spirituality and ideas. Cf., e.g., on the exemplary case of the Uniate churches, the monograph by Joseph Hajjar, Les Chrétiens uniates du Proche-Orient, Paris 1962. As well as the renewal of local Christianity, thanks to a favourable concourse of religious and diplomatic events, the energy of Catholic and (above all) Protestant missions must be taken into account. On these missionary activities on Islamic soil, see the important material in RMM, xvi (1911), A la conquête du monde musulman (1 vol.); Kenneth Scott Latourette, A hist. of the expansion of Christianity, vi: The great century (1800-1914), London 1944, chap. II (Northern Africa and the Near East), 6-64; A. al-Taâbî, American interests in Syria, 316-24.

This missionary activity did not simply provoke a defensive reaction in the Muslim world. In the eyes of many 'ulâmâ, it was exemplary from two points of view: it was a remarkable example of zeal in the service of a faith, and the actual content of its preaching was of value. Thus, in imitation of the Protestants, the reformists attached paramount importance to the Scriptures, though without ever losing sight of cultural needs and working towards an ethical and spiritual renewal of Islam. At the same time they aimed at the social and intellectual emancipation of the Muslim population by tirelessly advancing the popularization of modern knowledge.

These different factors (which must be placed in the general context of the Eastern question) gave rise to the intellectual ferment which led to the nahdâ. After centuries of cultural stagnation, the Arab renaissance provoked a lively intellectual curiosity in the East. From the beginning of the 19th century, the Arab elites began to acquire modern knowledge, some through translations, others by direct contact with European scientific culture and techniques. A decisive role was played by Arab student missions in Europe, by Western schools (religious and secular) in the Near East, and by national institutions organized on the European model. Cf. on this subject: C. Brockelmann, S II, 730 f.; Djurdjî Zaydâyî, Tavâhî idât al-taghfa al-arabiyâ, Cairo 1914, iv 186-217; Jâk Tâdîji, 'Arabat al-târîqat fi misr al-âmm (Cairo 1944); An important study by J. Heyworth-Dunne, An introd. to the hist. of education in modern Egypt; Ph. K. Hitti, Lebanon in History, chap. xxxi.

For Arab writers this intellectual activity was accompanied by a historical and sociological enquiry in an attempt to analyse their social and cultural situation in order to determine the exact causes of their backwardness, naturally with a view to remedying it. This is the dominant theme of articles in al-'Urwa al-wuthîkha (1884), then in Manâr (from 1898 on), especially those by Rashîd Ri’dâ and Muhammad 'Abduh (cf. for instance, the series of articles in vol. v (1902), under the general title: al-Islâm wa l-Nafrâmilyya ma‘a l-Sim wa l-madâmîyya (136 p.). This is also the central topic of Ummat al-târîkh, in which al-Kawâkibî attempts a precise diagnosis of the general indolence (istâdâr) which characterized the Muslim community at the end of the 19th century (cf. the 7th session, 109 ff. passim); on the theme of the "backwardness" of the Muslim peoples, see also two accounts: Mu‘âammad ‘Umar (d. 1337/1918), Ḥâdhîr al-mîsârijyin wa-sirr ta‘ākkurîshim, Cairo 1320/1902; Shāhîd Arslân, Limâmâ al-'akhkharâ l-Muslimân wa-l-imâmât âkâh dâma ghayr al-râkîm (Cairo ed. 1939).

The situation of Islam in the modern world thus became one of the most important themes in reformist writings. After Ernest Renan’s famous lecture on L’Islamisme et la Science (Sorbonne, March 29 1883) and the subsequent controversy between Renan and Djamâl al-Dîn al-Afghâni (cf. on this subject Homa Pakdaman, Dîmâmd-Ed-Dîn, 81 ff.), one of the major preoccupations of reformist authors was to refute the thesis that Islam is contrary to the scientific spirit and can thus be held responsible for the cultural backwardness of the Muslim peoples. “We wore out our pens and our voices”, cries Rashîd Ri’dâ “through writing and repeating that the misfortunes of Muslims cannot be blamed on their religion, but rather on the innovations that they have introduced into it, and on the fact that they ‘wear’ Islam like a fur coat turned inside out” (Mandr. iii (1900), 244). Cf. also the pleas of Muhammad ‘Abduh, al-Islâm wa l-Nafrâmilyya, and Muhammad

Having established their view of the situation, the reformists planned ways to stir up a new spirit in their co-religionists and to arouse in the Community the will to break out of its cultural and social stagnation. For this purpose, they continually referred to the kuru'anic verse: "Allah althereth what is in a people until they alter what is in themselves" (cf. al-iments, no. 371 (Sept. 1884), ed. repr. by Rashid Ridj in his *Tafsir*, x, 46-52; Muwammad 'Abdul, *Risalah al-tawfiq*, 174 (Ar. trans., 121); Rashid Ridj, *Tafsir*, x, 45-5, on sura VIII, 54). From this point of view, reformist thought seems to have crystallized around the idea of improvement (isldkh) of the existing situation. To achieve this goal, the adherents of isldkh advocated a struggle against those religious forces (in particular the brotherhoods) and social groups (conservative and traditionalist forces) which they saw as the incarnation of obscurantism. They also supported the reform of archaic teaching methods and courses and the popularization of scientific disciplines and modern techniques. Since they had no training in these last two fields, the reformists could do no more than stress the usefulness of Western sciences and techniques as essential instruments for the material and intellectual progress of the Muslim peoples. However, they devoted the greatest and most effective part of their efforts to action in the moral and social fields, where they had more ready access to an adequate vocabulary.

Reformist appeals for social and intellectual evolution (*takhaddum, laraqdi*) concentrated on the need to improve, correct, reorganize, renovate and restore: all these infinitives corresponding, grosso modo, to the different meanings of the *madar*, isldkh (cf. Lane, i/4, 1714: *SLH*). From then on isldkh became a sort of leitmotiv in reformist literature. In the texts of Muwammad 'Abdul, for example, we frequently find this term used as the mark of an impelling idea even in his earliest writings; cf. his first articles in the paper *al-Ahrdm* (1st year, 1876) reproduced by Rashid Ridj in *Ta'rikh al-ustawd al-imdm*, ii, 20, 22, 34; his articles in the official paper *al-Wafyf* al-misriyya, 1880-1 (ibid., 175-81). Isldkh also appears at every opportunity and in its different meanings in the review *al-Manar* (whose first no. dates from 22 Shawwal 1315/16 March 1898). We find, for example, the following usages: *al-isldkh al-dni wa l-iddiyma* (*"religious and social reform"*), i (1898), 2; *isldkh huwd al-7im wa-tarbisht al-ta'lim* (*"improvement of textbooks and reform of teaching methods"*), ibid., 11; *isldkh dakhilyiyati al-mamlaka* (*"reform (or reorganization) of the internal affairs of the Empire"*), ibid., 736; *isldkh al-nufus* (*"regeneration of souls"*, ibid., 737); *isldkh al-baqda asas al-isldkh* (*"law reform, as a basis for general reform"*), ibid.; in the editorial of the 40th no. (1898), Rashid Ridj calls for a "renovation from the pulpit eloquence" (*isldkh al-masabha*); in no. 42, p. 828, he proposes: *mukhabara fi isldkh al-Azhar* (*"exchange of views on the reform of al-Azhar"*).

These few references show the variety of uses to which the concept isldkh was put. However, the following areas seem particularly to have attracted the attention of reformist authors: a) *Teaching*. The question of the reorganization of Muslim teaching, especially in institutes of higher education like al-Azhar, occupied an important place in the work of Muwammad 'Abdul and Rashid Ridj (cf. the account of the action carried out in this sphere by *shaykh* 'Abdul in *Ta'rikh al-ustawd al-imdm*, i, 425-507). This problem can be linked to that of the reorganization of the mosques and waqf possessions. Better management of these would supply the educational system with increased means and new buildings. ( Cf. Rashid Ridj, op. cit., i, 630-45; *al-Manar wa l-Azhar, passim*). b) *Law*. The reform of the Muslim legal system was also one of the constant preoccupations of the reformists (see the numerous articles in *Manar* on this subject and the Report made by Muwammad 'Abdul, Mufti of Egypt, *Tabir mufti al-diyyar al-mishriyya fi isldkh al-mahkum al-tarbiyyi*, Cairo 1318/1900; on this subject *Ta'rikh al-ustawd al-imdm*, i, 605-29). c) *The Religious Brotherhoods*. The reformists never ceased to press for the reform (if not for abolition pure and simple) of the brotherhoods, which they accused of maintaining blame-worthy innovations in religious life, of encouraging the people in superstitious beliefs and practices, and of continuing to use a reactionary system of teaching in their educational establishments (cf. the articles in *Manar*, under the heading: *al-Buda* wa'l-khurdfdt; Rashid Ridj, *al-Manar wa l-Azhar, passim*). In their attempt to reform Muslim educational and legal systems and religious practice, the supporters of isldkh were aware that they were attacking the traditional structures of their co-religionists and to arouse in the Community. But their task did not stop there. For the isldkh advocated by Muwammad 'Abdul and his close supporters necessitated a vast movement of renovation which would embrace all sectors of Muslim life. Thus we see them advocating isldkh in purely secular domains (for example, language and literature, the organization of schools, the administration, the military regime, etc.). They believed that the *ulamad* worthy of the name should devote themselves to an overall reform of Muslim social organization, and not just to a limited religious reformism.

These calls for a general isldkh were fairly well received in Arab and Muslim intellectual circles at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. From the period of al-*Uruwa al-wutthb* (1884) on, the combined efforts of al-Afgani and 'Abdul, and other propagandists of the quality of al-Kawaki, succeeded in definitively integrating the idea of isldkh into modern Muslim thinking. From then on, no intellectual in the Arab world could remain indifferent to the reformist phenomenon (cf. *al-Manar*, i, (1899), 949; *al-isldkh al-isldmi wa l-ta'lim: isldkh* had become one of the principal and most topical subjects in the Arab and Turkish press; *Umm al-kurah*, 3). In literary circles, many profoundly secular writers and poets joined forces with the advocates of isldkh. Their sympathies did not lie with the religious movement, but with the powerful ferment that it then represented for Muslim society and for Arabs in general. For them, isldkh signified an appeal for progress, a breath of renewal and the promise of a better future for the Arab nation. Its fundamental call for religious renovation and moral regeneration was blurred in the eyes of many intellectuals by its social and cultural implications. Gradually isldkh acquired the shape of a sort of myth which attracted all, believers and unbelievers, Muslims or not, who were struggling for the social and cultural emancipation of their people. (The impact of isldkh in non-Muslim circles is apparent in writers like Salama Musd; cf. *Tarbiyat al-Salam Musd*,
For the reformists, consequently, fidelity to Islam concurrently with the religious reformists (the Salafiyya), some concerned secular intellectuals took up the cry for islāh, though with a purely social and cultural connotation. The most typical figure of this secular reformist current is the ʿIrāqī poet Djamal ʿṢādiq al-Zāhāwī (1863-1936 [q.v.]), who advocated a form of islāh devoid of any religious content (his beliefs are expressed in: nasaburī fi ʾl-ʾamāra arāma biš-maṣlaḥah dunyā-humā li ʾl-ʾamāra fi ʾl-dīnī).

The relative receptivity of Arab intellectual circles (more or less influenced by Western culture) was a determining factor in the diffusion of islāh. The reformists found allies, if not true sympathizers, among publicists and men of letters who were exasperated by the conservativism of the “old turban”, the defenders of clerical and university tradition (of al-Azhar, al-Zaytūna, etc.), by the apathy of the masses, and by the sluggishness of the political and administrative machine. Thus in the East as in the Maghrib, the younger progressive intellectuals drew close to the reformists, who in their eyes represented a dynamic party which, in the face of different forms of foreign domination, proclaimed the right of their peoples to education, progress and national dignity.

But islāh also benefited from a measure of support in liberal Sunni circles. Frightened by the prospect of society drifting away from Islam in the more or less distant future, and by the dynamism of Christian missionary work in Muslim lands, they were happy to witness the birth of a movement which was profoundly attached to the Sunna, and firmly committed to the defence of the faith, while at the same time recognizing the need for social evolution and modern scientific and technical development in the Arab world.

Yet, despite the interest that it aroused in the young progressive generation and enlightened Sunnis, islāh encountered some difficulties at the outset. From its inception, the movement was suspect to the powers then ruling the major part of the Arab world (Turkey, England, France), because of its cultural and political orientation (exaltation of Arabism, Pan-Islamism). Its social and political stand brought down on it the hostility of the ruling classes and the administrative authorities of the status quo (university, magistrates, religious hierarchy, brotherhoods). By its declarations of war on every sort of shirk, on magical and religious superstitions, on forms of popular piety, islāh distressed conformist circles. For the same reasons it was mistrusted by ordinary people, who were attached to traditions and rites that they regarded as an integral part of religion.

Inevitably, islāh was strongly attacked on several fronts (cf. for example, the long quarrel between supporters of islāh against the defenders of the educational and doctrinal traditions of al-Azhar, in Ṭashhīd Riḍā, al-Manār wa l-ʾAzhar). After all, it was a movement vowed to political resistance (anti-imperialist, if not anti-Ottoman) and social change (aimed at the traditional framework of Muslim society), and geared to moral and spiritual reform, attacking in particular certain ecclesiastical structures which were held as sacred (notably the brotherhoods and religious orders) and certain aspects of popular religiosity. Lacking a single magistrature amongst the umma and unable to invoke the moral authority of a reforming Church, the Salafiyya were open to the charge that they were changing and destroying the holy Sunni tradition. They had to wage an unceasing struggle for acceptance of the sincerity of their intentions and what they saw as the eminently Islamic character of their attempts at reform. Nevertheless, neither the traditionalist Sunnis nor the members of the brotherhoods were disposed to recognize the legitimacy of their efforts (cf. Mandār, i, 807, 822; Ṭashhīd Riḍā attacked by his adversaries; Ṭashhīd Riḍā, Taʾrīkh al-ʾistāḥah al-īlām, passim: the difficulties Muḥammad ʿAbduh met with when he was Mufti of Egypt; Ẓafir al-Kāsimī, Djamāl al-Dīn al-Kāsimī, 592; the bad reception given to Ṭashhīd Riḍā by the “ulama’” of Damascus, 603-4; the lack of success of the Salafiyya in Syria; A. Merad Le Réformisme musulman . . . Book i: the resistance of Algerian Sunnism and brotherhoods to reformist propaganda). Whether presented as a “road to damnation” (qalāla) in the wake of the Wahhabi “heresy”, or hastily assimilated to the progressive trends that were more or less favourable to the secularization of Muslim society, the Salafiyya movement met with strong opposition in Egypt and Syria, as in Algeria and Tunisia. Its adversaries rejected it in the name of the Sunna, which, in their eyes, could have no other form than that of classical Sunnism. The real meaning of islāh appears when we examine its fundamental principles and its main doctrinal lines.

B.—Fundamental Principles.—In origin, islāh is a religiously inspired movement. Yet an examination of the roots of the movement reveals that the arguments put forward by its proponents sounded a less profoundly moral and spiritual note than a social and cultural one. In the first reformist manifestos—the articles of Muḥammad ʿAbduh (and al-Afghānī) in the paper al-ʿUrwa al-wuthqā (1884)—social, cultural and even political considerations are more important than religious ones. In his Umūm al-kurā and in his Taḥāriʾ al-istibdā, al-Kawākibī made similar efforts. In the early stages of his review al-Manār (1898), Ṭashhīd Riḍā also paid a great deal of attention to social and cultural questions. Like his masters, he wished to persuade Muslims that the improvement of their moral and material condition depended upon a regeneration of Islam; this was to be accomplished by a “return to first principles”, in order to rediscover Islamic teachings and values in all their authenticity and richness. The whole of the later reformist debate hinges on this essential theme.

The Return to First Principles.—The theme of the return (rudjūt) to first principles is omnipresent in reformist literature. This constant reference to the beginnings of Islam is one of the most striking characteristics of islāh, and the reason why the reformists of the Salafiyya have sometimes been accused of “addiction to the past”. The need for a return to first principles is justified, in the doctrine of islāh, by arguments of a canonical and historical nature. The former, drawn from the Kurʾān, can be resumed as follows: Islam in its entirety is one of the most striking characteristics of islāh, and the reason why the reformists of the Salafiyya have sometimes been accused of “addiction to the past”. The need for a return to first principles is justified, in the doctrine of islāh, by arguments of a canonical and historical nature. The former, drawn from the Kurʾān, can be summarized as follows: Islam in its entirety is contained in the Scriptures (Kurʾān, V, 3, VI, 38); the teaching of the Prophet—inspired by God (LI, 3-4)—is the natural complement of revelation. The Religion can be received only from the hands of God and his Messenger (IV, 59), and Muslims must abide by what the Messenger of God has transmitted, in all matters of command and interaction (LI, 7).

For the reformists, consequently, fidelity to Islam...
is essentially defined by faithfulness to the two Sources, Revelation and the Prophet's Sunna.

The canonical argument, supported by an argument borrowed from historical tradition, is in fact a maxim attributed to Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795 [q.v.]): “The later success of this Community will only ensue through those elements which made for its initial success” (ia yasīla hāzira ḥadīthi ‘l-umma illsa bi-mā salūka bhih awamāhā). Now, we are told, the objective basis of the historical success of the Arabs was Islam (that is the Kur’ān and the Sunna) authentically received and fully accepted (cf. Rashīd Rīḍā, Taṣfīr, x, 437, x, 210 (important) ix, 293; Shīkāh, March 1939, 58). Like their far-distant predecessors (Ṣalāfīyya), Muslims of today could achieve temporal power (ṣiyāṣa) and know the happiness of moral well-being (ṣalāda), provided that they armed themselves with those moral convictions that constituted the strength and grandeur of the Salaf, and that they strove to demonstrate to contemporary Muslim society the values of faith and the general teachings of Islam, in their authentic purity (cf. Rashīd Rīḍā, Taṣfīr, ii, 339-41, x, 210; A. Merad, Le Réformisme musulman, 287 ff.). What exactly is this authenticity? The reformist reply is clear and simple: the whole of Islam is contained in the Scripture and the Sunna, with the addition, solely as a guide and not as a canonical source, of the tradition of the Salaf. This position is not fundamentally different from that of traditional Sunnism. What distinguishes ʿīṣāḥ from the classical doctrine in this respect is the meaning given by the reformists to each of these three basic references.

1. The reference to the Kur’ān. On this point, ʿīṣāḥ has, in principle, the same position as the Salaf. This is true of the nature of the Kur’ān, its status as a canonical source, and the way of approaching its exegesis.

a) ʿĪṣāḥ identifies the Kur’ān with the Word of God, uncreated, intangible, unalterable (Kur’ān, XLI, 42, XV, 9), and affirms the eternity and universality of its message (XXXIV, 25, VI, 90; Mandār, i, 1; Rashīd Rīḍā, Taṣfīr, ii, 163, iii, 289). Holding strictly to the dogma of the “uncreated Kur’ān” it rejects objective basis of the historical success of the Salaf. This does not simply reaffirm the stance of the Salaf (cf. Rashīd Rīḍā, Taṣfīr, ix, 178). This explains why the Salafiyya have never been able to supply the Muslims of their time with an original interpretation of the Kur’ān, despite the return to favour of reason in modern Islam (cf. R. Caspar, Le renouveau du Musulmanisme, in MIDEO, iv (1957), 141 ff.), and despite the historical investigations and psychological analyses made in the light of the Sīra by European orientalists and a few contemporary Muslim authors which have given us a better knowledge of the Prophet’s personality. Their doctrine, immobilized by a desire to remain faithful to the past and to the positions—sometimes negative—of the Salaf, has prevented them from acquiring a deeper knowledge of the historical, sociological and psychological dimensions of this religious source. It has also served as a basis for the revival of the Sīra and of the Nabi, to the detriment of the less familiar aspects of Islamic history (important), vi, 123, vii, 140-1, 191, xi, 264). The Kur’ān is the supreme authority of Islam, and, as such, the problem of its understanding (and consequently of its exegesis) is of capital importance, for the way in which the Revelation is understood governs the manner in which the message is translated into action.

c) The exegesis of the Kur’ān. Linguistically, the content of the Kur’ān is presented in two categories (cf. III, 7). Most of the verses have a self-evident meaning (mukhām) and pose no problems of interpretation. Certain other verses can be the cause of some uncertainty (mutaṣṣābīh) if their apparent sense is adhered to. In this case, the Believer must accept the revealed fact as it is presented (imrdr) in its most literal sense, showing a confident belief in the truth it contains, a truth which transcends the immediately perceptible linguistic message (cf. Taṣfīr, viii, 453, x, 141). God being the only one to know the reality of the mutaṣṣābīh, the Believer must have the wisdom and humility to commend himself to Him (laṣfīd, laslim). In the eyes of Muḥammad ʿAbduh this act of faith acquires the value of a canonical obligation (Taṣfīr, i, 252). This is also the position of Rashīd Rīḍā and Ibn Bādīs (cf. Taṣfīr, iii, 167, iv, 256, vii, 472, viii, 453, ix, 513, x, 141, xii, 358; Shīkāh, Jan. 1934, 6 June 1939, 206).
The reformist doctrine on the subject of Qur'ānic exegesis can be defined in relation to the problems of interpretation, ta'wil [q.v.], and commentary, tafsir [q.v.].

Ishāh severely condeems subjective interpretation (ta'wil), which claims to analyse a "hidden" sense beyond the literal sense, and a more or less gratuitous symbolism beyond the apparent images. On the subject of III, 7, Rashīd Riḍā clearly defines the reformist position (Tafsir, iii, 166 ff.). Ta'wil is a typical example of bida' (ibid., x, 141), since it cannot be justified either by the Sunna or by the tradition of the Salaf, who avoided interpreting uncertain passages (mutashabbiḥ) of the Scripture by relying on their own understanding (see also Muḥammad 'Abdūh, Risālat al-tawqīḥ, 7 [Fr. trans., 8]). The Salafiyya's distrust of ta'wil includes all esoteric and mystical interpretations and those of the supporters of a rational explanation at any cost. Cf. Tafsir, i, 252-3, iii, 172-96: an explanation of the reformist doctrine of the subject of the ta'wil with lengthy quotations from Ibn Taymiyya; criticism of the tendentious exegesis of the "men of bida'" (Dājmīyya, Kadariyya, Khawārīdīj, Bāṭīnīyya, Bābīyya, Bāhā'īyya, etc.), ii, 131-2; the "heretical" exegesis of the Bāṭīnīyya and of excessive Shiism; iv, 191; exegesis which is "orientated" in favour of one source of meaning or another, working on the text as if it had a purely arbitrary sense to the revealed statement. This is tafsīr itself [q.v.], a concept applied in the Kurʾān to the "Possessors of the Scriptures" (ahl al-kitāb) and applied by the modern reformists to stigmatize the use of the Qurʾānic exegesis for partisan ends (cf. Tafsir, i, 430, iv, 97, 282, vii, 506; Shihāb, Sept. 1935, 344-5). Included in the term taafsīr are pseudo-erdute commentaries which embroider the text with "false legends" (khabāb wa-khufrūf), in the style of the isra'ā'īliyyāt [q.v.] so frequently denounced by the reformist authors (Tafsir, i, 8, 18, 347, ii, 455, 471, iv, 466, vi, 332, 355-6, 449, ix, 190, 414, x, 384, xi, 474; Shihāb, July 1939, 254). The same warnings were issued against interpretation of the Qurʾānic passages dealing with the unkownable, ghayb [q.v.] (cf. Tafsir, i, 254, ii, 166 ff., iv, 254 ff. on III, 173, IX, 513; Shihāb, Oct. 1930, 534; Jan. 1934, 3-9). Reformist exegesis tends to banish ta'wil in favour of simple commentary, tafsir, and lays down the principle that, apart from a few verses containing a certain mystery (particularly on the subject of divine attributes, sifāt, and the states of future life, asbāb al-ghāyat), Qurʾānic revelation can be made just as comprehensible to contemporary Muslims as it was to the Salaf. Thus, the function of ta'wil is revitalized. Freed from its historicio-legendary husk and from commentaries of a largely grammatical and rhetorical nature, tafsir becomes a preparation for reading and meditating upon the Kurʾān. Those commentators whose primary interest was in the didactic aspect of tafsir have woven a veritable scripture (ḥijāb) between Muslims and their sacred book (Tafsir, iii, 302). According to the reformists, the essential aim of tafsir is to elucidate the moral values and spiritual "direction" (hady) which nourish religious feeling and guide the piety of the faithful (ibid., i, 25); it must not be seen as a demonstrative discipline capable of establishing scientific and verifiable truths and satisfying the modern mind which is avid for rationality. The reformist commentators (and above all Rashīd Riḍā and Ibn Bādīs) were in no way tempted by scientific exegesis, and, with the odd exception, did not give in to the fashion for compromise which was widespread in their day (cf. the typical case of a Tantawi Diwargar (1862-1940), in MIDEO, v (1958), 115-74). Consequently Rashīd Riḍā criticizes the lack of discernment with which Fājr al-Dīn al-Rāzī [q.v.] appeals to the scientific culture of his time to pad out his important commentary. He deplores an identical tendency amongst "contemporary commentators [...] who display so much seemingly scientific erudition in their tafsīr that they succeed in diverting the reader from the object of the Revelation" (Tafsir, i, 75). Moreover, when speaking of the biblically inspired stories recounted in the Kurʾān, Rashīd Riḍā, quoting Muḥammad 'Abdūh, criticizes those who would like to base the truth of the Book on the veracity of the facts it offers to the meditation of the Believers. "The Kurʾān is no more a historical work (ta'Rīḥ) than a narrative work (ṣaḥāīḥ): it is only a moral guide and a source of edification" (Tafsir, ii, 471). The historicity of the Qurʾānic story is less important than its moral content and its virtue as a source of inspiration. The role of the reformist commentator is above all to bring the Qurʾānic message as close as possible to the minds and hearts of Muslims. In his task, his goal will of course be to establish the meaning of the verses as exactly as human understanding permits. This implies a profound knowledge of all the resources of Arab lexicography and applied philology. It is mostly in the early tafsīr that there are some verses whose message is readily apparent; in some cases, what is revealed can be made more explicit with the help of references and parallels found in the Kurʾān itself (tafsir al-Kurʾān bi 'l-Kurʾān); in other cases it is necessary to employ the exegesis of the Batiniyya and of excessive Sufism; v, 279, 470). Some of the Prophet's teachings, on the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (al-rujūt al-fāyūḍ)
have the same importance as the Kur'ān, but their level of expression does not assume the inimitable nature of the latter (ibid., v, 279, § 3).

The Sunna makes Revelation explicit.—All the reformists agree on this point. The Kur’ān clearly says that the Prophet’s mission is to make manifest to men (li-tubahayya na ‘i-l-nās) the true meaning of the Scriptures (Tafsīr . . ., ii, 30, vi, 159, 472, vii, 139, viii, 355, 309; Şikāh, Oct. 1930, 535; Feb. 1931, 73). The Sunnah makes Revelation explicit to the Book, since it is an explanatory instrument (Tafsīr . . ., iv, 18, on III, 101); the Kur’ān constitutes the totality of the religion, and the Sunnah is an integral part of the latter only in the sense that it explains what was revealed (ibid., ix, 326). Herein lies the status of the Sunnah as the second canonical source.

By Sunnah is meant only the texts of Ḥadīth the authenticity of which has been duly established (cf. Muḥammad ʿAbdūh, Risālāt al-tañāṣīdī, 129 [Fr. transl., 132]), a very limited number of traditions which refer above all to the dogmas of faith and the forms of worship (e.g. prayer, pilgrimage). Beyond these descriptive traditions of holy acts, the remaining traditions about which there is no doubt (e.g. those with a moral content) “do not number more than a dozen” (Risālāt al-tañāṣīdī, ed. Rashīd Rūdā 202 n. 22; Tafsīr. . ., v, 434), and are essentially to be believed just because it is attributed to the Prophet, even if it carries the authority of an eminent traditionist or famous teacher. Rashīd Rūdā cites the example of Ḡazālī, who gave as authentic traditions which were “insignificant or simply invented” (Tafsīr, vi, 31). He was also severely critical of the apocryphal traditions (maßāḥif), attributing their origin to various factors: sandakah [q.v.], sectarianism, flattery towards rulers, human error, and senile forgetfulness. Moreover, rigorism and puritanism encouraged the traditionists to incorporate into Ḥadīth moral maxims which they considered just as edifying as certain traditions called “weak”.

The problem of the authenticity of Ḥadīth is extremely important from the reformist point of view, for the authenticity of the Sunnah as a source of the authority of the Prophet originates from God and must therefore be an article of faith for Believers (Kur’ān, IV, 80: “Whoever obeys the Messenger has obeyed Allāh”). Thus Muslims have every right to reject any normative tradition the authenticity of which is not absolutely beyond doubt, as is the Kur’ān. Hence the necessity of great care in distinguishing between the Sunnah, which carries the same authority as Scripture, and the traditions whose authenticity has not been completely established, even if they are in harmony with the “spirit” of the Salaf. In fact, the Salafīyya only recognize the normative value of a very small number of ḥadīths which are held to be rigorously authentic: ḥadīth muvaṣṣidīra, wa-halkūn mā hī (Manār, iii, 572). By stating that Muslims are obliged to follow “the Kur’ān and the Sunnah, and them alone” (al-Kawākilī, Umm al-kurūd, 73; Rashīd Rūdā, Tafsīr . . ., passim; Ibn Bāḍīs, Şikāh, Feb. 1936, 95), the reformists based their doctrine on the teachings of the Prophet (cf. Wensinck, Handboek, 130 A: “Clinging to Kur’ān and Sunnah alone”); 232 A: “Confining oneself to Kur’ān and Sunnah”). But, bearing in mind their very limited conception of the Sunnah, they maintain in fact that Islam as a religion (din) can essentially be reduced to the Kur’ān.

The doctrine of ḥadīth tends to attach a greater importance to the Kur’ān as a source than to Ṣunna as it has generally been accepted in classical dogmas. This trend is taken to its logical conclusion in the works of recent authors, who reduce the authority of Ṣunna almost out of existence in favour of the Kur’ān and iddīthāt [q.v.] (cf. Maḥmūd Abū Rayyā, a former disciple of Rashīd Rūdā: Aḥūd ala ‘l-sunnah al-muḥammadīyyā, Cairo 1958; and on present positions on the subject of Ḥadīth: REI, 1954, Abstrakta, 117-13; G. H. A. Juynboll, The authenticity of the tradition literature, Leiden 1960).

Logically, Islam could no doubt be defined exclusively in relation to the Kur’ān, a thesis upheld by another disciple of Rashīd Rūdā, Muḥammad Tawfīq Șīdrī, in his work al-Islām huwa ‘l-Kur’ān wadādhu which is a programme in its own right (Manār ix (1906), 515-25, 906-25). For this author, the foundations of Islam are the Book of God and Reason. Any doctrinal element imputed to Islam which satisfies neither the criterion of the given facts of the Kur’ān nor the fundamental demands of reason must be declared unacceptable. Elsewhere, M. T. Șīdrī demands complete freedom in evaluating the Sunnah. It must be limited in so far as it is in disagreement with the objective facts of the Book, but where it puts forward principles of wisdom (ṣikma) there is nothing to prevent the Believer from referring to it, as he might to any (profane) source. The Salafīyya certainly do not go to quite these lengths. The thesis of Muḥammad Tawfīq Șīdrī (presented with some reservations by Rashīd Rūdā) was immediately refuted by a defender of the classical doctrine (cf. ʿĪdāh al-Biṣṣirī, Uṣūl al-Islām: al-Kur’ān, al-Sunnah, al-īdāmāt, al-biṣṣirī, in Manār, ix, 699-711). In the eyes of the Salafīyya Islam cannot be reduced to matters of faith and canonical obligation (ḥadīthāt) which can only be held to be true in so far as they originate from Revelation and the very small number of ḥadīths shown to be authentic (muvaṣṣidī). Islam is also a political and social system, a complex of ethical values, a culture. In matters of usage (ṣādāt) and human relations (muʿāmalāt) determined by a socio-cultural framework which is not ruled by scriptural dispositions, the Sunnah is the basis of its authority as a canonical source. All that is transmitted by the Prophet originates from God and must therefore be an article of faith for Believers (Kur’ān, IV, 80: “Whoever obeys the Messenger has obeyed Allāh”). Thus Muslims have every right to reject any normative tradition the authenticity of which is not absolutely beyond doubt, as is the Kur’ān. Hence the necessity of great care in distinguishing between the Sunnah, which carries the same authority as Scripture, and the traditions whose authenticity has not been completely established, even if they are in harmony with the “spirit” of the Salaf. In fact, the Salafīyya only recognize the normative value of a very small number of ḥadīths which are held to be rigorously authentic: ḥadīth muvaṣṣidīra, wa-halkūn mā hī (Manār, iii, 572). By stating that Muslims are obliged to follow “the Kur’ān and the Sunnah, and them alone” (al-Kawākilī, Umm al-kurūd, 73; Rashīd Rūdā, Tafsīr . . ., passim; Ibn Bāḍīs, Şikāh, Feb. 1936, 95), the reformists based their doctrine on the teachings of the Prophet (cf. Wensinck, Handboek, 130 A: “Clinging to Kur’ān and Sunnah alone”); 232 A: “Confining oneself to Kur’ān and Sunnah”). But, bearing in mind their very limited conception of the Sunnah, they maintain in fact that Islam as a religion (din) can essentially be reduced to the Kur’ān.

1. The problem of the authenticity of Ḥadīth is extremely important from the reformist point of view, for the authenticity of the Sunnah as a source of the authority of the Prophet originates from God and must therefore be an article of faith for Believers (Kur’ān, IV, 80: “Whoever obeys the Messenger has obeyed Allāh”). Thus Muslims have every right to reject any normative tradition the authenticity of which is not absolutely beyond doubt, as is the Kur’ān. Hence the necessity of great care in distinguishing between the Sunnah, which carries the same authority as Scripture, and the traditions whose authenticity has not been completely established, even if they are in harmony with the “spirit” of the Salaf. In fact, the Salafīyya only recognize the normative value of a very small number of ḥadīths which are held to be rigorously authentic: ḥadīth muvaṣṣidīra, wa-halkūn mā hī (Manār, iii, 572). By stating that Muslims are obliged to follow “the Kur’ān and the Sunnah, and them alone” (al-Kawākilī, Umm al-kurūd, 73; Rashīd Rūdā, Tafsīr . . ., passim; Ibn Bāḍīs, Şikāh, Feb. 1936, 95), the reformists based their doctrine on the teachings of the Prophet (cf. Wensinck, Handboek, 130 A: “Clinging to Kur’ān and Sunnah alone”); 232 A: “Confining oneself to Kur’ān and Sunnah”). But, bearing in mind their very limited conception of the Sunnah, they maintain in fact that Islam as a religion (din) can essentially be reduced to the Kur’ān.

3. The tradition of the Salaf.—To a large extent, Ṣīrah appeals to the tradition of the Salaf as an explanatory source for the Sunnah and an important reference point for understanding the general meaning of Islam. The term ṣīrah designates a fact that is both historical and cultural. It implies firstly the idea of anteriority (cf. Kur’ān XLIII, 57), which in classical usage is naturally linked with the idea of authority and exemplariness. The Salaf are precisely the “virtuous forefathers” (al-salāf al-ṣāliḥ), the predecessors whose perfect orthodoxy, piety, holiness, and religious knowledge make them men worthy of being taken as models and guides. But, in the absence of sure and sufficient biographical references, these are difficult to ascertain. It is not so much their personal qualities, however striking, that make for the authority of the Salaf, but rather their historical experience, their contact with the
Prophet in some cases and with his Companions and Successors in others. Among the innumerable witnesses of primitive Islam, the Salaf are exemplary. They represent a certain form of Islamic orthodoxy at a given period of history. Hence the need to sketch the historical context of the Salaf. The chronological points of reference are inexact and often contradictory. By *salaf* was meant, for example:—a. the *Mother of the Believers*, A'isha, and the Patriarchs of the Caliphs, as well as Talha ass Zubayr (Lane, *Tafsir*, ed. Ma'arrif, i, 93);—d. The Companions and their successors (*tabi'in*, on the one hand in relation to the founders of the four *madhabs* (cf. Ahmad b. Hanbal who talks of “our pious forefathers”, *salafuna al-salih*, Wensinck, *Concordances* . . . . ., i, 505 B); and on the other the latter and their immediate disciples in relation to succeeding generations (al-Tahânwâl, *Kashshâf ishlåh al-funûn*, ed. Khayyat, iii, 767-9). In the works of modern reformist authors the definition of the Salaf is just as vague. For Rashîd Riḍâ they are the most eminent representatives of the primitive Islamic community, *al-sadr al-awwal* (*Tafsir*, li, 81, vii, 143, 198), those of the “first epoch”, *al-asr al-awwal* (*ibid.*., vi, 196, iii, 578), which cover the first three generations, *karn* (this term is not to be taken in the modern sense of “century” but in that of a “generation of men” (dhił) who lived during the same period of seventy to eighty years (*ibid.*, xi, 314, xii, 190). In the works of Rashîd Riḍâ and Ibn Bâdis we find the same traditional definition of the three first generations; i.e., that of the Prophet and his Companions (*sahâba*), that of their Followers (*tabi'in*), and that of the Successors of the *sahâba* (*tabi'in*), of which the most complete definition made by the “independent” doctors —independent of the Schools and Parties—who, following the example of the Salaf, were free from all sectarianism and all narrowmindedness, and whose only concern was to safeguard the integrity of the *Sunna* and the unity of the Community. Thus Aًbâ ʿIraq al-Shâfiʿî (d. 790/1388) is highly esteemed by Rashîd Riḍâ (cf. the eulogistic article that he devoted to him in *K. al-Ṭidbîm*, Cairo 1320/1904, i, 1-9; *Tafsir*, vii, 69-70; viii, 48-50), April 1937, 344), generations “which surpass in excellence (khayyârâ) all others, as is witnessed by the Impregnable [i.e., *Mubammad*]” (Ṣḥîbâh, Feb. 1932, 66, allusion to the ḥadîth: “the best of generations is mine, then the following, then which comes after”); cf. Wensinck, *Handbook*, 48A, lg. 40: “the best...”. This is worth comparing with the other ḥadîths quoted by al-Ṣâfî al-Dîn, Ṣalîbî, al-A. M. Shâkîr, 476, no. 1315; the latter and their immediate followers who follow them and those who follow these: after which untruth will appear”, cf. Wensinck, *Handbook* 48B “Mubammad admonishes...”).

A few chronological points of reference will serve as rough definitions of the three groups which make up the Salaf:—a) The *sahâba* (or *asbâḥ*), who date from the first conversions (at Mecca in 610 and Medina in June 622) until the death of Anas b. Mâlik (91/710 or 93/712), considered to be the last survivor of the Prophet's Companions (cf. Ibn ʿAqîl al-ʿAskâlañ, Ḳisâ, i, 138; Ibn Ḥazm, Ḳâbûm, iv, 152);—b) The *tabi'in*: a large number of these were contemporaries of the Prophet's Companions; some might even have been alive during the Prophet's lifetime but without satisfying the conditions which would have permitted them to be classed among the *sahâba*. The last of the *tabi'in* died around 180/796 (e.g.: Ḫusaym b. Ṣūfî al-Ṣalâmî, d. 183/799. He transmitted to Mâlik and Sufyân al- Ṣawârî) among others).—c) The *asbâḥ* al-*talâbîn*: There are no sufficiently precise criteria enabling us to define exactly this group of men; the reformists refer to them less frequently than to the other two, especially on the important question of *ṣârîñ* ascetics (cf. *Tafsir*, iii, 179, 208). In fact, they are essentially the most eminent disciples of the great *tabi'in*, Ḳâbûm, al-*talâbîn* (like al-Ḵâsim b. Mubammad b. Abî Bakr, 101/720; al-Ṣâbî, d. 104/723; al-Ḥasan al-Brânî, d. 110/729). Ibn Sîrîn, d. 110/729). The middle of the 3rd/9th century can be taken as the *terminus ad quem* of this last group of Salaf. Also covered by the term Salaf are “the doctors of the second and third generations” (*Tafsir*, ii, 82), notably the founders of the four Sunni *madhabs* and a certain number of their contemporaries, the strongest religious personalities from the early days of Islam, such as al-Awâlî (d. 757/1354), Sufyân al- Ṣawârî (d. 167/782), al-Ṭawârî b. Sâdî (d. 175/791) and Iṣâk b. Râdhîyân (d. 238/853, cf. *Tafsir*, vii, 552, viii, 453). Ahmad Ibn Ḫanbal (d. 241/855) would appear to be one of the last representatives of the age of the Salaf.

In reformist usage, the Salaf are sometimes mentioned in opposition to the *Khulaf* or “later generations”, under whose influence the message of Islam has been obscured, if not distorted, by innovation, the fanaticism of the Schools, and the mushrooming of sects (cf. *Tafsir*, viii, 265). This conception might appear simplistic, implying that reformists should cut themselves off from the cultural current which has never ceased to refresh the body of the *Umma* throughout the centuries. In fact the position of the Salafiyya is more subtle: outside the period of the Salaf defined above, the modern reformists do not refuse to take into consideration the contributions made by the “independent” doctors —independent of the Schools and Parties—who, following the example of the Salaf, were free from all sectarianism and all narrowmindedness, and whose only concern was to safeguard the integrity of the *Sunna* and the unity of the Community. Thus Abî Ṣâhî al-Ṣâfî al-Ḥâšî (d. 790/1388) is highly esteemed by Rashîd Riḍâ (cf. the eulogistic article that he devoted to him in *K. al-Ṭidbîm*, Cairo 1320/1904, i, 1-9; *Tafsir*, vii, 69-70; viii, 48-50), April 1937, 344), generations “which surpass in excellence (khayyârâ) all others, as is witnessed by the Impregnable [i.e., *Mubammad*]” (Ṣḥîbâh, Feb. 1932, 66, allusion to the ḥadîth: “the best of generations is mine, then the following, then which comes after”); cf. Wensinck, *Handbook*, 48A, lg. 40: “the best...”. This is worth comparing with the other ḥadîths quoted by al-Ṣâfî al-Dîn, Ṣalîbî, al-A. M. Shâkîr, 476, no. 1315; the latter and their immediate followers who follow them and those who follow these; after which untruth will appear”, cf. Wensinck, *Handbook* 48B “Mubammad admonishes...”).

Fidelity to the moral and religious tradition of the Salaf is a fundamental demand of *islâh*. Besides the two sources of this modern reformism this tradition as their only basic point of reference, justifying their attitude by the following arguments:—a) The Salaf received the sacred inheritance from the Prophet (the dogmas of the faith, the form of worship), and transmitted it faithfully, in word and deed, *kawâm wa-ṣâmâl* (*Tafsir*, vi, 277). They are the guarantors of the *umma* (*ibid.*, ii, 30, 82), and their liturgical tradition must be adhered to as an ideal norm, in the sense that it actualizes the spirituality of the Prophet, and to imitate this must be the highest ambition of every Muslim.—b) The Salaf best understood and followed the *kur'ânic* message, as it was handed down to them fresh from the Revelation (*ṣâlîh an kûn kamâ unsîlā*). After the Prophet, they are most qualified to interpret the Scriptures (*Tafsir*, iii, 178, 182, vi, 196; cf. R. Blachère, *Intro. au Coran*, 223 ff). Their reading and their meditations on the Book are indispensable for a modern understanding of the *Kûrân*, which must avoid being both too literal or too subjective—and thus arbitrary—
c) *The Salaf are the best source of information we have about the life of the Prophet and about the way he put the Revelation into practice. On many factual points their unanimous accounts (idjamā') are irreplaceable, rounding off information given by the two sources. The Salaf thus provide the necessary framework for an understanding of the Revelation and the Sunna.*

A complement to the Sunna and a source of inspiration in Islamic life (in spiritual matters as well as in secular acts), the tradition of the Salaf is more than an object of veneration for the modern reformists. The Salafiyya do not wish to be a group frozen in admiration of an ideal image of Islam reflected by the Salaf. They aspire rather to live Islam within modern society, in a simple and true manner, following the example of the Salaf. Moreover, for the theoreticians of *islāh*, this ideal expresses their desire to rebuild the Muslim personality, not by copying foreign values and cultures but by drawing upon the moral and cultural tradition of early Islam. It is this ideal that Ibn Bādīṣ defended in his column in *Shihāb* (already referred to): *Riḍāl al-salaf wa-nisā'ah* (from 1934 on); the lyrical and moralizing verses to the glory of the Patriarchal Caliphs like the *Umariyya* (Feb. 1918, 190 lines) by Ḥāfīz Ibrāhīm (d. 1932) and the *ʿAlawiyya* (Nov. 1919, more than 300 lines) by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-ʿUzzaṣ (d. 1931); Muḥīb al-Dīn al-Ḥāḍirī, *Maʿṣūma ṭ-raft al-awwal*, Cairo, 1378/1958.

The historico-cultural importance of the Salaf in the methodology of *islāh* is considerable. Even though the Salafiyya give priority to the two sources, they put forward the principle that the Revelation and the Sunna inaugurated a new order in human history, and that that order became a complete living reality in and through the acts of the Salaf. Thus the reformist conception of Islam could be summarized in a statement of the following type: "The constituents of Islam are the Qur'ānic revelation, Muhammad's Sunna, and the tradition of the pious forefathers (wa-mā hāna 'alayh al-salaf al-sālih)”, viewing this tradition from the aspect of its moral and dogmatic content (*Tafsīr*, vii, 143, 198, ix, 132, xi, 378; Ibn Bādīṣ, *Shihāb*, Feb. 1934, 99). Because they felt it was the concrete expression of the ideal "way" of Islam, the reformists continually cite the tradition of the Salaf in support of their missionary activity (*da'wah*) and their teaching in matters of Qur'ānic exegesis or social and political ethics. This fidelity to the Salaf governs one of the main doctrinal premises of *islāh*.

C.—THE PRINCIPAL DOCTRINAL POSITIONS.—*

*Islāh* aims at a total reform of Muslim life.

1. *For the reform of worldly matters, *islāh* employed oral teaching (waʿz, *tarāḥ*) in mosques and through cultural circles well-disposed toward the Salafiyya movement. Screened by their educational and scholastic (*al-tarbiya wa 'l-taʿlim*) or charitable (*khayriyya*) works, the Salafiyya, run by Rashīd Rīḍā, or the *Shihāb* in the Maghrib (1924-39), edited by ʿAbd al-ʿUzzaṣ, had a deep and lasting influence.

The general reformist themes propagated among the masses can be summarized as follows: the restora-
tion of worship to its original form (which entailed certain liturgical changes, minor in themselves, but extremely irritating to the mainland Sunnis); preaching against a host of practices which seemed religious but had no foundation either in the Prophet's Sunna or in the tradition of the Salaf (funeral rites such as the public recitation of the Kur'an over the tomb, the celebration of the mawlid [q.v.] etc.); and warning against pious beliefs and practices which the Salafiyya felt bore traces of the sunnism or the manifestation of shirk [q.v.] (cult of the saints, invocation of the dead, etc.). The reformers also exhorted the faithful to unite, to worship in solidarity aside from the diversities of Schools and to overcome the traditional opposition between Sunnism and Shi'ism; and they encouraged the development of a moral censorship designed both to ensure the canonical obligation to obey God and eliminate Evil, and also to cleanse Muslim society of vice, gambling, the use of alcoholic beverages and drugs, etc. The education of Muslim men (and especially women) in elementary hygiene and domestic economy (including the encouragement to save) was important, as was the cultivation of a taste for order and work well done. Other educational aims were the awakening of the Muslims' intellectual curiosity, so that they might study modern science and foreign languages; and the support of projects for youth such as scouting, artistic activities, cultural activity within the many circles (nadda) and associations of Young Muslims (djam'iyya al-ashba' al-muslimin). All this comprised an attempt to hasten the birth of new Muslim men, capable of facing fearlessly—and without the risk of alienation—the problems of the contemporary world.

2.—For theoretical reform. It is important to stress that the principal reformist authors were above all men of action who did not have the time to elaborate well-developed doctrinal works. The main religious ideas of Muhammad 'Abduh are set out in his Risalat al-tawhid, in 133 small pages. The rest of his teachings can be found scattered piecemeal through the bulky Tafsir by Rashid Ridâ, where his work cannot easily be distinguished from his disciples'. Al-Kawakibî, who died prematurely in 1902, printed no more than 1000 pages of itidab and Aumm al-kur'd, which contain only a small proportion of theoretical thought. The Algerian reformer, Ibn Bâdis, who, like 'Abduh, introduced many new ideas throughout his life, left no more than a series of articles of kur'anic commentary (that is, about 500 octavo pages), published in the Shihab (cf. A. Merad, Ibn Bâdis, commentateur du Coran). There remains the considerable work of Rashid Ridâ, in particular his Tafsir (Tafsir al-Mandhâr), which is the most important source for the study of the dogmatic positions of modern istah. The many secondary reformist authors simply developed the ideas of their masters when they were not simply imitating their writings and teaching.

The efforts of the Salafiyya centered particularly on criticism of the fashionable doctrines of their time, both on the ground that they were a rigid form of classical doctrine (that of the Sunna schools) or that they were rash analyses and formulations, the result of a modernism that was dubious in principle and incompatible with the criteria of orthodoxy which istah had set up. At the same time, the reformists attempted to work out "ideal" Islamic positions, bearing in mind the objective facts given in the two sources and the fundamental conceptions of the Salaf; the latter were essentially viewed through the interpretation of Ibn Taymiyya and his pupil Ibn Kayyim al-Djawziyya (d. 751/1350), whom they considered the soundest authorities on the tradition of the Salaf (cf. Tafsir, i, 253; it is thanks to these two that the author adhered so sincerely (ifmamuna kadda) to the doctrines attributed to the Salaf). From the critical works and commentaries of the reformists (cf. Bibliography) we can distinguish the following doctrinal positions:

1.—Methodology.—The dominant Sunnî doctrine based canonical knowledge (usul) on four fundamental sources (usul [q.v.]) and the recitation of the Kur'an (Tafslr, i, 253: it is thanks to these two that the author adhered so sincerely (ifmamuna kadda) to the doctrines attributed to the Salaf). From the critical works and commentaries of the reformists (cf. Bibliography) we can distinguish the following doctrinal positions:

I.—The two Sources (Kur'ânc and Sunna) constitute the basis of the whole legal system in Islam. Their authority frees Muslims from exclusive submission to traditional doctrinal authorities, thus effectively wiping out the diversences (idjimmah) between Schools (madhhab), the secular opposition between Sunnis and Shi'is, and the hatred nurtured in Sunni circles for sects felt to be heretical (particularly all Khâridjism, in its present form of the Ibadîyya [q.v.]). By returning to first principles, Muslims will be able to overcome the divisive effect of the Schools but will still be able to take up all that is best from each of the many contributions (Ibn Bâdis, Shihab, March 1926, 654, Nov. 1928, 230). This would permit, for example, the possibility of an eventual unification of Muslim legislation. By preaching tirelessly for a return to first principles, the reformists were led to voice severe criticism of the orthodox Schools and their teachers, the fakih (cf. al-Kawakibî, Umm al-kur'd, i, 72 f.; Muh. 'Abduh, Risalat al-tawhid, 15, 101, (Fr. trans. 19, 109); Rashid Ridâ, Tafsir, ii, 257, 377; essays: Tabbr' al-shi'id, vi, 145 and following references). In their eyes, the Schools generally identified themselves with trends hostile to reason and science (Tafslr, ii, 91-3); they hindered the research carried out by idjihab and consequently helped to stop the cultural progress of the Community; they in fact gave priority to the study of fikhr over knowledge based on the Kur'anc and on the Prophet's Sunna (ibid., v, 106, 120, ix, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30, x, 129-30). By encouraging the unconditional submission of the masses to their doctors, the Schools ignored kur'anic teaching, which says that Muslims must cling together (djam'iyya) to the one and only rope of salvation, the rope of Allah (rabi Allâh), which is the Kur'ânc (cf. the commentary of Rashid Ridâ on this kur'anic ref. (III, 390). The return to the two sources (and to the tradition of the Salaf) would thus be a unifying and reconciling factor for Muslims. Freed of their fanaticism and mutual prejudices, Muslims could reuni in the fundamental unity of their Umma, rediscovering their original fraternity, and together and above their ethnic and cultural ties. (The theme of the return to first principles was a powerful argument in favour of pan-Islamism, an idea dear to the reformist authors).
Can the return to first principles advocated by the Salafiyya be seen as reactionary? The reformists were not trying to restore to the old symbols (such as sunna, umma, djamâ'ā, imâm, dâr al-islâm, idjâhâd, idjâhâd) the exact same significance they had had at the time of the Salaf. Rather, such a return expresses their desire to take the two sources as an essential (but not exclusive) basis for their reflection, in order to resolve the moral problems that the modern world poses to Muslims. The use to which they put certain symbols found in the Kur'ân or the Sunna sometimes corresponds to preoccupations arising from daily life in the modern world. Behind what appears to be a fundamentalist return to the sources of Islam, the Salafiyya are in fact attempting to work towards a moral and doctrinal renewal by searching for subtle concordances between the Scriptures and present-day realities (see, e.g., the concepts of gharî (Kur'ân, II, 233; III, 159) and of Âlî 'l-amr (Kur'ân, IV, 59) and their respective interpretations by Rashîd Riḍâ, Tafsîr, ii, 414, iv, 199-205, v, 180-190). A logical consequence of the principle of a return to the sources is the rejection of tabâlîd [q.e.v.] and the search for new ways of practising idjâhâd.

2.—Tâblîd. The reformists vigorously criticized the spirit of servile dependence upon traditional doctrinal authorities (notably in the orthodox Schools). The concept of taklîd obviously does not apply either to the pious imitation of the Prophet, which is held to be a canonical obligation (cf. Kur'ân IV, 59, XXXIII, 21), nor to the trusting acceptance of the tradition of the Salaf, whose moral and doctrinal authority is loudly proclaimed by the reformists (see above). In these cases, the word idjâhâd (active fidelity) to the traditions of both the Prophet and the Salaf was used instead of tabâlîd. (Cf. in this respect the distinction made by Rashîd Riḍâ, Tafsîr, v, 238). Such a fidelity regulates and inspires the general mission of idlâh, which offers the imitation of the Prophet as an "ideal of knowledge and action" (H. Laouist, Essai, 226). For Ibn Bâdis, the better the imitation the better is the reformist mission (âlî 'l-amr) accomplished (âlî 'l-amr). It is the attempt to reach authenticity; it is the opposite of the spirit of speculation and innovation (ibdêdâ), which is as reprehensible at a religious level as is the spirit of servile dependance upon traditional doc-

3.—Idjâhâd. Isldâh affirms the necessity and legitimacy of the use of the idjâhâd, which Rashîd Riḍâ sees as "a life-force in religion" (haydî al-dîn, ibid., vi, 399). The fiction of the "closing of the gate" of idjâhâd (from the 4th/10th century on) is thus abandoned and with it the whole heritage of interdictions and myths which weighed heavily on the Muslim conscience for so long. But the reformists did not regard the opening of the mind to idjâhâd as absolute freedom for the critical spirit to call everything into question. Complete liberty of conscience in religious matters would lead to speculation without end (ibid., viii, 317), which was not what the Salafiyya wanted. Conservative Sunnism nevertheless blamed idlâh for encouraging innovation and favouring doctrinal "anarchy" (ibid., ii, 273, xi, 253). The theme of tabâlîd has been a constant source of misunderstanding between the reformists and their traditionalist adversaries. The former argues, on the definition of this principle nor on the extent to which it can be applied. The traditionalists, who thought of religion (in its broadest sense) as a divine work which is perfectly complete (Kur'ân, V, 3), were afraid that modern criticism might use idjâhâd to undermine the essential foundations of Islam. But the reformist conception of idjâhâd also had its limiting conditions. Firstly, idlâh defined an intangible sphere, which included the dogmas of the faith (sâkhâd), fundament-
al worship (‘ibādāt) and canonical prohibitions (talā’il dini), which are all based on the Scriptures, either because of their explicit and formal nature or because of the irrefutable authenticity of their interpretation (ma’uwa bāṭī ‘l-risāya wa ‘l-dalāla: Tafsīr, i, 118 (bis), xi, 268, 265; al-Wahdah al-islāmiyya, 136). In this domain there is no room for idīthād (Tafsīr, v, 211, vii, 217, x, 432, xi, 268), for it would be intolerably presumptuous to attempt to question fundamental religious facts, which form a “divine institution, revealed by God” (ibid., ii, 18, x, 432). Apart from these sacred matters, islāh permits the use of idīthād, while placing it on two distinct planes, each with a particular significance.

a)—As an effort to understand the two sources, idīthād is part of the right—and duty—of every Muslim to seek to understand by himself Revelation and the Sunna (ibid., ii, 390). One of the fundamental ideas of reformist preaching was that Muslims must feel personally concerned with the Word of God and the teaching of the Prophet which illuminates it. Constant meditation on the Scriptures, patient efforts to analyse and understand all the resources that it offers, should permit every Muslim to steep himself in the divine message and draw from it principles of its “politics” (social, economic, foreign, etc.). In accordance with the fundamental commands of the Kur‘ān and the Sunna.

b)—In so much as it is a constructive effort with implications both for the Community and in practical affairs, at a legislative rather than dogmatic level, idīthād comes under the authority of the alā ‘l-amr [q.v.]. These latter are the legitimate holders of authority (Kur‘ān, IV, 59) and because of their responsibilities, their moral worth, and their particular abilities are in charge of “binding and unbinding” (akh al-ball wa ‘l-shudh), that is the right to decide in the name of the Community and in its best interests. (On the definition and role of the alā ‘l-amr, cf. H. Laoust, Essai, 596, and Traité de Droit Public d’Ibn Taymiyya (on the latter’s point of view); al-Kawākibī, Umm al-kurā, 58; Rashīd Ridā, Tafsīr li, 492, iii, 21-12, iv, 199-205 [important], v, 180-1 Muhammad ‘Abduh’s position), 211-2, vii, 140, 298, viii, 102, xi, 164). The acts of the alā ‘l-amr should aim to bring about the moral good (islāh) and material welfare (masālih) of the Community. Their competence extends to affairs that are normally the responsibility of political leaders, but does not include matters of worship and personal status (ibid., v, 211). In these matters, idīthād would constitute a veritable heresy (ibid., xi, 253). Muslims could refuse to recognize this right (polITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CHIEFS) who attempted to use their idīthād in the sacred domain (ibid., viii, 508), which is the “right of God” (şık Allāh) over men (ibid., viii, 288).

Hence those attempts at idīthād suggested by some Arab heads of state in order to reform certain aspects of Muslim personal status which they considered incompatible with the spirit of contemporary civilization were invalid. In all that concerns canonical prescriptions which are authentically founded on the two sources, the role of the alā ‘l-amr is essentially to safeguard orthodoxy, by making sure that the Sunna, as it was formulated by the Salaf, is respected in its entirety (ibid., iii, 11-12). This is a natural corollary of the reformist doctrinal principle maintaining that idīthād is incompatible with certainty (yabīn) emanating from the absolutely evident facts of the Scriptures (ibid., ii, 18, 109). The Salafīyya only allow the use of idīthād in the absence of any explicit scriptural reference (ri’dāt), prophetic tradition (sunna) or general consensus (idīthād)—in this case the consensus of the Prophet’s Companions—that would resolve a given problem (ibid., viii, 210).

Given this important restriction, we can distinguish two types of problems to which the idīthād of the alā ‘l-amr is normally applicable. i)—Purely secular business (administrative organization, scientific and technical questions, military and diplomatic affairs, etc.). In these fields, the alā ‘l-amr are quite free to choose and decide, in so far as their choices are governed by the overriding interests of the Community, in line with the specific goals of Islam. ii)—On the other hand, in business which has some connection with canonical doctrine, the idīthād of the alā ‘l-amr could necessitate the interpretation of kur‘ānic texts whose apparent sense is not certain, nami al-dalīla (Tafsīr ii, 109). In this case, to be acceptable, the interpretation must be in agreement with the two sources in spirit and letter, for it is understood that idīthād can only be used in the context of the two sources and can only refer to the textual sources and different indications (dalā’il, kān’ūn) that they offer. It is a basic principle in islāh that consideration of the best interests of the Umma would never result in solutions incompatible with the spirit, and even more, the objective facts of the Kur‘ān and the Sunna.

In this light, idīthād is not unlike the method of kiyās (q.v.) as it is defined, for example, in the Risāla of al-Shāfi’ī (cf. J. Schacht, Origins, 122 ft.). Islāh denotes the “false idīthād and the bad kiyās” (Tafsīr, iii, 238, v, 203), which would allow the incorporation into religious law (dā‘l) of elements based merely on individual opinion (ra’iyyū) or on more or less arbitrary conclusions (istihsān and istiṣlah). In religious matters ra’iyy is held to be a sort of “calamity” (baliyya), for it only serves to hide dangerous innovations (ibid., viii, 398). While the reformists are very suspicious of kiyās, ra’iyy and istiṣlah according to the technical use of the fakhrā, they nevertheless accept these very modes of reasoning and judgement in certain clearly laid-down conditions (e.g., the ra’iyy of the most eminent religious men among the Companions (‘ulama’ al-salāhī); explanatory ra’iyy on the subject of kur‘ānic exegesis; the ra’iyy of the members of the shāhār (idīthād at al-shāhār), those responsible for the temporal affairs of the Community (ibid., vii, 164). On the different aspects of this question cf. Tafsīr vii, 164 (on the recommended ra’iyy, maḥmūd); vii, 190 (on the acceptable kiyās, saḥīh); vii, 167 ft. (on the evil of rejecting kiyās totally [cf. Ibn Baaz, Ikhām, vii, 53 ft., viii, 2 ft.] or of using it without restriction or intelligence). Throughout this debate, Rashīd Ridā adopts—grosso modo—the neo-Hanbalite point of view, according to Ibn Kāyīm al-Dzāwiyya (‘I‘ām al-Mu‘awwādi‘īn). In short, ra’iyy and kiyās are only particular aspects of idīthād and, like the latter, are only acceptable in matters outside worship (‘ibādāt). When determining rules and legal statutes (azkām), idīthād in all its forms is only to be used when there are no antecedents in either the Kur‘ān or the Sunna nor in the irrefutable
practice of the Patriarchal Caliphs (Tafsir, vii, 164). Beyond the attempt at personal interpretation of the divine Word, and the desire to be open to the grace (kudad) which flows from it, reformist doctrine limits idjhah to the type exercised by the ulam`-i-amr in public affairs of a secular nature. But so that it should not be a source of quarrel and conflict, the idjhah of the ulam`-i-amr must be derived from mutual consultation (shurad) in accordance with the ethical demands of the Kuran (XXI, 30). The Community is not bound by the personal and may be even contradictory opinions of individual mudi-tahids. Its acceptance by the ulam`-i-amr is a condition sine qua non of the validity of their idjhah.

Moreover, from the reformist point of view, this represents the most perfect form of idjm* (cf. Wensinck, Idjm*, iv, 187; xvi, 267). But the reformists do not accept the traditional classification and formulations which arose from it (Tafsir, v, 203-9). For them, classification of the subject is not justified by the two sources, (ibid., v, 213) even though the idea of idjm* is implicitly contained in the Kuran (IV, 115) and the Sunna (cf. Wensinck, Handbook, 48A; Ibn Hazm, Th`ahm, iv, 132 ff.). This methodological principle must not be defined in terms of the concept of “unanimity” (idjm*), but rather in terms of that of “community” (idjm*), the latter: ulam`-i-amr (ul`am` al-a`ma). Any tafa* later than the era of the Companions is without value, particularly if it sets aside the problem of the Caliphate (“that vain fancy”) and suggests the establishment of a Diam`at al-Musul`imin, a sort of permanent legislative institution designed to study specifically Muslim problems in accordance with Islamic principles and the ideals of the Community (cf. H. Laoust, Le Califat dans la doctrine de Rashid Rida, 1938, 21 ff.), but such a notion has meaning only within the perspective of a restoration of the Caliphate. With greater realism, Ibn Bads* sets aside the problem of the Community (cf. A. Merad, Reformisme, 376 ff.; idem, Ibn Bads* Commentat., Chap. IV).

Though they never managed to agree on the practicalities of its establishment, the reformists did tend to see the institutionalization of idjm* as a decisive step in the evolution of the Sunna in accordance with Islamic principles and the ideals of the Community. All who wrote on these lines held in common the idea that the Diam`a would be the organized in the form of “a permanent legislative institution” (Reconstruction, 164). Rashid Rida (1922) considered the idea of using the Diam`a, a consultative body appointed to assist the supreme head (al-imam al-a`lam) of the Community (cf. H. Laoust, Le Califat dans la doctrine de Rashid Rida, 1938, 21 ff.), but such a notion has meaning only within the perspective of a restoration of the Caliphate. With greater realism, Ibn Bads* sets aside the problem of the Community (cf. A. Merad, Reformisme, 376 ff.; idem, Ibn Bads* Commentat., Chap. IV).

Though they never managed to agree on the practicalities of its establishment, the reformists did tend to see the institutionalization of idjm* as a decisive step in the evolution of the Sunna in accordance with Islamic principles and the ideals of the Community. All who wrote on these lines held in common the idea that the Diam`a would be the privileged setting of the Community’s idjm*. It would play two roles: at a religious level, it would effect regulations by stating the orthodox position on matters that gave rise to serious disagreement (idjm*); in secular affairs, it would be the instigator of action, through applying the principle of idjhah in the vast area within its competence. It would thus work towards preventing any confusion between the respective levels of the idjm and the `had`d, and would contribute to encouraging the free enquiry that the Community requires in the spheres of applied science and material progress.

5.—The distinction between the `had`d and the `had`. Following the neo-Hanbalite school (cf. Ahmad b. Hanbal; H. Laoust, Essais, 247-8, 444), modern islah tends to make a clear distinction between the concerns of the `had`d (q.v.) and those of the `had`. Once again they justify their stand by the principle that in matters of worship everything has been completely and definitely decided by God (Kuran) and the Prophet (Sunna); for the rest, that is to say everything concerning with the organization of material life, the ulam`-i-amr are free to come to their own decisions (see above: idjhah).

3a.—The `had`d (ulm`-i-amr). It tends to see the ulm`-i-amr in public affairs of a secular nature as a body of men who are free to come to their own decisions (see above: idjhah). It is the ulm`-i-amr that is the sole criterion of orthodoxy, and the Community requires in the spheres of applied science and material progress.
all acts (including those of worship) and observances (of hadd and ta'dl [q.v.]) which constitute the service of God (‘ibadatu). It is out of the question for anybody to introduce the slightest innovation, either because of an idjihād or out of simple religious zeal. The fact of recognizing the inalterable quality of the ‘ibādāt, the very centre of faith, is itself an act of fidelity in what the Believers hold in certainty from God and his Prophet; it is the sign of a sincere and total belief in the latter’s Sunna. ‘Iddāt (habits, usages) cover a vast field of “earthly affairs” (umār dunyawiyya) “which are individual or communal, particular or general” (Rashīd Rīḍā, Ta’ṣifīr, vii, 140) and above all affairs of a political and legal nature (ibid., iii, 327, vii, 140, 200) which vary according to time and place. It is thus not a matter merely of the traditional legal rules (mu'āmalāt) or matters of “customary right”, as the term ‘idā (q.v.) is understood in the usual classical sense of ḥabīb. In the domain of the ‘iddāt, the reformists counsel tolerance (‘aṣf) and claim for the al-‘i’ām, if not for private individuals, freedom of decision and the free exercise of idjihād (al-Kawākibl, Umūr al-burādī, 67; Manār, iv, 210, vii, 959; Ta’ṣifīr, iii, 327, vii, 140-41, 193).

By virtue of this distinction, the reformists showed a prudent reserve about everything that has not been expressly decided by God or prescribed by the Prophet. For Rashīd Rīḍā that which has not been prohibited by God cannot be prohibited by Man; that which God has made licīt, Man cannot make illicit (Ta’ṣifīr, vii, 169); that which God has passed over in silence must be held to be tolerable, ‘aṣf (ibid., iii, 328, vii, 169). The “wise men” of the religion have no right to make things permitted or forbidden. Their role is simply to put into practice the revealed Law (qur'ānī), in its function only is obedience due to them. As for the kurānīc or prophetic references to certain secular matters (the use of food and remedies, etc.), they cannot be taken as binding; they are simply “suggestions” about what is preferable and not canonical prescriptions, irshād lā taṣhīrī (ibid., vii, 201).

The distinction between the ‘ibādāt and the ‘addāt permitted the Salafiyya to condemn the proliferation of devotional practices propagated throughout the centuries in the name of Sīfism and eventually adopted by popular religion, even though they are not based on the Kurān and the Sunna. It enabled them, moreover, to point to their prunings of classical juridical and moral doctrine (by means of ḥadāth) and the reduction of traditional observance, in support of their claim to be the apostles of a disciplined and discreet religious temper, which they believed to be closer to the spirit of moderation that had characterized authentic Islam (the “gentile religion”, al-ḥanīfiyya al-ṣamāhā), and more in harmony with the modern world. This distinction would also encourage a more tolerant view of local legal and social usage through classifying them as ‘addāt, and permit the toning down of doctrinal differences (ṣikkīnī) between the important currents in that area, it would also weaken the religious quarrels inherited from old schisms. Taken to its logical conclusion, this attitude would make it possible to envisage calmly the coexistence—in the bosom of the ‘Umma—of different political, socio-economic and ideological systems, provided that the fundamental unity of Muslims in faith and worship was safeguarded and their common attachment to the essential content of Islamic law (ṣarī‘a) unimpaired.

However, such a distinction between the ‘ibādāt and ‘addāt has more of an apologetic value than any real practical implication. The fragmentary (and rather vague) notions on this subject put forward by Rashīd Rīḍā and al-Kawākibl do not enable us to make an exact analysis of which aspects of traditional Muslim legislation must be considered fundamental, and thus untouchable, and which can be subsumed under the ‘addāt. The postulated tolerance in matters of ‘addāt is itself ambiguous, because of the restrictive character of the Kurān in which it is put forward by the Salafiyya each time they were obliged to define their political, economic, social or cultural standpoints (although these are, in theory, the field in which ‘addāt can be used). In the reformist perspective, indeed, there are few matters that can be envisaged independently of the moral commands and general principles contained in Revelation and the Sunna; and whatever creative activity is envisaged, its goal must be examined in the light of the ethical and religious criteria of the two sources. Islāh admits of the possibility of adapting Muslim institutions and life to the realities of the modern world, so long as this adaptation does not result in the destruction of the fundamental values contained in the two sources. Thus, on the subject of feminism and the relations between the two sexes, the Salafiyya declare themselves favourable to the emancipation of Muslim women, but not to the extent that the liberalization of their legal status would come into conflict with the legal dispositions established in the Kurān, or the family and sexual ethics of Islam (cf. on this subject, Ta’ṣifīr, xi, 283-87: “Islam confers on women all human, religious and civil rights”); Rashīd Rīḍā, Nidā: li ḍjins al-lātīf, Cairo 1351/1932; A. Merad, Le Réformisme musulman, 315-31 (“Les Réformistes et le Caire”). Although they claim the necessity of distinguishing between profane and religious matters, between man’s relations with God and merely human activities (which are not ruled by scriptural commands), the Salafiyya did not make any decisive contribution to the separation of theology and law. From their point of view, the ambiguity of the relationship din/ṣarī‘a (which they never really attempted to clarify) makes any separation of them particularly difficult, because of the fragmentation of the legal and moral doctrine that attempts to establish a clear-cut distinction between purely religious and social matters extremely difficult and a priori suspect. (It is worth noting the vigorous reaction of the reformists against the attacks made by ‘Alī ‘Abd al-Rāzīk (1888-1968), in his al-Islām wa-asārīl al-buhm, Cairo 1343-44/1925, to dissociate institutional and political problems from moral and theological ones; cf., Kerr, Islamic Reform, 179 ff.). Rashīd Rīḍā notes in passing the respective values of the concepts din and ṣarī‘a, which he considers unjustifiable to confuse (Ta’ṣifīr, vi, 147), but he does not draw any logical conclusion from the distinction. The distinction din/ṣarī‘a (which is no less vital than that between the ‘ibādāt and the ‘addāt) could have had important consequences had it been taken to its extreme; but the search into the possibilities of rigorously limiting the field of application of “religious law”, and thus removing from the “sacred” domain everything that did not have a fundamental link with belief or worship and should therefore come under idjihād. It was left to Modernism (lidadīd [q.v.]) to undertake this research (cf., e.g., the essays of Muhammad Ahmad Ḥusayn al-Ṣayyīd, in particular his al-Kurān wa-muṣḥḥīli ṣayyīdī al-mu‘āṣira (Cairo 1967), in
which he proclaims the legitimacy of "a new interpretation of the fundamental principles of the shari'a, in the light of modern experience" (31)). Incomplete though it be, the distinction between the 'ibdadī and the 'dddt suggests a need for rationality and a desire to be pragmatic, which served the Salafiyya as an argument against the stubborn conservatism of the traditionalists (giasmūd) and in support of the broadmindedness of 'dddt on the subject of progress and the modern world. At the same time it is a reply to those who preach out-and-out modernism, to the detriment of fidelity to authentic Islam (as it was illustrated by the tradition of the Sāafa). The reformists see in this modernism a renunciation of the "spirit of compromise" which their apologetics present as the ideal tendency of Islam.

II—Apologetics.—Alongside criticism of the traditional aspects of Islam as they appear in conservative Sunnism, in the magical and superstitions beliefs of popular religion and in the religious systems of the brotherhoods, apologetics form an important part of the principal reformist works. Though centred on internal problems of Muslim society, and often argued with missionary zeal, though centred on internal problems of Muslim society, and often argued with missionary zeal, though centred on internal problems of Muslim society, and often argued with missionary zeal, though centred on internal problems of Muslim society, and often argued with missionary zeal, though centred on internal problems of Muslim society, and often argued with missionary zeal, though centred on internal problems of Muslim society, and often argued with missionary zeal, though centred on internal problems of Muslim society, and often argued with missionary zeal, though centred on internal problems of Muslim society, and often argued with missionary zeal, through which they seek to demonstrate consequently, the reformists attempted to demonstrate the excellence of Islam, as a "religion", as an ethical system, as a social, legal and political system (shari'a). Reformist apologetics proclaim the excellency, eternal nature and universal character of Islamic law, in opposition to human legislation, which is always imperfect, despite constant revision and correction. The shari'a—whether in those parts that are based on the Revelation—draws its essence from divine wisdom; it is thus the legislation best suited to the needs of mankind (madūn al-muqtahidīn, art. 1900, Cairo 1327/1909 (Fr. trans., Taflat Harb, L'Europe et l'Islam, Cairo 1905); idem, al-Islām wa 'l-Nārāfīyya, art. of 1901, in Manār), or indirectly, in the form of warnings to Muslims against the seductions of Western civilization and ideologies. In both cases, the reformists attempted to demonstrate the excellence of Islam, as a "religion", as an ethical system, as a social, legal and political system (shari'a). Reformist apologetics develop along the following broad lines:

1.—The liberating message of Islam.——a. As a spiritual message. Here the argument is confined essentially to the exaltation of tawbāh [q.v.] as a principle of human liberation. Moral Liberation: the affirmation of divine unity abolishes all worship that is not directed to God (the Unique), and all pretension to infallibility, since the only infallible source is the Revelation and the Prophet, who is inspired by God (this argument refutes tabākī [q.v.], to the extent that the latter supposes submission to an authority which is believed, or pretends to be, infallible). On the other hand, the affirmation of divine transcendence condemns any domination based on the principle of intercession (shujā'ī) [q.v.]. Consequently, tawbāh denies any legitimacy to intermediary structures between man and God (as in institutional Churches), and destroys any need for the belief in the mediating function of certain categories of men (saints, mystics, etc.). Social Liberation: belief in the omnipotence of God is the basis of men's equality, for all men are equally subject to God and all men participate equally in the eminent dignity of their condition (cf. Muhammad ʿAbdūh, Risālat al-tawbāhī, 152-6; Fr. trans., 106; Eng. trans., 125); it emancipates man from all resigned or fortunate (naṣīrī) [q.v.], based on authority (tabākī), or to a status of inferiority or slavery imposed by the "great" (cf. Kurʾān, XXXIII, 67, XXXIV, 31-4; al-imām ʿulūfī). The form of worship itself (common prayer, pilgrimage, etc.) underlines the egalitarian character of Islam.——b. The liberating message of Islam is also illustrated by the ethics of the Kurʾān and the Sunna which accept the fundamental unity of mankind and reject all discrimination based on differences of race or social condition (cf. Muhammad ʿAbdūh, Risālat al-tawbāhī, 172; Fr. trans., 116-7; Eng. trans., 135; Taflīr, 484 ff.; an identical position in Muhammad Ḥṣāli, Reconstruction, 89; Fr. trans., 103).

2.—The universal quality of Islam.——a. As a religion (dīn). Reformist apologetics merely take up the traditional theme of the universality of Muhammad's mission ('umām al-baḥtiyya). For the Prophet was "elected to guide all nations towards Good ( . . . ) and call all men to a belief in the One God" (Muhammad ʿAbdūh, Risālat al-tawbāhī, 139; Fr. trans., 90; Eng. trans., 114; cf. also, Taflīr, vii, 610, on sūra VI, 90). Like many other Muslim thinkers in our own time, reformist authors believe that Islam is the perfect universal religion, since it incorporates what is essential in previous revelations (and especially Judaism and Christianity) and perfects their message (cf. Muhammad ʿAbdūh, Risālat al-tawbāhī, 166 ff.; Fr. trans., 112 (bottom) ff.; Eng. trans., 132 ff.; Taflīr, . . . ., 448-456).——b. As a social, legal and political system (shari'a). The reformists proclaim the excellence, eternal nature and universal character of Islamic law, in opposition to human legislation, which is always imperfect, despite constant revision and correction. The shari'a—at least in those parts that are based on the Revelation—draws its essence from divine wisdom; it is thus the legislation best suited to the needs of mankind (al-muqtahidīn, art. of 1900, Cairo 1327/1909 (Fr. trans., Taflat Harb, L'Europe et l'Islam, Cairo 1905); idem, al-Islām wa 'l-Nārāfīyya, art. of 1901, in Manār), or indirectly, in the form of warnings to Muslims against the seductions of Western civilization and ideologies. In both cases, the reformists attempted to demonstrate the excellence of Islam, as a "religion", as an ethical system, as a social, legal and political system (shari'a). Reformist apologetics develop along the following broad lines:

3.—The liberal spirit of Islam.——Outside matters of faith and the unalterable elements of the shari'a (both of which were expressly laid down in Revelation), Islam assigns no limit to the exercise of reason. This aspect of reformist apologetics, which has been amply dealt with by Muhammad ʿAbdūh
The theme of knowledge and civilization plays an important role in reformist propaganda (cf. J. Jomier, *Le Comment. coran. du Mandr*, chap. IV; A. Merad, *Ibn Bâdis, Commentat. du Coran* chap. IV, II1rd). Thanks to the intelligence with which God has endowed him, man can rise above erroneous belief and superstition, cultivate the sciences and adopt healthy beliefs: using it, he should also be able to increase his power over nature, to profit by the various resources of Creation, in order to achieve material power (‘izz, kwaww) and know a happy moral well-being. Presented in this way by the reformists, Islam appears as a religion which is particularly attentive to the moral and material progress of humanity. It was therefore an effective refutation of arguments of the type put forward by Renan (Islam is incompatible with the scientific spirit) and useful in revealing the inadequacy of Marxist-orientated criticism (Islam is a reactionary doctrine). The reformists deplore the judging of Islam by the behaviour and excesses of some of its followers who distort its image through their innovations, by superstitious beliefs born of ignorance, by the imposture of false “scholars”, and by the immorality of its politicians (cf. the objections enumerated by Muhammad 'Abduh, *Risâlat al-tawhîd*, 195-9; Fr. trans., 132-5; Eng. trans., 131-3). For when traced back to its authentic expression, to the Revelation and the Sunna, Islam is a religion compatible with science and civilization (*Tafsîr*, ..., ix, 23); it encourages progress and science (ibid., iii, 26, 34, 106); and exalts science and freedom of research, which are the conditions of man’s greatness (ibid., v, 258); Islam is capable of regenerating civilization in the East and saving that of the West (ibid., ix, 22). Whatever the case, consists in proclaiming the values of Islam as man’s basis and as a ‘gârî’a, Islam is a progression beyond previous religions (ibid., 208-88: the enumeration of the various domains in which Islam has been beneficial to mankind). Hence the Muslim duty to reveal the truth of Islam: this is part of the canonical obligation to “invite to Good” (Muhammad 'Abduh, *Risâlat al-tawhîd*, 159-9; Fr. trans., 135; *Tafsîr* iv, 26-46; Fr. trans., 116; Eng. trans., 135; *Tafsîr* iv, 26-46, on sûra III, 104) and to “call to God” (Ibn Bâdis, *Shikhâb*, April 1935, 6, ref. to sûras XVI, 125 and XII, 108). To call to God, in this case, consists in proclaiming the values of Islam, refuting, through its “proofs”, the false ideas ascribed to it, and in making known its “beauties”; all this in order to fortify Muslims in their faith and to enlighten non-Muslims, less perhaps in order to convert them than to dissipate their prejudices and fanaticism. However, the notion of missionary work is not foreign to the reformists (cf. J. Jomier, *Le Comment. coran. du Mandr*, chap. X). Nevertheless, Muhammad 'Abduh gives priority to the duty of Islamic tolerance over conversion: “Islam is capable, through its own light, of penetrating the hearts of men” (*Risâlat al-tawhîd*, 172). In practice, the act of inviting to God leads to a certain number of religious, moral and cultural attitudes, towards both Muslims and non-Muslims.
 Calling to God consists above all in leading a life that is in perfect agreement with the general commands of Islam. This is the best way to ensure that the influence of the ideals contained in the Qur’an will grow. On a spiritual as well as a moral level, the Prophet’s example, and that of the “pious forefathers,” must inspire believers: “the more perfect their imitation, the more perfect their accomplishment of the mission of calling to God” (Ibn Badis).—Practical, the truths contained in the Qur’an and thus helping to transmit the revealed message (tabligh al-risāla) is also “calling to God”: since this message has universal implications, each part of it must be made comprehensible to all men. This theme can be related to that of the djihād through the Qur’an (cf. Sāhīb, April 1932, 204 ff.).—For Ibn Badis, this Qur’anic expression seems to justify a militant theology and an energetic conception of religious preaching, both to rouse the masses from their inertia and indifference and to denounce the blindness of “bad religious teachers” (‘ulamā’ al-sā’i) in the face of the spiritual riches of the Revelation and their reluctance to make them manifest to men.—Calling to God also implies the attempt to bring back to the Islamic fold those Muslims who, seduced by secular ideologies or intoxicated with modern scientific knowledge, regard Islam as “a worn-out piece of clothing that a man would be ashamed to be seen wearing”, and deride its dogmas and precepts (Muḥammad ʿAbduh, Risālat al-tauwhīd, 198; Fr. trans., 134–5; Eng. trans., 135).—The idea of calling to God also implies a struggle against the corruption (jāsād) spread in Muslim society in the name of “so-called modernism” (Taṣīr, x, 45) and against atheism like that of Kemāli, the “philosophy of Abū al-ʿAlāʾ al-Mansūrī (ibid., iii, 242–3), warning against excessive individual freedom, which generates all sorts of abuse (ibid., viii, 330–1) and is more or less directly responsible for the “moral crisis of the West”; enlightening people on the dangers inherent in the separation of science and religion, the cult of science per se, and the frantic quest for material goods without any moral goal (ibid., xi, 243).—It is not simply a matter of development of Muslim culture and who wanted to look for a compromise between the fundamental demands of Islam and the necessary adaptation of Muslim life to the realities of the modern world.

The apologetic work of the Salafiyya was not simply episodic, for it demanded that they make an effort to understand their adversaries’ point of view and develop a measure of cultural open-mindedness (often, it is true, timid), and to remind Muslims of those aspects of their theological and moral doctrine which might have seemed too fundamentalist. But at the same time it revealed the diversity of their temperaments and attitudes in the face of practical problems, especially when they had gone beyond discussing the place of absolute fidelity to the two sources in the liturgical and dogmatic spheres, and to the tradition of the Salaf in the general ethics of Islam. Apart from the more or less favourable historical and cultural conjuncture, the success of islāh in the different parts of the Arab world has been linked, to some extent, to the way in which the Salafiyya have been able to cope with the concrete problems facing Muslim society as a result of its progressive entry into the social, economic, technical and cultural norms of the modern world.

At the end of almost a century of development, we can assess the ground covered by the Salafiyya reformist movement from the time of al-ʿUmmā al-wuṭūḥā (1884) to the present day; at this moment the Arab world is the scene of important debates on the methods of interpreting the Qur’an and the authenticity of Hadīth on the one hand, and the function and autonomy of religion on the other. This is particularly true in countries in which research and cultural activity are more or less “orientated” toward—if not “mobilized” in the service of—political
ul and social objectives that are held to be sacred, and in which national energy is often geared primarily toward social reorganization and economic construction in an attempt to overcome underdevelopment. The development of islāh in a changing Arab world can be divided into three important stages:

1. *The heroic stage*, during which Dżamal al-Din al-Afghānī, Muhammad ʿAbdūh and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Kawkābī laid the essential foundations of a total reform of Islam (cf. the programmes defined in ʿUmma al-ḥurra). Reformist action during this period aimed above all at the material and moral improvement of the Community, which had barely emerged from the Middle Ages. The social, political and cultural demands made by the three leaders of modern islāh had more effect than their doctrinal intervention (with the exception of Muḥammad ʿAbdūh’s Risālat al-tauḥīd which is a sort of guide for a basic theology). The reformists’ written and oral propaganda thus contributed to the Community’s growing awareness of notions of evolution, progress and creative effort (iqṭīṣād) on a spiritual and practical plane. It is true that the cultural climate of the period—end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century—was favourable to the adoption of these ideas in Muslim thought, for this was the era of scientism, the optimism brought about by technical progress, and the growth of the idea that efficiency was an essential element of economic prosperity and social success. Yet the function of the Salafiyya was to confer on these notions—and at first the idea of iqṭīṣād—a legitimacy that would satisfy the ʿUmma, by assimilating them to authentic principles of Islam (seen from an ethical and cultural angle). In its initial form the reformist current of contemporary Islam hastened the birth of Arab-Muslim awareness of the modern world, but also gave rise to aspirations (of a socio-cultural nature etc.) and questions which the succeeding Muslim generation had to face.

2. *The second stage* (approximately 1905 to 1950).—This period saw the emergence of a doctrinal system in which Raḥfūl Rūḍā and ʿUṣūl Ibn Bāḍīs played a vital part. The example of these two strong personalities impressed non-Muhammadan authors whose numerous essays (in reviews like al-Manār, al-Qāhira, Mağalḍa al-ḥubbān al-muslimīn, al-Risāla, al-Muqāllala al-sayyāma) enriched the thought of islāh and consolidated its doctrinal positions. The principal reformist authors during the first half of the 20th century will now be briefly examined.

a) In Syria Dżamal al-Din al-Kāsimī (1866/7-1914) was a faithful disciple of the neo-Ḥanbalī tradition. His compatriot Tāhir al-Dżazzūrī (1851-1919) put his vast erudition at the disposal of islāh (notably in the publishing field).—ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Maghribī (1887-1956), who in his youth was influenced by direct contact with Dżamal al-Din al-Afghānī, made a very fruitful contribution to islāh in Syria. Shāhīb Arslān (1869-1946) a brilliant writer (called ʿamīr al-bayān, “Prince of Eloquence”) and politician, was a firm believer in Arabism (cf. his monthly revue, La Nation Arabe, Geneva 1930-9); a personal acquaintance of the editor of al-Manār, he made a greatly appreciated contribution to that revue.—Muḥammad Kūrd ʿAll (1876-1953), ex-president of the Arab Academy at Damascus (1920-53), although not properly speaking a reformist author, was a firm believer in Muḥammad ʿAbdūh’s ideas and can be counted among the literary and political personalities of the Arab world whose moral support of islāh was greatly valued.

b) In Egypt there were many “spiritual sons” of Muḥammad ʿAbdūh, who were noce or less faithful to the original ideas of their master: Muḥammad Fārid Wajdí (1875-1954), the author of a ʿurūṣī commentary with concordist tendencies, was the energetic editor of the review al-Risāla (founded in 1933) and a fervent propagandist for Islam.—Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Maṭāghī (1881-1945) was twice (1928, 1935) principal of al-Azhār, where he contributed to the spread of reformist ideals and struggled to strengthen the links between the orthodox schools; he attempted reforms in the spirit of Muḥammad ʿAbdūh, of whom he was a worthy successor.—Muḥammad ʿAbdūh’s “Prince of Eloquence”) and politician, was a firm believer in Muhammad ʿAbdūh, to guide Muslim thought towards a doctrine that was a sort of neo-Muʿtazilism.

c) In Tunisia the main representatives of ortho-
reformist thought were ʿAlī Shāhī (d. in 1937), the much respected president of Ibn Bāḍīs, the two ʿUṣūl Muḥammad al-Tāhir b. ʿĀshūr (born in 1879) —author of a ʿurūṣī commentary (now being published, i-iii, Tunis 1956-71)—and his son Muḥammad al-Fāḍil b. ʿĀshūr: al-Ḥaraka al-adabiyya wa l-fikriyya fi Tūnis, Cairo 1956.

d) In Algeria, besides Ibn Bāḍīs, notable reformists were Muḥārak al-Mīl (1890-1943), the theologian of the Algerian reformist school (see Būkhārī); ʿUṣūl al-Ukūbī (1888-1962), a supporter of islāh who was greatly influenced by Wahhābī tendencies (he had spent his childhood in the Ḥijāz), and owned a newspaper, al-Islāh (Biskra 1927- ) which appeared irregularly; Muḥammad al-Bāṣhr al-Ibāḥānī (1889-1965) [see al-Ibāḥānī]; Muḥammad Tawfīq al-Madānī (born in 1899), historian and politician, who was very active in the campaign for a national culture in the context of the reformist movement.

e) In Morocco, where the orthodox reformism of the Salafiyya was diffused at a relatively late date, few important names and works emerged (cf. J. Berque, Ça et là dans les débuts du réformisme religieux au Maroc, in Études..., dédiées à la mémoire d’E. Lévi-Provençal, Paris 1962, ii, 471-94).

Amongst the representative personalities of islāh in the Sherifian empire, we might mention: Abū Shūʿayb al-Dūkkālī (d. 1937); Ibn al-Muwaqqīt (1804-1949), who was more interested in censuring public morality than any real renewal of Islam (cf. the art. by A. Faure on Ibn al-Muwaqqīt in Hesprides, 1932, 165-95); Allāl al-Fās (born in 1910), a writer and political leader (Independence Party, ʿSHb al-sīṣāhī) who claims to be a Salafi (cf. his Autobiographie, al-Nahd al-ḥalīlī, Cairo 1949). These various authors would seem to be continuators of the doctrinal and pedagogic work of the first teachers of islāh. It is nevertheless worth noting that numerous writers and poets, such as Hāfīz Ibrāhīm (1872-1932), Muṣṭafā Lutfī al-Manfalūtī (1876-1924), ʿAbābā Maḥmūd al-ʿAjṣāfī (1889-1964), Muḥammad al-ʿĪd (born in 1904) etc., indirectly helped to spread islāh by employing its moral and social themes in their works. Despite its undeniable fertility (which Brockelmann only partially describes in S III, 310-35, 435-6), the
fifty-year-long work of the reformists brought no solutions which satisfied the problems of all social classes within the Community. Their doctrines—social and political as well as theological and moral—seemed to correspond more closely to the aspirations of the newly emergent urban middle class. As a group, it was relatively enlightened, and sometimes combined a minimum Arab-Islamic culture with a gloss of modern culture in one of the European languages. It wished to demonstrate its allegiance to a particular form of tradition—that of the Salaf as defined above—and at the same time to show a certain interest in things modern. The ideals of this class were expressed in terms of moderation and compromise; in the religious sphere they sought "reasonable" positions that excluded popular traditionalism (which they saw as the sign of ignorance or a reactionary spirit), as well as intransigent fundamentalism (represented by certain Muslim Brothers (al-ıslâmî n-işlâyı [q.v.]). They also rejected modernism which they judged excessive (such as the advocacy of a completely secular state). The orthodox reformism of the Salafiyya was thus assured of a fairly wide public which believed in order and prudent evolution, which respected the moral authority of the religious leaders, and was convinced that the Community needed "guiders" to take it along the road of a progress that would be compatible with Islam. But the apparently harmonious development of işlâh was to suffer from the political upheavals and social and moral changes resulting from the Second World War.

3. Recent developments (since the '50s).—The post-war period marked the beginning of a complete change in the religious make-up of the Arab world. The make-up of the reformist camp underwent profound qualitative and quantitative changes. The spokesmen of işlâh were no longer of the calibre of Rashîd Rişâ (d. 1935) or ʿAbd al-Hâmid b. Bâdis (d. 1940), and at the same time the Muslim Brothers movement came to the forefront. It attracted attention by means of political action and through the doctrinal works of several remarkable personalities, like Hasan İsmâ'îl al-Hûşaybî, leading guide and successor of Hasan al-Bannâ [q.v.]; Muhibb al-Dîn al-Khatîb, a publicist of Syrian origin, ex-director of al-Maṭâ bi al-Salaflîyâ (in Cairo); the Syrian Muṣṭafâ al-Sîbâî (d. 1965); Sayyid Kûtîb (executed in 1966), author of a kur'anic commentary, Fi ʾişlâh al-Kur'ân; Muhammad al-Ghâzlî, whose apologetic and doctrinal works amount to more than 7,000 pp. (cf. REI, Abstracta, 1961, 105-6); and Saʿîd Ramadân, founder and still editor of the revue al-Musllîmân (Cairo-Damascus, 1951- ; Geneva, 1961- ).—b. The reformist movement lost that place in society which was its strength between the wars: the supporters of the main current of işlâh (in direct line from Rashîd Rişâ, for example) were quickly regarded as inheritors and supporters of a moral and social order already described as "traditional"—c. Paraadoxically, the historical success of the reformist movement—in Algeria and, up to a point, in Egypt—contributed to its disintegration and fall. Attracted by power (and some actually absorbed into public office), many missionaries of işlâh abandoned their former zeal for the triumph of Islamic values and settled for a prudent opportunism. Forced by events to supply "official" religion with structures and a doctrine, they in their turn became a conformist force. The defence of pure Islam, which had been the aim of işlâh in opposition, was taken up by men who were enemies of any compromise with regimes which they held to be unjust or illegal, the same men whom their opponents happily called fascist or reactionary.

—d. The younger generation, less and less restricted by the ability to speak Arabic only, succeeded in discovering a new vision of social and moral realities around the world (through the cinema, the illustrated press, and foreign literature); new philosophies (cf. the success of Existentialism after the War and the increasing dissemination of Marxism—which followed Communist penetration—in Arab countries); new more alien revolutionary ideologies (anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, Arab Socialism and utopianism); and a new political ethic inspired by the "Spirit of Bandung" (1955). All these factors made the young generation sceptical about the virtues of işlâh and doubtful of its fundamental principles, principles which had seemed as satisfying to the mind as they were reassuring to the faith of the preceding generation.—e. The rise to power of new social forces in the newly independent countries (Syria-Lebanon: 1946; Libya: 1952; Sudan: 1955; Morocco and Tunisia: 1956; Algeria: 1962), or those whose monarchies were supplanted by republican regimes (Egypt: 1952; 'Irân: 1958; Tunisia: 1957; Libya: 1969), relegated to the background the notables and national bourgeoisie, who had held power in the shadow of the previous regime. In taking over the apparatus of state, the younger generation naturally sought to extend its power to districts controlled by the reformist faith. But the apparently harmonious development of işlâh was to suffer from the political upheavals and social and moral changes resulting from the Second World War.
invoked in support of official ideology, not for the religious values it represented or for its references to Islamic authenticity.

This complex of phenomena which has become apparent throughout the Arab world over the last few decades clearly shows two things: the striking weakening of islah as a "driving force" in Muslim society, and its replacement by politics, which is now becoming the moving spirit on every level of national life. Politics is the most important factor of life today, for, considerably helped by the mass media and propaganda techniques, it seizes public attention, concentrating on it the acts of its rulers; in this way the life of a whole nation hangs on the "historic" speeches and oracular utterances of national leaders, those heroes and demi-gods of modern times. (Thus it is that positions actuelles de Vextense coranique en Egypte .

The role of political language itself has acquired such prominence over other forms of expression (literature, religion, etc.) that it impregnates them with its concepts and its dialectic. (In many cases the religious vocabulary seems to be nothing more than the simple transposition of the political). New powers—the state, the party—have taken over the primary role in the life of the Umma, and have directed its social and cultural orientations. Sometime these powers, armed with totalitarian might, try to force the citizen's duties and beliefs on him. From this moment, religion ceased to be the most important factor in Muslim life and found itself dispossessed of its traditional function as interpreter of symbols and record of the community's conscience.

In this social and cultural context, the voice of islah lost much of its strength and effectiveness. The reformist public itself moved in the direction of modernism and atheism or became reformist groups whose concept of the role of islah in the modern world differed from that held by the Salafiyya. Such tendencies seem to be the logical result of the ideas implicit in the two main strands of reformist thought since the beginning of the 20th century—the liberal trend, which favoured a global realignment of Muslim life to the modern world and a development influenced by a certain liberal spirit—this trend did not gain the sympathy of either the modernists—fervent defenders of social and cultural liberalism and freedom of conscience—nor that of the young who were still attached to Islam, but aware of the social and political changes taking place around them. Fully committed to the "logic of history" and hoping to avoid both the ambiguities of a reformism that was not progressive enough for them and the manifest fundamentalism of the religious movements, which they felt to be reactionary, the young opted for a populist islah, and, taking the part of the mass of the population which previous regimes had for so long ignored, fought for social justice (one of the dominant themes in the politico-religious literature of the post-war years; cf. Sayyid Kutb, Al-t'adla al-iglima*iyya fi 'l-Islăm, Cairo 1952; Eng. trans. J. H. Hardie, Social Justice in Islam, Washington 1953). They pleaded for the socialization of culture (cf. the Egyptian "Cultural Library", aimed at the popularization of science and making it accessible to the common people). They attempted to establish a new Arabo-Islamic humanism, based on a socialist state which would put an end to exploitation and oppression, without itself employing terror (cf. in this respect the principles set down by one of the theorists of Arab Socialism (Ba'th), Salāḥ al-Dīn al-Bayṭār, Al-Siyasa al-'arbāisiyya bayn al-madha* wa 'l-taqbih, Beirut 1960; Fr. trans. by Marcel Colombe, in Orient, xi (1966), 127 ff.). Finally the reformist writers of this avant-garde group refused to adhere not only to social and political forms that they considered to be decisively condemned by History, but also to collective representations and ideas that they felt were the product of a medieval mentality. On the other hand, to the extent that they express, in the language of our day, something that is essential to the kurānic...
message, they attempted to integrate with Muslim thought the leading concepts of contemporary culture (notably in relation to the Third World), even in the case of ideas that are the product of nominally aesthetic ideologies such as socialism (iqtisâriyya [q.v.] and the revolution (thawra [q.v.]).

In conclusion, even though islah no longer appears to be a religious and cultural current with the force, homogeneity and unity of tone that it had in the inter-war period, it continues to evolve differently in different forms, some vehement, others more moderate. Whether we consider the liberal islah of the moderate intellectuals who claimed for Islam tolerance and freedom of investigation, preached the emancipation of peoples through education and instruction, and based their optimistic vision of human evolution of the triumph of Reason and Science; or the militant islah of the Muslim Brothers, with their mystique of solutionism could no longer remain enclosed within the static universe of the Salafiyya. By the very diversity of its current trends islah can escape from the rigid dogmatism which always haunts monolithic movements, and in this way is present at the present-day front where many thinkers and university teachers who feel personally concerned with the future of Islam in the modern world can attempt to give Islamic culture a "new start". This has given rise to a proliferation of essays and critical works, claiming to be inspired by islah, everywhere in the Arab world (Egypt, Lebanon, Tunisia etc.), and even in Pakistan, where the ideas of Muh. I. K. M. A. Merad, for example, continue to be a fertile source of inspiration.


1959: this little work gives a summarized form of all the main themes of reformist propaganda to be developed by R. Riḍā and Ibn Bāḍīs.—d) Ibdm, Ṭabāṭībr al-aṭtābiṣd, Cairo 1318/1900, enlarged re-ed., Aleppo 1957. This essay was to have less impact in reformist circles than the preceding work.

—e) Muḥ. ʿAbdūh, Risālat al-tawḥīd, Cairo, 1315/1897; new ed. (expurgated as far as the question of the “created Qurʿān” is concerned), with notes, by R. Riḍā, Cairo 1326/1908. This ed. was considered, as definitive for more than half a century (17th. reprint 1379/1960). A new ed. by Maḥmūd Abū Rayya uses the text of the original ed. revised and corrected by the author, Cairo, Maʿārif, 1966. Fr. trans. based on the 1st. ed. by B. Michel and Moustapha Abdel Razik, Risālat al-Tawḥīd—Exposé de la religion musulmane, Paris 1925; Eng. trans.: [Ṭabāṭībr] Musaʿād and K. Cragg, The Theology of Unity, London 1966.—f) Ibdm, Ṭabāṭībr ṣaḥḥār al-Dawwānī li ʿl-tabbāt al-ṣaḥḥās, Cairo 1292/1875; re-ed. in Sulaymān Dūnān, Al-ṣayyāh, M. ʿA. bayn al-ṣayyās wa-l-ṣāḥib al-maṣūmīyya, Cairo, 1377/1958, 2 vols. In the Introduction (64 pp.) the ed. situates the thought of M. Ṣ. in relation to the problems of faith and reason, and criticizes the “excessive” rationalism of ʿAbdūh. For the same sort of approach note his discussions on ṭabāṭībr al-ṣaḥḥās (written in 1294/1877), 1st ed., Cairo 1295/1878. According to R. Riḍā the author reconsidered, towards the end of his life, a large part of his youthful work (which deals with kalām, Sufism and the falsafa).

—g) Ibdm, Al-ʾĪslām wa-l-Nasāʾīyya maʿa l-ʾilm wa l-madāniyya, Cairo 1320/1902 (replies and apologetic refutations).—h) Rāḍī, Ṭafṣīr al-Kūrān al-ḥākim al-ṣaḥḥīr bi-Ṭafṣīr al-Maḥānār, in 12 vols., Cairo 1340/1927-34 (this commentary stops at verse 52, sūrah XII, and thus only covers 2/5 of the Qurʿānic text).—i) Ibdm, Taʿrīkh as-suṣṭād al-imām al-Ṣayyib Muḥammad ʿAbdūh (see above, 3. c.).—j) Ibdm, Al-ʾĪshāfīyya al-imām al-ʿĪṣām, Cairo 1341/1922-23 (Fr. trans. H. Laoust, Le califat dans la doctrine de R.R., Beirut 1938).


6. Periodicals which frequently deal with the problems of reformism in an Arab context: LʾAfrique et lʾAsie; Orients dʾOrient Contemporain; IBLA; Islamica; JAOS; MIDEO; Orient; OM; the old Revue du Monde Musulman; the Revue des Etudes Islamiques and its Abstrac, etc. (A. Merad).

ii.—IRAN

Islamic thought and expression bearing a distinctively modern stamp has been of less quantity and importance in Iran than in the Arab lands or the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent. No figure has emerged comparable in influence or literary output to, for example, Sayyid Kutb or Muhammad Ḥiṣnī [eq.]. This may be attributed in part to the relative isolation of Iran from intellectual currents in other parts of the Muslim world by virtue of its profession of Shiʿism, and in part, too, to the very nature of Shiʿism, which, being in its essence an esoterism, is less susceptible to those storms of historical change that have provoked modernist reaction elsewhere. Traditional learning and institutions have, moreover, been unusually well preserved in Iran, and while Islamic modernism in other lands has frequently arisen from “lay” impatience with ʿulamd (which deals with the ʿulamāʾ impatience with the ʿulamāʾ and a desire to expound and implement its dictates) to the faith and a desire to expound and implement its dictates independently of them, the Iranian ʿulamāʾ have, by contrast, maintained a high degree of influence and prestige. There have nonetheless been certain currents of modernist expression in Iran, elicited in large part by the western impact and tending to the presentation of Islam above all in terms of social and political reform and compatibility with modern science and rationality. The beginnings of such expression are to be traced to the reign of Fath ʿAlī Shah (1797-1834), when Abbas Mirza invoked Qurʿānic sanction for the introduction of certain military reforms of western provenance. The depiction of social and
political reform as deriving from religious precept and duty thereafter became a commonplace of reformist thought. It received little systematic exposition, however, and was frequently voiced by persons themselves lacking in substantial religious belief and concerned above all with the forging of a tactical device for gaining ‘ulama’ and mass support for reform and westernization. Most prominent and influential among this class was the Perse-Armenian Mîrzâ Malkum Khan (1834-1908). On the basis of his private statements (particularly to his friend and confidant, Akgünzada), it may be concluded that he was a free-thinker; yet he belongs to the history of Islamic modernism in Iran by virtue of his expedient and influential exposition of the Islamic acceptability, even necessity, of reform. This theme he put forward in a number of treatises, especially Kitâbâ-yi ghâyibi, and above all in the celebrated journal Kâmân, published in London from 1890 to 1898.

In the identification of religious duty with the need to reform, the question of law played a crucial part: whether the law of a regenerated state was to be the şari’a or a code of western inspiration. The problem was solved — if only in the most immediate sense — by the equation of both on the basis of allegedly shared fundamentals: the just and orderly functioning of society for the increase of prosperity. This equation, explicit in the very title of Malkum’s journal, was set forth more clearly (and probably with a greater degree of inward conviction) by Mîrzâ Yusuf Khan Mustâshâr al-Dawla in his treatise entitled Yak Kalima (1870). The “one word” of the title is law, which constitutes the sufficient solution to all of Iran’s problems, and the law in question consists of the French legal codes, which Mîrzâ Yusuf Khan attempts to prove compatible with Islam by means of quotation from the Qur’ân and Hadith. He wrote another work in similar vein, Rûh-i Islâm, in which he stated: “I have found proofs and evidences from the Glorious Qur’ân and reliable traditions for all the means of progress and civilization, so that none shall henceforth say, ‘such and such a matter is against the principles of Islam,’ or, ‘the principles of Islam are an obstacle to progress and civilization’.”

None of the works or tendencies indicated so far emanated from the ‘ulama’, although they may have been influenced by some among them to various degrees. It is not until the years of the constitutional revolution (1905-1911) that we find a coherent and serious statement on questions of political and social reform, inspired by genuine concern and expressed in scholarly terms, issuing from the ulama class. The work in question is a treatise on constitutional government from the viewpoint of Shi’i Islam, entitled Tanbih al-umma wa tanbih al-milá dar asâs wa usul-i maqriziyat (first published 1909, reprinted with an introduction by Sayyid Muhammad Tâlikânî in 1955). The author was Shaykh Muhammed Husayn Nâ’tîn (1860-1936), a mujtahid resident in Nadîf, who had been a pupil of the celebrated Mîrzâ Hasan Shâhriârî, author of the fatwa so effective in the tobacco boycott of 1891-1892, and who enjoyed the close friendship of the great constitutionalist divines, Mullâ Kâzîm Khur-râsânî and Mullâ ‘Abd Allâh Mâzar dârânî. The participation of a large and significant number of the Iranian ‘ulama’ in the constitutional revolution has often been regarded as a result of confusion and circumstantial pressure, as the continuation of traditional ‘ulama’ hostility to the state in a situation the novelty of which they failed to recognize. Nâ’tîn’s book delineates the positive doctrinal reasons for their support of constitutionalism, firmly grounded in the Qur’ân and Sunna. He defines the functions of the state as the establishment of equilibrium within society and its defence from external attack. The power enjoyed by the state should be limited to that necessary for fulfilling these functions; any excess tends inevitably in the direction of tyranny, which in turn tempts the ruler to usurp the divine attribute of sovereignty, and thus to commit the cardinal sin of shirk.
Such perversion can be fully prevented only by the ‘isma of the ruler, his freedom from sin and error, and it was for this reason that legitimate rule belonged to the Imams during their lifetime. After the occultation of the twelfth Imam, legitimacy has withdrawn from the earthly plane, and a degree of usurpatoriness is bound to haunt all existing regimes. It is nonetheless both possible and desirable to reduce that degree to a minimum by limiting the power of the ruler and instituting an assembly (majlis) of representatives which shall implement the consultative principle enunciated in the Kur‘an. Such an assembly may act as a legislature only with regard to matters not already covered by the sharia, or by giving specific implementation to items legislated for in general manner by Kur‘an and Sunna. The functioning of the assembly is to be regulated by a constitution, and objections that the constitution somehow vies with the sharia was as a new, comprehensive code are ill-informed or misconceived. There results from conceding to the assembly a limited legislative power a duality of religious and secular law; but the innocence of secular law will be guaranteed by the presence in the majlis of a number of mujtahids, and in any event, perfect implementation of the sharia, with all aspects of life integrated according to its ordinances, will be possible only with the return of the Imam to the plane of manifestation. Nairn’s statement of the desirability of constitutional rule in Shi‘i terms indicates not only how the ‘ulama’ were able, in later decades, to refer to both the Kur‘an and the constitution as sources of authority for political life, but also how it was possible for them to ally themselves with secular elements in the pursuit of common political objectives.

Modernist thought and expression, in Islamic terms, remained dormant throughout the reign of Ridā Shāh (1926-1941), under whose auspices a nationalist ideolog—secularist and anti-Islamic tendencies was fostered, although not as energetically as in neighbouring Turkey. After his deposition and the succession to the throne of Muhammad Ridā Shāh, a certain freedom of expression came into being of which use was made by various religious circles, and although the possibilities of unlimited expression have since suffered a sharp decline, Islamic modernism in Iran has continually developed in the post-war period. During the last decade in particular, a large body of religious literature has made its appearance, modern in its tone of thought and its preoccupation with socio-economic problems, the interrelations of science and religion, and the task of restating Islam in a manner comprehensible to secularly educated youth.

In the period between the accession of Muhammad Ridā Shāh and the overthrow of prime minister Muhammad Musaddik in July 1953, the resurgence of Islam as a visible factor in public affairs was marked by an extreme degree of political activism, largely unaccompanied by intellectual or literary activity. This observation applies both to the organization of the Fidā‘iyya-i Islam (q.v.), under the leadership of Nawab Sa‘ādat Khan and to the Islām-i ‘Azmi movement. Burūjdī’s death deprived the Shi‘i community of one of its foremost pupils of Mullā Kāzīm Khurshānī in Najaf. In his speeches and correspondence, Khurshānī reflected the thinking of this earlier generation of ‘ulama’, accepting, like Na‘īnī, the Kur‘an and the constitution as dual sources of political authority. His expression of the theme had an abrasive polemical edge that reflected the extreme tensions of the period.

At this time, the dominant figure in the religious life of Iran was not Kāzīm Khurshānī, but Ayāt Allāh Husayn Burūjdī (1871-1942), a figure universally acknowledged to have exceeded Kāzīm Khurshānī in piety and learning, while quietist—and even occasionally loyalist—in his political attitudes. Burūjdī could not, in any important sense, be called a modernist, for he did not concern himself to any remarkable degree with political or social problems. Nonetheless, during the one-and-a-half decades that he functioned as sole majlis-i takhrīr (q.v.) of the Ijā‘īna ‘ashrī Shi‘i community, he initiated a process of renewal and self-criticism within the religious institution which has gathered momentum after his death and largely contributed to the contemporary spate of religious concern and thought in Iran. Burūjdī established a network of communication reaching out from Kum to all regions of the country to regularize the collection of sahm-i ‘imām, a measure that later proved useful for the dissemination of religious guidance and directives. In the field of pure scholarship, he revived the independent study of hadīth and instigated a critical revision of the fundamental Shi‘i manual, Muḥammad b. Kāsan al-Hurr al-‘Ammūlī’s Wasaḥ ‘alā ‘al-sharī‘a ‘al-takhfī al-madhdhib al-islāmiyya, issuing an organ under the title of Risālat al-Islām. This concern of Burūjdī has survived his death, and while the absence of diplomatic relations between Tehran and Cairo for a number of years made it difficult to pursue contacts with the Azhar, with their co-operation, there was established in Cairo, with a branch in Kum, an institution called Dār al-takhfī bay‘al-madhdhib al-islāmiyya, issuing an organ under the title of Risālat al-Islām. Another initiative of Burūjdī which has continued to bear fruit was the dispatch of Shi‘i emissaries to western Europe, both to cater to needs of Iranians abroad and to propagate Shi‘i Islam among interested Europeans.

The death of Burūjdī deprived the Shi‘i community of its sole ‘ard, and the problem of leadership and direction posed itself in an unusually acute manner. It was widely felt that the traditional process whereby one or more of the mujtahids, qualified by piety and pre-eminence in religious learning, had emerged to be sources of guidance, was defective and incapable of answering the true needs of the community. For all the deep respect that Burūjdī had enjoyed, his failure to provide a measure of Ayāt Allāh Abu ‘l-Kāsim Kāshānī, the Fidā‘iyya never evolved a consistent ideology or any serious programme for reshaping the life of state and society in Islamic terms. Their organ, Zilzila, consisted largely of commentaries on questions of the day, with more permanent questions receiving only fragmentary treatment. Kāshānī, although temporarily co-operating with the Fidā‘iyya, represented the tradition of the constitutionalist mujtahids of the early part of the century and had indeed been one of the foremost
A single individual. Some therefore concluded that a collective *mārjā* was desirable. Many of these considerations, together with suggested solutions, were adumbrated in a collective volume entitled *Bahālī dar bārā-yi mārjā*ṣayat wa rāhānīyat*, first published in 1963 and since reprinted with supplementary material. This book, the work of seven authors, including both *ulāmā* and lay writers, was probably the most influential and substantial piece of religious writing to appear in Persian since Nāmī’s discussion of constitutional government. It concluded a brief and clear exposition of certain fundamental concepts such as *tāhliā, idāfiḥā* and *waltāyayat* (treated by Sayyid Muhammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā’ī and Muṭṭaharī, and of the proper social function of the religious classes in general and the *mārjā* in particular (discussed by Mahdī Bāzargān and Sayyid Muhammad Bihīḥū). Possibly the most important sections were those in which Muṭṭaharī discussed the need to provide an independent financial basis for the religious institution, thus freeing it of subservience to either state or populace, and those in which Bāzargān and Sayyid Muṭṭaharī Dījavāri proposed the replacement of a collective by an individual by a *mārjā* (termed by the latter *gharā-yi jāfūr*).

In addition to such discussion of problems peculiar to Shi’ism in the present age, the postwar religious scene in Iran has also witnessed the translation into Persian of modernist works produced elsewhere in the Islamic world. Some of the authors most frequently translated are Sayyid Ḥutb, Muhammad Ḥutb, Ṣul al-Ḵardāwī and others associated with the Ḥkwān al-Mūslīmīn [q.v.], and Mowlānā Abū ‘l-‘Alā Mawdūdī, leader of the Pakistani Dhamā‘āt-i Islām. Among the more influential of the works translated, special mention may be made of Sayyid Ḥutb’s *Al-‘Adāda al-dinīyya fi-l-‘Ilām*. The translations are occasionally supplied with footnotes to indicate Shi’i divergent opinions when deemed necessary.

The most prolific and influential writer of original modernist literature in Iran today is Mahdī Bāzargān, one of the contributors to the collective volume already mentioned. His work is characterized by the clear influence of certain Sunni modernists, a concern with demonstrating the plausibility of scientific fact with religious truth, and a clear and persuasive style. His first book was *Mūḥāhirāt dar Islām* (1943; later reprinted), a detailed demonstration of the biological and hygienic utility inherent in the Islamic prescriptions for ritual purity. Of his later production, totalling some twenty titles to date, mention may be made of *‘Īshan wa parasūkht* (1963), a work subtitled “the thermodynamics of man”; *Du‘ā‘* (1964), discussing the psychological benefits of prayer; and *Dārs-i Dīnqār* (1965), stressing the continuing need of man and society in the modern world for religion. Bāzargān has also been politically active as one of the moving spirits behind the Niḥṣāt-ī ‘Azādī, a religiously orientated component of the proscribed oppositional National Front. One of his associates in this venture has been Sayyid Ḥusayn Tālīkānī, author of a number of works including the significant treatise *Dīnqār wa Shāh rād* (1965).

Most of the works of Bāzargān and Tālīkānī have been published by a Tehran house known as Shirkāt-i Inqilāb, which continues to put out an ever-increasing volume of modernist religious literature. A few specimens may be cited by way of example: Ṣalāt Ghaflūrī’s *Islām wa ‘ilmāniyya-yi dīnānī-yi kūshk-i bāchā* (1964), aiming to show how Islam has predefined the notion of universal human rights; Muhammad Taḥtī Sharī‘atī’s *Taḥfīz-i μwāt* (1967), a commentary on the last gīʻāt of the Kūr‘ān, marked by rationality in tendency; and Muhammad ʻArifī Ḥabībastī’s *Dīmā‘āt-yi insānī-yi Islām* (1969), a work stressing the universalist and fraternal aspects of Islam.

There are too certain special classes of religious literature worthy of note. One is the popular religious biography, of which the chief exponent is Ṣayyid al-ʿĀlidīn Rahnamā. His immensely successful biography of the Prophet, *Pāyāmbar*, first published in 1937, has gone through more than fifteen editions and been translated into French (Paris 1957). Rahnamā’s work is characterized by skilful narrative technique and a free use of invented dialogue. A two-volume *Zindagānī-yi Ismāʿīl Ḥusayn* (new edition 1966) has enjoyed similar popularity. Also deserving of mention in the same genre is the Persian translation of C. V. Gheorghiu’s French biography of the Prophet under the title of *Muḥammad, paygāmbari ki az nāv bāyd darshā* (1964).

Poetical literature forms another notable division of contemporary religious writing. Numerous works have been written stressing the unique identity of the Shi’i, partly as an adjunct to and partly in contradiction of, moves towards a Sunni-Shi’i rapprochement. Probably the best work in this category is Sayyid Muhammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā’ī’s *Shīa dar Islām* (1969). The vast work in Arabic on the supposed appointment of ʿAlī as successor to the Prophet at the pool of Khumm, *Shaykh ʿAbd al-Husayn Amlī’s al-Ghadr*, has been partially translated into Persian. A more popular treatment of the same subject is the anonymous and collective work *Hasāṣastīn jurds-i tārīkh-yi dāstān-i ghadr* (1969). Other works are aimed at refuting the attacks made on Shi’i Islam by the radical anti-clerical Aḥmad Kasravī in his frequently reprinted *Shīgarī*. In this category mention may be made of Hūdādī Sirāji Anṣārī’s *Shīa chi migāyad* (third edition, 1960), and Muhammad Taḥtī Sharī‘atī’s *Fā’ida wa lusūm-i din* (1966). Finally, there exists an extensive literature in refutation of Bahā’īsm, chiefly in pamphlet form.

In addition to the printed word, the broadcast lecture on religious subjects has played a part of importance in the diffusion of contemporary Islamic thought, particularly in an era of decreasing mosque attendance. The name of the Andjuman-i Tablīghat-i Islāmī, founded in 1943 by Dr. ʿĀlī Allāh Shīhābūrū with headquarters in Tehran and branches in a number of provincial cities. It published a number of booklets on the fundamentals of the organization, as well as a magazine entitled *Nār-i dānīsh* and a yearbook bearing the same name. The activities of the organization seem to have faded out in the late 1950s.

In 1965 there was established in Kum an institution called the Dār al-Tablīgh al-Islāmī, the fulfillment of the wishes of the late Burūjīrdī and under the auspices of another mujtāḥid, Ayat Allāh Muhammad Kāzim Sharī‘atmadārī. The institution trains students in the religious science, not, like the traditional *madrasas*, for the sake of pure knowledge, but with a view to the effective propagation of religion among the masses. English is among the subjects taught, and it is intended to institute missionary activity abroad. On the occasion of the fourth anniversary
of the institution, a lavish volume entitled Simd-i Islam was published, containing contributions by leading contemporary religious writers. Closely associated with the activities of the Dâr al-Talibîyân is an author by the name of Sayyid Hâdi Khurâsânî, a figure well-known in international Islamic circles and editor of the popular religious magazine Maktab-i Islam (appearing since 1958).

More recently still, there has been founded in Tehran the institution known as Husayniya-yi Traghâd, a centre where well-attended lectures on religious subjects are given by prominent figures both from the 'ulamâ' and the world of learning. It too has publications to its credit, the most notable being a two-volume collection of papers entitled Mu'azzamât, bi-l'amât i pa.webaynân (1969). During the hâdir season, the Husayniya establishes a temporary branch at Minâ, where Iranian pilgrims go to receive guidance and hear lectures on the significance of the pilgrimage.


(Hamid Algar)

iii.-Turkey

Within the Ottoman-Turkish context islâm seldom meant modernism in religion. The word has more often been associated with political reform which, in turn, meant at first (during the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries) the restoration of the old political order, and later (approximately after 1800), a reconstitution of the political system on the basis of principles more and more remote from those of sultanate and caliphate. There is no word consistently used to denote the idea of religious modernism, as distinct from the modernization of religious institutions such as the madrasas, where again the term used was islâm. There is no major movement of religious modernism comparable with those found elsewhere in the Islamic world.

The absence of a concept and movement of religious modernism seems to be a result of the characteristic Ottoman fusion of religion and state, symbolized by the frequent use of the term din-i-devlet by Ottoman writers. In an institutional or in a theological sense, very little scope was left for the rise of a religious modernism independent of political reform movements. The Ottoman polity had succeeded more than any other in maintaining Islam and its representatives, the 'ulamâ', within the framework of the state organization. The religious institution, which represented no spiritual or ecclesiastical authority, was merely a segment of the ruling institution, and was organized into an order or odâba [q.v.]. Its role lay mainly in the cultivation of jurisprudence (fîkh), the giving of opinions on legal matters (ifâh), and the execution of the sharî'a law and the hânsûn (hadâ). The madrasa was not primarily a school of theology, but was chiefly a training centre of jurisprudence. Through its judiciary, the state had adopted Sunnî orthodoxy, with an emphasis on Maturîdî theology and the Harâmî school of jurisprudence, and thus limited the possibilities for theological controversies.

However, besides the orthodox religious institution, with its educational and judicial regimentation and hierarchy, scope was also given to another stream of religious institutionalization which came closer to what might be regarded as an autonomous spiritual institution. These were the mystic orders or fârîkâs, of which there was a rich variety as a result of their tendency to split and multiply. Most of them, however, adhered, at least ostensibly to one or other of the main conservative, moderate, and extremist trends in terms of their attitudes toward the world and the state. It was only when a clash took place within the accepted limits of discrepancy between the 'ulamâ' and Şî'î orders that there was the possibility of some kind of religious controversy. Upon such a clash extended to the basic tenets of orthodoxy, the 'ulamâ' tended to view it more in political than religious terms and treated the exponents of such views as heretical. In all such cases the 'ulamâ' easily obtained the support of the political power. The majority of the fârîkâs, however, avoided open antinomianism and maintained their position within the framework of the Ottoman polity. They adopted quietism or indifferentism on theological-political matters and were inclined more and more to ritualism and incantation or to poetry and art. This tendency not only safeguarded their existence, but also added prestige and enhanced their popularity among various classes of society, particularly among the artisans, the military, and the bureaucracy. The fârîkâ thus represented another example of the union between religion and state, attracting the participation not only of the 'ulamâ' but also of high ranking statesmen, often even of the rulers themselves. Furthermore, the Ottoman state succeeded, in the later period, in making the fârîkâ a semi-official pillar of the state by recognizing the mâsh'âyiyyîh alongside the 'ulamâ' in various ceremonial affairs.

After a fairly long period of partnership between the state, the 'ulamâ', and the fârîkâs, religious and spiritual controversies arose when in the 19th century all of them faced the earliest challenges of the modern world. The objects of their controversies, such as coffee-drinking, smoking, intoxication, the use of silk or jewellery, emotional extravagance in daily life or in religious observance, belief in powers above or beyond the state and God may seem unimportant, but they were innovations partly introduced by the material affluence of the ruling class and the monetary and fiscal crises caused by the advent of an inflated economy and the concomitant disruption of the traditional orders of the Ottoman polity, accompanied by the impoverishment of the masses. The confluence of these factors made the problem of innovation (bid'a) the central theme of religious controversies. The 'ulamâ' and the mâsh'âyiyyîh accused each other of such innovations while the state, perhaps the real culprit, took the occasion to tighten its grip upon both.
However, no basic change in the traditional outlook of the 'ulamā' and Şīʿi orders took place before the challenge of the modern world, although one should not conclude that the 'ulamā' always took a negative attitude toward innovations. Because of their vested interest in the maintenance of the Ottoman system, their attitude to change was dictated by their principle of maslahah, political expediency. Only in a few cases did the 'ulamā' openly oppose government policies and attempts at reform. In periods of tension the 'ulamā' turned against the Şīʿis rather than against the state, and under their attacks, the fārikas became more docile. This was an important stage on the road towards their later decline and discredit. The 'ulamā' as a whole stood firmly on the side of the state, although with a relative degree of elasticity, but they survived the first phase of the crisis only with a tangible loss of religious vitality and initiative. Both of these religious institutions were thus in decline, long before 1800. Already in the middle of the 17th century Koçi Beg [q.v.], in his Risāla, had described the corruption of the corps of 'ulamā', and later Hādīdd Khalīfa (Kātib Celi) [q.v.] in his Miṣān al-bafrk fi ikhtiyar al-afyf (English translation by G. L. Lewis, The balance of truth, London 1957) ridiculed the nonsensical controversies raging between the 'ulamā' and the shaykhīs and deplored the depth of ignorance in rational and religious sciences in the madrasas. While the 'ulamā' had become thoroughly worldly, the fārikas tended to become more removed from reality.

The reign of Selîm III (1789-1807), as the first period of serious attempt at comprehensive reforms, found the 'ulamā' more active in worldly affairs than interested in religious reform. Among the reform projects submitted to this ruler the best one was prepared by 'Abd Allâh Molla, a high ranking member of the 'ulamā'. None of his recommendations for the reforming of the religious institution, however, had any effect upon the Shaykh-Isâlîm, the head of the 'ulamā', nor upon his colleagues, and produced nothing tangible which could be called modernism in religion. The fārikas fell into further disrepute and, at least on one of them, the Bektaşhiyya, received a death blow from the 'ulamā', and the Janissaries under Muhammed II in 1826, because of the alleged association between the two. Since then, the fārikas have never recovered, with the exception of two intervals, the first during the reign of 'Abd al-Hamîd II (1876-1909) and the second from the 1940s on.

The earliest sign of a fundamental change in the position of the religious institution only appeared when some of the provisions of the Tanzîmât charter were implemented. At first, the 'ulamā' managed to ignore the implications of the Tanzîmât reforms for religious modernism. While the Tanzîmât proved to be a new step in further involving the religious institution in politics, at the same time it marked the first split between religion and state. For example, while the Shaykh-Isâlîm, as the head of the religious institution, was given a permanent and prominent position in government, half of his clerics were appointed for the new Ministry of Justice, the regulation of all pious foundations was assigned to the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Awâlî, and all newly formed schools were put under the Ministry of Education [see Bâb-1 mashkîyat].

Despite this trend of laicization of the institutions which were traditionally under the control of the religious institution, the Shaykh-Isâlîm, the 'ulamā' and the madrasas continued to play conspicuous roles in worldly affairs. That these activities varied from combating the laicized institutions, or sabotaging the codification of the Medjelle, to backing the state against the interference of the European Powers aimed at further secularizing reforms and participating in secret conspiracies for the deposition of rulers, is an indication of the fact that the 'ulamā' had lost their internal unity, and their association with the state had become tenuous.

During the Tanzîmât, as well as the constitutional movement of the Young Ottomans, the 'ulamā' produced no prominent religious thinker. The only outstanding figure who came from the 'ulamā' class was Ahmed Djewdet Pasha (1822-1895 [q.v.]), but he became prominent only after he left the religious institution and became a secular statesman. Djewdet was perhaps the greatest reformer of the period, but as a legal reformer and not as a religious thinker. He succeeded in curbing the tendency of the Tanzîmât statesmen toward a wholesale adoption of new codes from France on the one hand, and, on the other, recognized the inability of the 'ulamā', as the spokesmen of the şari'a, to fulfil the requirements of a modern legal system. The Medjelle [q.v.] (1870-77) and the Kânûn-û-Èrddî (1858) were the major products of his attempts at the modernization and codification of Islamic law. His enlightened modernism, however, did not extend to constitutionalism. While he received the acclaim of the Young Ottomans as a modernist on matters of fîkh, he sided with 'Abd al-Hamîd II against the constitutionalists, although it was the very same ruler who interrupted Djewdet's work in codification under pressure of the famous reactionary Shaykh-Isâlîm, Hasan Fehmi [q.v.].

The reign of 'Abd al-Hamîd II (1876-1909 [q.v.]) was a period of total eclipse for any type of religious reform. It became instead a period of resurgence for the fârikas, particularly for those which had no historic position in the Ottoman empire but were imported, mostly from North Africa, and which 'Abd al-Hamîd seems to have encouraged in order to renew Ottoman influence in Arab countries. These fârikas became centres of obscurantism, and the attempt to use them for political purposes sealed the fate of these once vigorously supported destructions of the Janissaries under Muhammed II in 1826, because of the alleged association between the two. Since then, the fârikas have never recovered, with the exception of two intervals, the first during the reign of 'Abd al-Hamîd II (1876-1909) and the second from the 1940s on.

Some influence of Muhammad Abuh's modernism was found, on the other hand, in pre-1908 writings of the secular intelligentsia who were at war with 'Abd al-Hamîd. Dr. 'Abd Allâh Djewdet, who is regarded as one of the most extreme atheists among the Young Turks, was the first to give space to Muhammad Abuh's ideas in his review Ezîdhâd, published in exile. After the restoration of the constitutional regime in 1908, the first modernist review, Sirât-û Mû斯塔fîm (later Sebîl-û-Èrreed), appeared as the organ of the younger 'ulamā', who no longer associated themselves with the Old Order. The leading figures of this modernist review, however, were handicapped by the complications created by the impending clash between the Pan-Ottomanism of the Young Turks and the Islamic-Arab nationalism of the Egyptian modernists. The review appeared to be more in the footsteps of Rashîd Rîdî than Muhammad Abuh. In reality, very little space was given to Abuh in Sirâtûs-û Mû斯塔fîm; only two arti-
cles were published about him, both being translations. What was believed to be modernism in Arab countries thus appeared in Turkey to be a religious reaction against the Ottoman caliphate. The secular Westernists also denounced these modernists as reactionaries. A controversy between the two camps, Tewfik Fikret and Mehmet Akif (Ersoy), has remained ever since as the model of the conflicting views of the modernists and the traditionalists.

While the modernists of the Stratič Mustakim steadily turned conservative in Səbıl-ul-Reşad as they were challenged by Westernists and nationalists, the cause of religious modernism was taken up more strongly by the secularist intelligentsia. 'Abd Allah Djewdet [see DİJWEDET] and Kılıçzade Haşki, both writing in İttihat, launched attacks against the traditional 'İlāma as well as the modernists. The most prominent and influential figure, however, appeared from among the ranks of the Turkist nationalists. This was Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924 [see GÖKALP]). Unlike his contemporary Müşə Dîyar 'Allah or Bigief (1875-1949), the theologian and reformer of the Turkish Muslims of the Russian Empire, Gökalp was neither a theologian nor a religious thinker. As a romantic populist and nationalist sociologist he developed a three-principled ideology, in which Islam was significant only within the limitations of westernizing modernism and of the cultural revival of the Turkish nationality. In the scattered writings of Gökalp (ed. and trans. by N. Berkes) we find his views on Islamic modernism inseparable from his ideas of the secular state and national culture.

The religious modernism of Gökalp paved the way for the more radical secularism of the Kemalist era (1923-1930). Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938) was even more remote from the tradition of the "Islamic sciences", the 'İlāma, the madrasas and the jarikas, which he always associated with backwardness, ignorance, superstition and conspiracy, and he saw no place for them in the increasingly laicized political and social institutions. The most spectacular of his revolutionary changes were the abolition of sultanate, caliphate, and Islamic law. The 'İlāma organization, the madrasas, and the jarikas were closed and their properties transferred to the waqf administration, which had already become a department of government.

It would be misleading to regard the Kemalist reforms as a total eradication of Islam in Turkey. What was really eradicated was Islam in its entanglements with the Ottoman pattern of state and religion. To the extent to which Islam had been institutionalized within this historic polity, within which it had always suffered from formalism and sterility, it inevitably suffered from the disestablishment of that polity. Islam was now made dependent upon the voluntary adherence of the believer; the places of worship were kept open and their administration put under a department of religious affairs financed by the state, but deprived of any prerogative of theoretical or doctrinal authority. While the recognized religions (Islam, Christianity, and Judaism) were taken under the protection of the law, any political formation in association with any of these religions was banned, and the establishment of any new sect or jariha was prohibited. The decline, stagnation, and corruption of the old religious institutions, which were nothing but the recognized religions, was mostly favoured by dissatisfied groups of Westernized intelligentsia and a faction of the nationalist youth. The fact that all of these were given a free hand, partly because of the rise of the multi-party system in opposition to single party rule, and partly because of the relative consolidation of democratic freedoms, has led to the development of a religious modernism and those who believed that they are the signs of a reactionary return to the past to attach an exaggerated importance to them as representing a stage going beyond the Kemalist conception of religious reform. That all appear to have class, occupation, region, and party motivations and alignments indicates that the Kemalist reforms succeeded in changing the Ottoman polity into one in which religion can become a point of political conflict as it is in all modern democracies.

Indian Muslims were among the first Muslim peoples to come in contact with Western civilization; but it was only after the establishment of the rule of the British East India Company in the wake of the Battle of Plassey (1757) that the direct impact of Western institutions came to affect their lives and minds. The reform of the civil and criminal, but not the personal branches of the sharia law, which developed in the last decades of the 18th century [see sharia], was the first major injection of reformism affecting the legal and social life of the Indian Muslims. But in the formulation and development of this reformism they played no part.

The direct impact of Europe was felt by some Indo-Muslim travellers during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. These included I'tisham al-Din, Yusuf Khan Kammalpuri, and Mirza Abu Talib Khan. Of these the last [q.v.] was by far the most receptive and analytical. The influence, if any, of these travellers on the formation of opinion among the Indo-Muslim elite was insignificant.

The apologetic formulation of modernism is traced usually to Sayyid Ahmad Khan [q.v.], whose writings are, no doubt, the foundation of its subsequent development; but the actual pattern of this apologetic was formulated a decade or so earlier by Karamat Ali Djawnpuri (d. 1873) in his Ma'adhik al-Islam (Eng. tr. Ubaydi and Amir 'Ali, Calcutta 1967). He presents the later quite familiar apologetic thesis that modern scientific discoveries not merely coincide with, but have actually resulted from the inspiration of the Kur'an, transmitted to Europe through Spain; and that in absorbing the discoveries of modern Western sciences, Muslims would really be reverting to the truth implicit in their own religion.

The towering figure of Sayyid Ahmad Khan dominates the entire edifice of Indo-Muslim modernism. He equates the implied and interpreted truth of Qur'anic revelation with his understanding of two 19th-century criteria of judgement, "reason" and "nature". Revelation is the word of God, and "nature" the work of God; between the two there can be no contradiction. Of the four traditional sources of Islamic law, he rejects ijtihad (consensus) [q.v.]; substitutes hisya (analogy) [q.v.] by ijtihad (use of individual reasoning) [q.v.]; which he considers to be the right of every educated and intelligent Muslim; doubts in his exegesis of the Qur'an, by stressing the attributes of God as the Nourisher, the Provider, the Merciful One and the Beautiful One. Whereas Ikbal had placed man at the centre of the universe as God's viceregent with limited potentialities, Azad again restores God to the supremely authoritative position in the scheme of the universe, and leaves man little choice but to admire, obey, worship and follow Him.

Both Ikbal and Azad influenced the thought of either slavery or polygamy. On the other hand, he justify interest on capital and property, equating the forbidden riba (usury) with compound interest.

Sayyid Ahmad Khan's work was supplemented by that of his associates, of whom Siraj 'Ali, who wrote extensively of the possibilities of reform in a modern Muslim state and on ijtihad [q.v.], was more radical. Mabdi 'Ali Khan Musin al-Mulk, who was also Sayyid Ahmad Khan's successor in implementing his educational and administrative policies, was comparatively more moderate in his religious views. The apologetics of Sayyid Ahmad Khan and his colleagues were only partly accepted by the Indo-Muslim upper middle class elite; they were rejected in various details, but on the whole broadened the horizon and liberalized the concept of religious faith. They were totally repudiated by the 'ulamā'.

Amir 'Ali [q.v.], who wrote exclusively in English, with a mixed Muslim and Western readership in mind, did not belong to Sayyid Ahmad Khan's Aliagar movement, but was very considerably influenced by it, and propagated its apologetic and reformist formulations.

Whereas Sayyid Ahmad Khan was opposed to revivalism as backward-looking, it became a recurrent theme in the drama of modernization with the Mu-suddas and other poems of his associate Hāfī [q.v.]; this element reached its zenith in the pan-Islamic verse of Ikbal [q.v.].

Muhammad 'Iqbal (1877-1938) is the most outstanding figure of 20th-century Indo-Muslim modernism; but compared to Sayyid Ahmad Khan his modernist orientation and analysis is more subtle, vague, less easy to grasp in its totality and at times even contradictory. His appeal is primarily poetic, to some extent intellectual, but not exclusively theological.

The set of values which 'Iqbal more or less arbitrarily selects as necessary for the development of the individual self and the community are not directly derived from the Kur'an, but traced to it apologetically. These values are movement, power and freedom, which form the recurring leitmotifs of his poetic work and of much of his sustained writing. In his religious thought intuition is a basic concept and defined as a higher form of intellect; at certain stages it is equated with prophethood; and it plays an important role in 'Iqbal's Bergsonian view of evolution, which is basically moral despite its reliance on the value of power. In law 'Iqbal also places a great deal of emphasis on idtgihād; but unlike Sayyid Ahmad Khan he accepts the validity and broadens the concept of idqna' equating it with democracy or a parliamentary system of government; at the same time making some concessions to the view that the 'ulamā' have also a role to play in any movement aimed at reformism in order to balance it—a view which to a great extent has influenced the pattern of constitution-making in Pakistan. For Indian Islam he proposes a role of conservativism which may counter-balance the secularism adopted by Turkey.

His contemporary Abu'l-Kalam Azād (1888-1955) is not exactly a modernist; but he liberalizes and humanizes Islamic belief, in his exegesis of the Kur'an, by stressing the attributes of God as the Nourisher, the Provider, the Merciful One and the Beautiful One. Whereas Ikbal had placed man at the centre of the universe as God's viceregent with limitless potentialities, Azād again restores God to the supremely authoritative position in the scheme of the universe, and leaves man little choice but to admire, obey, worship and follow Him.
Ghulam Ahmad Parwiz (Parwez) whose modernism is, on the whole, this-worldly and pragmatic, but based on an untenable extravagant and far-fetched interpretation of the kūrānīc terminology. Because of his exegetical extravagance his influence on the modernist élite has been minimal.

These landmarks of the intellectual history of modern Islam in India had some effect on the social modernization of the Muslim upper classes up to 1947. Only after that date did the great debate between westernization and orthodoxy begin in Pakistan, and it still continues. In terms of social reform the one precocious gain so far made by modernism in Pakistan has been confined to the revision of Muslim family law, which has made polygamy a little more difficult and divorce a little less easy. The élite which created Pakistan and which has been ruling it are synonymous". It is true that to recognize "aslamān" is to say: 'We surrender' and not merely a (general) act of submission and surrender to God, and not merely obedience to God's commandments, but also an affirmation which grants submission, total surrender (to God) — masda of the 1IVth form of the root S I M.

I. Definition and Theories of Meaning.

1. — Kūrānīc references. — The "one who submits to God" is the Muslim, of which the plural Muslimun occurs very often throughout the sūras. Islâm, on the other hand, occurs only eight times there; but the word must be considered in conjunction with the fairly common use of the verb aslama in the two meanings which merge into one another, "surrender to God" (an inner action) and "profession of Islâm", that is to say adherence to the message of the Prophet. The eight occurrences of Islâm are as follows:—

a). Three verses stress its quality of interiority: "Whosoever God desires to guide, He expands his breast to Islâm" (VI, 123); Islâm is a "call" from God, which must prohibit falsehood (LXI, 7) and which places whoever receives it "in a light from his Lord" (XXXIX, 22).

b). Three other texts, constantly quoted throughout the centuries, stress the connection between ṣīla and din (q.v.). It is certainly appropriate in this context to translate din as "religion", though without forgetting the idea of debt owed to God which it connotes. "Today, I have perfected your religion (din) for you; I have completed My blessing upon you; I have approved ṣīla for your religion" (V, 3), and "the religion, in the eyes of God, is ṣīla" (III, 19). The surrender of the Bedouins to God is a "call " from God, which must prohibit falsehood (LXI, 7) and which places whoever receives it "in a light from his Lord" (XXXIX, 22).

c. The action which operates ṣīla supposes a "return" to God, taevā, a conversion. The Kur'ān speaks of "conversion to ṣīla"—to condemn the unbelief (kufr) of those who had nevertheless made a profession of faith (IX, 74). Similarly it condemns the complacency of the Bedouins who boast of their ṣīla "as if it were a favour on their part" (XLIX, 17). In addition: "Say: 'Do not count your ṣīla as a favour to me; nay, but rather God confers a favour upon you, in that He has guided you to belief, if it be that you are truthful" (ibid.). A little earlier, the very important verse XLI, 14 had made a clear distinction between ṣīla and imān: "The Bedouins say: 'we believe'. Say: you do not believe; rather say, 'We surrender' (aslama). Faith has not yet entered into your heart".

It would therefore be an exaggeration to state, with A. J. Weisneick (The Muslim Creed), Cambridge 1922, 22, that "in the Kur'ān the terms ṣīla and imān are synonymous". It is true that to recognize oneself as a Muslim and to be a believer are two existential realities which take possession of a man's whole being to ensure his salvation (ibid.). But the Kur'ān (XLIX, 14 and 17, and still more IX, 74) evokes an explicit profession of ṣīla which is in no way a guarantee against the sin of kufr, and has no saving value unless it is the expression of faith. On comparing these verses with III, 19 and V, 3 (insistence on the idea of din), we see that the kūrānic statements themselves urge men to make ṣīla not merely a (general) act of submission and surrender to God, and not merely obedience to God's commandments, but also an affirmation which grants...
admission to the ummat al-nabi, the “people of the Prophet”, whatever their inner dispositions. These diverse connotations were to recur throughout the ages, as a result of the self-awareness brought about by the umma.

2. — Some hadîths. — In the collections of hadîths the emphasis, in defining islâm, will be placed upon submission to God, expressed by deeds: above all, the prescribed acts of worship, including adoration of the One God, but also the ēshârât, “good works”. Thus, by way of example: in al-Bukhârî, ii, 37 (hadîth of Gabriel), after defining imân by its content (“to believe in God, in His angels, in the future life, in the prophets, in the resurrection”), the Prophet, in reply to the question “What is islâm?”, replies: “islâm is to adore God without associating anything with Him, to observe the ritual prayer (salût), to pay zakât, to fast during the month of Ramadân” (similar text in Muslim). But it is also “to give food (to the hungry) and to give the greeting of peace (salâm) to those one knows, just as to those one does not know” (al-Bukhârî, ii, 5). And the best islâm will be that of the Muslim of whom one has to “fear neither the hand nor the tongue” (ibid., 4).

The Musnad of Ibî Hanbal (iii, 134; cf. A. J. Wensinck, op. cit., 23) states: “islâm is external, faith being to the heart”. — Some scholars, who identify faith and prescribed works, similarly identify faith with islâm: “actions are valid only through the intentions,” says the hadîth (al-Bukhârî, ii, 41). Whoever commits a grave transgression of the prescriptions of the Law loses the status of mu'min and Muslim, and reverts to the status of kufr according to the Khârijîs, to an “intermediate status” (between faith and unbelief) according to the Mu'tazilis.

b). Many Hanâfs (Hanafî-Mâturidis) similarly consider islâm and imân to be synonymous, but define each of them essentially as verbal confession (ibrâr), sometimes linking this with intimate adherence, or at other times, following the Murîdîs, with knowledge of the heart, or both of these. The Hanâfi-Mâturîdî texts of the Fîkh Aḥkâr I (doubtless 2nd/8th century) and of the Wâsyiyat Abî Ḥanîfa (3rd/9th century) ignore the question. Towards the end of the 4th/10th century, however, the Fîkh Aḥkâr II was to draw an at least nominal distinction. It was to state (a. 18) that current language distinguishes between imân and islâm, and that islâm is defined as “total surrender (taslîm) and total obedience (imkîyâd) to the divine commandments”. The text adds: “there is no faith whatever without islâm, and islâm could not exist without faith; the one and the other are like the outside and the inside [back and belly]; in the literal translation of A. J. Wensinck); and religion (dîn) is a name which covers both of them, and all the commandments of the Law”. Here then imân is as it were the inner, hidden reality of islâm, from which it could not be separated.

c). In its definition of faith, the Hanâbis however were to remain faithful to the text of the Musnad cited above, and to the Ābhâda VI of Ibn Hanbal, who affirms the distinction between islâm and imân. Accordingly, in the 4th/10th century, Ibn Baṭṭa returns to the Kurân, XLIX, 14 and affirms: “The term islâm does not have the same meaning as the term imân. Islâm is a word which denotes the community of religion (milâa), and imân is a word which expresses an adherence of faith (tasdîk)” (from the translation of H. Laoust, op. cit., 80/82). The choice of “surrender” by the Hanâbis is characteristic: islâm is “religion”, no longer solely in the sense of a debt due to God, but in the sense of a “religious community” attached and connected to a prophet (cf. below). Thus, in the 4th/10th century, we find the use of islâm to denote the Muslim religion as an organized and differentiated religion. A century later, Ibn 'Aqîl in the same way was to make islâm obedience to the commandments of God. But he who commits a great transgression “does not retain his status of mu'min to become merely Muslim, for islâm forms part of imân” (G. Makdisi, Ibn 'Aqîl et la résurrection de l'Islam traditionniste aux XIe siècle, Damascus 1963, 527).

d). The Ash'âris and the Shâfi'î jurists also made a distinction between islâm and imân. After defining faith as words and deeds, and then by its content according to the “hadîth of Gabriel”, all that remains in the credo of the Makâlid al-Iṣlâmîyyûn (ed. 'Abd al-Hâmîd, Cairo n.d., i, 322, identifies islâm with the two constituent parts of the shahâda, in other words with the verbal testimony which grants admission to the Community of the Prophet, and concludes: “islâm is different from imân”. The credo of the Iba'ma (ed. Cairo 1348, 10), without defining islâm, states that it is “wider than faith” and specifies “that all islâm is not faith”. If we compare these views with the text of the Luma' which above all regards faith as inner adherence (huwa tasdîk bi-lldh'; cf. R. J. McCarthy, The Theology of al-Ash'ârî, Beirut 1953, 75/104), we understand that the later Ash'âris were able to claim that islâm, the observance of the prescriptions ordained by the Law, and above all the explicit profession of the shahâda, can be “practised” without faith, and that faith (inner tasdîk) can exist without islâm (here of milâa, and not dîn, in this text for whom every believer is a Muslim). But islâm without faith is the way of hypocrites (mu'nâfîkin), consigned to God’s chastisement; faith without islâm need not be culpable, in the event of some invincible external obstacle; it would become so if the testimony to islâm was not given through cowardice, weakness or half-heartedness. It would then be a fault not of unbelief (kufr) but of grave prevarication (fiqîk). —

When he summarizes the Shâfi'î theses (which he contrasts with the identification made by the Hanâfs),
al-Dhurrafi says that “islam is the verbal profession of faith without the agreement of the heart, while faith is the agreement of the heart and the tongue” (Iṣrāfīl, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 23).—This thesis was later to be generally accepted.

Whatever definition of faith might be proposed, it remains true however, for the Hanballs and the Ash'aris alike, that iman and islam, without becoming identical, imply one another. Islam, says H. Laoust in summarizing the philosophy of Ibn Taymiyya (Contribution à une étude de canonique de ..., Ibn Taimiyya, Cairo 1939, 74, n. 3), is the “external and so to speak social application of the Law”, and iman in the “interiorization of islam”. (Thus once again, despite the difference of the conceptions involved, we come across “the outside” and “the inside”, sahr and ba'in, of the Fikh 'Akbār I).—An outline of the most usual teaching is provided in the 19th century by the Ash'ar al-Bādhirī (Ḥādiyya ... ala' Dzawārīl al-tauhid, ed. Cairo 1325/1906, 28-9), who says: “Iman and islam are different in their significance but not in truth, that is to say in the subjects (who profess them). ... But it is a question here of faith which assures salvation, and of islam also, otherwise there would be no reciprocal connection”. The same nuances appear in the 20th century, for example in the Ḥaṣūl Muḥammad of Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ḥāvikāli (Cairo 1325/1906, 500).—It should be noted however that only certain Ash'arīs and Shafī'īs applied the term mu'min, but not Muslim, to the man who has faith in his heart and who dies without having been able to profess islam. In general, it was considered preferable to call him Muslim, not before men but in the eyes of God.

4. — The “world of islam”.—In this way, therefore, islam is “to give oneself unconditionally to God” (G. Maksdisi, op. cit., 224); so much so that, as the Ḥanbalis were to take pleasure in saying, “the religion of all the prophets is islam”. Abraham, Moses and Jesus are true muslimun. But it is the “seal of the prophecy”, manifested in the Kur'an, which was to “perfect the religion”. According to the first part of a much quoted hadīth, “the best of all things is islam; the foundation of islam is the ritual prayer and, with the salāt, all the other obligations (tāfarīd) prescribed by the Law. Now, it is the observance of the Law, its “external and so to speak social application” (H. Laoust), which is the binding force of the Community of the Prophet. And so wherever the ḥurūnic prescriptions are observed communally, there islam will be; such will be “the lands of islam (bilād al-islām), “the world, the house, of islam” (dār al-islām).

Such expressions are traditional. It was in this way that, at the beginning of the 5th/11th century, al-Mawardi examined the various categories into which the bilād al-islām are divided (al-Ḥikam al-sulṭānīyya, beginning of chapt. xiv, ed. Cairo. n.d., 151 ff.). The implication remains that islam, practised in this way, is the testimony, renders socially, to faith in the One God and to free adherence to the prophetic mission of Muḥammad. The Ḥanafī Sibīl Ibn al-Dīwāzī (d. 654/1256) in his Mirāṭ al-'alam mentioned the “purchased” conversions of Jews and Christians, which the Ash'arīs sought to make in Bağdad in the 5th/11th century, and he repeats the protests of the supporters of the sharīf 'Abū Dīnār, a Ḥanball: “This is the islam of gifts, not the islam of conviction” (quoted by G. Maksdisi, op. cit., 356). 'Abū ʿAmin al-Ghazālī was similarly to question the degree of validity of a forced conversion to islam.

“There is no compulsion in religion” (Kūrān, II, 256), and “religion, in the eyes of God, is in truth islam” (II, 19). Even in the writings of those who distinguish most sharply between iman and islam, at no time will this reference to inner conviction be found absent. But the point of first importance, for the jurist who is studying and formulating the statutes and laws of the bilād al-islām, is not so much the degree of individual interiorization of the muqābal of reciprocal relationship islam-imān, as the communal observance of those prescriptions which make islam, those ghāčir al-islām “the blazon of Islam” (L. Massinon), which are symbolized by the banners of the imāms, the guides of the Community.

This is so true that a synonym of dār al-islām was to be dār al-'adī “the world of justice”, in which “the rights of God and of men”, ordained by the Kur'ān are observed and protected. On the other hand there was to be the dār al-kufr “world of unbelief”, which is the dār al-barb “world of war”. The jurists analyse the circumstances in which it can become “obligatory” to abandon the dār al-kufr in order to enter the dār al-islām or at least the dār al-yahūb, which has concluded a treaty of “reconciliation” with the dār al-islām.—Anyone who describes himself as a Muslim means to affirm thereby not so much his care for the practice and personal observances (although certainly not neglecting such matters) as for adherence to a Community of the faith and ofMuḥammad. It is here perhaps, far more than in any “sacral” conception of the political organization, that this specific spiritual-temporal fusion of the Muslim City has its root.

5. — From islam to Islam.—In European languages, it has become customary to speak of Islam to denote the whole body of Muslim peoples, countries, and states, in their socio-cultural or political as well as in their religious sphere. And it is in a similar sense that modern Arabic often uses al-islām. What connection does this very general meaning retain or not retain with the etymological significance of the word, and its evocation of “surrender to God”?

This question, an important one if we wish to avoid misconceptions and misunderstandings, has been discussed recently in a well-documented and apposite manner by Professor Wilfrid Cantwell Smith in The Meaning and End of Religion (New York 1964, chap. iv “The special case of Islam”, 75-108). As the author indicates, it is only recently (19th-20th centuries) that Islam has incontestably become the chosen term to signify both a religion and a politico-social area (fortuitously replacing “Mohammedanism” “Islamism” and other such terms). Religious and cultural history thereby adopts the very name by which the bilād al-islām designate themselves, as a title of honour. And it is merely since the beginning of the 19th century, probably under the influence of Western ideas, that writers in Arabic have employed it in an equivalent way.

W. Cantwell Smith emphasises, by reference to Brockelmann's Geschichte der arabischen Literatur, that this term ʿism, though comparatively rare in the Kur'ān, with the passage of time appears more and more frequently in the titles of works in Arabic. In the classical period (the Western Middle Ages) it was already used more commonly than imān, and often in correlation with niṣām, system, organization; in the 19th century, the relative figures for imān and islam are 7% and 93% respectively. It is this that Prof. Cantwell Smith calls “reification in Islam”. The emphasis thus appears to be placed on Islam as the organization and self-defence of the Community which is its expression, and much less on the inner
personal values which the etymology of the word connotes. It appears however that our present brief examination of the use of *islām* according to Muslim formulations and usage itself may suggests a few remarks here, which do not invalidate, but which limit and qualify the slightly different perspective of Prof. Cantwell Smith.

a). If it strue that *islām* signifies primarily the action and state of the man who surrenders himself totally (to God), nevertheless it would be erroneous to regard it, in the etymological sense, as a kind of synonym for *ta-wakul bi-l-lāh*, the (interiorized) "abandoning" of oneself entirely into the hands of God. As the Kur'ān understands the word, *islām* is indeed, as the Fiṣḥ Ṭabar I I I says, a surrender (tasllm) to the divine Will as expressed by the Kur'ānic teaching, and an obedience (inbiyyād) to His commandments; and, by this very means, admission to the Community, "the best to have arisen among men" (Kur'ān, III, 110). Quite soon, admission to the Community was to be the aspect preferred. If the requisite inner attitude does not correspond to it, there is some grave individual failing (fįşk), there is no abandonment of *islām*.

b). Prof. Cantwell Smith observes that, in the classical age, the diversity of religious beliefs was to express itself by *miṣl* rather than by *adyān*. But we have already noted that the Hunball Ibn Bāṭaṭa, in the 4th century, defined *islām* as a *miṣl*, hence a community, the Community of Muḥammad. The difference between *din* and *miṣl*, al-Djurdjanl says (Tařīfāt, iii), is that "*din* relates to God, and *miṣl* to the Prophet".

c). The Kur'ān however defines *islām* as religion, *din* (III, 19; V, 3); but not as a religion, Prof. Cantwell Smith justly notes. The plural of *din*, *adyān*, he further notes, does not occur in the Kur'ān. But if the religion, *al-din*, which renders to God that which is due to Him, is indeed *islām*, it is, through that very fact, *millat al-nabi* and *ummat al-nabi*. For the Muslim, Islam is not one religion among others, it is the religion, and the other religions (*al-adyān*) are such only in so far as they participate in Islam. Each prophet sent from God has his *miṣl*; but the *din* is unique, accomplished by surrender to God and obedience very definitely in the Korānic teaching, already lived by the prophets that preceded it, and expressed accordingly to all its needs by the "seal" of the revelation, the Kur'ān.

We do not think that these various connotations are absent from the Muslim works of the contemporary period. To take one example only, we find them in the Risāla li-taawkīd of Muḥammad Ṭubăh. "The religion of Islam, or Islam", says Ṭubăh, "is the religion brought by Muḥammad" (Cairo 1353, 152). And the whole final section of the Risāla constantly speaks in this sense of Islam, its principles, its spirit and its extension in the world (ibid., 152-206, French trans., Paris 1925, 104-40). As soon as the *ummat al-nabi* began to expand in space and time in the face of other religious communities, what Prof. Cantwell Smith calls "reification" was found to be inscribed in the original fundamental data. Historically, on the one hand, and the progress of the phenomenology of religions on the other, have not ceased to confront Muslim thought with this twofold fact: the existence of non-Muslim religions, established in their faith and their ritual observances, and, moreover, the uncertain faith and the failure to "practise" by certain men who none the less continue to invoke the help of the *umma*. Hence the anxiety to defend Islam as a religion and a community, while nevertheless the old Hunball and Ash'ari distinction between *imān* and *islām* is repeated and emphasized.

But this distinction, however generally admitted it may be, is in no way intended to justify the proclamation of *islām* by one who denies *imān* or who even does not bother to appreciate the true values of faith. Those who are Muslims simply through having heard the call of Islam, or because they were born of Muslim parents, but who do not have faith in their hearts, then, according to what Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal mentions, says (loc. cit.), their *islām* is feeble and sickly. Only those who seek for a sincere faith (*imān sādiq*) hear the call to *Islam* with regard to God alone.

At the present time there are three meanings of the word *islām* says Prof. Cantwell Smith (op. cit., 107): 1) the immediate existential meaning of personal surrender of oneself entirely to God; 2) the empirical reality of the "world of Islam", as it exists sociologically; 3) the ideal Muslim community—"a concrete historical ideal" we would gladly say—as it must tend towards its realization. These three meanings in fact remain closely bound together in Muslim thought, today as in the past, and no study of Islam, no analysis of the Muslim Community or of the world of Islam should separate them.

Bibliography: in the article. (L. GarDET)

ii.—Diffusion of Islam

In our present state of knowledge, the diffusion of Islam can only be studied in broad outline. In the first place, with regard to numbers, we often have to content with approximations; nor should it be forgotten that, with the world population increasing at an accelerated pace, even the most accurate statistics prove to be out of date within a few years. Moreover it sometimes happens that in certain countries Muslims and non-Muslims adopt different sets of figures, particularly when these figures serve as the basis for political claims or considerations of honour. In the second place, such figures do not reflect the qualitative aspect of this diffusion. It is possible for conversions on a massive scale to be produced within the space of a few years (as in the case of the Galla tribe in Ethiopia, to the west of Harar, in about 1930-50). But it must not be forgotten that, for these conversions, the way had sometimes been prepared over a long period, by a whole process of maturing and by favourable circumstances which, in themselves, cannot be statistically expressed.

A. — General Survey. The diffusion of Islam has been the consequence of a certain number of factors which are more or less easily discernable; over and above the particular attraction this religious movement has exerted upon men, the personality of its first leaders and the economic circumstances of Arabia at the time, among other things, there is a further point which requires to be examined—the part played by wars. Even if, in the vast majority of cases, the conquered remained free not to change their religion, the introduction by force of arms of a Muslim régime which took upon itself the administration of their country represented the first stage of a process which was bound to end in their gradual conversion.

The conquest itself was not brought about suddenly. It was often achieved in waves, with ebb and flow, but it was governed by a tide which, save in Europe, proved to be rising ever higher. Thus Damascus, reached as early as 13/634 by reconnoissance units, was attacked and conquered much later; recaptured by the Byzantines, it finally fell into the Arabs' hands.
in 930. Similarly Tunisia, where a first raid in 20/647 was followed by a respite of more than twenty years before the final conquest and the founding of Kayrawân (50/670). So too Transoxiana to which, after an initial invasion in 52-4/672-4, the Arabs returned at the beginning of the following century; or Chinese Turkestan, reached in 93/713, and to which they returned in 133/751. Kâbûl in Afghanistan was reached by the end of the 1st/7th century, without being occupied, and two centuries were to pass before the Muslims came back in strength to stay. Muslim warfare had been a war of movement, a war of wide spaces, steppes or deserts.

The first period of expansion extends from the death of Muhammad to the end of the Umayyad caliphate of Damascus. One century was enough for the Muslims to achieve an extraordinary epic feat. The dynamism of the new community combined with favourable circumstances to allow their success. The weakness of the Persians and the Byzantines after decades of war between them, their exhaustion, which caused them to underestimate the newcomers' strength, the internal conditions within the Roman empire of Byzantium which was then in difficulties, with its territory being engulfed by the barbarian invasions, the resentments of the various peoples ruled by Byzantium, the divisions among the Christians, all these considerations were in favour of the Muslims. But the new fact, as compared with the multiple barbarian invasions of the time, is that the barbarians were assimilated by the countries they conquered, whereas Islam on the contrary imposed itself upon the old civilizations. The most remarkable point about the diffusion of Islam is not so much the fact of the conquests as that of their permanence. When Islam became the religion of a territory, it never thereafter ceased to be so, except in Europe (and even then under armed pressure), and except in the centre and south of India, where many of the Hindu sultanates were revived after the first Muslim conquests.

In this way, we can trace the conquests of Syria-Palestine (13/634-19/640), Egypt 18/639-22/642), the Maghrib (49/669-8/702), Spain and Narbonnese Gaul 92/711-85/705), and, in the east, of Írâk (15/636-20/648), Armenia and then Iran (21/642), as far as Transoxiana and Chinese Turkestan. The river Indus was reached in 91-4/710-3, but these advanced positions were afterwards abandoned.

In the direction of Byzantium, which was besieged without success, the Muslim advance was blocked in Asia Minor where a state of flux for long prevailed.

In East Africa, colonies of Muslim merchants are recorded at a very early date at trading depots on the shores of the Indian Ocean. Under the ʿAbbâsids, these conquests were rounded off with the capture of Mediterranean islands such as the Balearics and Sicily. But, most important, Muslim culture was gradually taking shape, increasing the spread of Islam, and the populations, while left free to retain their faith, little by little adhered to the new religion, the religion of the ruling class and of the new society. In Spain, however, Islam was confronted by the Reconquest, which started early and eventually culminated in the fall of Granada in 1492.

Everywhere else, however, expansion continued, sometimes by force of arms, sometimes by peaceful proselytism. Towards the year 1000, the first stage in the conquest of India began: finally the whole Ganges valley was conquered about 489/1092-606/1209. Various raids during the 8th/14th century succeeded in bringing almost the whole peninsula under the domination of the Muslims. They were however obliged to withdraw from many regions, especially in the centre and south. Islam came to Indonesia by way of a Muslim centre situated in the north-west of Sumatra, at the end of the 7th/13th century; in the 8th/14th century, Java was governed by Muslim rulers.

In sub-Saharan West Africa, it was shortly after the year 1000 that Islam was established. There is no mention of a Muslim prince at the head of the Songhay at Gao on the Niger as early as 400/1009-10. Islamic rulers are found at Kauem (north of Lake Chad) in about 473/1081-90/1097. Little by little, Muslim kingdoms appeared (in particular Mali, in the 7th/13th century); but their Islam was still a religion of the court of the warlike or literate aristocracies, which had no contact with the masses. It was later, with the military activities (especially of the Fulanis) and the activities of the brotherhoods that the islamization of the masses was brought about, during the 18th and 19th centuries. Under colonial rule the process of conversion was extended still further.

In East Africa, Islam began to spread from Zaylāʾ (a port situated opposite Aden) a centre of Islamization even in the 6th/12th century. Climbing up to assail the high Ethiopian plateaus, where they never succeeded in gaining a real foothold, the Muslims established themselves firmly in the less elevated regions to the east and south (especially in Harar).

In the Nile valley, the Christian kingdoms of Nubia held out until the 8th/14th/16th centuries, when they disappeared. The islamization of Nilotic Sudan was followed by that of the minor kingdoms situated between the Nile and Chad. In the 18th century, Islam came to predominance to the south of the Sahara, from the Atlantic to the Red Sea, except only in the Ethiopian Highlands.

Along the Gulf of Guinea, the impenetrable equatorial forest—even when not infested with tsetse flies—for a long time halted the shepherds who were the Muslim conquerors of the territory. But with the modern age the situation has changed. With the conversion of a section of the Yorubas (near Lagos) and penetration into other tribes hitherto reputed to be impossible to convert, with the remodelling of populations characteristic of countries today, this forest no longer forms a boundary, and many Muslims intermingle with the inhabitants of the coastal towns.

The commercial centres on the African coast of the Indian Ocean, which remained isolated in their world of business transactions, gradually became stronger (especially in the 4th/10th century). But it was in the 19th and 20th centuries that they became centres of islamization; the suppression of slavery and the opening of the hinterland had swept away the barriers that confined them to their trading-ports. Consequently there has been a considerable, though recent, advance by Islam in these zones during the last half-century (Kenya, Tanzania and even to the eastern Congo).

In all these conquered lands in Asia or Africa, or in all the sultanates ruled by Muslims, a special world was created, the Muslim world, where life, art and thought were marked by Islam, even though many traces of the past still survived. The simple imposition of a foreign political framework was very quickly followed by the adoption inwardly of Muslim values.

Finally, to conclude this general survey, it should be noted that the attack launched by the Ottoman Turks finally, in 1455, swept away the barrier of...
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Constantinople. Europe was invaded as far as Vienna which was twice besieged, in 1529 and 1683, though without success. The ebb then followed, particularly in the 19th century and at the start of the 20th.

B. — Present characteristics. If we attempt to trace on a modern map the distribution of Muslims throughout the world, it becomes apparent that Islam is a religion which is almost confined to Asia and Africa. The only exceptions to this rule are some millions of Muslims in Turkey in Europe and in the Balkans, migrant and transient workers in western Europe, and immigrants in North and South America.

In the countries where Christian minorities remain, as well as in pagan countries, Islam is making progress, above all because, in order to be truly integrated into Muslim society, it is necessary to be a Muslim. Since this integration alone permits certain marriages, the proportion of the conversions to Islam undertaken on the occasion of marriages is very high. This integration also facilitates the finding of employment and advancement to higher posts. In certain countries, questions of social castes sometimes enter, since conversions take place particularly in certain strata of the population. But however that may be, in view of the simplicity of the Muslim dogma which places man face to face with God the Creator and Providence, and in view too of the aspect of fraternity which Islam presents to the newcomer (especially when he is received into a brotherhood), man’s fundamental religious sense is satisfied. Thus the step to be taken does not deter anyone who is no longer greatly attached to his old religion.

Tolerance for ancient customs has also played a part in many countries, since Islam requires merely a profession of faith for a convert to be able to enter the community. Then, little by little, Islamization has been effected in depth. Moreover, Muslim society, which gave the new member the satisfaction of belonging to a vast community covering the entire world, with its own military, cultural, religious and political renown, has always exerted effective control over him. While leaving those who served it very free, from the moment they made their profession of faith, it has always been at pains to protect its members from other possible pressures and, above all, to prevent them from leaving Islam once they have adopted it. Until recently, the apostate was put to death; even now, proselytism is still strongly disapproved of, and the man who deserts Islam cuts himself off from his own people, save in exceptional cases, even though modern jurists no longer authorize the death penalty for apostasy.

Paradoxically, among the features which have favoured the expansion of Islam during these last decades must be included colonial occupation. In many cases the occupying powers relied on Muslim elements possessing a higher degree of civilization than the pagans, in the countries where these still survived. Alternatively, it placed without discrimination under the same legal system inspired by Islam, both Muslims and those who were neither Muslim nor Christian. In the same way, by destroying the tribal framework of African paganism, colonialism created the great numbers of rootless people who have found in Islam a justification for social existence. All the more since Islam has presented itself as a native religion, not as a colonial importation, while the difference in the standard of living, so obvious in the case of Christians newly arrived from Europe, did not arise between Muslims and pagans, who all sprang from the same soil. Peace too has assisted the movement of preachers or merchants belonging to brotherhoods.

In Black Africa, the Qur’ānic schools have been centres of Muslim expansion, both through the scope they have given for zeal to have effect, and also through the number of future propagators of Islam who have been formed there. The poverty of the material equipment in the great majority of these establishments, like that of the curricula, must not be misinterpreted. Thanks to these, the values which the children have learnt to respect, above all the sense of dedication and pride in belonging to the Muslim community, have profoundly marked whole regions. The story of David and Goliath is repeated in these schools in the triumph of poor resources. At the present time, incidentally, in many Muslim countries the official school has replaced the Qur’ānic school.

The conditions affecting the expansion of Islam are extremely variable, according to the countries concerned, and we should not make any attempt to systematize them. There are large organizations working through pamphlets (like the Ahmadiyya in Pakistan); there is the sending out of teachers and preachers; there is a whole system of instruction by radio. But the Muslim missionary apparatus is infinitely less cumbrous than that of the Christians. It is the natives of the country concerned who open schools, after having been sometimes (though not always) educated at centres abroad. It is the Muslims themselves, especially the merchants, who bear the chief responsibility for the missions. Finally, the brotherhoods have played a very great part in this movement. But whatever the differences, it is striking to observe wherever Islam is established, the same pride in the community, with as a consequence a certain number of common basic attitudes, affecting the manner of life and thought. This pride and its consequences, by favouring a certain impermeability to foreign influences, have been powerful weapons in resistance to colonialism.

For some thirty years, the Muslim world has been evolving very rapidly. Universities have been founded (see *Iskandariyya*). The instability of the world economy has made itself felt everywhere. Travels and contacts have multiplied. Socialism has changed the face of many societies and, above all, Islam has adopted modern methods of communication—pamphlets, radio, television, etc. The number of people who listen on their transistors to sermons in *Ramaḍān* is now vast.

C. — Statistical outline. Basing themselves on the figures for world population valid in about 1960, some good authors privately estimated that there might be 453 million Muslims in the world. At the present time, with the increase in population, they now exceed 500 millions.

The figures which follow will indicate a total based upon the statistics for the populations of individual countries (in 1966), as contained in the *UNESCO Statistical Yearbook* (1967). After that, the article will provide details, so far as it is possible to do so, of the proportion of Muslims within the different countries. Figures given without further details signify the number in thousand. 1. — Africa (perhaps 130 million Muslims out of 318 million inhabitants).

a) Arabic speaking Africa (perhaps 70 million Muslims)
- Morocco 13,451 (Muslims only)
- Mauritania 1,070
- Algeria 12,102 (total population)
- Tunisia 4,458 (id.)
- Libya 1,676 (id.)

b) Other African countries (perhaps 59 million Muslims)
- Senegal 6,272 (id.)
- Somalia 3,661 (id.)
- Ivory Coast 2,884 (id.)
- Mali 2,464 (id.)

2. — Asia (perhaps 290 million Muslims out of 1,810 million inhabitants).

a) Pakistan (perhaps 80 million Muslims out of 83 million inhabitants)
- West Pakistan 67,119 (id.)
- East Pakistan 12,702 (id.)

b) Other Asian countries (perhaps 210 million Muslims)
- Iran 72,551 (id.)
- Afghanistan 11,100 (id.)
- Bangladesh 29,102 (total population)
- Indonesia 25,102 (id.)
- Iraq 6,451 (id.)
- Turkey 11,451 (id.)
- Iran 72,551 (id.)
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— E.A.R. (Egypt) 30,083, two million of whom are Christian
— Sudan (Khartoum) 13,940, 70% of whom are Muslim
b) Africa south of the Sahara, excluding the Sudan (perhaps 60 million Muslims)
— Somalia 2,380, of whom 99% are Muslim
— Nigeria 58,600 (7), of whom 43% are Muslim
— Ethiopia 23,000 (7), of whom 40 to 50% are Muslim
— Senegal 3,490, of whom 75% are Muslim
— Niger 3,433, of whom 72% are Muslim
— Mali 4,654, of whom 65% are Muslim
— Guinea 3,608, of whom 62% are Muslim
— Chad 3,361, of whom 55% are Muslim
— Upper Volta 4,955, of whom 26% are Muslim
— Tanzania 10,717, of whom 23% are Muslim
— Ghana 7,945, of whom 20% are Muslim
— Cameroon 5,330, of whom 20% are Muslim
— Kenya 6,643, of whom 10% are Muslim
Smaller numbers of Muslims are found in the following countries, in which they represent respectively the proportion of the population as indicated:
— Sierra Leone 33%, Gambia 73%, Portuguese Guinea 26%, Ivory Coast 25%, Dahomey 15%, Liberia 15%, Mozambique 11%, Malawi 7%, Botswana 5%, Togo 3%. Elsewhere the proportion is still smaller.

N.B. A better knowledge of the countries to the south of the Sahara made it possible, in about 1945, to assert the existence of numerous isolated pagan communities in regions thought to be wholly Islamized (certain zones of Chad, North Cameroons, North Nigeria). Since then, a movement has been started among these pagans for conversion to Islam; in north-western Nigeria, this was vigorously supported by the political authorities, in the years preceding the disturbances of 1965.

For Nigeria, the reader will note a very clearly marked break in the rate of growth of population. As, until 1952, this was following a regular increasing curve, the figures given since that date correspond with an acceleration which requires to be explained before it can be accepted.

For Ethiopia, to which Ertria has since been added, the Annuaire du Monde Musulman, 1954, accepts only half the figure officially given (cf. p. 389).

2. — Asia (perhaps 390 million Muslims out of 1,868 million inhabitants)

a) Arab countries of Asia (perhaps 29 million Muslims), the principal centres being:
— Saudi Arabia 6,870
— Yemen 5,000
— Irak 8,338, of whom 95% are Muslim
— Syria 5,450, of whom 88% are Muslim
— Lebanon 2,400, of whom 50% are Muslim
— Jordan 2,040, of whom 92% are Muslim
b) Islam in the USSR, 30 million (?) Muslims
— Iran 23,781, of whom 98% are Muslim
— Afghanistan 15,960 (almost all Muslim).

c) Islam in the Middle East (perhaps 72 million Muslims), in
— Turkey 31,880, of whom 99% are Muslim
— Iraq 25,781, of whom 86% are Muslim
— Iran 23,781, of whom 98% are Muslim
— Afghanistan 15,960 (almost all Muslim).

d) Islam in Pakistan, India, Ceylon and Burma (perhaps 145 million Muslims), the two major groups being
— Pakistan 105,044, of whom 86% are Muslim
— India 498,680, of whom perhaps 11% are Muslim
e) Islam in China, 15 million (?) Muslims
f) Islam in South East Asia (perhaps 100 million Muslims), chiefly located in
— Indonesia 107,000, of whom 87% are Muslim
— Malaysia and Singapore 10,212, of whom 44% are Muslim
— Philippines 33,477, of whom 5% are Muslim.

3. — Europe.

A little less than 5 million Muslims in the Balkans, to whom must be added the Muslim workers in western Europe, so far as they have not been included in the figures for their respective countries of origin.

To conclude this survey, the figure of 525 million Muslims might be suggested for the year 1966, a year during which the total world population has been estimated at 3,356 million inhabitants. The Muslims would represent about one-sixth of all human beings, or slightly less.

Bibliography: Since the list of books concerning this subject is too long to be given in full, the reader is referred to the bibliographies relating to the different countries dealt with above.


J. JOMIER

ISLAM, ENCYCLOPAEDIAS of [see MAWSNY A.]

ISLAMABAD, the name given by the emperor Awrangzb (1618-1707) to several towns in India, for reasons not precisely known. All these towns were already included in the Mughal territories and were not freshly conquered from the Hindus to provide an excuse for their rechristening. Of these Cittagong [q.v.], now in East Pakistan, at the head of the Bay of Bengal, is still known occasionally in religious circles as Islamábád, the official name remaining the original Cittagong. Mathurá, on the river Yamuná, known for its numerous temples and Hindu shrines, was given the name Islamábád after a serious insurrection by Gokálá Dhá, a leading zamindar of the area, had been suppressed by the imperial forces under Hasan ‘Ali Khán, in 1806-1807. The name never became popular and the town continued to be known as Mathurá, although coins of gold, silver and copper were struck there with the mint name of Islamábád from the time of Awrangzb till the reign of Sháh ‘Álam II (reg. 1757/1759-1788/1789). Amanábád in the Kashmir valley, situated at 33° 44′ N. and 75° 12′ E. above a mile from the Nilaáb (Jhelum), also received the name Islamábád and is still known to the Muslims of the area by this name. Known for its shawls, spas and springs, it is not known when this new name was given to Amanábád or why. The fort of Cákana, near Poona, one of the strongholds of Sívádži, the Maharája chief, was named Islamábád after it had been taken by Awrangzb’s general Sháh ‘Álta Khán in 1753/1762, after bitter fighting.


ISLAMABÁD, the new capital of Pakistan [q.v.], was set up in 1960 on the recommendation of a special commission, headed by General Yáby Khán, then (1971) president of Pakistan. Situated between 33° 19′ and 33° 50′ N. and 72° 34′ and 72° 25′ E.,
some 8 miles from Rawalpindi, the general headquarters of the Pakistan army, the site elected “answers all questions relating to climate, landscape, communication, defence...”. Off the road to Murree, a nearby hill station, and spreading over an area of 351 sq. miles, consisting mostly of natural terraces, rising from 1700 to 2000 ft. above sea level, it is divided into 40 sectors, each measuring 800 acres, reserved for residential purposes. The climate is extreme, the temperature ranging 115°F in summer and dropping down to 27°F in winter. Rainfall is plentiful, but the area around is mostly arid and the town depends on supplies of fruit and vegetables from the plains. Construction work, started in 1961 under the Capital Development Authority, a statutory body, still continues and will take many more years to complete. In early 1970, 8,000 houses of various types had been constructed, accommodating more than 60,000 people, mostly government officials and their families. Schools and colleges, markets and shopping centres, hospitals and dispensaries, post and telegraph offices, cinemas, hotels and restaurants, public parks and other civic amenities have been provided. The Islámábád University, meant for advanced post-graduate studies in science and technology, has started functioning. A grand mosque, designed by a Turkish architect, and the practice began of mentioning the sultan's name before the khan's in the sanctuary roofed by tilted flat slabs, supported on double beams, will accommodate 100,000 persons.

The plan of the town is based on the principle of “dynapolis”, i.e., allowing for growth in scale and size. Practically all the government offices and ministries, including diplomatic missions, are now housed in Islámábád. The president of Pakistan, however, still lives in Rawalpindi.

A fast expanding town, the population is expected to reach the half million mark by 1980. Besides the President’s House and the National Assembly building, two major landmarks, provision has been made for setting up a national library, archaeological and war museums, national archives etc. Over a million trees have been planted all along the 125 miles of roads and boulevards to give colour to the landscape.


ISLÁM GIRÁY, the name of three Khans of the Crimea.

ISLÁM GIRÁY I (938/1532) was the son of Mengli Giráy [q.v.]. As the leader of the party wishing to follow an independent policy, he embarked on a struggle with his brother, the khan Sa’det Giráy, the appointee of the Ottoman sultan, enjoying the support of the Crimean tribal aristocracy, who wished to wage unrelenting war on the Russians. With this following, in 933/1527 he ravaged the region of Riazan and threatened Moscow. In 938/1532, Sa’det Giráy, assisted by the Ottoman governors of Kefe and Azak, brought him to battle but was defeated and fled to Istanbul (May). Islám Giráy did not dare, however, to defy the sultan, and so consented to serve as kälgháy [q.v.] to the new khan sent from Istanbul, Sâhib Giráy. As such, he made overtures of friendship to Moscow. Two months later he rebelled against the khan and withdrew into the steppe region of Or-Kapl. Defeated by Sâhib Giráy, he asked for pardon and was allowed to settle at Or-aghel. Soon afterwards he was killed in a raid by one of the mirázs, Bâşlî Beg.

ISLÁM GIRÁY II (992/1584-996/1588). Having lived as a hostage in Istanbul under Süleymán I and Selim II, he fell from favour upon the accession of Murâd III and withdrew to Konya, where he devoted himself to Mevlevi mysticism, but after the rebellion of Mehméld Giráy he was appointed khan, being escorted to the Crimea by an Ottoman squadron under the Kapudan Pascha. The mirázs acknowledged him as khan, and Mehméld Giráy, while attempting to take refuge with the Nogáys of the steppe, was taken and executed (Lhùl i-Kâtha 997/end of 1584). But Mehméld’s son Sa’det Giráy, with his Nogáy followers, defeated him, and he took refuge, wounded, in Kefe. With Ottoman support he defeated his rival (battle of Andal, 992/1584) and entered Bagh-esaray. A second uprising having failed, Sa’det Giráy finally fled to the Volga region. His brother Murâd, however, had gone to Moscow and returned, with Nogáy and Cossack followers, planning to attack the Crimea. The Ottoman sultan warned the czar against intervening and preparations were made for a campaign against Astrakhan, where Murâd’s force was gathered; but Murâd unexpectedly died. Thenceforward Islám Giráy made repeated raids into Russian territory (Krapînina taken, 995/1587). During Islám Giráy’s reign Ottoman suzerainty over the Crimea was strengthened, and the practice began of mentioning the sultan’s name before the khan’s in the “tribute” of the Khânaate. He died in Safar 997/December 1588, and was buried by the Ulu Dîmâf at Akkermán.

ISLÁM GIRÁY III (1054/1644-1064/1654), the eldest son of Selâmét Giráy, was, as a young man, taken prisoner by the Poles during a raid. Released after seven years, he settled at Yanbolu. In 1045/1635 Bahâdîr Giráy made him kâlhghây; and with this office he helped to preserve the Khânaate’s influence over the Manşûr tribe. When, on the death of Bahâdîr Giráy, Mehméld Giráy was appointed khan, Islám Giráy lost the office of kâlhghây, and was banished, first to Ka’fa-i Sultâniyye and then to Rhodes. Finally, thanks to the backing of Dîndî Khodja, [see Husavn Dîmpâr], he procured the khâluâtate in Rabî’ II 1054/June 1644. He applied himself first to restoring control over the Circassians by eliminating Hakhumaham, the beg of the Zhabun. He came into conflict with the uülgh-âgha (i.e., vizier) Sefer Ghazi, who had helped procure his elevation to the Khânaate, and the mirázs, which wished to engage in a policy of raids into Russian and Polish territory. In the first trial of strength (Radîb 1055/August 1645) they were defeated, but not crushed; and in 1057/1647 they succeeded in procuring Sefer Agha’s re-appointment as uülgh-âgha.

Successful raids made in 1055/6/1646-6 forced the czar to sign a treaty by which he undertook to send the annual “tribute” of uülgh-khâste and bîlebks and to put an end to Cossack raids on Azak and other Ottoman territory (text in V. Velyaminov-Zernov, Matériaux pour servir à l’histoire du Khanat de Crimée, St. Petersburg 1864, no. 104). A raid led by the beg of the Shîrin tribe into Russian territory in 1057/1647 was a failure, and there ensued a long period of peace between Russia and the Crimean Khânaate. As for Poland, a critical situation arose when the Cossacks of Zaporohz under Böghdan Khmelnitsky rebelled against the King of Poland and sought Crimean protection. In spite of protests from the Ottoman authorities, who wished to maintain the state of peace with Poland, Islám Giráy could not let this opportunity slip: he granted Khmelnitsky the rank of khan and put at his disposal a Crimean force of 4000 men under the Ur-beg Tukhâr.
These Cossack and Tatar troops won several victories over the Poles in Rabl on 11 May 1648, and the mediation of the khan enabled the Cossacks to conclude a very favourable treaty with the King of Poland (Treaty of Zborov, 1059/1649). Under pressure from the khan, Lubul, the voysoda of Boghdan (Moldavia) concluded an alliance with Khmelinsky (1606/1650), and in the following year the Ottoman sultan took him overtly under his protection; but in that year Khmelinsky and a Tatar army commanded in person by the khan were defeated by the Poles (there is no justification for attributing the defeat to treachery by the khan: Cambridge History of Poland, Cambridge 1950, 514). The Cossack-Tatar alliance was maintained until the conclusion of peace between Poland and the khanate on 24 Mubarram 1064/15 December 1653: in 1064/1653 Khmelinsky, while negotiating with the Ottoman sultan (who sent him a horsetail and standard, see Na’im, v. 278), was also seeking the protection of the czar.

İslam Giray died in Şahbâb 1064/June 1654.

Bibliography: See, for the dynasty in general, the bibliography to the article İGIRAY, and for details the articles İSLAM-İGIRAY I, II, III, in IA, fasc. 52, pp. 1104-8. (Halil Inalcı)

ISLÂM (See ISTANBUL.)

ISÌ, a river on the Algero-Moroccan borders, a sub-tributary on the left bank of the Tafna. Of little importance in itself, this river was the scene of several battles, since it constitutes an obstacle on the East-West route between Algeria and Morocco. Battles occurred here between the Marinds and the 'Abd al-Wàddids in 668/1270 and 670/1271, and above all there was the battle between the French troops under Maxime Bugeaud and the Moroccan troops commanded by Mawlay Muhammad, the son of Sultan Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahmân.

Bugeaud’s army consisted of some ten thousand men, the Moroccan army of about 30,000, more than two-thirds of whom were tribal cavalry. The vital part of the battle was fought during the morning of 14 August 1844 on the right bank of the river. The tactics and discipline of the French army, or rather of Bugeaud’s troops, were the same as they had been in the battle of the Marinds and the ‘Abd al-Wàddids, a very long way when dealing with an important person or a pejorative sobriquet (e.g., ‘Umar and ‘Amr); a proper name being by its nature definite, the tendency has always been to treat them as diplômes, and in present usage the case-ending tends to be suppressed. Furthermore, the usual indication of the feminine is not necessarily taken as such, and Tajz, for example, or Dîaryya are men’s names. In general only the names of the Prophet (Muhammad, al-Muṣṭafâ etc.) or of some of the figures of the early Islamic period (‘Umar, ‘Ali, ‘Uṯmân, etc.) have survived from among these ancient names, specimens of which will be found in Caskel, Gâmarat an-nasab des ibn Kalbi, Leiden 1664. b) Biblical names in their kûnânic forms: İbrâhîm = Abraham; İsâ = Jesus; Mûsâ = Moses; İsma’il = Ishmael. c) Compound names in two main patterns: i) ‘Abd (slave [of]) followed by Allâh or one of the divine names (see al-‘Abd al-Allâh); ii) the ancient theophorous names made up of ‘Abd and the name of a pagan divinity (‘Abd Manât etc.) have disappeared with Islam. ii. Allâh preceded by a construct substantive (e.g., Hibat Allâh “gift of God”)

d) Persian names drawn from old Iranian history and legend (e.g., Khusrâw, Djamshîd, Rustâm). e) Turkish names (Arslân, Tughrul, Timur). These were common in the period of the first Turkish migration into the Middle East and regularly appear (though much distorted in the orthography) as the names of military commanders in the medieval Arabic chronicles of Syria and Egypt. Thereafter they fell into disuse, but they were revived in modern Turkey under the influence of nationalist movements. They frequently consist of, or comprise, names of predatory animals and birds: Babur, (Bay)bars, (Al)parslan, Layt, Sonkur, (Er)göhrîf. They soon triumphed over the pejorative sobriquets’ wishes: Yeter (“enough”—after a succession of stillborn babies; the same root probably appears in ‘Abd ‘Ali, ‘Abd-Hasan), Satlmlîf (“he has been sold”—by a hitherto barren mother through a vow to a saint). f) Names of diverse origins, especially Berber and birds: Babur, (Bay)bars, (Al)parslan, Layt, Sonkur, (Er)göhrîf. They soon triumphed over the peasants’ wishes: Yeter (“enough”—after a succession of stillborn babies; the same root probably appears in ‘Abd ‘Ali, ‘Abd-Hasan), Satlmlîf (“he has been sold”—by a hitherto barren mother through a vow to a saint). f) Names of diverse origins, especially Berber and birds: Babur, (Bay)bars, (Al)parslan, Layt, Sonkur, (Er)göhrîf. They soon triumphed over the peasants’ wishes: Yeter (“enough”—after a succession of stillborn babies; the same root probably appears in ‘Abd ‘Ali, ‘Abd-Hasan), Satlmlîf (“he has been sold”—by a hitherto barren mother through a vow to a saint).

h) Names based on honorific titles (see labab, below).

3) The nasab or pedigree, a list of ancestors, each name being introduced by the word īm [q.v.], “son of”. The second name of the series is preceded by bînî, “daughter of”, if the first name is that of a woman. Muslim historians quote as many generations as they feel to be necessary and sometimes go back a very long way when dealing with an important person or in order to avoid confusion, but the usual practice is to limit the nasab to one or two ancestors. It is not uncommon for one or more of the ancestors in the list to be mentioned by a name other than his īm (e.g., ‘All b. Abî Tâlib). If, in the genealogical series, two persons bearing the same īm are known in history, the elatives al-‘abbar and al-asghar are sometimes used: Marwàn al-‘asghar b. Abî 9-Djântîb Yâhya b. Marwân al-‘abbar b. Abî Ḥaḍa. Converts whose natural fathers had not embraced Islam were conventionally given, especially in the Ottoman
period, the *nasab* Ibn 'Abd Allâh (or 'Abd and one of the divine names); but such a *nasab*, known to be fictitious, was employed only when custom demanded the use of one, e.g., in a legal attestation or epitaph.

In Persian the word *šbn* is usually omitted and replaced by the genitive particle -i: e.g., Hasan-i Šabbâb. In the Muslim lands generally, with the exception of Arabia and the Maghrib, *šbn* is no longer used, and the name and father's name are simply juxtaposed, Ahmad 'Ali 'Abd al-'Allâh, son of 'All. The Persians, followed by the Turks, often use *sadde* (son) added as a suffix to the father's name, *nisba* or title, which is placed before the *ism*: e.g., Kâdîzâde = "son of the judge"; ŞâhÎrî al-Manâzî-r-zâde = "son of the commentator on al-Manâdûr"; Pîrdîpâzâhîde = "son of Pîr Pasha". The Turkish word *oglu* is also used in the same way, but usually for noble or ruling families, rather than *'ilâmâ*: e.g., Mîkhâloğlu = "son of Mîkhâl". Many of these names in *sadde* and *oglu* have become surnames of a sort, borne by whole families and referring to a common ancestor rather than to an immediate progenitor: e.g., Köprüli-zâde, a name borne by a family claiming descent from the famous Ottoman viziers. In the same way the Arabic *šbn* may sometimes refer to an ancestor rather than a parent, and be used as a kind of a surname: e.g., Ibn Khâdîdîn, Ibn Baṭţîţa, Ibn Snîn, Ibn Āli (also Kemîkîzâde).

4) The *nisba* is an adjectival ending in -i, formed originally from the name of the individual's tribe or clan, then from his place of birth, origin or residence, sometimes from a *magâhab* or sect, and occasionally from a trade or profession. A man may thus have several *nisbas* which are normally given progressing from the general to the particular and in chronological order of residence: e.g., al-Kurayshî al-Hashimî al-Baghdâdî dîsama al-Mawjiî al-Sayrâîl = "of the tribe of Kuraysh, of the clan of Hashim, of the city of Baghdad and then Mosul, the moneychenger".

The speciality is often indicated at the end without the suffix 1: al-Ḫâfî. In Arabic the *nisba* is always preceded by the definite article (al-) which in Persian disappears. Among the Turks the place-*nisba*, with the ending -i (or -Îr), is normally placed at the beginning of a name; e.g., Târîfîl 'Ali Rîzâ, "the Smyriot Ali Riza". The *nisba* may be arbitrarily handed down from father to son, though its original relevance is lost.

These are the elements which normally make up a name. The *labâb* an honorific or descriptive epithet which is usually placed after the *nisba* and sometimes represents a nickname, often a title, might be added. In its original and simplest form it is a descriptive nickname usually referring to a physical characteristic: e.g., al-Ṭawâlî, "the tall", al-'Awar "the one-eyed", al-Aṭrâsh "the deaf". It follows the *ism*. These nicknames are felt to be less pejorative than the sobriquets (nabâz) such as al-Ḫîmrân "the ass" (= Marwân I).

*Labâbs* of a different sort were adopted as regnal names by the 'Abbâsid Caliphs of Baghdad (see B. Lewis, *The regnal titles of the first Abbasid Caliphs, in Dr. Zachir Husain Presentation volume*, New Delhi 1968, 13-22), and after them by most other Muslim rulers: e.g., al-Rashîd "the rightly guided", al-Mudawakkil ʿalî Ḥîlāb "who entrusts himself to God". At a later date Persian and Turkish *labâbs* are encountered, as well as Arabic: e.g., Dâhângîr "world seizer", Yıldırım "thunderbolt".

Independently of the names of the Kings of the Yemen, consisting of Dîhû followed by a substantive [see al-‘Anâwî], early on there appeared in Arabic nicknames composed of Dîhû (fem. Dîhât) and a noun in the dual commemorating a notable trait or deed: e.g., Dîhât al-Nîţâmîyân "the woman with the two waistbands" (= Arâmâ bint Abî Bakr); Dîhû 'l-Hîdârâtayn "the man who has been made the two *hîdrâs*" (= Dîhût-fâr b. Abî Ṭâlîb); Dîhû 'l-Ŷamînîyân "the ambi*ded*" (= Ťâhir b. al-Ŷusûn). Under the 'Abbâsid honorifics of the same type were given to high personages: e.g., Dîhû 'l-Kâmâlamayn "the man of the two pens", Dîhû 'l-Wizâratayn "the man of two victorizes".

From the end of the 3rd/9th century and especially from the 4th/10th *labâbs* of honour were bestowed by the Caliphs upon princes, statesmen, generals or high officers of state. These were usually compounds with *Dawla* ("State"), *Din* ("Faith") or both: e.g., Bâd-âr al-Dîn "full moon of the Faith"; Nâşîr-âl-Dawla "Defender of the State". Similar compounds may be formed with *Mulûk* ("Kingdom") (Nuşám al-Mulûk "Order of the Kingdom"), with *Iståm* (Sayîl al-Iståm ("Sword of Islam") etc. Many persons are known principally by their *labâbs*, e.g., Salâdîn (= Šâlîb al-Dîn).

In the course of time many of these *labâbs* ceased to be titles borne only by ruling princes and their officers, and became little more than personal names. In the Ottoman period the members of the *'ilâmâ* were usually known by a combination of *labâb* and *ism*, with a tendency for each *ism* to be linked with a specific *labâb*: e.g., Sinân al-Dîn Yûsuf, Mûbîy al-Dîn Muḥâmmad (see F. Babinger, in *İsl.,* xi). The carefully graded honorifics employed in Islamic chanceries in addressing members of the "religious" and "secular" institutions and foreign rulers and ambassadors, corresponding to the *inscriptive* of European diplomatic practice, were known by the plural of *labâb*, *alâb* (Turkish *elâb*). These, understandably, became progressively more elaborate, so that manuals drawn up for the guidance of chancery clerks usually contain a section devoted to them (e.g., Ferîldîn, *Munîşâdî al-Sâldîn*, i, 2-13) (see *Diplomatic*).

The use of nicknames of various types was encouraged in the Ottoman Empire by the fact that so many prominent personages—not to speak of the whole corps of Janissaries, etc., for whom payrolls had to be kept—were of non-Muslim origin, so that a dozen men with the same *ism* could not be distinguished, as could the Muslim-born, by their *nasâs.* By Turkish syntax, a nickname usually precedes the *ism*, while a title, arising from the individual's actual rank or employment—*Pasha*, *Agha*, *Miûferifîka*, *Reîs* (for sea-capitains). *Cauwugh*, etc.—usually follows it. The apparent exceptions are Sulûn, which invariably precedes the name of the ruler (but follows the name of a princess or of a few conspicuous saints), and *Shehzâde*, "prince"; but here too the word when preceding may be in origin a nickname and when following a "title of honour".

Nicknames may be *nisâs*, either referring in the strict sense to a town (Filîbelî, Edeznella, etc.) or family (Sokolûa), or vaguely to a race or people (Turks, Čerkes, *Arab* which in Turkish usually means "nègro"); they may refer, sometimes, unusually, to personal characteristics: Uzûn ("tall"), Sarf ("fair"), Tabânt-yassî ("flat-footed"); they may be bestowed posthumously by chroniclers: Maştûl "(the executed)", Khîrîn ("the traitor"), Hezârprâh ("hacked to pieces"); they may refer to the individual's position or employment: Nîshântîlî, Miîmâr, Dâmâd, and frequently (and somewhat confusingly) may survive from a former employment, for example in the
Palace service: Lala ("tutor [to a prince]"), Silibdar ("sword-bearer" [to the sultan, while a page]); they may be a religious appellation Hāddīdī, Aḥbāb, Sūfū, Gāvūr, etc.

Even the sultans are usually distinguished by nicknames rather than regnal number: Fāṭih Mehemmed [II], "Genē" Oṭğmān [II], "Avğlī" Mehemmed [IV]. When the nickname follows the ism, contrary to the rule in Turkish, we probably have a suppressed Persian ḏafet: Mehemmed [-I] Fāṭih, Bāyezīld [-I] Well [II].

In the late 10th/16th century there was a transitory fashion, especially in the chancery, for the adoption of "Iranian" names (zād, above) (thus the famous Ferdlūn is called in his wūfīye "Aḥmed Ağa ... al-Šahīr bi-Ferdūdin Ağa"), and also for the use of just one letter of the personal name, e.g., Dāl Elendi, for Dāl-i Mehemmed, cf. "Ayn-i ʿAllî, Lām-i ʿAllî (U. Heyd. Ottoman documents on Palestine, Oxford 1960, 16 and note).

A Turkish custom is the ǧobek adī, "navel name". This is a name given to a new-born child by the midwife as she cuts the umbilical cord; it is invariably a good "Muslim" name, such as Mehemmed or ʿAllī for boys, Fāṭima or ʿAyyūhe for girls. The explanation for it may be that since it is considered unlucky to choose a name before the birth, this provisional name is given at the very inception of the infant's independent existence in order to ensure that if it does not live it will have died a Muslim. The ǧobek adī is in practice not used, being superseded by the esan (< ad̄lān) adī, the regular ism, which, having been chosen at leisure by the family, is bestowed, with a recitation of the ad̄lān, a few days later (usually after three days, but avoiding the insidious Tuesday). Another Turkish custom is to change a baby's name if it does not thrive or is feeble. In Turkey, and particularly in the country districts, regular Islamic names may take on barely recognizable hypocoristic forms: Muṣṭafā > Mīstık, Fāṭima > Fādīk, Mehemmed > Mem or Memi, Sālum > Sīlū, İbrâhîm > İbīd, etc.

Among other onomastic elements the most important is the ṭakabīl or pen-name adopted by a poet or writer, e.g., Fīrdausī "the Paraisiac".

A person may be mentioned by one or more of these components, or by several of them at the same time; there are no fixed rules, and only usage seems to decide, although there is not always unanimity upon a single appellation. Thus the poet usually called Abū Nuwās is sometimes referred to by the name al-Ḥasan b. Hānī or by the nisba, al-Ḥakamī. In the biographical works the authors class persons according to their ism in order to avoid confusion, and indicate the kumya, the nisba, and the ṭakab after the nasab, specifying at the same time the name most commonly used. Thus the biography of Ibn al-Kāḷānīṣī, the author of the Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades, whose full name is Abū Yaʿlā Hamza b. Abad b. ʿAll b. Muhammad al-Tamāmī al-Dimashkī al-ʿAṣmī ibn al-Kāḷānīṣī (the father of Yaʿlā), Hamza the son of Ṣaad the son of ʿAll the son of Muḥammad, of the tribe of Tamām, of the city of Damascus, the Chief (of the Chancery), the son of the hatter), will be found under Ḥamza b. Abad.

None of these components strictly speaking amounts to a surname, though in practice the ṭakab or nisba or maʃīfā (as in the case of Ibn al-Kāḷānīṣī [see below]) is sometimes so used.

In the contemporary Orient the custom is to use two names the first of which is a sort of personal name, the second being usually the father's name. It may, however, be equally the name of a grandfather or remoter ancestor, or a second personal name adopted by choice or given in the family, at school, in the army, etc., or one of the above mentioned categories. The use of surnames is spreading among the upper classes, and the introduction of compulsory registration in several Islamic countries will accelerate their adoption. In Turkey (1934) and Persia the adoption of a surname was imposed by law. (En.)

ISM (I.), "name", is the technical term used in Arabic grammar to signify the noun. Ism is a biliteral and, as such, belongs to a very ancient linguistic stock (see H. Fleisch, Traité de la philologie arabe, i, § 52 b) it has been given a w as a third radical consonant so that it may be included in the scheme of morphological formations: broken pl. asma', denominative verb: samād, yasmād, more frequently samā, yusamād, "to call, name". Of the Arab grammarians, the Kūfians derive ism from wasm "sign" (/wɑsm/). The Basrans from sumumw "elevation" (/ʃmɑw/) (see their discussions, Ibn al-Anbārī, K. al-Ismāʾ, ed. G. Weil, first question discussed).

Ism is the first term of the great tripartite division: ism, fišl, harf, which begins the ʿiṣbāwīyī or his name (see wa, and in E. I. ism). Sibwayhi gives no definition of ism; he merely gives examples: raṭjul "man", faras "horse", ḏārī "wall". Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1004) records (al-Šāhībī, 82-3, ed. Beirut 1982/1963) the definitions suggested by the masters who followed: al-Ākhfash (disciple of Sibwayhi), al-Kīsā (d. 189/865), al-Farrā (d. 207/822), Hīšām al-Darfīr (d. 209/824), al-Mubarrad (d. 285/904), al-Zājdāḏ (d. 310/922). None satisfies Ibn Fāris. In fact, these masters, except the last, do not give a true definition, but a description of the noun in its grammatical relationships; thus al-Farrā says: "the noun (ism) is that which admits the tanmūn, the ṭidāfā (construct) or alif̄ and lām (the article)". Ibn al-Anbārī also records another definition of al-Mubarrad (op. cit., 2, 1. 20) and the definition of Thaʾlab (d. 291/904) (ibid., 1. 4). As Ibn al-Anbārī himself says (ibid., ii, 10-11), concerning al-Mubarrad, their dicta might serve for an etymology (ṭabīk) but not for a definition. With al-Zājdāḏ (d. 310/922), on the contrary, we find a true definition of the noun, but here it is under the influence of Greek logic.

Aristotle, in the Organon, in the Peri Hermēneias (the De Interpretatione, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, Oxford 1956), gives the two following definitions: for the noun (16a, 19-20): onomā (a noun) esti (is) phōnē (a sound) stēmānikh (with meaning) kata sunthēkēn (by agreement) aneu khrōnou (without time), and he adds: "no part of which has meaning in isolation"; for the verb (16b, 6-9): rhēma (a verb) esti (is) to prossēmēnon (that which indicates also) khrōnon (a time) (i.e.; that which, in addition to its proper meaning, contains the indication of a time), and he adds the same remark as for the noun.

The Aristotelian definition of the noun is found in that of al-Zājdāḏ: sawest mukatā'a mafẖūm dālā ʿalā maʃnā, ghayr dālā ʿalā zamān wa-li mākan: fōnhē, here sawest, is qualified by mukatā'a "cut off [from others]", mafẖūm "understood", dālā ʿalā maʃnā stēmānikh; for aneu khrōnou, the exclusion of place is added to that of time; kata sunthēkēn is omitted; it refers to the large question of the origin of language, whether by institution (tanmūn wa-li yidkēb) or by revelation (wa-la tawddūʿ wa-tawdk̇ih). The Arab definition that, with some variants, subsequently became the general one is given by al-
Strafi (d. 368/978) in the Šahr of the Kitab (Ms Cairo, ii, 134): *kullshay* dalla lafzuh 'alma *nafsih* ghayr mubiar min modiyiy aw ghayrh fa-huwa ism (1st part, 7 end), “everything the expression of which indicates a meaning unconnected with a specific time, past or otherwise, is a noun”.

This definition qualifies the preceding one by indicating a *samdan mubassal* “a specific time”, but that is not enough to satisfy Ibn Faris’s objection, (al-Sâhibî, 84, l. 13-15), that al-Zâdîjâdî’s definition of the noun is equally valid for the *harf*. Al-Zamakhşarî (d. 538/1143) omits the qualification mubassal (Mufassal, ed. J. P. Broch, § 2) [see *rīl*], but adds *fi nafsih “in itself”: *al-isam ma’la *nafsih* fi nafsih dalalâtn modiyar-dabn *‘an al-ıbtîrân. Al-Djurjânî (d. 816/1413) (Ta’rîfî, 15) explains simply what is to be understood by this absence of *bithrân*: *al-isam mà *dalla *alma “nafsih* ghayr mubiar bi-ahad al-asmar al-thalîna.

Remarks: the philosopher al-Fârâbî (d. 390/999), in the Šahr Aristotle’s *fi l-‘ibdra* (the Peri Hermeneias) (ed. W. Kutsch and S. Marrow, Beirut 1960), 29, l. 25-26, prescribes, concerning ane *hronou* (translated: *modiyaradu min al-sâmân “deprived of time”), the addition of *bi-dhdtîh wa-bi-shaklih “by itself and its form” if it is necessary because of the fear of modiyîn al-mughdlitûn, “attacks of the *Sophists*”; if not, it should be omitted. But, in the definition of al-Zamakhşarî, *fi nafsih* was introduced in order to separate *ism* from *harf*.

It is, incidentally, strange to note that grammarians such as Abû ‘Ali al-Fârîst (d. 377/987) and Ibn Djinnt (d. 392/1002), who must have been aware of al-Strafi’s Šahr to the Kitâb, adhered, as far as the noun (and the verb) were concerned, to definitions of the type of those of al-Zâdîjâdî’s predecessors: Abû ‘Ali Idrîs (Ms Cairo, ii, 81), 5: Ibn Djinnt, *Luma* (Ms Berlin 646) 2.

The definitions of the noun and verb that became general in the Arab grammarians appear to derive from Greek logic. It has, besides, been adequately shown under *rīl* how unjustified the tense-system of the type of those of al-Zâdîjâdî’s predecessors: Abû ‘Ali Idrîs (Ms Cairo, ii, 81), 5: Ibn Djinnt, *Luma* (Ms Berlin 646) 2.

Because of the great tripartite division referred to above, Arab grammarians included under the *ism* first the noun proper: *ism al-djîns “common noun”, *ism al-sâlam “proper noun” [see *sâlam*], *ism al-ayn “concrete noun”, *ism al-mawd “abstract noun”, then *ism al-fâl “nomen agentis (active participle)” and *ism al-mak “nomen patientis (passive participle)”*. These two are, strictly speaking, *sîfa* [see *sîfa*]; the adjective (*sîfa* musubbaba) is assigned to the *sîfa*; the *sîfa* and its extensions are called *sîfâ*, in its use as a metaph. Then al-mâdhar “infinitive”, and all the nomino-verbal derivatives: *ism al-sâmân wa-l-mâdhân “noun of time and place”, etc. Then the pronouns: the personal pronouns: *al-mudmarî [see *mudmar*], the demonstrative pronoun: *ism al-isghâra, the relative pronoun: *al-ism al-mawdî*, collectively called *al-mudhârât*. Then the numerals, the noun of number: *ism al-‘adad. All these categories will be found in the Tables of the Mufassal referred to above (212-3), with references to the text and a still further devel-

oped nomenclature in Wright’s *Ar. Gr.* 2 (1, 104-10).

The Arab grammarians found an *ism* in the interrogatives: *kyay* “how?”, *ayna “where?”, *kam “how much?”, *matâ “when?”, in *îdâ *idâh (generally conjunctions), in *haythu “where” (Ibn Fâris, *ibid.*; for *kam, Sbawahî, i, 250, l. 13, ed. Paris; for *matâ, Ibn Hîshâm, Muğmî 1-latholic, s.v.)*. Finally, they included in the *asmâ* al-afâl “verbal nouns” expressions that would seem to us to be interjections or exclamatory locutions, or even onomatopoeia, when they perceived in them some verbal action, particularly an imperative sense, see §§ 182-99 of the Mufassal.

Bibliography in the text; in addition: *Dict. of Tech. Terms*, i, 710, l. 24-715, l. 18; the K. al-âmasîl al-bâlîyya fi l-nâhuw of Abu l-Bâkàî *Abd Allâh al-Ukbarî (d. 616/1220) (Ms Cairo, i, 158) contains a discussion of the definition of *ism* (2nd question) and of the etymology (ishkîbî) of *ism* (4th question); in the latter, like the Bayrans, he derived *ism* from *sumuw*, in the former, he attributes to Ibn al-Sarrajî (d. 316/929), a contemporary of al-Zâdîjâdî (d. 310/922), a definition of *ism* so sophisticated that it appears improbable: *huwa kull lasf dalla *alma* nafsih, ghayr mubiar bi-sâmân mubâssal (93 r, lines 4-5) As a matter of fact, in al-Muâsîrî *fi l-nâhuw*, Beirut 135/1965, 2, Ibn al-Sarrajî states that the definition of *ism* of the type of those of al-Zâdîjâdî’s predecessors. (H. Fleisch)

*ISMA*, as a theological term meaning immunity from error and sin, is attributed by Sunnîs to the prophets and by Shi’is also to the imâms. In early Islamic moral failures and errors of Muhammad were freely mentioned, although there was an inconsistent tendency to minimize them. The definition of imam as the divinely appointed and in particular to deny that he had ever participated in the worship of idols. The term and the concept of *ism* do not occur in the Kur’ân or in canonical Sunnî *Hadîth*. They were first used by the Imâmî Shi’â, who at least since the first half of the 2nd/8th century maintained that the imâm as the divinely appointed and guided leader and teacher of the community must be immune (ma’sum) from error and sin. This doctrine has always been a cardinal dogma of Imâsmism. While the early Imâmî theologian Hîshâm b. al-Hakam (d. 179/795-6) restricted this impecabili-

ty to the imâms, holding that prophets might disobey the commands of God and then would be criticized by a revelation, later Imâmî doctrine always ascribed it equally to prophets and imâms. The extent of the immunity was gradually ex-

The views of the tradicionalist scholars of Kumm, affirmed that prophets and imâms, though fully immune from major (kabrib) and minor (saghdib) sins, were liable to inadvertence (sakw), which God might induce in them in order to demonstrate to mankind that they were merely human. His opinion was refuted by Shaykh al-Mufîd (d. 413/1022), who held that prophets and imâms after their vocation were immune from inadvertence and sin, while admitting that they (except for the Prophet Mu-

hammad) might have committed minor, not disgraceful (ghayr mustubhâfa) sins before their vocation. Al-Mufîd’s disciple al-Shârîf al-Murtagâ (d. 436/1044), who wrote a book on the impecabili-

ty of the prophets and imâms, held that they were fully immune both before and after their vocation. This has become the accepted Imâmî doctrine, later expressly including immunity from inadvertence. It is, however, admitted that imâms may chose the less com-
commendable alternative or neglect commendable super-
erogatory acts. 'isma is commonly defined as a kind-
ness (luff) bestowed by God and, as in Sunni doctrine,
is not a natural quality of prophets and imams. It does
cannot incapacitate to commit acts of disobe-
dience and thus does not invalidate the rights of
prophets and imams to reward.

The Ismālī doctrine of the 'isma of imams and
prophets is shared by the Ismā'īliya. The Zaydiya
do not consider 'isma a qualification of the imām,
though some later Zaydi authorities have attributed
it to 'All, al-Hasan and al-Husayn specifically.

Outside Shi'a the 'isma of the prophets was first
and most consistently upheld by the Mu'tazila. Al-
ready al-Nazzām in the late 2nd/8th century taught
the impeccableability of the prophets, and by the time of
al-Ash'ārī immunity from unbelief and from major
sins both before and after the prophetic mission was
considered the unanimous doctrine of the Mu'tazila.
There was some dispute as to whether prophets might
commit minor sins consciously or not. While al-
Nazzām held that the sins of prophets reported in the
Kūrān could arise only from inadvertence or errone-
ous interpretation (tazil) of God's commands, al-Dījābīs maintained that they have must have been com-
mittled knowingly, since unconscious infraction of the
divine law in his view was not sinful. In the classical
discipline since the two al-Dījābīs the extent of the
immunity was defined as including all major sins and
minor sins "causing aversion" (munāffira). This de-
inition resulted from the premise that prophecy
was an act of kindness incumbent on God for the
guidance of mankind and must be protected by Him
from any impediments to its effectiveness. Abū ʿAll
al-Dījabbī (d. 309/920-6) asserted that even minor
actions, if committed by a prophet, must be consid-
ered as causing aversion and admitted only sins by inadver-
tence or erroneous interpretation. Abū Ḥāṣim (d. 321/
933) and the majority of later scholars held that inten-
tional minor sins were not necessarily "causing aver-
sion". The immunity applied equally to the time be-
fore and after the mission, though Abū ʿAll al-Dījabb-
ī was not quite consistent in rejecting major sins before
the mission.

Ash'ārī doctrine on the 'isma of the prophets varied,
generally moving from a negative attitude toward
wider affirmation. Scholars with traditionalist leanings
were more reserved in affirming the sinlessness
of the prophets, since this conflicted with a
literal acceptance of passages in the Kūrān and
Hadīth. The view later ascribed to al-Ashʿari, that
prophets were immune from error and sin after,
but not before, their mission is probably not authen-
tic. It reflects, however, the later common Ashʿari
doctrine, which restricted the immunity to the time
after the mission, admitting both major and minor
sins, though not unbelief, before it. Concerning the
extent of immunity after the mission the views differ-
ed. Abū ʿIṣāḥ al-Iṣākṣiyhī and the later school doctrine.
Abū ʿIṣāḥ al-Iṣākṣiyhī's denial of a
rational basis of the claim of 'isma of the prophets beyond immunity from inten-
tional lying in the transmission of the divine message,
admitting the possibility of errors by inadvertence
or forgetfulness. The latter admission was rejected
by his contemporary Abū ʿIṣāḥ al-Iṣākṣiyhī and
the later school doctrine. Abū ʿIṣāḥ al-Iṣākṣiyhī's denial of a
rational basis of the claim of immunity from sin was
commonly accepted by later doctrine, though major
sins were excluded on the basis of revealed texts
(samāʿ) or consensus. Ibn Fārak (d. 406/1015) held that
prophets may commit minor sins intentionally, but
not major sins. It is thus evident that 'Abd al-Qāhir
al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037) expresses his wish rather
than the fact in claiming an Ashʿari consensus af-
firming the immunity of prophets from all sins after
their mission. After him al-Dījāwīn (d. 478/1085)
stated as his personal view that prophets commit
minor sins, and al-Dījāwīn's disciple al-Ghazālī affirmed
that prophets commit sins and are obliged to
ask God for forgiveness. Even Fakhr al-Dīn al-
Rāzī (d. 606/1209), who argued at length for the
isma of prophets on rational grounds, admitted unintentional minor sins after, and major sins
before, their mission. Against the Ashʿari school tradi-
tion, full immunity of the prophets was upheld by
the Kādī Ḥyād (d. 544/1149) and al-Subkī (d. 771/
1370), the former expressly including the time be-
fore the mission.

Māturīdī doctrine generally was more positive in
claiming sinlessness for the prophets. Although some
Māturīdī scholars admitted minor sins in prophets,
others, especially those of Samarkand, strictly denied
all sins including "slips" (mallātī). No difference was
made between the time before and after the mission.
The importance given to the doctrine of 'isma is re-
lected by the fact that it is usually included in
Māturīdī creeds in contrast to Ashʿārī and Hanbal
creeds. Under the Sāljuq the charge of imputing
sins both before and after the prophetic mission was
become the standard doctrine of the Imāmīs, with
the isolation of the Imāmīs from the mainstream
of the school's theology.

Particular views on 'isma were developed in Sūfī
circles in connection with their doctrine of mystical
sainthood. Some Sūfis from al-Dījāwīn (d. 298/920) to
Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 638/1240) have attributed virtually
complete impeccability, far beyond the common
Sunnī doctrine, to Muhammad as the ideal Sūfī saint.

'isma was also often, against some dissent, attribu-
ted by Sunnī, Muʿtazilī, and Shiʿī theologians to
the angels.

Bibliography: al-Ashʿārī, Māhālāl al-Islāmīyyīn, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1929-33, 44 f.,
226 f.; al-Muṣīf, Aḥwāl al-māhālāl, Tabriz 1371, 29 f., 35, 117; idem, Taṣawwī al-Fīlād, Tabriz 1371,
60-2; al-Sāghīr al-Murtādī, Tanūṣ al-anbīyā, al-Nādirī (ed.: W. R. Müller: (trans.), Al-Bābu
'l-Ḥādī 'l-ʿAshgār... by... Ibn al-Mubāhak al-Ḫullī, London 1928, 64-8: al-Majīlī, Bihār an-nawār,
Tabriz 1303-5, vi, 268-9, vii, 228-35, 265; al-Khayyāt, Al-İstiʿārāt, ed. H. S. Nyberg, Cairo 1925, 95-6;
ʿAbd al-Dījābīr al-ʿAsadābādī, al-Muḥkāmī, xvi, ed. M. al-Khūdāyīrī and M. M. Kāsim, Cairo
1965, 279-316; Ibn Ḥazīm, Al-Fīqāl fi l-mīlāl wa l-nīlāl, Cairo 1317-21, 1, 15-25: Baghdādī, Fārāb,
210; idem, Usūl al-dīn, Istanbul 1928, 167-9; al-Dījāwīn, al-İršād, ed. M. Y. Mīšīk and ʿA. A.
ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo 1935, 338 f.; al-Kāt
ISMA'IL, the biblical Ishmael, is already mentioned in four places in the Qur'ān which date from before the Hijrā, in a list of holy men of antiquity: in Sūra XIX, 54 f. it is said of him: "He was one who spoke the promise truly, and was a prophet. He enjoined upon his people the prayer and the almsgiving, and was in his Lord's eyes approved"; in Sūra XXXXVIII, 48 he is connected together with Elisha (al-Yasa') and Dhu 'l-Kifās as "one of the good"; in Sūra XXI, 85 f. together with 1drīs and Dhu 'l-Kifā as "one of the patiently enduring and the righteous, whom God caused to enter into his mercy"; in Sūra VI, 86 it is said of Ismā'īl, Elisha (al-Yasa'), Jonas and Lot, that "God gave each one a preference above the worlds". These references to Ismā'īl and others are, in each case, part of a larger context where the question of who is the true son of Abraham is raised.

As a centre of pilgrimage and make it a place of the pure monotheistic faith (Sūra II, 127-9). In so far as Isaac is also named, Ismā'īl is given precedence as Abraham's son (Sūra XIV, 39; II, 132 f.; II, 136 = III, 84; II, 140; IV, 163). In the interpretation of the relevant passages, chronological difficulties indeed arise. Sūra XIV, 35-41, in which Abraham champions the security of the holy territory of Mecca and (verse 39) prays God for having given him Ismā'īl and Isaac in spite of his great age, is usually attributed to the third Meccan period. And in Sūra XXXXVII, which is even attributed to the second Meccan period, the birth of Isaac is first mentioned in verses 112 f., so that it must be assumed that the preceding verses 100-7, which also deal with a son of Abraham and with his (intended) sacrifice, refer to Ismā'īl. Consequently there would already be evidence for the connexion between Ismā'īl and Abraham from the period before the Hijrā in two passages. Edmund Beck, however, who has critically examined the problem, takes Sūra XIV, 39 to be a Medinan interpolation and he supposes that even in the two verses II, 125 and 127, which are no doubt Medinan, the name of Ismā'īl is a later addition. Thus he concludes that Ismā'īl was first connected with Abraham in the Medinan period (Le Muston, lxv (1952), 80-3). Beck does not commit himself concerning Sūra XXXXVII (see above); Richard Bell, however, does consider the section which deals with the sacrifice of Abraham's son (verses 102-7) as a later Medinan addition, and further concludes that verse 101 ("So we felicitated him with a mild-tempered youth") "probably referred to Isaac, but when Ishmael began to assume importance to Mohammed, it was taken as referring to him, and verses 112 and 113 (Annunciation of Isaac) added". However these explanatory attempts by Beck and Bell may now be regarded, Ismā'īl in any case takes a subordinate part in the kūrānic legend concerning the foundation and purification of the cult of the Ka'bah. It is true that he is numbered among the patriarchs who have been given revelations (Sūra II, 136 = III, 84; IV, 163), but the leading part remains reserved for Abraham; for these matters, therefore, see Ismā'īl. Remarkably enough, there is no further hint in the Qur'ān—nor in the brief hint in Sūra XIV, 37—still no reference to the genealogical role which, according to Genesis XVI and XXV (and later also according to Arabic-Islamic tradition), fell to Ismā'īl as a connecting link between the Israelites (Jews) and the Arabs. He is considered only as the son of Abraham, and in Sūra II, 133 is mentioned together with Abraham and Isaac as one of the "Fathers" of Jacob.

The commentaries on the Qur'ān, the "stories of the prophets" (Kisāʾ al-anbāʾiyyāt), and the universal histories give various details concerning the part played by Ismā'īl in the building of the Ka'bah and the introduction of the pilgrimage ceremonies (here Ismā'īl plays the same subordinate role as in the Qur'ān). The story of the sacrifice of Abraham's son also is further elaborated, whereby the question of whether this son is to be identified with Ismā'īl or Isaac remains open. The many divergent accounts from Ismā'īl's early youth and married life are more detailed. The expulsion of Hagar and her child Ismā'īl is described in accordance with Jewish tradition (which for its part goes back to Genesis XXI). According to Islamic tradition, Abraham does not simply send them both into the desert, but accompanies them himself as far as Mecca. There of course, he leaves them to their fate, since he has to go back to his wife Sarah. Hagar, full of pity for the
thirsty child, runs back and forth between the two hills al-Safa and al-Marwa—the origin of the later pilgrimage ceremony of the Sa'ya [q.v.]. Meanwhile, however, the little Isma'il scratches the sand and thus helps the spring of Zamzam to break through. Thereupon the Arab tribe of Djurhum settles in the neighbourhood with the permission of Hagar, and, in the absence of Isma'il, the latter's second wife, is hospitably welcomed by her, and, leaves behind for his son the request, similarly coded, that he should maintain the marriage with her. On a third visit Abraham calls on Isma'il to help him in the building of the Ka'ba (see above). After his death Isma'il is buried near his mother Hagar in al-Hidrj inside the Haram.

By the post-kur'ânic tradition Isma'il becomes linked with Mecca and the Arab world even more closely than by the Kur'ân. He is said to have learned Arabic (from the Djurhum). In the genealogical trees which the Arab genealogists have drawn up, he is counted as the ancestor of the northern Arab tribes in Rabî' II 1205/De- resistance, stormed Isma'il in Rabî' II i205/De-


**ISMA'IL** (Isma'il), an Ottoman fortress town situated in the Budjak [q.v.] region of Bessarabia, on the left bank of the Kilia river of the Danube. Ewliyã Celebi states that a certain Isma'il lived in this area under Ottoman domination in 889/1484 at the time when Sultan Bâyazid II took Kilia and Ak-Kermân from Moldavia. Evidence dating from 977/1568-9 (cf. Uzançcıgil, IV, 526, note 1) indicates that a small fort (palanka) was built at Isma'il in that year, craftsmen from Wallachia and Moldavia being summoned to share in the work of construction. In 1003/1595, during the long war of 1001/1593-1015/1606 between the Ottoman Empire and Austria, Isma'il fell to a mixed force of Transylvanians, Moldoviots and Wallachians under the command of "Andrea Barzai" (cf. Hurmuzâki, III/ii, 95). A few years later Georgius Dousas was to describe the town as noted for its trade in fish—Smieli uberrima est optimorum piscium captura, atque eo vilitas. Isma'il suffered from Cossack raids in 1010-1011/1620 and in 1033-1034/1624. Ewliyã Celebi, recounting his travels in the year 1067/1657, gives some details of interest about Isma'il. He notes that it had a superintendent of customs (gêmûrik emîni), but no fortress commandant, since there was no fort there (bafe olmâdghîndân dinârî yolûd). The town contained two thousand houses (khânê), with a population of Muslims (located in three distinct areas—ûçîlâm makhâlesîs), Greeks, Armenians and Jews. Tatars inhabited the regions adjacent to the town. Isma'il conducted a flourishing trade in such products as butter, cheese, salt from Wallachia (çîfak ûzv), grain, sugar, salt, coffee, grain, tobacco, wines, silk and lead, etc. A thick thousand waggon loads of fish pickled in brine (balkal sahalamargas) went each year, through Isma'il, to Poland and to the territories of Moscow. State-owned fisheries existed along the banks of the Danube. Isma'il had also a market where white slaves of either sex might be found for sale. A little more than a hundred years later de Tott, passing through the Budjak in 1821-1825, observed that Isma'il was an entrepôt pour la traite des grains par le Danube and also a centre for the manufacture of châgrins de Turquie, i.e., of shagreen. Isma'il, standing at the junction of routes from Galatz, Khotin (Choctzim), Bender and Kilia, became a fortress of importance during the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries as a result of the confrontation between Russia and the Ottoman Empire in the lands bordering the Black Sea. Russian troops under Ismail (its fortifications now demolished), was a stronghold designed to function as a base controlling large forces. The Russians, under the command of Suvorov and in the face of a desperate resistance, stormed Isma'il in Rabî' II 1205/Decem...
Ismā'īl was related, through both his mother and his grandmother, to the Ak Koyunlu rulers, the Safavid Ak Koyunlu alliance had broken down during the lifetime of his father Haydar [128], and Ismā'īl, while still an infant, was arrested with his elder brothers ʿAli and Ibrāhīm, and imprisoned for 4½ years in the fortress of Iṣṭaḥḵr in Fārs (end of Rabīʿ II 894/March 1490—end of Shawwāl 898/August 1493). Civil war broke out between rival Ak Koyunlu princes, and one of them, Rustam, made use of Safavid support to defeat one of his rivals (Shawwāl 898/August 1493). In 899/1494 Rustam, realizing that a powerful popular support for the Safawids constituted a threat to his own position, had Ṣalāḥ killed. Ismā'īl fled to Ardabil and thence to Gīlān.

For nearly five years (899/1494-905/1499), Ismā'īl remained in hiding at Lāhīdǰān, where he had been given sanctuary by the local ruler. During this time he maintained close contact with his murīds in Rūm, Kārākūn, ʿAdhārbaḏyān, and elsewhere. Since these murīds, also known as kizilbāš [q.v.], were mainly Turcoman tribesmen, Ismā'īl in order to make the Safavid daʿwa more effective, addressed them simple verses in their own Turkish dialect, using the tokhallas of Khatāʾī [see below]. In 905/1499 Ismā'īl emerged from Gīlān to make his bid for power, and the following year some 7,000 Sūfīs of the Safavid ārbaša assembled at Erīrīndān. After a campaign in Shīrūn in which Ismā'īl avenged the deaths of his father and grandfather (see Ṣawṟūn), he defeated a large Ak Koyunlu army under Alwand at the decisive battle of Sharār. This victory gave Ismā'īl control of ʿAdhārbaḏyān, and in 907/1501 he was crowned at Tabrīz.

Ismā'īl spent the next decade extending the Safavid empire: Fārs and Ṣurkh-čād Ādījam were conquered in 908-9/1503; Māzandarān and Gūrgān, and ʿYāzd, in 909/1504; Dīl, in 911/1507; Bagdād and Ṣurkh-čād ʿArab in 914/1510 (the local rulers of Khūzestān, Luristān and Kurdistān acknowledged his suzerainty); Shīrūn in 915/1509-10. Finally, on 30 Ṣaḥāb 916/December 1510, Ismā'īl routed the Shīrāz Ūzbeks in a great battle at Marv. A few days later, Ismā'īl entered Harāt, and proceeded to consolidate his conquest of Khūzestān.

The following year, 917/1511, Safavid troops penetrated as far as ʿAmār-i Shāhli, and in support of the Timūrid prince Būḥar, who was hoping, with their aid, to recover his Transoxanian dominions. Any idea Ismā'īl may have entertained of annexing Transoxania to the Safavid empire was dashed in 918/1512, when a powerful Ūzbek army swept the Safavid expeditionary force back across the Oxus. This was followed by an uneasy truce with the Ūzbeks which lasted some eight years, but Ismā'īl proved himself unable to arrive at a permanent solution to the problem of the defence of the north-east frontier.

By 916/1510, therefore, the whole of Persia was in Ismā'īl's hands, but the establishment of a militant Shiʿite state on the Ottoman border constituted a challenge which Sultan Selīm could not afford to ignore, and in 920/1514 he invaded Persia and inflicted a crushing, but not decisive, defeat on Ismā'īl at the battle of Cāldīrān [q.v.]. His aura of invincibility dispelled, Ismā'īl never again led his troops in battle. During the last ten years of his life, he took a less and less active part in political affairs, and gave his viziers virtually a free hand in administrative matters.

After his defeat at Cāldīrān, Ismā'īl became more interested in exploring the possibilities of an alliance with European powers, in order to attack the Ottomans on two fronts. In 921-2/1516 he received an
envoy from Louis II, King of Hungary, in the person of a Maronite monk named Fr. Peter, and an ambassador from Charles V of Germany also reached him about the same time. In Şahwâl 920/August-September 1523, Ismâ’îl sent a letter to Charles, expressing his astonishment that the Christian powers, instead of devoting all their energies to fighting the Turks, were squabbling among themselves (details from unpublished material made available to me through the courtesy of Dr. W. Gerd). The Şafawids thus carried on the series of diplomatic exchanges with the West, which had begun in Ak Koyunlu times, and which had as their chimerical objective the organizing of joint military operations against the common foe, the Ottomans.

Ismâ’îl’s achievements have been overshadowed, perhaps unfairly, by those of his illustrious descendant, ‘Abbâs I [q.v.]. Ismâ’îl possessed the charismatic appeal, the powers of leadership, and the personal value, to bring to a successful conclusion more than a century of active revolutionary endeavour. In addition, he displayed a high degree of political acumen and statescraft. On his accession, he was faced by complex problems of great urgency. There was the problem of how to incorporate the Şüfi organization of the Şafawid fârâka, of which Ismâ’îl was the mûrûbi, into the newly established Şafawid state, of which he was the pâdişâh. There was the problem of how to reconcile the “men of the sword”, the Turcoman military élite which had brought him to power, with the “men of the pen”, the Persian bureaucrats on whom he depended for the political control of the religious institution, in order to prevent the ‘ulamâ’ from assuming a dominant position in the state (the undue growth of the power of the mudjâhidûs was later to become one of the principal causes of Şafawid decline). The fact that Ismâ’îl’s policies, original and ingenious though they frequently were, ultimately failed to solve these problems, indicates not so much the inadequacy of his policies as the insobrieties of his death. On his death in 930/1524, Şah Ismâ’îl was buried in the Şafawid family mausolue at Ardâbîl. He had four sons: Tahmâsp [q.v.], who succeeded him; Sâm; Alikâs [q.v.]; and Bahârmâ: and five daughters.


2. His Poetry: The founder of the Şafawid state was also a poet who wrote under the pseudonym (tâkhâlîs) of Khâtâtî. His poems, with few exceptions, are in the Turkish language of Amediyân-, or Khatâbî (a term used in the indigenous sources, as distinct from Çağhatâtî and Rûmî). Khâtâtî’s poetical output consists of: (a) The Dîwân, the oldest and most authentic Ms. of which was completed in 948/1541, eighteen years after Şâh Ismâ’îl’s death. This Dîwân contains 254 bâsida-ghâzâls, three mathnâws, one murâbbâ’ and one musâdas. The first twenty-four religious and didactic poems are, however, not in alphabetical order. Some of the poems of this Ms. contain outspoken utterances such as “I am the absolute Truth”, and “I am God’s eye (or God himself)”, etc. These poems and a number of technically imperfect poems together with a poem in syllabic metre are omitted in the later Mss., which have apparently undergone a process of “expurgation”. The great part of the content of Khâtâtî’s Dîwân consists of the lyrical poems. (b) The Dâh-nâmah, which was composed in 911/1506 in the mathnâwî form, and in the katastî metre. The subject of this poem is the exchange of ten letters between the lover and the beloved, which ultimately leads to their union. It includes a number of ghâzâls in the same metre. This Dâh-nâmâ belongs to a literary genre which was very popular in the Persian and Turkish literatures of the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries. (See T. Gandjel; The Genesis and Definition of a literary composition: The Dâh-nâmâ (“Ten love-letters”), in Der Islam, xlvi (1971), 59-66). A collection of poems in syllabic metre, which bear the tâkhâlîs Khâtâtî, and exist, not in the Mss. of the Dîwân, but in various miscellaneous copies, can with confidence be ascribed to the poet of ‘Alawi-Bektâşî circles, in which the royal poet was venerated (see T. Gandjel; Pseudo-Khâtâtî, in Iran and Islam, Edinburgh 1971, 263-266). The songs called xaxtâ = catâ in praise of Şâh Ismâ’îl and Şâh Tahmâsp, which Michele Membre mentions (Relazione di Persia (1542), Naples 1969), 48), were most probably the syllabic poems bearing the pseudonym of Khâtâtî. Khâtâtî was greatly influenced in his poems by the work of the Hurfî poet, Nestîmî [q.v.]. Khâtâtî’s poetry, besides its literary merit, which is far from negligible, is important, in that it contains data concerning the true nature of early Şafawid Shi‘ism. Although the poets who composed Turkish poems in Şafawid Persia were for the most part influenced by Nawa’î and Fudûlî, there is evidence of a certain influence by Khâtâtî on some poets of this period, such as Amârî, Zafar and Sâdîb. But it was in ‘Alawi circles that the poems and the person of Khâtâtî exercised a lasting influence. His poems were recited for centuries in ‘Alawi-Bektâşî circles of Anatolia. In his native Ahammerdîn, the Ahl-i Hak, who incorporated him in the syncretic pantheon of their sect, considered him to be the pîr of Turkestan (i.e., Ahammerdîn and the neighbouring Turkish-speaking lands), in whose person God spoke in Turkish Khâtâtî’s türdî dedi, and finally the adepts of the extremist Shabak sect in Irâk included the poems...
ISMA‘IL I -- ISMA‘IL II

ascribed to Kha^a'I in their sacred book, the Buyruff.


ISMA‘IL II, born 940/1533-4 (this is conjectured from the available evidence; no chronicle gives his date of birth), died 13 Râmân 985/24 November 1576. In 964/1556, he was appointed governor of Khurasan. After only a few months at Harât, Ismaîl was suddenly arrested (Safar 964/December 1556), and taken to the fortress of Kâhkâhî in A’dhârbdjûdân, where he remained a prisoner for nearly twenty years. Various reasons are put forward to account for Tahnâmîs action. Some sources point out that Ismaîl’s arrest followed closely upon the signature of the Treaty of Amasya (962/1555), he was appointed governor of Khorûsân.

After only a few months at Harât, Ismaîl was suddenly arrested (Safar 964/December 1556), and taken to the fortress of Kâhkâhî in A’dhârbdjûdân, where he remained a prisoner for nearly twenty years. Various reasons are put forward to account for Tahnâmîs action. Some sources point out that Ismaîl’s arrest followed closely upon the signature of the Treaty of Amasya (962/1555), he was appointed governor of Khorûsân.

When the unsettled conditions in Khurasan during the years between the fall of the Tâhirîs and the final establishment there of Ismaîl and four other Safawî princes perished in this way. When Ismaîl began to put to death officers whose only crime was that of having held important positions under his father, the kisîlîbâd regretted that they had placed him on the throne, and conspired to assassinate him. Ismaîl is alleged to have been a less than enthusiastic Twelver Shi‘îte. This gave the kisîlîbâd both an added incentive to remove him, and also a plausible excuse for their action. Ismaîl’s addiction to narcotics made it easy for the kisîlîbâd both to carry out the murder and to give it the air of death by misadventure. With the connivance of Ismaîl’s sister, Pârî Kân Kânîn, the conspirators placed poison in an ecutary containing opium, which was consumed by Ismaîl and one of his boon-companions. Ismaîl was succeeded by his elder brother Muhammad Khudâbânda [q.v.].

Bibliography: W. Hinz, Schah Ismaîl II, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Safaviden, in BSOS, xxxvi (1933), 10-100, with full details of the European and Persian sources####

(£. M. Savory)

ISMA‘IL, MAWLÂY [see ‘Alawîs and mawlây Ismaîl].

ISMA‘IL b. ‘ABBÂD [see ibn ‘Abbâd].

ISMA‘IL b. AHMAD, Abû ‘Alîshî, called al-‘Alîr al-‘Addâ or al-‘Addî, the first member of the Sâmânî family effectively to rule all Transoxania and Farghânâ as an independent sovereign. Born in 234/849, he spent 20 years as governor of Bûhkâh on behalf of his brother Naṣr, who himself resided at Samarkand (260/874-279/892). The unsettled conditions in Khorûsân during the years between the fall of the Tâhirîs and the final establishment there of Ismaîl and one of his boon-companions, Ismaîl was succeeded by his elder brother Muhammad Khudâbânda [q.v.].

When Naṣr died in 279/892, Ismaîl became master of all Transoxania, transferring the capital to Bûhkâh, where it was to remain till the end of the dynasty, and securing recognition from the ‘Abbâsî Caliph. In the following year he led an expedition into the Turkish steppes against the camp of the Kârîk Kâghân at Talas (modern Djambul), capturing an immense booty of slaves and beasts and converting the principal church of Talas into a mosque; he also subdued the local transoxanian dynasty of rulers of Sîrjûsunâ in the Syr Darya valley. In view of the claim of the Safârîs (q.v.) to be successors in the east of the Tâhirîs, ‘Amr b. al-Lâyi’s attempt to assert his suzerainty over Kînvarz and Transoxania was predictable. Safârîs might in Persia was such that in 285/898 the caliph al-Ma’tâqîd was forced to issue a decree deposing Ismaîl and awarding an investiture diploma to ‘Amr for Transoxania and Bûhkâh. ‘Amr marched
northwards to take possession of his new territories, and summoned Isma'il, the Abu Da'udids of Tabarištan and the Farighnids of Gūzgān to allegiance. There was considerable fighting south of the Oxus between the Sāmānids and Šafārīds, until in 287/900 'Amr was defeated near Balkh and captured. Although Isma'il was technically in rebellion against the 'Abbasids, the caliph was overjoyed at the removal of so dangerous a rival as 'Amr. Isma'il's victory gave him access to the caliph, to whom he addressed a letter asking, to judge from the notice in the Aḥdant, Isma'il the Abu Da'udids of Tabarištan, and an offensive launched against Tabarištan itself. By 287/902 the Sāmānids held territory as far west as Rayy and Kāzwin, although Isma'il's successors were unable to hold this in face of the resurgence of Daylam peoples. Isma'il died in 295/907. The historical and anecdotal sources unanimously praise him for his moderation and justice; influenced by his victory over the Šafārīds, they commend his faithfulness to the Caliphs and his Sunnī piety. His tomb is still shown in Būkhara (cf. Schroeder in Survey of Persia, iii, 946-9), but the mausoleum seems in fact to belong to the later Sāmānī period.

**Biography:** See the long section on Isma'il in Narshakhlī, tr. R. N. Frye, 77-94, to be supplemented by such historical sources as Tābarī and Ibn al-Athīr; amongst adab works, those of Nīʿām al-Mulk and 'Awfī; Barthold, Turkestan, 222-6; R. N. Frye, Buhkara, the medieval achievement, Norman, Okla., 1965, 39-49.

**ISMA'IL b. BULBUL, Abu'l-Šaqr, vizier of the 'Abbāsīd Caliph al-Mu'tamīd [g.]]. Of Persian or Mesopotamian origin, he was born in 230/844-5 and claimed to belong to the Arab tribe of the Ṣhaybān. Abu'l-Šaqr, who had been a secretary and had been in charge of the diwan of the Royal Domains, appeared on the political scene in 265/878, when the regent al-Muwaffak had appointed him vizier, a post which he had to abandon shortly afterwards only to regain it at the end of the year. But Isma'il played a minor role while the regent had Ṣādib b. Makhład [g.]] as his personal secretary, and it was only from the year 272/885-6 that he really exercised the functions of vizier. Though not responsible for military affairs, he ran the administration and was in charge of the appointments to the various state offices. It was then that he appointed the Banu 'I-Furat brothers to the financial offices. These brothers, whose Shī'a convictions he shared, helped him in his attempt to face the difficulties that beset him at the time. But he came up against the hostility of al-Muwaffak's son, the future al-Mu'tadīd, whom his father had prevented from going off on an expedition against the Tūlūnids and whom Isma'il himself attempted to eliminate from public affairs first during his absence and then during the regent's illness. After the death of the latter, in Ṣafar 278/May 892, al-Mu'tadīd, who had become regent, hastened to arrest Isma'il who died shortly afterwards, a victim of his attachment to the Caliph, but also of the support he had lent the Shī'īs and perhaps of his unorthodox opinions.

**Biography:** D. Sourdel, Viziers, index; S. Boustanly, Ibn ar-Rümî, Beirut, 1967, 157-66. (D. Sourdel)

**ISMA'IL b. AL-KĀSIM [see Abu 'l-Ṭāṭiyah].**

**ISMA'IL b. NŪH, Abu Ibrāhīm al-Muntashir, the last of the Sāmānīds of Ta'usoxania and Khurāsān. When in 389/999 the Karākhānīds' Ilīg Khan Naqr occupied the Sāmānīd capital Būkhārā, Isma'il and other members of the family were carried off to Uzgend. He contrived, however, to escape to Khwarazm, and for the next four years kept up a series of attacks on the Ghaznavids in northern Khurāsān and the Karākhānīds in Būkhārā. In 393/999 he obtained the help of the Oghuz, traditional allies of the Sāmānīds, and according to Gardizi, it was at this point that the leader of the Sādīqūs became a Muslim. Isma'il's attempts to restore his dynasty's power all ended in failure; he took refuge in the Ķara Kūn desert, where he was killed in Rabī'I 391 or Rabī'I 393/Dec.-Jan. 1004-5 or Jan.-Feb. 1005 by a group of Arabs of the Banī ʿIdā. According to 'Awfī, Isma'il was the most gifted of his dynasty in regard to poetry and its transmission, and his short-lived courts at Būkhārā attracted many literary figures.


**ISMA'IL b. SEBÜKTIGIN, Ghaznavīd amīr, third son of the founder of the Ghaznavid empire and last of the family to recognize the suzerainty of the Sāmānīds. When Sebüktigin died in Sha'ban 387/August 997, he left the provinces of Ghazna and Balkh to Isma'il, and command of the army in Khurāsān to his eldest son Māḥmūd; this allocation of Ghazna to Isma'il was probably influenced by the fact that he was Sebüktigin's son by a daughter of Alpītigin [see Alp-Takîn], the original commander of the Turks in Ghazna. Māḥmūd refused to accept these arrangements, and demanded recognition as supreme overlord in the Ghaznavīd dominions. He obtained the help of his brother Naṣr, governor of Bust, and of his uncle Buγhraçuq, governor of Harāt, and in a battle outside Ghazna defeated Isma'il (Rabī'I 388/March 998). Thus after a reign of only seven months, Isma'il was deposed and imprisoned for the rest of his life in Gūzgān.


**ISMA'IL b. YASĀR al-Nisâʾī, Median poet, who died at a very advanced age some years before the end of the Umayyad dynasty (132/750). The descendant of an Āḏharbāyjānī prisoner, he was a mawād of the Taʾym b. Murra of Kurayḥ and it is said that he owed his niṣāb to the fact that his father prepared meals—or sold carpets—for weddings, but this interpretation should be treated with caution. At Medina, where he lived, he had become a supporter of the Zubayrids, but his friendly relations with Urwa b. al-Zubayr [g.]] (in whose company he went to the court of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān after the fall of 'Abd allāh b. al-Zubayr (73/692)) gained him access to the caliph, to whom he addressed a panegyric; in spite of his secret hatred of the Marwānids, he later wrote in praise of several Umayyad caliphs and princes, up to al-Walid b. Yazid (135/743). To judge from the notice in the Aḥdant, Isma'il...
b. Yasar's poetical work contained hardly any satires but consisted of panegyrics, *muhahhayat* (notably of his brother Muhammad, and of a son of 'Uwais b. al-Zubayr) and *ghasals*, which were set to music. However, the most striking feature of his poetry seems to be a clearly expressed desire to disparage the Arabs and to glorify the 'Adjam; one verse refers to the *wa'd* of new-born girls, others to the poet's own illustrious origin; it is said that he was even bold enough to recite before Highâm b. 'Abd al-Malik, at al-Rusafa, a poem in which he omitted to praise the caliph but held forth at length on his own glorious ancestors; he was punished for this audacity by being thrown fully-clothed into a pond and then banished to the Hidjaz. In this respect, Isma'il b. Yasar al-Nisa'i may be considered as one of the first *Shu'ubis*; his son Ibrâhim followed him in this, according to the *Agâni*, which however devotes to him only a few lines. His brothers Muhammad and Musâ, known as *Shahawat*, were also poets [see *MUSA SHAHAWAT*].


[Ch. Pellat]

**(ISMA'IL RUSUQ B. AL-DIN ISMA'IL B. ÂHMAD AL- ANKARAWI, (710-15/1613-2), a commentator of the *Mathnawi* of Djâlîl al-Din Rûmi. His date of birth is unknown, but it is known that he was born in Istanbul, received a good education, was active in trade and entered the Khalwatiyya order of dervishes (cf. *Sharh-i Mathnawi*, i, 11, introduction). Having contracted an eye disease, Isma'il went to Konya where he became a follower of the Mawlawî *Shaykh* Bostân Celebi (d. 1400/1630), who named him *Khâlija*. Isma'il then went to Istanbul, where he became *Shaykh* of the Mawlawî-khâne (Mevlevi dervish house) of Galata, a position which he kept until his death. He lies buried in the *turba* in the courtyard of his Mawlawî-khâne.

His main works are:

1. *Fâtih al-abâyî*, a commentary on the first 18 chapters of the *Mathnawi*, and of certain difficult terms.
2. *Diwâni* al-Âdâmi, a commentary on the *kurâ*ic verses, *hadîths* and Arabic verses in the *Mathnawi*.
3. *Sharh-i Mathnawi*, written after the other two preceding works. This commentary, on which Isma'il's fame rests, and which until recent times was the most popular work explaining the *Mathnawi*, is largely inspired by the ideas of Ibn al-'Arabi (d. 638/1240). It dwells on the mystical rather than the grammatical significance of Rûmi's couplets. It was, nonetheless, criticized by the Mawlawîs because it included a commentary on an apocryphal seventh volume of the *Mathnawi* (see A. Gölpinarlı, *Mevlânâ’dan sonra Mevlevih*, Istanbul 1953, 143). Isma'il's seven-volume commentary was printed in Istanbul in 1289/1872-3. It was also translated into Arabic, in a somewhat abridged form, under the title *al-Minchâqi al-kawi sharh al-Mathnawi*, by Djiangî Yusuf Dede of Tripoli (d. 1680), and published in Cairo in 1289/1872-3. Isma'il's work also forms the basis of R. A. Nicholson's *Commentary on the Mathnawi of Jalalîn din Rûmi*, London 1937. It was finally translated into Persian by Dr. 'Isam Sattîr-zâde (Sharh-i Kabir-i Ahlkarawi dar Mathnawi-yi Rûmî, Vol. i, Tehran 1348 solar).


In addition to these commentaries, Isma'il composed independent treatises for full list see M. Tahir and Âydam Hilmi, op. and loc. cit., the best known being:

1. *Mishâd al-balâgâha wa mishâh al-jašâda*, written in Turkish, but based on Arabic and Persian manuals of rhetoric. It was printed in Istanbul in 1284/1867-8.
2. *Minnâdî al-furqâr*, an explanation of *ŠIFI* terminology, based largely on the *Manâsîl al-saârîn* of 'Abd Allâh Anşârî (d. 481/1088-9). It was published in Istanbul in 1286/1869-70.
3. *Hududiyat al-sâmâ*, a brief treatise in defence of the *sâmâ* dance of the Mawlawî Whirling Dervishes. This has been published both separately and also together with the preceding work.

Finally, Isma'il's poetry was collected in a *Dîvân* (see catalogue of *Dîvân*). He himself was the subject of a eulogic *kaşîda* by the poet *Shawaiq* al-Ghâlibi, a proof of the wide respect in which he was held by his religious and mystical knowledge (see Ahmad Hilmi, op. cit., 73-6).

*Biography:* In addition to the works cited, *Sâhib Dede*, *Saifnâ-i Hafîsnâ-i Mawlawiyân*, Cairo, 1283/1666-7, ii, 37-44, which corresponds to *Sharh-i Mathnawi*, i, 1-11, introduction; *Esrâr Dede*, *Tadhkira-i Shu’ârâ-i Mawlawiyân*, Ist. Univ. Lib., TY 80, 125-7; *A‘lî Anwar, Samâhâna-i-Adâb, Istanbul 1309/1891-2, 80-83. (TAHŞIN YAZICI)

**ISMA'IL 'ÂŞIM EFENDI** [see ČELEBÎ-ZADE].

**ISMA'IL GASPRAŃSKI** [see GASPRAŁI].

**ISMA'IL GHA'LIB**, (1846-1895), noted Turkish historian and numismatist. Son of the grand vizier Ibrâhim Edhem Paşa [q.v.], brother of Hamdî Bey [see 'ÛTHMÂN HAMDÎ], director of the Imperial Museum, and of the historian Khâliî Edhem [see EDHEM], he was born in Istanbul, entered government service at an early age, became a member of the Council of State and in 1894 was appointed a special assistant to the governor of Crete. Taken seriously ill there, he returned to Istanbul in 1895 and died the following year. His grave is in the cemetery of the Iskele Dîâmîa in Usküdar. Isma'il Ghâlib's last reputation as a scholar rests on his accomplishments in the field of Islamic numismatics. During and after Hamdî Bey's administration he was responsible for putting in order and expanding the museum's great collection of Islamic coins. His private collection was bought after his death by the Imperial Mint. His main works are:

Bibliography: J. H. Mordtmann in El., s.v. Ghalib (Turkish translation in İ. A., s.v. Gahib); Ibrahim Alsedin Gönül, Seçme Kitâbâlar Adamlar Ansiklopedisi (Istanbul 1933-1935). (G. C. Miles) ISMA'IL HAKKI 'ALİŞAİN (also 'Alisya'n-ı zade Ismail Hakki, in modern Turkish Ismail Hakki Eldem), 1871-1944, Turkish writer and diplomat. Educated in the Imperial School of Political Science (Mülkiye), he joined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and served as director of Consular Service and as consul in Marseilles, Zurich and Munich. Soon after his retirement in 1923, he joined the staff of 'Abd Allah Djezdet's Litttith and taught at the University of Bursa. He retired from the Ministry in 1927 and worked as a journalist and literary critic. His most important works include a series of biographies of Turkish poets of the 19th century, and a translation of Charles Baudelaire's Les Fleurs du mal, Elem čığıleri (Istanbul 1927), which made Baudelaire's poetry popular in Turkey.
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Bibliography: F. E. Karatay, Istanbul universitesi Kütüphanesi Türkçe bosnalar alfabe Kataloğu, Istanbul 1956, i, 185-84; Adil偶像, pas- tikanbul Anıtı, Istanbul 1287-89, a commentary on Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî's Mathnawi on traditional lines; (3) Faraq al-Rû, a commentary on Yâzîdîoghlu Mehemdî's Muhammediya, Bûlak 1252; (4) Shahr-i Pani-i 'Ațâr, a translation with grammatical notes and commentary of Farîd al-Dîn 'Aṭâr's Pand-i 'Atdar, Bûlak 1250; (5) Sîsîa-i jârbal-i Djihiyyiya, a treatise on the order, with biographies of the leading shaykhs including his own, Istanbul 1291; (6) Dîwân followed by Mâkâlî, the same volume, Bûlak 1257, Istanbul 1288; (7) Kans-i Muhîî, where he expands his approach to pantheistic Sûfism, Istanbul 1290; (8) Tughî-i Khâliîiya, a collection of moral admonitions, Istanbul 1256; (9) Mu'âdîyâ, a verse narra- tive of Muhammad's ascent to Heaven, Istanbul 1269; (10) Kitâb al-natâh, a comment on traditional lines;

Bibliography: F. E. Karatay, Istanbul universitesi Kütüphanesi Türkçe bosnalar alfabe Kataloğu, Istanbul 1956, i, 185-84; Adil偶像, pas- tikanbul Anıtı, Istanbul 1287-89, a commentary on Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî's Mathnawi on traditional lines; (3) Faraq al-Rû, a commentary on Yâzîdîoghlu Mehemdî's Muhammediya, Bûlak 1252; (4) Shahr-i Pani-i 'Ațâr, a translation with grammatical notes and commentary of Farîd al-Dîn 'Aṭâr's Pand-i 'Atdar, Bûlak 1250; (5) Sîsîa-i jârbal-i Djihiyyiya, a treatise on the order, with biographies of the leading shaykhs including his own, Istanbul 1291; (6) Dîwân followed by Mâkâlî, the same volume, Bûlak 1257, Istanbul 1288; (7) Kans-i Muhîî, where he expands his approach to pantheistic Sûfism, Istanbul 1290; (8) Tughî-i Khâliîiya, a collection of moral admonitions, Istanbul 1256; (9) Mu'âdîyâ, a verse narra- tive of Muhammad's ascent to Heaven, Istanbul 1269; (10) Kitâb al-natâh, a comment on traditional lines;

ISMAİL HAKKI, MANASTIRLI [see Supplement].

ISMAİL PASHA, khedive of Egypt, 1863-79, second son of Ibrahim Pasha [q.v.] and grandson of Muhammad 'Ali [q.v.], was born in Cairo on 31 December 1830. He received his early education in the private palace school founded by his grandfather for his family, where he studied Arabic, Persian and Turkish. At fourteen, he spent some time in Vienna, where he was sent for treatment of an eye complaint. Two years later, in 1846, he was sent to Paris to join one of the Egyptian educational missions under the preceptorship of the Armenian Istifân Bey. There he studied French, some of the modern sciences and certain aspects of engineering. He returned to Egypt in 1848.

Upon the death of Ibrahim Pasha in 1848, Ismail's cousin, 'Abbas Hilmi I [q.v.] (son of Tûsûn Pasha) succeeded to the pashalik. After the death of his grandfather, Muhammad 'Ali, the following year, 'Abbas I reportedly distrusts his uncle 'Abd Pasha and his cousins, with all of whom he disputed the disposition of Muhammad 'Ali's inheritance. Consequently, Ismail, along with other princes of the House, went to live for a time in Istanbul and to solicit the assistance of the sultan against 'Abbas I. Sultan 'Abd al-Madjid appointed Ismail a member of the State Judicial Council. A few years later, upon the accession of his uncle 'Abd Pasha to the vice-royalty in 1854, Ismail returned to Egypt, and was appointed president of the State Judicial Council.

The following year (1855), he was entrusted with a mission to the court of Napoleon III in Paris in connection with Sa'id Pasha's policy of seeking greater independence from the Porte, for this purpose taking advantage of Egypt's participation in the Crimean War (1854-6). He also headed another diplomatic mission on behalf of Sa'id Pasha to the Vatican. In 1861, Sa'id appointed him sirdar (commander in chief) of the army in the Cretan uprising of 1866 and Ismail's financial extravagance over the opening of the Suez Canal, as well as his intrigues with foreign powers, led the sultan to issue a firman on 29 November 1869 practically rescinding Ismail's gains from that of 1867. However, Ismail's visit to Istanbul and lavish bribery of Turkish officials secured him two more firmans: one of 10 September 1872, abrogating and superseding that of 1869, restored to him the right to borrow from and raise loans in Europe; another of 8 June 1873 ratified and recognized its conditions.

At home and in Europe Ismail affected the trappings of a modern ruler. The participation of Egypt in the Paris Exhibition of 1867 was followed by the gala opening of the Suez Canal two years later. Despite the fact that the American Civil War (1861-5) had produced a great boom in the export of Egyptian cotton, Ismail's pursuit of an African empire involved expensive military campaigns in the Sudan, Ethiopia and Uganda. In the meantime his expensive extraction of firmans from the sultan coincided with the decline of French influence in Egypt after the fall of Napoleon III in 1871. Ismail began to look towards England for financial and other assistance.

Added to these ventures were the vicissitudes of his domestic policies. Ismail reorganized the army and navy as well as army education. He also built new schools and allowed more Europeans to found their own in the country; subsidized newspapers and journals; expanded and improved the government press at Bulûk [q.v.]. He founded a national library (later, Dar al-Kutub), a geographical society and a museum under the direction of the French archaeologist Mariette Pasha. He signed a convention outlawing the slave trade in his dominions, and organized the first state postal service in Egypt. His organization of the country into fourteen provinces, or districts, became the basis of the administration of Egypt for the next one hundred years.

During Ismail's reign the country's exports doubled complex and hazardous relations with ambitious European powers (Britain and France for example); a risky confrontation with the Ottoman sultan of the country; and a huge—and in the end ruinous—financial outlay. Domestically, this policy of vast, radical and rapid Europeanization involved grave dangers to the ruler, because it sowed the seeds of economic, social and cultural dilocation. This policy, directed against the Ottoman sultan, was dependent on European powers for money and political support and thus led inevitably to foreign intervention in the affairs of Egypt and eventually to its occupation by British forces. These consequences, in turn, aroused the resentment and opposition of the Egyptians to and their own rulers, who were associated with the coming of European control, that is, with the forfeiture of the autonomy Egypt enjoyed before 1875.

In seeking to achieve the first objective of his policy, that of greater independence, Ismail purchased from the sultan the firman of 27 May 1866, by which the order of succession was changed to one of primogeniture in his own line. He also secured the right to increase the size of his army, coin his own money and confer titles. Another firman of 8 June 1867 granted him the title of khedive, autonomy in the conduct of his internal and financial affairs, the authority to conclude treaties with other sovereign states regarding customs, ports, trade transit and the regulation of foreign community affairs. A brief interlude of strained relations with the Porte, arising out of the Egyptian involvement in the Cretan uprising of 1866 and Ismail's financial extravagance over the opening of the Suez Canal, as well as his intrigues with foreign powers, led the sultan to issue a firman on 29 November 1869 practically rescinding Ismail's gains from that of 1867. However, Ismail's visit to Istanbul and lavish bribery of Turkish officials secured him two more firmans: one of 10 September 1872, abrogating and superseding that of 1869, restored to him the right to borrow from and raise loans in Europe; another of 8 June 1873 ratified and recognized its conditions.

By the time Ismail became viceroy of Egypt on 18 January 1863, he had thus had relatively wide experience in the administrative, diplomatic and military affairs of the country. Moreover he had firsthand experience of Europe and of the politics and administration of the Porte in Istanbul.

In contrast to the relatively unimaginative and meagre rule of his two predecessors, 'Abbas Hilmi I (1848-54) and Sa'id Pasha (1854-63), Ismail's reign brought Egypt material prosperity, and economic, social and cultural advancement. But also brought financial bankruptcy and domestic and international difficulties. As ambitious as his illustrious grandfather, the founder of the dynasty, yet operating in changed circumstances and without his grandfather's military resources or force of personality and character, Ismail attempted to accomplish too many things too quickly. His policy, disastrous though it turned out to be for himself and Egypt, had three major objectives. One of these was to secure greater autonomy, and ultimately complete independence, for Egypt from the Ottoman sultan. The second was to accelerate the commercial, military and cultural modernization of the country. The third was to acquire an African empire. All three objectives entailed
in a decade, and the annual revenue of the state rose from £5,000,000 in 1864 to £145,000,000 in 1875. The telegraph and railway networks were extended in Egypt and the Sudan. The town of Isma'iliyya was built, and the new major irrigation canals of Ibbrāhimiyya in Upper Egypt and Isma'iliyya between Suez and Cairo were constructed. Isma'il developed further the sugar refining and textile industries. Moreover, the municipal edification of Cairo and other major towns attracted foreign investment and commerce, while some Egyptian companies and banks were also founded.

By 1870, however, Isma'il was in great financial difficulties. At home, he tried to raise money through the notorious Mūkahala Law of 1871, by which the government invited landowners to pay six times the annual land tax in advance in return for a perpetual reduction of one half of the tax. His borrowing in Europe had raised the Egyptian public debt to nearly £90,000,000. In 1875, he was forced to sell his 176,602 shares in the Suez Canal Company to the British government for an immediate cash payment of £4,000,000.

Isma'il's financial difficulties led to the setting up of a European Control Commission over Egyptian finances, the institution in 1876 of a Caisse de la Dette Publique with representatives from European credit states. The previous Mixed Tribunals, empowered to adjudicate disputes between Egyptians and foreigners, as well as between foreigners resident in Egypt, were established, further diluting Egyptian autonomy and eroding the authority of the khedive and his government.

Inevitably, the financial crisis of the years 1875-9 had repercussions within Egypt, and particularly in the relations between Isma'il and his ministers, landed notables, religious leaders and army officers. Attempts to associate all of these with his policy of independence and Europeanization began with his experiments in representative institutions. A Consultative Assembly of Deputies was instituted in 1866. A dilated and weak form of cabinet government was tried in 1876-9, shortly before Isma'il's deposition, by making the khedive's government responsible to the Assembly. But all of these measures were of no avail in salvaging the deteriorating financial condition of the country, or in saving Isma'il's own position. Instead, sedition in the army was accompanied by mounting pressure from his foreign creditors who suspected his insolvency. His desperate attempts to use a national Egyptian base against the European control of his finances failed. Moreover, his expensive promotion and subvention of an inept native press served to undermine his position further. Nor did his participation in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877 on the side of his Ottoman suzerain prevent the latter from deposing him at the insistence of the European powers on 25 June 1875. The next day, Isma'il left Egypt for Europe. He died in Istanbul on 6 March 1879.

Even though the social and economic changes which occurred during Isma'il's reign came to constitute the foundations of the further development and modernization of the country, the khedive's impatient Europeanization programme was politically a superficial one. Together with the financial problems and their international repercussions, it is fair to suggest that the reign of Isma'il generated complex problems for Egypt, with which its inexperienced leaders and emerging administrators could not adequately cope. These led to the occupation of the country by Britain and the subsequent political difficulties which this event generated for the next seventy-five years.

Nonetheless, by his ambition and financial recklessness, Isma'il forcefully stimulated and induced the emergence of modern Egypt, and outlined its future development. To this extent, he cannot be viewed facilely as the disastrous khedive of Egypt, but as one of the country's creative rulers.

supported by the Dİwān and accepted by the sultan. But the grand vizier’s seal was in the hands of the Shaykh al-İslam Fāṣl Allâh Efendi, who was supporting the rebellions. The rebel leaders were placated by being granted various offices: Fāṣl-Allâh came to the Palace and handed the seal to the sultan; and Ismā‘īl Paşa was finally officially installed. Thereupon all the high-ranking members of the ‘ulûma’ (including the Shaykh al-İslam and the şâdî of Istanbul) were dismissed. The crowds at the Palace approved the new appointees and dispersed, so that on 26 Rabī‘ II 1099/2 March 1688 Ismā‘īl Paşa embarked on office with his authority unquestioned. The rebel leaders and their supporters were apprehended and immediately put to death, and numerous changes were made in Palace posts and in provincial governorates. But these measures led only to new friction between the townsfolk and the Kaplâlî and between the ‘ulûma’ and the grand vizier. Furthermore the loss of various strong points in the Eğrî-Kırka region and the fortress of Kanîn increased the tension at the capital. The grand vizier now made the capital the center of appointing Yeğen ʻOṯmân Paşa, governor of Rumelî and one of the rebels, as Şerâdîr, on the Austrian front with the rank of vizier. ʻOṯmân Paşa rallied to his side some of the insurgents who had managed to escape from Istanbul and the Şâdîlâs and Şehbâns of Rumelî, and demanded the Grand Vizierate, obliging Ismā‘īl Paşa to proclaim a call to arms (nefîr-i ‘âmm [see MÂRÎ]) in Rumelî and Anatolia against his supporters. The hostility which the Shaykh al-İslam Debbâh-zâde Mêhmed Efendi had felt from the first towards Ismâ‘īl Paşa now spread to all the ‘ulûma’. On the ground that they had accepted bribes, Ismâ‘īl Paşa wished to dismiss and the sultan’s friends: ʻArâb-zâde ʻAbd al-Wahhâb Efendi and the Dâr al-Sa’âda Ağâsî Muṣṭâfa Ağâ, who made common cause with the ‘ulûma’ and began making secret complaints to the sultan. The sultan, persuaded by his intimate Muṣṭâfa Ağâ, finally dismissed Ismâ‘īl Paşa on 28 D穿越a II 1099/30 April 1688. Ismâ‘īl Paşa was ordered to stay in seclusion in his yâlî at Arâîdülûlîrdî and then, on 10 Rabâ‘ II 1099/1 May 1688, was removed to Rhodes. Where, during, the Grand Vizierate of Kûrâlû-zâde Fâdvî Muṣṭâfa Paşa, he was executed (Şâbân 1101/May 1690). The main reasons for his death were his differences with Fâdvî Muṣṭâfa and other members of the Kûrâlû family; the complaints of the sons of Zaun al-ʻÂbidîn Paşa, who had allegedly been unjustly executed during his Grand Vizierate; and the allegation that he had extorted money from the heirs of Sîyâvûş Paşa. His head was sent to Istanbul and his body was buried in Rhodes. He is described as a covetous and irritable man, who, though intelligent, often took rash measures than he really meant to.

Bibliography: Archive documents: two firman of Radji‘ II 1099/2 March 1688, ordering him to pay 400 purses to the treasury (from his exile in Rhodes) Başbakânûl Arşî, Mâhkîmû me register No. 59, pp. 155, 159; order for his execution, etc. same register, pp. 162, 163, 173; firman ordering the searching of his house and the register No. 59, pp. 155, 159; order for his execution, Ms T 2489, fol. 35b; ‘Oṯmân-zâde Muṣṭâfa, Ms of Zubdát al-tawdîkh, Istanbul 1282, i, 345, 526, ii, 367-119; Şeyhîlî Mehmîd Ef., Wâhid-i jûfâda, I. Un., Lib., Ms T 2489, Bol. 35b; ‘Oṯmân-zâde Şâhîb, Hâdidâl al-awzârâ, Istanbul 1271, 111-4; ʻUyûr-zâde Aμîn ‘Abdâr, Ta’rîh-i, Istanbul 1293, ii, 73; Perâdî-zâde Seyyid Mehmîd Şâdî, Ta’rîh-i Gûhîîn-i ma‘ârif, Istanbul 1252, ii, 667-78; De La Croix, Abîtêz chron. de l’hist. ott., Paris 1768, ii, 60c-2; Hammer-Purgstall, Histoire, xii, 247-57, 308-9; Sîdîlî ‘Oṯmâni, i, 354-5; I. H. Üzunçarşî, Osmanlı tarîhî, illîz, Ankara 1954, 427-9; I. H. Danîyûn, Kronoloji, iii, 465-6, 517; IA, art. Mehmîd IV (M. Cavid Baysun).

Mû‘ûn Aktepe

ISMÂ‘ÎL ŞÂBRÎ, an Egyptian poet (1886-1953), distinguished by his kunya of Aμîn Umâyma from another and better known Ismâ‘îl Şâbru. His earliest poetic works date from 1910, and his writings as a whole were collected and published after his death. His “love songs” (Ghâsul-i âghânî, p. 183-258 of the diwa‘n) deserve especial attention for the technique of his prosody and a certain purity of language and style; some of these songs, of remarkable lyric inspiration, have been set to music and are a worthy addition to the legacy of the most romantic and pathetic sentimental songs of the period. While it is of no great importance that, in the writings of his maturity, Ismâ‘îl Şâbru succeeded in redeeming the intellectual inconsistency of some of his youthful ʻâṣâls, it should be emphasised that this author, who possessed a very good knowledge of an admiration for classical Arabic poetry, sometimes yielded to the temptation to insert in his own poems hemi stichs from al-Buṭrûf, al-Mutanabî and other celebrated ‘Arâbîs poets; where this has happened, the editors of the diwa‘n have indicated this indiscrepancy with a note.

The two poems entitled respectively al-ʻNûmîyya al-kubrâ and al-Hamzîyya al-kubrâ (p. 27-75 and 76-98 of the diwa‘n) contain some beautiful and occasional verse, inspired by purely contingent social events, a feature which the author shares with other more celebrated contemporaries such as Aljmad Shawkl and Hafîz al-Mahamzi. In the last section of the diwa‘n, contains little information regarding the author’s life and professional life, is the work of Ahmad Kamâl Zâd, ‘Amîr Muhammad Bubayrî and Muhammad al-‘Aṣâsî; it was published in Cairo (n. d.) by the Ministry of Culture and National Guidance. (U. Rizziatano)

ISMÂ‘ÎL ŞÂBRÎ, an Egyptian poet and statesman, was one of those who contributed
to the awakening of national consciousness in Egypt at the end of the nineteenth century. Born in Cairo on 16 February 1854, Isma'il Şabri benefitted from the influence of two cultures, classical Arabic and French, with which he came into direct contact when he was sent away to Aix-en-Provence in order to complete his legal studies. On his return to Egypt in 1878 after obtaining a degree in law, he turned first to the magistracy, taking a post at al-Mansūrah, then became governor of Alexandria (1886-9) and later under-secretary of state at the Ministry of Justice. He died on 16 March 1923.

Isma'il Şabri's poetic talent manifested itself early in life, as can be seen from the youthful compositions which he published in the review Rawd al-Madāris al-Miṣriyya at the age of sixteen. These admittedly simple exercises in poetry nevertheless already displayed that admiration for classical models of the 'Abbāsid period which the poet was to retain even in his mature years. However, the beneficial contact with modern French poetry as it evolved at that time not only helped to enrich his mind, but especially to make keener his perception in regard both to the contingent social and political problems of his country, and the reflections of a more general nature and meditations on the destiny of humanity. Opposed to the occasional poetry to which many of the writers of his time applied their talents, Isma'il Şabri was a patriot of exemplary rectitude, incapable of lending himself to easy compromises with the two powers who at time controlled the policies of Egypt, Turkey and England. His diwan contains no ḍüstād dedicated to the sultan 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, nor to other dignitaries in his services. Love, death, and the fatherland were the themes of his poetry, the brilliance of which is due to the loftiness of style and profundity of thought expressed in unlaboured imagery. His poetic works are not numerous, especially when compared with the production of his contemporaries, probably because he wrote to please himself, refusing all demands other than those of inspiration.

Bibliography: The Diwan was published fifteen years after the poet's death by Aḥmad al-Zayn, Cairo 1938; the preface to the work by Tāḥā Ḥusayn is interesting from the critical standpoint. Abundant source material can be found in essays and articles published in reviews in the works of Dī. A. Dāğhīr, Maṣādir al-dirāsā al-adabīyya, iii: al-Rāshīd, 1880-1933), Beirut 1936, 534-6, and ʿUmar Rıḍā Ḥaḥbālā, Muṣāḏarāt al-muwaṣṣīfīm, Damascus 1376/1957, 272-3; Ṣub. 'Abd al-Munīm al-Faḍlāl, Ḍawat al-adab fi Miṣr, v, Cairo 1956, 138-7; ʿUmar al-Dāsālī, Fi l-adab al-adhīm, ii, Cairo 1950, 117-25; some differences concerned certain events of his life in Brockelmann, S III, 28-21. It should also be added that Aḥmad al-Shawādī dedicated a long elegy to him (al-Shawādīyā, iii, Cairo 1935, 115-8). (U. Rizzaṭadīn) ISMAİL ŞAFĀ (1867-1901), Turkish poet of the transition period between the Tanzimat and the Therueit-i Fünum schools. Born in Mecca where his father, Meḥmed Behjed, a native of Trabzon and a merchant, he and his two brothers moved to Istanbul. His happy life in Arabia and the desert left a strong impression on his memory which is reflected in many of his early poems. In Mecca his father had taught him Arabic and Persian. In Istanbul he passessed, with his two brothers, the entrance examination, as a boarder, to the Dar al-shaḥaṣa, a well known high school for gifted orphans. On his graduation in 1890 he served for a short time in the Telegraph Office and later taught literature in various secondary schools. He married very young but lost his wife and contracted tuberculosis himself. After a short stay in the island of Midilli (Mytilene), where he went in the hope of a recovery, he returned to Istanbul. Because of his liberal ideas, which he did not care to hide (see below), he was marked down as a suspect by the Hamidian secret police. His house in Gedik Pasha, where he and his progressive friends frequently met, was constantly watched. At the suggestion of Isma'il Kemal (a deputy for Berat in Albania after the 1908 constitution), a group of prominent intellectuals, including Isma'il Şafā and the leading Therueit-i Fünum poet, Tewfik Fikret, went to the British Embassy to congratulate Britain on her victory over the Boers. Unaware of the contradiction with their own professed ideals, they claimed later that they did this as a gesture against the sultan. This was used as a pretext to round them up and to send them into provincial exile. Isma'il Şafā was banished to Sivas where he succumbed to the harsh climate a year later (1901).

Isma'il Şafā published his first poems in Nājdī's Memdji'-a-i Mu'allīm and later in the periodical Mirdād. At the age of twenty he was a well known poet in literary circles. Verses poured from his pen with such ease and spontaneity that Nājdī "the Master" (Muʿallīm), whose influence on these early poems is obvious, gave him the nickname of Ṣabrī 'l-Mādīr ("the born poet"). He soon became leader-writer of the Mirdād until it was closed by the censor. Gradually Nājdī's literary influence was replaced by those of Rızā'-zādā Ekrem, 'Abd ul-Ḥakīm, and particularly Tewfik Fikret with whom he had become close friends and regularly contributed to his Therueit-i Fünum. Critics of both old and new schools were unanimous in recognizing his unusual poetical gift. Owing to his early poems, which are mostly sentimental reminiscences of his childhood, Isma'il Şafā is generally accepted as a fine sensitive poet who wrote, with a spontaneous style, simple melancholic poems of nostalgic, lyric and religious inspiration. This early and incomplete judgment of his work strongly influenced later criticism, but leaves out most of his posthumously published work, which reveals him as a poet with unusual gifts of humour and social and political satire. In particular his poem Taṣāʾalum ("Complaint of injustice"), first published in Ahmed Rıdā's Young Turk organ Mesgāwet in Paris (supplement to No. 9, 1893) and reproduced with minor variants and omissions in 'Abd Allāh Djevdet's Iḏjārā (No. 105, 8 May 1930), is a true forerunner of the political satire of the later Esḥāf and Fikret tradition. "You gathered around you a few vile individuals and tyrannized people on their advice. You gave power to the corrupt, ignorant and unpatriotic, you enabled informing into a profession, you made great men suffer in banishment, you insisted on the execution of a very great man (i.e., Midbat Pasha), tell, o Khalifa, are you any different from an executioner? They informed you of unjust acts, you ignored it; your slaves harmed people, you ignored it; foreigners made profit out of the country, you ignored it; friends warned you about everything, you ignored it. You preferred dependence to guiding sermons... The treasure of the state is in the hands of a few thieves... The country is in ruin, the
people hungry... The day of your fall will be a feast day for the people..." In the circle of close friends Ismā'il Šafā used further to expound his naïve projects of plots to overthrow 'Abd al-Ḥamīd (Ḥalīd Ziya Uṣūkčī, Kirk Yūl, Istanbul 1936, iv, 79).

Another important poem which seems to have passed almost unnoticed is his Tahāmīs of the Dāmmād Muḥammad Pasha's ḍajīda, an ironical eulogy of Ḥasan Pasha, the Minister of the Navy during the Greco-Turkish War of 1897. It is a biting satire, full of pungent wit, inspired by Ziya (Diya) Pasha's famous Zafar-nāme against 'Abd al-Ḥamīd who had kept the Turkish fleet perpetually at anchor in the Golden Horn, during his reign, thus causing its utter decline. Ismā'il Šafā describes, with vivid images, the sorry state of the local population, who, at the instigation of the tribal chieftains, deposed and dispossessed by his uncle Shah Abd al-ʿAziz, rose against the Sayyid. In 1235/1819 he was captured, but was later freed. On being politically influential at Delhi, could not watch with complacency such an open incitement to insurrection and also later allow money and material to be collected within their sphere of influence and sent to the mujāhidīn, as the followers of Sayyid Ahmad later came to be commonly known, in their stronghold in the northern parts of the country. In 1241/1825 he left, along with his leader Sayyid Ahmad, for Yaqūtsan via Sind. Passing through Bahāwulpūr [q.v.], Nayyarābād [q.v.] and Shikāpūr (Sind), this voluntary force, which had considerably swollen on the way, reached Kābul from where the volunteers slipped into Peshāwār. Making it their general headquarters they launched a holy war against the Sikhs, fighting the first battle at Akōrā, near Nowshera, on 20 Dūmādā II 1242/21 December 1826 and defeating the enemy with considerable losses. A number of other engagements followed bringing victory after victory to the mujāhidīn. Furnished with their success they set up their own government in the areas under their occupation with Peshāwār as the seat of administration. Certain reforms introduced by them in the social sphere concerning to the laws of Šarīʿa, for instance the remarriage of widows and the collection of ḫūṣr, resulted in the disaffection of the local population, who, at the instigation of the tribal chiefs, deposed and dispossessed by Sayyid Ahmad, rose against the mujāhidīn and in a secret night-attack killed all the tax-collectors and sub-administrators appointed by the Sayyid. This massacre was a serious set-back to the movement, and practically the whole of the territory around Peshāwār slipped out of the control of the mujāhidīn. The Sikh ruler of the Pāndjāb, Ranjit Singh, a shrewd politician and skilled statesman, took full advantage of the situation and inflicted a series of reverses on the rapidly dwindling forces of the Sayyid, who now also faced financial difficulties, for practically all the routes through which money came had been cut off either by the invading Sikhs or the hostile Pāthan tribes—mainly the Yūsufzāis.

The mujāhidīn, now led by Ismā'il, were driven out of Peshāwār, which they had occupied in 1246/1829 by ousting Sultan Muḥammad Khan, a brother of the amir of Afghanistan, who ruled Peshāwār as the tributary of the Sikh chieftain Ranjit Singh. Considering it a challenge to his sovereignty, Ranjit Singh marched in person and with the help of his European mercenaries, Generals Ventura and Avitabile, re-occupied the city, entrusting subsequent operations to his son Sher Singh. Better equipped, better trained and numerically superior, the forces of Sher Singh inflicted the final defeat on the mujāhidīn at the battle of Bahkot (24 Dūr-i Ḍāla 1246/16 May 1831), in which Ismā'il and his leader Sayyid
Ahmad lost their lives. He was buried on the edge of the battlefield where his tomb still exists. No attention was paid to his grave during the Sikh or the British rule. It has now been renovated and the government of Pakistan has paid due attention to its upkeep and maintenance.

In spite of his pre-occupation with ḍīhād, traveling and delivering sermons, Shah Ismā'īl yet found time for writing books on diverse subjects. His writings include: (1) Tābūyāt al-imān (ed. Cawnpore 1343/1924), deals mainly with the unity of God and deprecates idolatrous practices such as the invocation of saints, angels etc. Its supplement Tazkīr al-Ḥikwān was composed by Muhammad Sultān in 1250/1834; (2) Mansāb-ī imāmāt (in Persian), deals with the concept of imāma in Islam and its various kinds (ed. Karachi 1962, Lahore trans. Lahore 1940); (3) Risāla Usūl al-fikr (in Arabic, ed. Delhi 1311/1893), a short treatise on 36 pp. on the principles of Islamic jurisprudence; (4) Tanwir al-‘aynayn fi tāḥrīt ra‘ī al-yadayn, (in Arabic, ed. Lahore n.d.), an exposition of what he and his followers stood for (for his spiritual guide Sayyid Ahmad and helps understand his teachings and the tenets professed by him; an exposition of what he and his followers stood for (its content see JARS, ii, 316 ff.); (5) Radd al-tāḥrīt al-cālī (in Arabic), Asafiyyah; 666; (6) Iddh al-hakfr al-sanh fi ahkdm al-mayyit wa ‘l-darth (1832), 479 ff.); (9) Radd al-ṣabab al ‘l-adīdd, (Ms.); Muhammad Nu‘mān, Ṣirāt-ī ‘alamīyya wa tāḥkīr al-abrār (Ms.); (10) Judhūl-i Fadl-i Hakk, (Ms.); ‘Āḥīd al-Ḍabārār, Kīṭāb al-‘l-batrā (Ms.); ‘Āṭī Muhammad Ḵān Shikārpaṭī, Rūz-nāma (in Persian, Ms. in the private collection of Husamuddin Rashid, Karachi); Amar Ṣāḥīb, Zafar-nāma-i Randīlī Sīnān (ed. Sītā Rām Kohlī, Lahore 1928; Muhammad Ḍī‘afar Thānāṣārī, Tawwārikh-i ʿagība or Sawānīkh-i Āḥmadī, Sādha warfare 1914; Mirzā Ḥayāt Dihlawī, Ḥayāt-i jāyihā, Lahore, n.d.; Siddīkī Hasan Ḵān, Tīktor ḍīhād al-abrār min tāḥkīr dhunād al-abrār, Bhopal 1293/1878; idem, Tarjim-ūn-i Wāhābīyā, (not seen); idem, Ḥabīb al-nubālā al-mustakīm, Cawnpore 1289/1872, 416; Ghlām Rāsūl Mīhr, Sayyid Ḥabīb Ahmad Shāhīd, Lahore n.d., extensive bibliography and pp. 13-26 for a critical appraisal of the original sources; Abdullah Butt (ed.), Ḥabīb Ahmad Shāhīd, Lahore 1953; W. W. Hunter, The Indian Muslims, Calcutta 1945; Gazetteer of the Hozur District, London 1908; S. M. Ikrām, Rād-i Kauṯārī, Lahore n.d.; al-Furqān (Bareilly, Urdu monthly), Şāh Ismā‘īl number, 1325 A. H. Shaban; JASB, i(1832), 479 ff.; JARS, ii, 316 ff. (A. S. Bazmī Ansārī).

ISMĀ‘ĪL ŚIDKI, the Egyptian politician and statesman, was born in 1875 into a family of Egyptian notables. Both his father and maternal grandfather enjoyed high positions in the official hierarchy of khedivial administration. Like most of his contemporaries who aspired for a political career, he studied law and took part in the anti-British student agitation encouraged by the khedive. Upon completing his studies in 1894, he was appointed a minor official in the Ministry of Justice. He rose quickly, partly through his own effort and initiative, but mainly through the influence of his family had, to be come the permanent under-secretary at the Ministry of Interior in 1908. In 1914 Śidki had his first cabinet appointment in the government of Rūshdī Pasha, from which he resigned soon after.

When the First World War ended in 1918, Śidki joined the Wafd movement and was exiled with Ṣa‘īd Qāżīlī to Malta in 1919, but when the Wafd was allowed to proceed to the Peace Congress he was among its members. In Paris differences arose among the delegates and Śidki, foreseeing the futility of Wafdist demands, left for Cairo. His departure from the Wafd marked a turning point in his career, for he became the moving spirit of the anti-Wafdist element in Egyptian politics. He played a leading role in the drafting and implementation of the Declaration of Independence of 1922 which granted Britain at her pleasure powers of the Suez Canal zone as well as the Constitution of 1923, both documents abhorrent to the Wafdist. Henceforward and until his retirement in 1946, Śidki was tireless in his confrontation with Wafdist policies in the conduct of Egypt's public affairs. He did not hesitate to employ armed force, including the use of British troops, to suppress Wafdist opposition and silence their publications. It was this that earned him the doubtful distinction of being the strong man of Egyptian politics. His reputation as a financial expert, however, was justly deserved.

Ismā‘īl Śidki became prime minister of Egypt twice, in 1930 and 1946, each time in the wake of nationalist ferment and public disturbances caused by the Wafdist failure to reach agreement with Britain on her position in Egypt and the Sudan. In 1932 Śidki amended the Constitution, restricting suffrage, and he formed the People's Party to give him support in Parliament. Śidki's terms of office were unhappy and unpopular. He failed to obtain sufficient concessions from Britain to normalize the relationship between the two countries, and he did not succeed in marshalling the support of Egyptian moderates to contain the extremism of the Wafd. In 1946 an agreement was intialled in London between Śidki and Ernest Bevin, British foreign secretary at the time, but once more Wafdist opposition made ratification impossible. Upon his return from Eng-
land, a sick and broken man, he retired from public life. Isma'il Sidki died in 1948.

History: Pre-Fatimid and Fatimid Times. After the death of Dja'far al-Siddiq's son Isma'il, after whom it is named.

The early Isma'ili missionaries in Western Persia and in Khurásan and Transoxania, in BSOAS, xxxii (1960), 56-90. A convert of al-Nasafi [q.v.], one of the ḏḍ'is of Khurásan and Transoxania, was the first to carry the propaganda to Sijistan, probably in the early decades of the 4th/10th century. Presumably in the first half of the 4th century, the Khurásani movement was converted by ḏḍ'is from Khurásan. In the Yemen two missionaries, 'All b. al-Fadl and Ibn Hawshab, known as Manṣūr al-Yaman [q.v.], in 268/881 established themselves in the area of the Djiabal Maswar and succeeded in gaining strong tribal support. In 270/883 Ibn Hawshab sent his nephew al-Haytham as a missionary to Sind. Later he sent ʿAbd al-Mannūr b. al-Diannābī [q.v.], a follower of Hamdān Kārmaṇ and 'Abdān, founded a Karmatji state in al-Bahrayn, from where he later conquered al-Qatif, Uman and al-Yamama. The whole movement was centrally directed, at first probably from al-Ahwāz and al-Baṣra and later from Salamiyya in Syria. Muḥammad b. IsmaiIll was active as an Imam, who had disappeared and was about to reappear as the Kā'im and to rule the world. The leaders of the movement in the absence of the Imam claimed the rank of ḏudūdas [q.v.].

In the year 286/899, after the succession of the future Fātimid Caliph ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ṭaḥrit, the leadership in Salamiyya, a schism split the movement, provoked by the claim of ʿUbayd Allāh to the imamate for himself and his ancestors. Hamdān Kārmaṇ and 'Abdān, who may have previously drifted slightly away from the doctrine propagated by the leadership, broke off their support. 'Abdān consequently was murdered by a subordinate ḏḍ'ī, Zikrawayh b. Mihrwawayh [q.v.], who at first pretended to be loyal to the leadership. Zikrawayh and his sons organized the "Kārmatji" revolts among Syrian bedouin tribes from the year 289/902 until his capture and execution in 294/907. Doubts concerning Zikrawayh's loyalty, which soon turned out to be justified, induced 'Ubayd Allāh to leave Salamiyya for the journey which ended with his establishment as caliph in Raṣkāda in 297/910.

Though information concerning the attitude of the various Ismai'lli groups following the split of the movement is scanty, the results can be summarized with some degree of probability as follows: The community in the Yemen at first remained faithful to ʿUbayd Allāh. ʿAll b. al-Fadl, however, in 299/913 renounced his allegiance to him and made war on Ibn Hawshab, who remained loyal. After ʿAll's death in 303/915 his party disintegrated rapidly. The ḏḍ'is in the Maghrib and probably in Sind, having been sent by Ibn Hawshab, also remained loyal. There are indications that the ḏḍ'is in Khurāsan generally maintained its allegiance to ʿUbayd Allāh, who was able to appoint some ḏḍ'is there, but there were probably also counter-currents. The communities in ʿIrāk, al-Bahrayn, and western Persia refused to recognize the Fātimid claim to the imamate. Among the Karmatīs of ʿIrāk ʿIssa b. Mūsā, a nephew of ʿAbdān, continued the latter's work propagating the imamate of Muhammad b. Ismai'll, who would return as the Kā'im. After 320/932 he was active in Baghdād. He and other ḏḍ'īs in ʿIrāk ascribed their writings to ʿAbdān, thus stressing the doctrinal continuity. The ḏḍ'īs of al-Rayy were in close contact with those in ʿIrāk and with the Karmatis of al-Bahrayn and like them were expecting the reappearance of the Mahdi-imān for the year 316/928. At least in the twenties of the 4th century (1030-9) they controlled the missions in Mosul and Bagdad. They worked successfully among the Daylamis and won at least the temporary allegiance of Daylami leaders like Asfār, Mardawīdī and later of some rulers of the Mughirūd Dynasty. The Karmatis of al-Bahrayn, led by ʿAbū Ṭāhir al-Diannābī, were predicting the appearance of the Mahdi-imān for the year 316/928. In 319/931 they accepted a Persian prisoner of war as the Expected One, and ʿAbū Ṭāhir turned the rule over to him. The early disastrous end of the affair weakened the ideological vigour of the Karmats of al-Bahrayn and their influence among the ḏḍ'īs in ʿIrāk and Persia, but did not generally lead to an expansion of Fātimid influence. Soon afterwards the great revolt of the Khāridjī Ābū Yazīd [q.v.] under the Fātimid Caliphs al-Kā'im and al-Manṣūr stifled any Fātimid activity among the eastern Ismai'lli communities. Only the fourth Fātimid, al-Muʿizz (341/953-365/975), was in a position to lead an intensive campaign to regain the allegiance of the schismatic Ismai'llis. His efforts were partially successful, but failed in regard to the Karmatis of al-Bahrayn and Hadhramawt, who in eastern hostility erupted after the Fātimid conquest of Egypt in 358/966, in open warfare against the Fātimid armies. After concluding a peace with the Fātimid al-ʿAzīz in 360/973-979, the Mahdi-imān of al-Bahrayn were reduced to a local power unable to exert any ideological influence beyond its boundaries. The movement still supporting the doctrine of the return of Muhammad

The first time of al-Mu'izz a Fātimid vassal state was established in Multān in Sind. The Isma'īllī dā'ī there succeeded before 348/959 in converting a local ruler. Multān became an Isma'īllī stronghold where the khuffa was read in the name of the Fātimid caliph. This success probably strengthened the Fātimid cause also in the neighbouring regions, for in Murlūn the khuffa was also read for the Fātimids about the year 378/988. The dā'ī Abū Ya'qūb al-Sijisti (q.v.), who supported the Fātimid doctrine at least from the time of al-Mu'izz on, probably was active in Sijdhān before his death in the second half of the 4th/10th century. In Dirūfīt in Kirmān a Fātimid dā'ī was residing toward the end of the 4th/10th century. The Isma'īllī state in Multān lasted until 401/1010-1, when Maḥmūd of Ghazna annexed the town, took its ruler prisoner and massacred many Isma'īllīs (see S. M. Stern, *Isma'īllī propaganda and Fātimid rule in Sind*, in DC, xxiii (1949), 298-307).

During the last years of the reign of al-Ḥākim (386/996-411/1021) extremist Isma'īlīs in Cairo began to proclaim the divinity of this Fātimid caliph. Their leadership soon passed to Ḥamza b. 'Ali (q.v.), who became the founder of the Druze religious doctrine. The official Fātimid da'wa organization remained adamantly opposed to this movement, although al-Ḥākim at times showed it favour. After al-Ḥākim's death it was persecuted by the Fātimid government and wiped out in Cairo, but succeeded in solidifying its hold over the mountainous regions in Syria which, with some modifications, became the permanent home of the Druze community. The Druze religion (see DURUZ), though derived from Isma'īl doctrine, transformed its basic ideas to such a degree as to be usually considered as falling outside the range of Isma'īlīs.

In Ḥirḵiyā the Isma'īllī communities were practically exterminated by popular riots after the accession of al-Mu'izz b. Bādis, Zirid vassal of the Fātimids, in 407/1016. The missionary efforts of the Fātimids during their residence in Ḥirḵiyā had achieved the conversion of only small groups of the urban population, while the masses, led by the Maḥṭūlsa, were solidly opposed to Fātimid rule and Shi'ism. Large numbers of Kūtān tribesmen, who traditionally furnished the main body of the Fātimid army, left for Egypt with the Fātimid al-Mu'izz. Most of the leading dā'īs also departed at that time. The Sanḥājī tribe, which supported Zirid rule, now officially adhered to Isma'īlīsm. During the year 407/1016-7 the Isma'īllīs in al-Ḵayrawān, al-Mansūrūlya, al-Mahdıyya, Tun, Tripoli, and other towns were attacked and massacred by the populace with the countenance of the government. Sporadic massacres took place also during the following years. The Isma'īllī communities were thus extinguished long before al-Mu'izz in 440/1049 renounced his allegiance to the Fātimids and recognized 'Abbāsīd sovereignty (see H. R. Idiris, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Zirides*, Paris 1962, 143-9).

During the reign of the Caliph al-Muṣṭaṣir (427/1036-427/1049) the Isma'īllīs achieved new successes in the Yemen and India. In the Yemen the da'wa after the death of Ibn Hawshāb had suffered major setbacks and survived only precariously, though in the period 379/989-387/997 it had gained the allegiance and support of the Ya'furid amir 'Abd Allāh b. Kāftūn, ruler of Schābī and conqueror of Šabīd from the Ziyāyids. In 429/1038 'Allī b. Muḥammad al-Ṣulaybī, Fātimid dā'ī and founder of the Šulaybīd dynasty, rose in Masār in the Ḥarāz region. Through the activity of the Šulaybīds (q.v.) Fātimid sovereignty came to extend over all of Yemen and temporarily over other parts of Arabia like Qumān and al-Bahrain (see H. F. al-Hamdānī, *Al-Šulaybiyyān*, Cairo 1955). The Šulaybīds also furthered renewed efforts at spreading Isma'īlīsm on the Indian subcontinent. Although parts of the Isma'īllī community in Sind evidently had survived the persecution under Maḥmūd of Ghazna and Isma'īlīsm seems to have been espoused by the Sūmra dynasty of local Hindu origin (see A. H. al-Hamdānī, *The Beginnings of the Isma'īllī Da'wa in Northern India*, Cairo 1956), contacts with the Fātimid da'wa faded. The Isma'īllīs in Sind may have drifted partially back to Hindu practices and beliefs. A new Isma'īllī community was now founded by Yemenite da'īs in the area of Cambay, Gudjarāt, which had close commercial ties with the Yemen. According to the traditional account an Arab da'ī, 'Abd Allāh, arrived with two Indian assistants in Gudjarāt in 460/1068, sent by the Yemenite chief da'ī Lamā b. Mālik. Less in the last years of the reign of al-Muṣṭaṣir the Isma'īllī cause in Persia was reinvigorated by the activity of Ḥasan-i Šabbāb (q.v.). After travelling widely and carrying on propaganda in various regions of the country, he seized the fortress of Alamāt (q.v.) in the mountains of Daylam in 483/1090, thus opening a new phase in the Isma'īllī activity in Persia. The clandestine missionary work to which the da'wa in Persia had mostly been restricted was replaced by a policy of open revolt which, in the face of the overwhelming military strength of the Seljuq government, was based on the seizure of impregnable mountain fortresses, thus opening a new phase in the Isma'īllī cause. Another da'ī, Abū 'Hamza, captured two castles near Ararat in the border region between Fārs and Kūhristān. After the death of al-Muṣṭaṣir the...
Tanşir in 487/1094, a major split occurred in the Ismāʿīlī movement concerning the succession to the imamate. Al-Mustansir had originally designated his eldest son, Nizār [q.v.], as his heir. Later his youngest son, Aṣmad, found the support of the vizier al-Aḍal [q.v.], who after the death of al-Mustansir placed him on the throne with the title al-Mustaṣill [q.v.]. Nizār fled to Alexandria, where he rose in revolt, was defeated, seized and immured. Hasan-i ʿAbdallāh and the Persian Ismāʿīlīs upheld the right of Nizār to the succession and refused to recognize al-Mustaṣill. In the absence of the imam, Hasan-i ʿAbdallāh became the supreme chief claiming the rank of ḫudūḏa. After his death the leadership continued with the rulers of Alamūt. Beginning with the fourth ruler, Hasan al-dāʿīʾibārīs ʿI-salām (557/1162-561/1166), they came to be recognized as imāms. Against numerous ʿAlīdūḏ attacks the Nizārīs were able to hold and expand their territories in the Elburz mountains and Kuhištān. The fortress Shāhāḏa near ʾIsfahān, which they seized about the year 494/1100, was lost again in 500/1107. Some time afterwards the Nizārī fortresses near Arradjan were overcome. Among the Ismāʿīlīs in Egypt and Syria there were also partisans of Nizār. In Egypt they were gradually suppressed. In Syria, which fell largely outside the Fāṭimid territory, they were soon organized by emissaries from Alamūt and were seriously rivalled by the supporters of the Fāṭimid caliphate, especially in Damascus and Aleppo. The Dājjal al-Summāḵ and surrounding area north of Ḥamāt soon became a stronghold of the Nizārīs. As in Persia they aimed at acquiring fortresses, but failed in their first attempts, and practised political murder. In 520/1126 Tuḥṭagīn, ruler of Damascus, ceded to them the fortress of Bānīyā on the frontier with the Franks and gave them official recognition in Damascus. His son Būrū in 523/1139 encouraged anti-Ismāʿīlī rioting in Damascus in which the Nizārī community was virtually wiped out. The fortress of Bānīyā was consequently surrendered by the Nizārīs to the Franks. Soon afterwards they achieved lasting success in the Dājjal Baharī ʿa area west of Ḥamāt. In 527/1132-3 they acquired the fortress of Kadmus, and other fortresses came into their possession during the following decade. Maṣṭūf, the most important stronghold, was seized in 535/1140-1. The Ismāʿīlīs in Persia and Syria there were also partisans of Nizār. Later he and all other members of the Fāṭimid family were permanently detained as prisoners by the Ayyūbīd rulers. As a result of a pro-Fāṭimid conspiracy in Cairo in 568/1172-3 many of the supporters of the deposed dynasty were exiled to Upper Egypt, which became a hotbed of pro-Fāṭimid activity. In 572/1176-7 a pretender claiming to be al-Hāfiz al-Qāsimī al-ʿĀṣirī declared himself imām. The Dājjalīs soon became a rare minority.

The post-Fāṭimid period. Hāfizīyya: After the overthrow of the Fāṭimid caliphate in 567/1171 the Hāfizīyya, no longer enjoying official support, gradually disintegrated. Al-ʿAḍīdī, the last Fāṭimid caliph, had appointed his son Dāʾūd as his successor with the title al-Hāfiz. Later his youngest son, Nizār, was proclaimed as his heir. After al-Amīr's death his eldest son, Nizār, was recognized by the Hāfizīs as the imām after al-ʿAḍīdī. He and all other members of the Fāṭimid family were permanently detained as prisoners by the Ayyūbīds. As a result of a pro-Fāṭimid conspiracy in Cairo in 568/1172-3 many of the supporters of the deposed dynasty were exiled to Upper Egypt, which became a hotbed of pro-Fāṭimid activity. In 572/1176-7 a pretender claiming to be al-Hāfiz al-Qāsimī al-ʿĀṣirī declared himself imām. The Dājjalīs soon became a rare minority. al-Hāfiz lost all official backing with the Ayyūbīd conquest. The Tayyībiyya dāʾūds ʿAll b. Muḥammad al-Walīd (d. 612/1215) still composed polemical treatises and poems against the "Madjīdīyya", but they were already becoming a rare minority. Ṭayyībiyya [q.v.]: The insignificant Ṭayyībi communities in Egypt and Syria, known as Amūrīyya, are only rarely mentioned in the sources. Toward the end of the 6th/12th century there is a vague reference...
to the presence of Amiriyya in Egypt. In Syria a community of Amiriyya is still mentioned about the year 972/1564 in the Bakri and Zabad mountains near Sa‘id. These isolated communities probably did not survive much longer. Only in the Yemen and India could the Ta‘yibi da‘wa, under the undisputed leadership of the da‘i muflak, establish itself permanently. After Ibrāhīm al-Hamīdī the position of da‘i muflak remained among his descendants until 603/1209, when it passed to Muhammad b. Muhammad of the Banū ‘l-Walid al-Anf family, which was named after his ancestor Ibrāhīm al-Anf, who was a prominent supporter of the Āl Shāhīs and a descendant of the Umayyad al-Walid b. ‘Utba b. Abī Sufyān. It remained in this family, with only two interruptions in the 7th/13th century, until 946/1539. The traditional stronghold of the Ismā‘īlī da‘wa in the Yemen was in the Harāz [q.v.] mountains, though there were scattered communities in other parts of the country. The da‘ifs generally enjoyed the support, or at least protection, of the Hamādāns [q.v.], who permitted them to reside in Sa‘n‘ā‘ and later, in the 8th/14th century, in the fortress of Dhu Marmar. Their relations with the Ayyūbids and the Rāsīlids were fair, but the Zaydī imāms were mostly hostile. The Zaydī pretender al-Mansūr ʿAli b. ʿAlī al-Dīn expelled them from Dhu Marmar in 929/1524 after a prolonged siege, and they lost their habitation in the Harāz mountains. The Zaydī Imām al-Mu‘thahhar b. ʿAbd al-Dīn in the 10th/16th century relentlessly persecuted the Banū ‘l-Anf and seems to have practically extinguished the family. The relations with the da‘wa in India remained close. The Ta‘yibi community grew mostly undisturbed, though in the first half of the 9th/15th century persecution under the Sultanate of Gudjarat resulted in mass conversions to Sunnism. In 946/1539 the position of da‘i muflak passed to an Indian, and after his death in 947/1540 the headquarters were transferred to Gudjarat in India.

After the death of Da‘ūd b. ʿAqīl b. ʿAbd al-Malik, in 959/1551, the succession was disputed. While in India Da‘ūd Būrān b. Tāhir al-Dīn was established, Da‘ūd b. ʿAbd al-Malik’s representative in the Yemen, Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Hasan al-Hindi, claimed to have been designated successor by the deceased da‘i muflak. The dispute was not resolved and led to the permanent schism between the Da‘ūdī and Sulaymānī factions which accepted separate lines of da‘ifs. Among the Sulaymānīs, whose cause had few adherents in India, the position of da‘i muflak in 1050/1640 passed to the Yemenite Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Faḥd al-Makramī [q.v.] family, in which it has remained since with few interruptions. The Makramī da‘ifs established themselves in Na‘dirān [q.v.], where they were supported by the Banū Yām [q.v.]. Before 1131/1719 they conquered the Harāz region in the Yemen and held it against all attempts of the Zaydī imāms to expel them. The Da‘ūd al-Hasan b. Hībat Allāh (d. 1285/1767) conquered Ḥadramawt and unsuccessfully fought the rise of the Ayyūbī dynasty in Central Arabia. From Harāz the Makramīs were expelled in 1289/1872 by the Ottoman general ʿAbd al-Malik Pasha, who took their fortress ʿAtṭāra and treacherously killed the Da‘ūd al-Hasan b. Ismā‘īl ʿAlī Shībām al-Makramī. The present da‘i muflak of the Sulaymānīs is Da‘ūd al-Dīn ʿAli b. al-Ḥusayn al-Makramī, who succeeded his father in 1930 (see A. A. A. Fyzee, Three Sulaymānī Da‘ifs: 1936-1939, in JBBRAS, xvi (1940), 101-4). Besides the Banū Yām in Nāṣirān, the people of the Dībāl Maḥārib in Harāz are Sulaymānīs. In India the Sulaymānīs da‘ifs are represented by Ṣāfīābīs residing in Baroda. Sulaymānīs live mainly in Bombay, Boroda, and Ḥadīrābād, Deccan.

The Da‘ūdī da‘ifs after the split continued to reside in India, where the great majority of their followers live. The da‘wa generally was able to develop freely, though there was another wave of persecution under Arwaṅgīl (1047/1637-1088/1679). Since 1200/1785 the headquarters of the da‘ifs have been in Surat. The present da‘i muflak is Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Bakr al-Dīn, who succeeded his father Tāhir Sayf al-Dīn in 1966. Da‘ūdī Ismā‘īlīs live chiefly in Gudjarat, Bombay, and Central India. In Yemen there are Da‘ūdīs in the Harāz region. (For minor secessions from the Da‘ūdīs [see Bohorās].)

Nizārīyya [q.v.]: The imāmate of the Nizārīs remained vested in the lords of Alamūt until the surrender of the fortress to the Mongol conqueror Hūlagū in 654/1256 and the consequent execution of the imām Rukn al-Dīn Khūshbū. Practically nothing is known about the imāms following him. Later lists of the imāms differ widely concerning their names, number, and sequence. The list now considered official in the Aḵā Khānī branch has come to be generally accepted only since the latter half of the 19th century. There are vague indications that the imāms after the fall of Alamūt resided in Aḏharbāyjān. A split occurred in the line of imāms when Muhammad Shams al-Dīn, usually considered the son of Khūshbū, or his son Mu‘min-Shāh, who is omitted in some lists. One line continues with Kāsim-Shāh, the other with Muhammad Shāh. The Kāsim-Shāh imāms in the latter part of the 9th/15th century resided in Aḏjudān, a village near Māḥallāt, where the tombs of some of them are preserved. From this time until the 19th century the imāms were usually affiliated to the Nīṣārī Ālā’ī ʿṢūfī order. After a lapse of nearly one and a half centuries there are further tombs of imāms in Aḏjudān dating from 1043/1631 to 1090/1680. It is unknown where the family lived in the intervening period. Imām Shāh Nizar, who died in 1134/1722 is buried in Kāhāk, a village near Aḏjudān (see W. Ivanow, Tombs of some Persian Ismā‘īlī Imams, in JBBRAS, iv (1938), 49-62). In the time of Nāṣir Shāh ‘Ṣūfī Shāh (r. 1376-1397) Imām Sayyid Hasan Beg moved to Shāb-i Bābak and acquired a winter residence in Kirmān. The imāms now rose from their previous obscurity to involve ment in political life. Imām Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Shāh was governor of Kirmān from 1169/1756 until his death in 1206/1791-2. His son Shāh Khallī Allāh, who enjoyed the favour of the Kāḏār Fāṭḥ ʿAlī Shāh, returned to Kāhāk and later moved to Yadz, where he was killed by a mob in 1232/1817. Khallī Allāh’s son, Hasan ‘Alī Shāh Maḥallātī, was granted by Fāṭḥ ʿAlī Shāh the title Aḵā Khān [q.v.], which has remained hereditary among his successors. After a vain attempt at gaining independent rule of Kirmān, Hasan ‘Alī Shāh moved to India in 1259/1843 (see H. Algar, The Revolt of Aḵā Khān Maḥallātī and the Transference of the Ismā‘īlī Imamate to India, in SI, xxiv (1953), 55-81). Bombay became the permanent seat of the imāmate. The present (1971) Aḵā Khān, Karim Khān, succeeded his grandfather, Sultan Muhammad Shāh, in 1937.

The branch of Muhammad-Shāh apparently was closely associated with the Nīṣārī community in Daylān. In 776/1374-5 Khudawand Muhammad, who may be identical with Muhammad-Shāh, gained possession of the fortress of Alamūt with the support of the local Nīṣārīs. He was consequently expelled and sought refuge with Timūr, who sent him
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to confinement in Sultaniyya. The family continued
to live in Sultaniyya until after 894/1489. Members of
it, however, were repeatedly active among the
Nizarls in Daylam until the middle of the gth/isth
century. The most famous imam of the MuhammadShahi line, Shah Tahir Husaynl DakkanI, because of
his religious following aroused the suspicion of the
Safawid Shah Ismacil, was exiled to Kashan and
later forced to leave Persia. In 928/1522 he came to
Alimadnagar in the Dekkan, where he was instrumental in bringing about the proclamation of Shicism
as the official religion by the ruler Burhan Nizam
Shah. Shah Tahir probably died in 956/1549. His
descendants lived in Alimadnagar and later in
Awrangabad (see W. Ivanow, A forgotten branch of the
Ismailis, in JRAS, 1938, 57-79). The last imam of this
branch, so far as is known, was Amir Muhammad
Bakir, whose last contact with his Syrian followers
was in 1210/1796. As well as in Daylam, the Muhammad-Shahl line had supporters in Badakhshan and
the Kabul area in the ioth/i6th and uth/i7th
centuries, though by the beginning of the I3th/i9th
century the Ismacllls there seem to have generally
adhered to the Kasim-Shahl line. The community in
Syria generally recognized the Muhammad-Shahi
line. In a period of troubles contact with the Imam
Muhammad BSkir was lost after the year 1210/1796.
In 1304/1887, after a vain search for descendants of
Mubammad Bakir, a section of the Syrian community
recognized the Agha Khani line. In 1957 about 30,000
Syrian Nizarls, living in Salamiyya and the villages
of al-Khawabi, adhered to the Agha Khani line.
About 15,000, known as Djacfariyya and living in
Kadmus, Masyaf, and some villages near Salamiyya,
continued to adhere to the Muhammad-Shahi line
The Nizarl communities, widely dispersed territorially and partially separated by language barriers,
developed largely independently of each other,
especially after the fall of Alamut. They were led by
local leaders, shaykhs or pirs,, who alone could claim
access to the hidden imams The Syrian Nizarls
during the later Alamut period continued to be
ruled by Persian agents sent by the imams. After the
fall of Alamut they at first preserved their political
independence and joined the Muslim efforts to expel
the Mongol invaders in 658/1260 from Syria, but later
were gradually subdued by the Mamluk Sultan
Baybars I. By the end of the year 671/1273 Baybars
controlled all their fortresses. The Isma'llls remained
subjects of the Mamluks and later of the Ottomans,
paying a special tax. During the late i8th and the
i9th centuries they were frequently involved in
clashes with their neighbours, especially with the
numerically stronger NusayrTs, who repeatedly occupied their fortresses. About the middle of the igth
century the Ismacills restored the town of Salamiyya
[q.v.] and settled the surrounding area east of Hamat,
where now approximately two thirds of the communitv live. The last Nusayri attack and occupation
of Kadmus took place in 1920, causing much damage
to property and manuscripts (see N. N. Lewis, The
Isma^llis of Syria today, in Royal Central Asian
In Persia the Ismaclll communities were decimated by massacres but survived after the surrender
of Alamut and the other fortresses in Daylam and
Kuhistan. Alamut was briefly reoccupied in 674/
1275, but lost again in the next year. In the second
half of the 8th/i4th and the first half of the gth/isth
centuries it was repeatedly, though only for short

spans of time, i'n Nizarl hands. The Nizari community in Daylam was still a force in the local power
struggle in this period, though it was usually on the
defensive, especially against the Zaydi rulers of
Lahidjan. After this time it gradually disappeared. In
Kuhistan small IsmaciK communities have survived
in the area of Ka°in and Birdjand. Other Nizarl communities are found in the area of Nishapur in Khurasan, around Kirman, in Sirdjan and the Djabal
Bariz, and in the area of Mafcallat and Yazd.
The IsmacIHs of the Upper Oxus region seern to
have accepted the Nizarl imamate before the end of
the Alamut period, though the exact date and circumstances are unknown. Local tradition in Shughnan
[q.v.] mentions two ddeis, Sayyid Shah Making and
Shah Khamush, who were sent by the imam and
became the founders of the dynasties of pirs and
mtrs ruling Shughnan. In 913/1507-8 Shah Radiyy alDin, who is perhaps to be identified with the imam of
the Muhammad-Shahi line of that name, the father of
Shah Tahir DakkanI, came from Slstan to Badakhshan and with the support of the local Ismacills
established his rule over large parts of the region. In
consequence of quarrels among his supporters he
was killed in spring 1509. In the uth/i7th century
another imam of the Muhammad-Shahi line, Khudaybakhsh, seems to have taken up residence in
B a d a k h s h a n and died there in 1074/1663-4. The
Ismaclll communities continued to be guided by local
dynasties of pirs. There are Nizarl communities
recognizing the Agha Khans also in the area of
Ghazna, in C h i t r a l , Gilgit, H u n z a , where they
are known as Mawla'is, and in the area of Y ark and
and Kashghar.
The date and circumstances of the introduction of
Nizarl Ismacilism in India are obscure. A continuity
of Ismaclli activity in Sind, especially the Multan
area, ever since the early dacwa there, is attested by
sparse notices in the sources. In the first half of the
7th/i3th century this activity extended to Dihli. It
may at this time well have been inspired by emissaries
of the imams of Alamut; but definite evidence is
lacking. The first pirs mentioned in the religious
literature of the Indian Nizarls cannot be dated with
any degree of certainty. The shrine of the earliest one,
Satgur Nur, is in Nawsari in Gudjarat, where the
religious texts place his activity. The presence of nonTayyibl Ismacllis in Gudjarat is vaguely attested for
the first half of the 7th/i3th century. Pir Shams alDin according to the texts came from Persia to Sind
and became the founder of the dynasty of pirs there.
If the traditional pedigree of pirs is reliable, he may
have lived in the first half of the Sth/i^th century, as
some sources suggest. Other sources date him one or
two centuries earlier. His mausoleum is in Multan.
Pir Sadr al-Dm and Pir Hasan Kablr al-DIn of the
9th/i«th century are buried near Uch, south of
Multan. Sadr al-DIn is traditionally considered the
founder and organizer of the Khodja [q.v.] community,
which consists mostly of converts of the Hindu
Lohana caste. Kablr al-Dm's son Imam-Shah after
about the year 875/1470-1 was active in Gudjarat
where he converted numerous Hindus.
Imam-Shah died in 926/1520 and is buried in
Pirana near Ahmadabad. His son and successor Nar
(Nur) Muhammad-Shah (d.94O/i533-4) repudiated the
recognition of the imam in Persia and claimed the
imamate for himself, thus founding a separate sect
whose adherents are known as Imam-Shahls or Satpanthls. The sect later split further around different
lines of pirs. It has tended to revert toward Hinduism.
Its followers, who are to be found chiefly in Gudjarat


and Khandesh, consider themselves mostly as Imami Shi'is, though they recognize the Isma'ili imams before the split (see W. Ivanow, The sect of Imam Shah in Gujrat, in JBBRAS, xxii (1936), 19-70). Other Nizari in Gujrarat remained faithful to the imams in Persia. The great majority of Nizaris on the Indian subcontinent belong to the Khodja community. There are, however, other Nizari groups, such as the Shamsis, followers of Pir Shams al-Din in Fandjar and others. The Khodjas live chiefly in lower Sind, Cutch, Gujjarat, Bombay, and in diaspora in East and South Africa, Ceylon, and Burma.

Doctrine. Pre-Fatimid and Fatimid times: Nothing definite is known about the doctrine of the early supporters of the imamate of Isma'ili and his son Muhammad. Isma'ili sources maintain that the Khattabiyaa (q.v.), the followers of the extremist Shi'i Abu 'l-Khattab (q.v.), constituted the bulk of the early Isma'iliyya. Later Isma'ili doctrine, however, generally condemns Abu 'l-Khattab and does not appear to be substantially influenced by the heresies ascribed to him and his followers (see W. Ivanow, Ibn al-Qaddab, Bombay 1957). The "Umm al-khidah preserved by the Isma'ilis of Badakhshan, in which Abu 'l-Khattab appears as a saintly disciple of Imam Muhammad al-Bakir and his sons are called the founders of Isma'iliism. The sources written not earlier than the beginning of the 4th/10th century and perhaps as late as the early Alaman period. The ideas of the Shi'i ghulat (q.v.) represented in it are for the most part not specifically Isma'ilis and evidently not derived from Isma'ili sources. The work thus must not be considered "proto-Isma'ili".

The doctrine propagated by the pre-Fatimid Isma'ilis revolutionary movement of the second half of the 3rd/9th century can be derived in its outlines from later Isma'ili works and reports of anti-Isma'ili authors. It embodied already the basic framework of the later Isma'ili religious system, though it was consequently modified in some important respects. Fundamental was the distinction between the dhikir exterior or exoteric, and the ba'tin (see Batinyya), inward or esoteric, aspects of religion. The dhikir consists in the apparent, generally accepted meaning of the revealed scriptures and in the religious law laid down in them. It changes with each prophet. The ba'tin consists in the truths (hadi'ik; hidden) concealed in the scriptures and laws, which are unchangeable and are made apparent from them by the i'tifal (q.v.), interpretation, which is often of a cabalistic nature relying on the mystical significance of letters and numbers.

These truths form a gnostic system comprising a cosmology and a cyclical hierohistory. At the basis of the pre-Fatimid cosmology was a myth, only imperfectly reflected in the later sources, according to which the divine imperative kun, consisting of the letters kaf and nun, through duplication formed the two original principles ka'ni and kaddar. Kaudi was the female and kaddar the male principle. The seven letters kaddar were known as the seven higher letters (al-akhir al-sulayyina) which are the archetypes of the seven messenger prophets and their revealed messages. From the two first principles proceeded three spiritual powers, dżadd, fath, and khayal, identified with the three archangels Dibra'ili, Mikail, and Isra'ili, which mediate between the spiritual world and man in the physical world (on this triad see H. Corbin, Le livre réunissant les deux sagesse, Tehran-Paris 1955, Etude préliminaire, 91-112). The cyclical history progresses through seven eras, each inaugurated by an enunciator (najjib) prophet bringing a revealed message. Each of the first six najjibs, Idaun, Noh, Ibrāhīm, Musa, 'Isa, and Muhammad, was followed by a fundament (asas) or silent one (sāμīt), who revealed the ba'tin of the message, and by seven imams. The seventh imam in each era rises in rank and becomes the najjib of the following era, abrogating the law of the previous najjib and bringing a new one. In the era of Muhammad, 'Ali was the asas and Muhammad b. Isma'il the seventh imam. Muhammad b. Isma'il on his reappearance in the near future will become the seventh najjib, the Kā'im or Mahdi (q.v.), and will abrogate the law of Islam. His message will, however, consist in the full revelation of the ba'tin truths without any dhikir law. He will rule the world and then end the physical world, sitting in judgment over humanity. During his absence he is represented by twelve budis residing in the twelve regions (d'asā'ir) of the earth. The cyclical history was sometimes coupled with astrological speculations, and astrological predictions were made specifically concerning the date of the coming of the Kā'im.

Before the coming of the Kā'im the ba'tin must be kept secret and can be revealed to the neophyte only on swearing an oath of initiation with a vow of secrecy and on payment of a due. The initiation, known as badhaq, was no doubt gradual, but there is no evidence of a strictly fixed sequence of grades generally followed at one time or another.

In the pre-Fatimid era religious sources. The imams in Isma'ili religious texts serve mostly ideal functions and cannot be taken as corresponding closely to the actual organization (see W. Ivanow, The organization of the Fātimid propaganda, in JBBRAS, xv (1939), 1-35).

From about the beginning of the 4th/10th century onwards the early cosmology was superseded and partially replaced by a cosmology of Neoplatonic origin, apparently first propounded by the dā'iq al-Nasafi (q.v.). In this cosmology God is described as absolutely beyond the origin, on which the divine imperative kuni kadar, the plants with the vegetative nāmiya; soul develop from them the animals with the sensitive (hiisiyaa) soul develop, and from the latter, man with the rational (nādhā) soul. Al-Nasafi's cosmology was generally adopted in its essentials, though refined and elaborated by the later authors. Some minor points aroused controversy among them. The principles of the spiritual world in this cosmology were identified with terms of the religious sphere. Thus the Intellect in religious terminology was equated with the Pen (Kalam) and the Throne ('Arsh), and the Soul was identified with the Tablet (La'ah) and the Footstool (Kursi) etc. Much stressed were the analogies between the spiritual, astral, and physical worlds and between man as the
microcosm and the physical world as the macrocosm. The official Fāṭimid da'wa apparently did not accept this cosmology until the time of the Caliph al-Mu'izz.

A somewhat different cosmological system was propounded by the dā'ī Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī (q.v.) (d. about 411/1021). Instead of the duality of the Intellect and the Soul his system comprises ten intellects in the spiritual world. The Soul is replaced by the Second Intellect or First Emanation (al-Munbātīkh al-Awsal), proceeding from the lower relation (al-nisba al-adwān) of the First Intellect. The Third Intellect or Second Emanation and First Potential Being, proceeding from the lower relation (al-nisba al-adwān) of the First Intellect, is equated with matter and form (al-hayāt wa 'l-sūra). From the First and Second Intellects proceed seven further intellects. The tenth one is the Active Intellect (al-'Aql al-Fā'dīl) or demigre going the physical world. The structure of the astral and the physical worlds and of the religious hierarchy were similarly modified by al-Kirmānī in close analogy to the spiritual world. The system of al-Kirmānī was not adopted by the Fāṭimid da'wa. Only among the Ṭāyyībīs in the Yemen did it replace the earlier traditional system.

Fāṭimid doctrine, because of the Fāṭimid claim to the imamate, was forced to modify the early doctrine concerning the role of Muḥammad b. Isāmāl as the first imām and Mahdī and the restriction of the number of imāms to seven. ʿUbayd Allāh al-Mahdī at first radically broke with this earlier doctrine by asserting that the imām after Dīyaʾar al-Sādīq had been his son ʿAbd Allāh rather than Isāmāl and that the imāmate continued to be handed down among his descendants without restriction in number. Soon, however, attempts were made to accommodate the Fāṭimid claim to the imāmate with the earlier theory. Muhammad b. Isāmāl was again recognized as imām and as ancestor of the Fāṭimid. His return as the Kāʾīm was sometimes interpreted spiritually, as being realized in the rise of the Fāṭimids, who would gradually fulfill the predictions concerning the Kāʾīm. A second heptad of imāms, often called the deputies (ḥudūf) of the Kāʾīm, was admitted in the era of Muḥammad as a special privilege of the latter. The eschatological expectations in respect to the Kāʾīm were to be fulfilled after the expiration of the second heptade of imāms. This theory also had to be abandoned as the Fāṭimid caliphate continued, though even then the eschatological events generally were expected in the near future (see W. Madelung, Das Imamat in der frühen ismaʿilitischen Lehre, in Isl., xxxvii (1961), 42-125).

Fāṭimid doctrine, in contrast to the pre-Fāṭimid attitude which tended to depreciate the sākīr, consistently maintained the equal importance of the sākīr and the bāṭīn and made every effort to suppress antinomian trends, which, however, often came to the surface among more radical Ismāʿīlī groups. The Ismāʿīlī sīkhi was closely elaborated chiefly by the Kādī al-Nūmān (q.v.) (d. 369/979), whose work Dāʾīʾīm al-Īslām became the most authoritative exposition of it. Ismāʿīlī law agrees in general with Imāmī law, but does not permit the muʿāa (q.v.) temporary marriage and nullifies bequests to a legal heir except with the consent of the other heirs (see A. A A Fyzee, Compendium of Fatimid Law, Simla 1969). In the ritual, Ismāʿīlī sīkhi also agrees generally with Imāmī doctrine (see R. Strohmann, Recht der Ismaʿiliten, in Isl., xxxi (1954), 131-48). It gives, however, full authority to the imām for determining the beginning of a new month rather than requiring the sight of the new moon. In practice the beginning of the month was fixed by astronomical calculation. Thus it fell often one or two days earlier than for the other Muslims. This often led to friction in particular in respect to the beginning and end of the fast month of Ramadān.

Post-Fāṭimid times. Ṭāyyībī doctrine: The Ṭāyyībī community in the Yemen and India preserved a large part of the Fāṭimid religious literature and retained the interest in the gnostic cosmology and cyclical history of the Fāṭimid age. Ṭāyyībī doctrine, however, from the beginning adopted the cosmological system of al-Kirmānī in place of the traditional Fāṭimid system, and modified it by introducing a mythical "drama in heaven", first described by the second dāʿī muḥāfīd Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī (q.v.), which profoundly shaped the Ṭāyyībī gnosis. According to this myth, the two emanations from the First Intellect, the Second and Third Intellects, were rivals for the second rank after the First Intellect. As the Second Intellect reached this position by his superior efforts, the Third Intellect refused to recognize his superiority in rank. In punishment for this failure he fell from the third rank behind the following seven intellects and, after repenting, became stabilized as the Tenth Intellect and demigre (muḍābdār). The physical world was produced out of the spiritual forms (eṣamār) together with the Tenth Intellect refused to recognize the superiority of the Second Intellect and out of the darkness generated by this sin. The Tenth Intellect, also called the Spiritual Ādām (ʿĀdām al-Rūḥānī), tries to regain his original rank by calling the fallen spiritual forms to repentance. The first representative of his daʿwa on earth was the First and Universal Ādām (ʿĀdām al-Āwāl al-Kullī), owner of the body of the ibdāʾ world (al-dhulākh al-ibdāʾī-ya), who opened the first cycle of manifestation (dawr al-kawr) and is distinguished from the Partial Ādām (ʿĀdām al-Dīyaʾī), who opened the present age of concealment (dawr al-satr). After his passing he rose to the horizon of the Tenth (Intellect) and took his place, while the Tenth rose in rank. Similarly the Kāʾīm of each cycle after his passing rises and takes the place of the Tenth, who thus gradually rises until he will join the Second Intellect. Countless cycles of manifestation and concealment succeed each other until the Great Resurrection (Kiyāmāt al-Kiyāmāt) which consummates the megacycle (al-kawr al-aʿsam), sometimes specified to last 360,000 times 360,000 years.

The soul of each believer on his initiation is joined by a point of light, which grows as he advances in knowledge. On his passing it rises to join the soul of the holder of the rank (ḥadd) above him in the hierarchy. It continues to rise from ḥadd to ḥadd until it is gathered together with the souls of all other believers in the light temple (haykal nārān) in the shape of a human being which constitutes the form of the Kāʾīm (suра Kāʾīmīya) of his cycle, which then rises to the horizon of the Tenth. The souls of the unbelievers remain with their bodies, which are dissolved into inorganic matter which is consequently transformed into various harmful creatures and substances in descending order. Depending on the gravity of their sins they may eventually arise again through the ascending forms of life and as human beings may accept the daʿwa or end up in Sīdījīn in torment lasting as long as the megacycle.

Continuing the Fāṭimid tradition Ṭāyyībī doctrine
maintained the equal validity of the ṣahih and the bājin and repudiated antinomian trends. Kādī al-Nuṣāmī’s Daṣākim al-ʿIlām remained the authoritative work of ʿīsh. 

Nizarī doctrine: Owing to the upheavals in the political history of the Nizarī communities, their wide dispersal, the language barriers between them, and the repeated loss of large parts of their religious literature, Nizarī doctrine is marked by major shifts in time and nearly completely independent local traditions.

Doctrinal discipline: While the preaching (daʿawāʾ ḍajidda), most eloquently formulated, though not originated, by Ḥasan-ʿī Ṣabbāḥ himself. The new preaching entailed an apologetic reformation of the old ʿīshī doctrine of taʿlim, i.e., the authoritative teaching in religion, which could be carried out only by a divinely chosen imām in every age after the Prophet. Ḥasan-ʿī Ṣabbāḥ reaffirmed the need for such a teacher as a dictate of reason and went on to prove that only the Ismāʿillī imām fulfilled this need. In his argumentation he seems to have stressed the autonomous authority of each imām, independent of his predecessors, thus unwittingly authorizing the later shifts of doctrine. The doctrine of taʿlim had a strong impact in the Sunnī world, as is reflected by its elaborate refutation by al-Ghāzālī [g.v.] and others.

A religious revolution took place under the fourth lord of Alamūt, Ḥasan ʿalā dhikriḥi al-ʿilām (557/1162-561/1166), who on 17 Ramaḍān 559/8 Aug. 1164 solemnly proclaimed the resurrection (kiyāma) in the name of the imām, whose ʿududūna or deputy (khālīfā) he declared himself to be. In consonance with the Ismāʿillī expectations concerning the kiyāma he announced the abrogation of the ʿarshīa, which so far had been strictly enforced by the lords of Alamūt. The resurrection was interpreted spiritually as the manifestation of the unveiled Truth in the imām which actualized Paradise for the believers who could grasp it, while it condemned the non-Ismāʿillī opponents to spiritual non-being, i.e., Hell. After the murder of Ḥasan by a brother-in-law opposed to the abolition of the ʿarshīa, the doctrine of the kiyāma was further elaborated by his son and successor Muhammad (561/1166-607/1210). Ḥasan before his death seems to have hinted that he himself was the imām at least spiritually. Muḥammad now maintained that his father had been the imām also by physical descent, apparently alleging that he was the son of a descendant of ʿImām Nīzār who had secretly found refuge in Alamūt. The line of imāms thus continued through Ḥasan and Muḥammad in the lords of Alamūt. Muḥammad put the imām, and specifically the present imām, at the centre of the doctrine of the kiyāma. The resurrection consisted in viewing God in the spiritual reality of the imām. This doctrine entailed the exaltation of the imām over the prophet, which became characteristic of Nīzārī thought. At the same time a new figure, the imām-kaʿīm, was introduced in the cyclical history. The imām-kaʿīm in the various eras was identified as Melchizedek (Malik al-Ṣalām), Dhūʾ ʿl-Karnayn, Khīḍr, Maʿadd, and, in the era of Muḥammad, as ʿAll. He was recognized by the prophets in each era as the locus of the divinity. In the kiyāma the imām-kaʿīm, i.e., the present imām, who is identical with ʿAll, appears openly in his spiritual reality to the believer, who in his spiritual relationship to the imām is identical with Salmān [g.v.]. The ranks of the teaching hierarchy intervening between the imām and the believer have, in agreement with the Ismāʿillī expectations concerning the kiyāma, faded away. There are only three categories of men left: the opponents (aḥl al-taqadda) of the imām who adhere to the ākhari a, the ordinary followers of the imām or people of gradation (aḥl al-tarāttub), who have gone beyond the ākhari a to the bājin and have found partial truth, and the people of union (aḥl al-awāḥda), who see the imām in his true nature discarding all appearances and have reached the realm of full truth. The kiyāma doctrine was clearly influenced by Šūfi terminology and prepared the way for the close relationship between later Nīzārī Ismāʿillīsm and Šūfism.

The kiyāma doctrine was repudiated by Muḥammad's son and successor Djalāl al-Dīn Ḥasan (607/1210-618/1221), who proclaimed his adherence to Sunnī Islam, publicly cursed his predecessors, and imposed the Sunnī ākhari a on his followers, inviting Sunnī scholars to instruct him. As he continued to be considered by them as the imām, his orders were accepted without opposition. There is evidence that at least before his death he acted towards his followers again in the fashion of an Ismāʿillī imām. Under his son ʿAlī (618/1221-653/1255) the enforcement of the ākhari a was relaxed, though it was not officially abolished. The adjusted doctrine which now was developed to explain the new religious situation is expounded in the contemporary Ismāʿillī works of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī [g.v.]. The reimpersonation of the ākhari a by Djalāl al-Dīn Ḥasan was interpreted as a return to precautionary dissimulation (ṭabiyya) and a new period of concealment (sair), when the truth is hidden in the bājin, in contrast to the preceding period of kiyāma, when the unveiled truth was apparent and available to all. The kiyāma proclaimed by Ḥasan ʿalā dhikriḥi l-ʿilām, coming at about the middle of the millennium of the era of the Prophet Muḥammad, was merely anticipatory of the final kiyāma at the end of it. In the era of Muḥammad periods of sair and kiyāma may alternate according to the decision of each imām, since every imām is a potential imām-kaʿīm. The state of spiritual union (awāḥda) in the time of sair is restricted to the ʿududūna of the imām, who proclaims the doctrine of the kiyāma (tafīyya) and possesses the truth of the imām, with whom he is consubstantial. The aḥl al-tarāttub are divided into the strong (akwiyd) and the weak (dwaṣad) according to their closeness to the truth.

Conditions in the post-Alamūt period favoured the adoption of Šūfī ways of life by the imāms and their followers also externally. Ismāʿillī ideas were often camouflaged in Šūfī forms of expression, especially in poetry. Doctrinal works were written again from the 9th/16th century on, at a time when the victory of Shiʿīsm in Persia permitted the Nīzārīs and their imāms to act somewhat more openly. The doctrine of the late Alamūt period as expressed by Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī was essentially retained. Works of the ʿAṣmāʿīd age, which still influenced al-Ṭūsī, were no longer available. Interest in the Ismāʿillī cosmology and cyclical history diminished in the realm of folk speech as the revealer of the spiritual truth and only access to the essence of the imām, already stressed by al-Ṭūsī, was further elaborated.

A special literary tradition within Nīzārī Ismāʿillīsm in Persian was retained by the community of Badakhshan. Although many works of the Alamūt and post-Alamūt period found their way there, the community remained particularly attached to the works genuine and spurious, of Naṣīr-ʿl-Khansraw.
Fāṭimid doctrine in the adaptation of Naṣir, including the Fāṭimid cosmology, thus maintained their influence. The community of Badalshahīn also transmitted and revered the Umm al-kitāb representing largely non-Iṣmāʿīlī thought.

Syrian Naṣārī literature, written in Arabic, developed independently of the Persian literature, even during the Alamūt period. Persian works were not translated into Arabic or vice-versa. The Syrian communities preserved a substantial selection of Fāṭimid religious literature, partially different from those preserved by the Ṭāyrībīs. Even though theḥiyāma was proclaimed, apparently with some delay, in Syria, theḥiyāma doctrine had practically no impact there. The scholarly doctrine continued mostly in the Fāṭimid tradition. Syrian doctrinal works, while concentrating on the traditional cosmology and cyclical history, virtually ignore the current imam, the central figure in the Persian Alamūt and post-Alamūt doctrine. In religious literature of a popular type Raḥīq al-Dīn Sīrān is extolled as a saintly hero and his cosmic rank is described in terms appropriate to the imām. Much of the Syrian Iṣmāʿīlī literature was destroyed later during the feuds with neighboring communities.

Among the Khodjīs Iṣmāʿīlī literature, both Persian and Arabic, has been virtually unknown. Only a single Persian work, the Pandiyāl-i Qandamardī containing a collection of religious and moral admonitions of the Nizārī Imām al-Mustanṣir (end of the 9th/10th century), was accepted as a sacred book, perhaps a century after his death. The traditional religious literature of the Khodjīs and the Imām Shīrīn is known as Satpanth [q.v.], a genre, i.e., True Path, designating the religion preached in it. It consists of numerous writings in verse form, called gnans, written in, or translated into, several Indian languages. Most of them are ascribed to the medieval pirs, but cannot be dated exactly and probably have undergone changes in the transmission. They contain hymns, moral and religious instruction, legendary histories of the pirs, and descriptions of their miracles, but no formulated creed or theology. Their religious content is a mixture of Islamic anaqa and Hindu, especially popular Tantric, elements. While idol worship is condemned, Hindu mythology is accepted. All is described as the Tenth Avatar or incarnation of the deity, and the imāms are identical with him. The Kurān is considered the last of the Vedas, which are viewed as holy scriptures whose true interpretation is known to the pirs. The religious role of the pir or guru is exalted. Acceptance of the true religion will free the believer from further rebirths and open paradise for him, which is described in Islamic terms, while those failing to recognize the imāms must pass through another cycle of rebirths. The traditional Iṣmāʿīlī cosmology, cyclical history, and hierarchy are unknown (see W. Ivanow, Satpanth, in Collectanea I. The Iṣmāʿīlī Society, Leiden 1948, 1-74).


Iṣmāʿīliyya, a town in Egypt on the western bank of the Suez Canal and on the northern shore of Lake Timsah. The town originated from huts of workers and engineers engaged in excavating the Suez Canal. Its foundations were laid by the Inspector General of the Suez Canal Company on 27 April 1862. After the succession of the Khedive Iṣmāʿīl to the throne on 18 January 1863 it was called Iṣmāʿīliyya. In 1864 a network of streets and squares, a central square (maydān), a government building (sarāy) and a pump for water-supply were established, and in 1868 the town was connected to the Egyptian railway network. When the digging of the Canal was completed, most of the personnel engaged on it moved to Port Saʿīd, and from 1870 onwards the number of Iṣmāʿīliyya inhabitants was in the range of about 3,000 for almost two decades. From the 1890s the town grew steadily to more than 15,000 inhabitants after World War I and more than 50,000 after World War II. From World War I until the final evacuation of British troops in the 1950s, a large British army and air force base was situated near Iṣmāʿīliyya, and many foreign residents dwelt in the town. In 1928 Ḥasan al-Banna [q.v.] founded in Iṣmāʿīliyya the movement of al-Ikhwān al-adilṣ (the Bohorās or Khodjīs) [q.v.]. During the unilateral abrogation of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936 in October 1951, Iṣmāʿīliyya became the scene of frequent clashes between British troops and Egyptian police, culminating in a six-hour battle on 25 January 1952. This resulted, one day later, in the Cairo riots known as "black Saturday".

Until 1960 Iṣmāʿīliyya formed part of the Canal Governorate, but in that year it became the centre of a separate province (muḥāfaẓa) which included al-Kanṭara to the north and al-Tall al-Kabīr to the west. In 1966 the number of inhabitants of Iṣmāʿīliyya province amounted to 344,789, of whom 162,370 lived in Iṣmāʿīliyya, and many foreign residents dwelt in the town. In 1928 Ḥasan al-Banna [q.v.] founded in Iṣmāʿīliyya the movement of al-Ikhwān al-adilṣ (the Bohorās or Khodjīs) [q.v.]. During the unilateral abrogation of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936 in October 1951, Iṣmāʿīliyya became the scene of frequent clashes between British troops and Egyptian police, culminating in a six-hour battle on 25 January 1952. This resulted, one day later, in the Cairo riots known as "black Saturday".


ISNA, Arabic name of a town in Upper Egypt (Egyptian Te-snet, Coptic Sne; Greek Latopolis, from the fish Latos worshipped there; in European accounts Esne, Esnè), lying on the left bank of the Suez Canal. Its foundations were laid by the Inspector General of the Suez Canal Company on 27 April 1862. After the succession of the Khedive Iṣmāʿīl to the throne on 18 January 1863 it was called Iṣmāʿīliyya. In 1864 a network of streets and squares, a central square (maydān), a government building (sarāy) and a pump for water-supply were established, and in 1868 the town was connected to the Egyptian railway network. When the digging of the Canal was completed, most of the personnel engaged on it moved to Port Saʿīd, and from 1870 onwards the number of Iṣmāʿīliyya inhabitants was in the range of about 3,000 for almost two decades. From the 1890s the town grew steadily to more than 15,000 inhabitants after World War I and more than 50,000 after World War II. From World War I until the final evacuation of British troops in the 1950s, a large British army and air force base was situated near Iṣmāʿīliyya, and many foreign residents dwelt in the town. In 1928 Ḥasan al-Banna [q.v.] founded in Iṣmāʿīliyya the movement of al-Ikhwān al-adilṣ (the Bohorās or Khodjīs) [q.v.]. During the unilateral abrogation of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936 in October 1951, Iṣmāʿīliyya became the scene of frequent clashes between British troops and Egyptian police, culminating in a six-hour battle on 25 January 1952. This resulted, one day later, in the Cairo riots known as "black Saturday".


ISNA, Arabic name of a town in Upper Egypt (Egyptian Te-snet, Coptic Sne; Greek Latopolis, from the fish Latos worshipped there; in European accounts Esne, Esnè), lying on the left bank of the Suez Canal.
the Nile halfway between Luxor and Kundu. It was
for a time the capital of a mudiriyya, and is now a
markaz in the mudiriyya of Kafr [q.v.], with over
20,000 inhabitants. It is celebrated for the ruins of
the temple of the god Chnum, which dates from the
Ptolemaic period, in which a number of Roman
emperors are depicted in the garb of the Pharaohs.
In the Muslim period Isna was a flourishing provincial
town. According to Edfuwi quoted by Makrizi the
town had 10,000 houses, and produced annually
40,000 irredd of dates and 10,000 irredd of zabib.
At the present time blue cotton fabric used through-
out Egypt is woven there.

Bibliography: Yāqūt, i, 265 f.; Makrizi, Khīṭaṣa, i, 237; Amelineau, Géographie de l’Égypte, 172; A. Boineq Bey, Dictionnaire géographique de l’Égypte, Cairo 1899, 183. The most detailed
account, which also takes account of economic
conditions, is by Makrizi, in the Mamkonian family (see Hübshmann, 249; Marquart, Ernstlarh, 165-7).

At the time of the Arab invasion of Persia, the
Sāsānīd Spahpah of the East established himself in
the Caspian fastnesses of Tabaristan, where he invi-
eted the fugitive Emperor Yazidīd III to take refuge
(Christensen, 507). We now have the New Persian
form ispahbadh, defined in the Muqtaṣar al-tawāri̇kh, 420, as “Amir” or “Amr-Spahpah.” An Arabic
version of this becomes ispahbaddh (cf. Dīawānī, al-Mubarrad, ed. Sachau, 99; Līsān al-ʿarabī, v, 8; in Tādār al-ʿarās, ii, 569, we have isbahbaddhān, said to occur in a verse of Diyarī, or, more rarely, ispahbaddh (cf. Brünell, al-ʾAblār
al-bākiyya, 101, tr. 109, following Marquart’s correc-
tion of anabaddh, the alleged title of the princes
of Gurgān).

The Isbahbadhs of Gīlān are early mentioned in
the Arabic accounts of the conquests. Thus in 22/643
Suwayd b. Mukarrīn wrote to al-Farrukhān the
“Isbahbadh of Khurāsān over Tabaristan and the
Djīl Dīllān” (Ṭabarī, i, 2659). Later in the century,
the references become more frequent, e.g. in the
story of Kaṭarī b. al-Fudūjī’s revolt (Yā’qūbī, Historiae, ii, 329, years 78-9697-9), and in that of ʿUmar b.
Abī l-ʾSaʿīd’s revolt in Ray ( Ibn al-A ḥlārī, iv, 355-6,
year 83702). Coins of these Isbahbadhs, with Pahlavi
titles, appear shortly after this (see a. D. Mordt-
mann, in ZDMG, xxxiii (1879), 110-12; R. Vasmer, E1, art. Māsāndarān, appendix on coins). These Isb-
haabadhs are those of the Dābbūyid family (401/466-758), a parallel line of which formed the long-
lived Pāhdūṣānīd dynasty of Rūyān and western
Tabaristan (see Dābūya and Bādūsānīds).

Another local line in the mountains of Tabaristan
which used Isbahbadh as the title of its chiefs was
that of the Kārīnwand-ḫūfūdānīyān (572 to 225/
839-40), who latterly recognized the Bawandās (see
below) as overlords. The last ruler of this line was
the celebrated Māzyār b. Kārīn [q.v.], who was exe-
cuted during the caliphate of al-Muʾtasim for plot-
ing a Zoroastrian revolt, and who claimed to be
“Djīl-i Dīllān, Isbahbadh Khurāsān, al-Māzyār, Mu-
ḥammad b. Kārīn, Muwālī (i.e. not Mawla) Anūr al-
Muʾmin” (Yā’qūbī, Buldān, 277, tr. 81, cf. idem, Historiae, ii, 582, and Tabarī, iii, 1295).

Lastly amongst these Caspian dynasties, the Bā-
wāndis of Tabaristan used the title of Isbahbadh.
This family can be traced from the time of the Arab
invasions till well after the Mongol conquests; the
second of the three lines of the dynasty (466/666/
10741210) is specifically known as that of the Isbah-
badhīyān (see Bawand). As well as being thus used
as a regnal title by the Bawāndis of the early 7th/
13th century, we find Isbahbadh used in this region,
as a common noun meaning "local chieftain"; cf. Ibn Isfandiyar, Ta’rikh-i Tabaristan, ed. Ibkhāl, ii, 171, tr. Browne, 255, where Shams al-Mulk Rustam II b. Ardašīr is greeted on his accession in 602/1206 by "the isfahbadin, the Bawandān, the military leaders and the town notables".

However, the title was also known amongst the Daylamids of the south-western corner of the Caspian, as well as in the south-eastern one; in the time of the Ziyārid Waḥammadī (mid-4th/10th century) there was an Ispahbadh of Mīrghān, named as Ḵᵛājā-i Dālā (A. Kasravi, Ṣahābūr-dān-i gūn-nām, i, 57-8). During the first two centuries or so of Islam, the title also persisted to the east of the Caspian, on the northern and eastern marches of Khorāsān. The Ispahbadh of Balkh was amongst the local princes of Bāḏgēš and Țuḵhārāstān who were persuaded by the Ḵawāfīd Ṭehrānī Nizāk (see Ḵayātīl) to throw off allegiance to Ijlūṭayba b. Muslim’s Arabs in 90/709 (Tabarī, ii, 1206, 1218, cf. also 1300); and shortly afterwards, in 917/936, an Ispahbadh of Nāsā, named as Īlghānd (see Justi, Ḥarāmās Namesbuch, 142), acted as commander of the Khākān of the Western Turks’ army against the Arabs (Ṭabarī, ii, 1597-9). An interesting usage of the term is in an inscription on the Kaʿba dating from 200/815-16 in al-Maʿmūn’s Caliphate. This commemorates the for- warding to Mecca from Khurasān of the captured governor of Mecca and held the city for a while of the Seldūqīs: in 487/1094 or 488/1095 the Amir as al-Iṣhāqīnīn (see Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, 5) was an Ispahbadh of Mughan, named as Ḵᵛājā-i Dālā (Asrākī, Ḵᵛājā-i Dālā Makka, ed. Ẅistenfeld, i, 158; Répertoire, i, 92-3, No. 116); but the usage of this title by the Turkish slave general Sebūkṭūṁīn al-Muʿīzzī by ordering, amongst other things, that he should be addressed as "Ispahsalar"; after this commander’s death, Bāḵtiyr ī in 360/974-5 offered the title to the general Alptūnīn, leader of his rebellious Turkish troops (Miskawayh, in Eclipse of the ‘Abbasid Caliphate, ii, 258, 293, tr. v, 273, 314; Ibrāhīm b. Hīāl al-Sāḥibī, Rûṣūlī, Beirut 1909, 163; see also instances in Rūḥāwārī, in Eclipse, iii, 81, 107, tr. vi, 82, 111). But as disorder grew in the Buyid provinces under ‘Abd al-Dawla’s weaker successors, the title became debased, and as appears from several cita- tions in the sources it came merely to mean "commander" or even just "officer" as distinct from the rank-and-file; cf. Ibn al-Dījwālī, al-Munīqām, viii, 72: ġāmāʾi mā in-šīrāz wa jīb al-ḥavarāsīyya, and on the whole topic of Būyid usage, M. Kabīr, The Buyukid dynasty of Baghdad, Calcutta 1964, 137-9.

Amongst other dynasties of the east, however, the title usually retained its original, more exalted meaning. It is attested in this sense for the Ẓafarīd army of Ḵhalīf b. Aḥmad’s time (reigned 352/963-393/1003), and is distinguished in the sources from the Ḥādīq al-Ḥudjīdāb, al-Ḥudjīdāb al-Kabīr or Ṣāḥib al-Dījvāh for the supreme commander of the Buṭyid army [see Ḥājīb, iii. Eastern dynasties], but Ispahsalar was also used and carried with it an especial honour. Thus in 360/974, ʿĪzāl-Dawla Bāḵtiyr ī conciliated the Turkish slave general Sebūkṭūṁīn al-Muʿīzzī by ordering, amongst other things, that he should be addressed as "Ispahsalar"; after this commander’s death, Bāḵtiyr ī in 364/974-5 offered the title to the general Alptūnīn, leader of his rebellious Turkish troops (Miskawayh, in Eclipse of the ‘Abbasid Caliphate, ii, 258, 293, tr. v, 273, 314; Ibrāhīm b. Hīāl al-Sāḥibī, Rûṣūlī, Beirut 1909, 163; see also instances in Rūḥāwārī, in Eclipse, iii, 81, 107, tr. vi, 82, 111). But as disorder grew in the Buyid provinces under ‘Abd al-Dawla’s weaker successors, the title became debased, and as appears from several cita- tions in the sources it came merely to mean "commander" or even just "officer" as distinct from the rank-and-file; cf. Ibn al-Dījwālī, al-Munīqām, viii, 72: ġāmāʾi mā in-šīrāz wa jīb al-ḥavarāsīyya, and on the whole topic of Būyid usage, M. Kabīr, The Buyukid dynasty of Baghdad, Calcutta 1964, 137-9.

Amongst other dynasties of the east, however, the title usually retained its original, more exalted meaning. It is attested in this sense for the Ẓafarīd army of Ḵhalīf b. Aḥmad’s time (reigned 352/963-393/1003), and is distinguished in the sources from the Ḥādīq al-Ḥudjīdāb, who may have been the com- mander of the slave troops only (C. E. Bosworth, The armies of the Ẓafarīds, in BSOAS, xxxi (1968), 547 n. 52). The Turkish dynasties which established themselves in the eastern and central lands of the Caliphate from the end of the 4th/10th century onwards adopted the existing Arabic and Persian mili- tary terminology just as they adopted much of the existing administrative practice. In Ẓafarīd usage, Ispahsalar alternates with Arabic equivalents for "supreme commander" like Ḥādīq al-Ḥudjīdāb and Ḥādīq al-Ḥudjīdāb al-Kabīr and with the Turkish one Subaši, and these are used, for example, to denote the commander-in-chief of the armies in Khurāsān or India; the simple term sālār or Ḥādīq apparently denoted a step lower, that of "commander" or "general of- ficer": Yet the compound and simple terms are both used for the commanders of special component divi- sions of the army as a whole; we hear of the com- mander of the Indian army of the Ẓafarīds (1021-31) at Lahore, convenient for raiding into India (C. E. Bosworth, Ghaznevid military organisation, in Isl., xxxvi (1960), 44).

Great Seldūq military terminology frequently em- ployed such expressions as Ispahsalar-i Dūrg or Amīr-i Ispahsalar for the commander-in-chief of the
whole Saljiq forces (cf. I. Kafesoglu, Sultan Melikşah derinde buyuk Selçuklu imperatorluğu, Istanbul 1953, 158), or else for the commander of the army in an important region like Khurāsān (cf. Bundarī, Zubdāt al-nusra, 56). These phrases were further used as general terms for "commander, general officer," alternating with such expressions as Amir al-umārah, Amir-i amirān, Amir-sālār, Muḥammad-al-diyās, Sabāqān, etc.; this diversity of nomenclature was handed on to the Sāliqūq of ṫûm in the 7th/13th century (cf. I. H. Uzuncarsılı, Osmancı devleti teşkilâtına medhalı, Istanbul 1945, 59-60). The Amir-i Isfahsālar often appears in official letters and investiture diplomas emanating from both the Great Saljūqs and their eastern neighbours and initial vassals, the Khwārzm-Shāh. This title was usually conferred on a newly-appointed Shībna (q.v.), military governor or commander of the police. One document in Mun- tedab al-Dīn Dīwūyayīn's Atatāb al-kal-āb, ed. Kazwīnī and Ikbāl, Tehran 1329/1950, 74 ff., emanating from Sanjāş's chancery, describes how both the deceased amirs ʿImād al-Dīn Kāmā and his son ʿAllāʾ al-Dīn Abū Bakr were anūrs of Khurāsān with the title of Amir-i Isfahsālar; this designation and the governorship of the Balkh region are now conferred on Abū Bakr's son ʿImād al-Dīn Abū ʿI-Ḥāfīz. Especially interesting is the detailing of the insignia of a Sālār-i Isfahān and Shīb-nāra (i.e. the governor of a strategically-situated frontier province): distinctive official robes, a horse with special saddle and accoutrements; a jewelled collar; a shield and sword-belt; the right to a salute of kettledrums in the military encampments; a standard; a tent of regal dimensions; etc. (see also H. Horst, Die Staatsverwaltung der Grosskungen und Ḥorasmīsāhs (1038-1231), Wiesbaden 1964, 161). A peculiar expression found in the military itetlture of the Khwārzm-Shāh is that of Khār Isfahsālar, apparently meaning "commander of a ṯāḥih or frontier region" (Khār, Turkish "frontier region," roughly synonymous with ʿāra, see Kāshgharī, Divān lughāt al-turk, tr. Atalay, i, 324-5: Khār "uncultivated, vacant turk, kir (cf. Kāshgharī's Marām, ʿāra, azāz- Khār al-Dīn Abu Bakr were amirs of Khurāsān with the title of Amir-i Isfahsālar; this designation and the governorship of the Balkh region are now conferred on Abū Bakr's son ʿImād al-Dīn Abū ʿI-Ḥāfīz. Especially interesting is the detailing of the insignia of a Sālār-i Isfahān and Shīb-nāra (i.e. the governor of a strategically-situated frontier province): distinctive official robes, a horse with special saddle and accoutrements; a jewelled collar; a shield and sword-belt; the right to a salute of kettledrums in the military encampments; a standard; a tent of regal dimensions; etc. (see also H. Horst, Die Staatsverwaltung der Grosskungen und Ḥorasmīsāhs (1038-1231), Wiesbaden 1964, 161). A peculiar expression found in the military itetlture of the Khwārzm-Shāh is that of Khār Isfahsālar, apparently meaning "commander of a ṯāḥih or frontier region" (Khār, Turkish "frontier region," roughly synonymous with ʿāra, see Kāshgharī, Divān lughāt al-turk, tr. Atalay, i, 324-5: Khār "uncultivated, vacant turk, kir (cf. Kāshgharī's Marām, ʿāra, azāz-
further given to the commanders of provincial armies or town garrisons, especially when these were formed of mercenary troops (‘askıryaya). Van Berchem’s examination of Börd inscriptions indicated that the titles al-Amir al-Isfahsalar al-Aqljali al-Sayyid al-Kabir were a set formula in the designation of these Atabegs of Damascus, from Zahir al-Din Tughlign onwards; an interesting point is that though the lesser titles might be borne by subordinate members of the family, e.g. the Atabeg’s wali al-‘adad or heir, the exalted titles al-‘Ablabak and al-Isfahsalar were reserved for the Atabeg himself. As examples of other leading figures of the period using the titles al-Amir al-Isfahsalar, one may cite Aşık Şonkor al-Bursuki of Mosul; Şirkhü when he was in the service of Nūr al-Din al-Zangi; the commander of Şirkhü and Şalha al-Din, Kara Kuş; Şalha al-Din’s commander Karaga; Şalha al-Din himself as addressed in letters from Nūr al-Din; and by al-Malik al-Mu’azzam, Şharafl al-Din Isfahsalar al-Adall when he was governor of Şalha in the Hāvarā, ‘Izz al-Din Aybak (M. van Berchem, Épigraphie des Atabeks de Damas, in Florilegium Melchior de Vogüé, Paris 1909, 32–9; idem, Matériaux pour un Corpus inscriptionum arabicarum, i. Égypte, Paris 1903, 638–42, No. 458; idem, Eine arabisch Inschrift aus dem Ostjordanlande, in ZDPV, xvi (1893), 85–6, corrected in Matériaux, i, 640–1; Ibn al-Kalânaši, ed. Amedroz, 167, 193, 197, 327 and passim; Abū Shama, Kitāb al-Rawaqlaym, Cairo 1287–8/1870–1, i, 161; Hasan al-Bābšā, al-‘Ablabak al-İsmaā‘iyya, Cairo 1957, 150–7).

The title Isfahsaldr and the nisba of al-Isfahsaldr both survived into the 17th/13th century and beyond amongst the Mamluks of Syria and Egypt, the latter term being found as a component in the titles of the great amirs and the second term in their designations on objects d’art and in inscriptions (e.g. the inscription on the madrasa and mausoleum built in 715/1315 by the Amīr Şonkor al-Sa’di, see Matériaux, i, 723, No. 529). According to Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-Umnari, cited in Şuhb al-‘adad, vi, 7–8, the honorific al-isfahsaldrī was specially reserved for the ummari al-fahlakanāh, but he goes on to say that its use had been abandoned in his own time (sc. the last decades of the 8th/14th century), perhaps because of the term’s debasement, the common people were using the term Isbahsaldr for all the guards around the sultan’s circle.

Nevertheless, we still meet İsfahsalar in use as one of the titles of the Amīr Şayf al-Din Yaṣhbak, the Duvādār and commander-in-chief of the Egyptian army, carved on his palace in 880/1475–6 (Matériaux, i, 452, No. 305).

This seems to be the end of its use in the central lands of Islam. Although İsfahsaldr appears as a common noun in Ottoman sources, it was not a title in the Ottoman Empire the usual title of the commander-in-chief was Serdar or Ser‘asker (qq.v.).

(ii. MUSLIM INDIA)

From Ghaznavid usage (see above), the term passed to the Ghurids and thence to the Dihlī sultans in Muslim India. In the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries we can discern two or probably three usages of İsfahsaldr. Firstly, it denotes the commander-in-chief of the Ghurid army; in his inscription on the Kuwwat al-İslam mosque in Dihlī (857/1251), Kūth al-Dīn Aybak describes himself as Amīr-ı İsfahsalar-ı Aqljali-ı Kabīr (J. Horovitz, The inscriptions of Muhammad Ibn Sām, in Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, Calcutta 1911–12, 13). Secondly, in it denotes the 7th/13th century an officer who in theory commanded 100 cavalry, that officer below the rank of amīr (see the description of the decimal chain of command in Barān’s Ta‘rīkh-i Firuzshāhi, ed. Syed Abdul Khān, Calcutta 1862, 145); but in the 8th/14th century under the Tughrīlids, the İsfahsaldr had probably sunk to the command of 10 men only, the equivalent of a sarhaq in the empire of the 12th/18th centuries. Finally, it seems to be a general term denoting “commander of high rank,” “general officer”; the last title refers to his grandfather İz iz al-Dīn İṣsam, who was ‘Arīd or chief of military affairs and Wakīl-i Dar under Balban (later 7th/13th century), as İsfahsaldr (Futuh al-salādīn, ed. A. S. Usha, Madras 1948, 447–8). By a curious coincidence, the maternal grandfather of the historian Baranī also held the office of Wakīl-i Dar [and] Bārbak in the same reign, and is called the İsfahsaldr Humād al-Dīn (Barani, op. cit., 41). The title [Sipah] Salar is given already in the early 8th/14th century to the warrior-saint Mas‘ūd Ghażlān of Bahraṇī, who allegedly flourished in early Ghaznavid times; this title is probably meant in a general sense, unless it is a reminiscence of the Ghaznavid title Salar given to the commander of the Indian ghāzīn (see above, and also gahzi mi‘ās). Under the Lodī sultans of Dihlī in the 15th and early 16th centuries, İsfahsaldr was possibly used in the sense of “general officer” (‘Abd al-‘Āzīz Ḥasan, Ta‘rīkh-i Şer Şahā, ed. S. M. Iqām al-Dīn, Dacca 1964, i, 6).

In Mughal usage, the term İsfahsaldr is sometimes applied to the Khānkāhānīn, being especially applicable when that officer took the field in the absence of his sovereign (see Nizām al-Dīn Ahmad, Ţabakāt-i Akbarī, ed. B. De, Calcutta 1932, ii, 425–6, and Kāṁgār Ḫusayn, Ma‘ālik al-‘aṣrār, B. M. Ms. Or. 171, ff. 117b, 120a). Similarly in the Deccan, the historian Fārsīgha appears to use İsfahsaldr as a synonym for Amīr al-‘umārā (see Ta‘rīkh-i Farigāh, Kāmpūr 1290/1874, 279). In the Sultanate of Bengal during the 9th/15th century, İsfahsaldr was evidently used for “supreme commander”. The Chinese interpreter Mahuan, who visited Bengal with a Chinese embassy in about 811/1408–9, remarks that “they have a standing army; the chief officer in kind, the commander-in-chief of which is called Pa-szu-la-urh” (G. Phillips, Mahuan’s account of the kingdom of Bengal, in JRAS (1895), 532, also in N. K. Bhattacharji, Coinage and chronology of the early independent Sultans of Bengal, Cambridge 1922, 171).

ISPARTA, town in south-west Turkey (Pisidia), situated at an altitude of 1025 m., in a fertile plain between Burdur and Egridir, the Apollonia-Sozopolis of antiquity. The modern name preserves that of the Byzantine fortress Saporda (not Baris Pisidiae, see E. Honigmann in Byzantinon, xiv (1939), 655); in Muslim sources of the 7th/8th/13th–14th centuries it appears as Sabarta. After its capture by the Saltikiks in 600–1/1203–4 it belonged to the Western frontier-province of their dominions. With the break-up of the Saltikik empire, the Hamid-ogullars (q.v.), whose base was Egridir, incorporated the Western frontier-province of their dominions. In 783/1381 the Ottoman Sanjak of Hamid-ili, later becoming its chef-lieu. It was the native town of the
reformer Khalil Hamid Pasha (d. 1785) who erected there several public buildings and a library. As the seat of the Metropolitan of Pisidia (from the middle of the 8th/14th century) Isparta had several churches and a seat of the Metropolitan of Pisidia (from the middle of the 8th/14th century) Isparta had several churches. After the First World War, in earlier days its chief products were textiles and attar of roses; the carpet industry has become increasingly important since the end of the 19th century.

The town, which in later Ottoman times was called Hamidibad, is now the capital of the vilayet of Isparta, which comprises the haseis of Isparta, Egridir, Uluborlu, Yalvaç, Sarki Karaağaç and Sütçüler. The population of the town in 1960 was 35,981.

Bibliography: Ibn Batūṭa, ii, 266; Katb Celebi, Dīkānāmī, 639-40; Evliyâ Celebi, Seyhkhâbâ- nâmâ, ix, 283; F. Lucas, Voyage dans la Grèce . . . , 1, 240 f.; V. J. Arundel, A Visit to the Seven Churches of Asia, London 1828, 118-32; idem, Discoveries in Asia Minor, London 1834, i, 340 ff., ii, 1-22; W. J. Hamilton, Researches in Asia Minor, i, London 1842, 483; F. Sarre, Reisen in Kleinasien, Berlin 1896, 167-8; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, Paris 1890, i, 850 f.; Illustration in de Laborderie, Voyage de l'Asie Mineure, Paris 1838, 106; id., s.v. (by Besim Darkot), with fuller bibliography.

ISPENDEJEE, Ottoman name of an 'urfî ('urfî) tax levied on adult non-Muslim subjects, and amounting usually to 25 akces a year. Neither of the explanations advanced for its etymology (pendjik [q.v.], Hammer-Purgstall, Staatsverfassung, i, 213; spenah: C. Trubella, in THIM, i, 63) is convincing; in texts of the first half of the 9th/15th century (e.g. H. İnalci, ed.), Sârîs-i Defter-i Sancak-Sîr Arous, Ankara 1954, p. 130) it is spelled ispendjê. The oldest reference to this tax belong to the reign of Bayezid I (Arus, p. 103). According to this register (of 835/ 1431; see its introduction, p. xxxivii), ispendjê of 25 akces was collected from married males, whilst 6 akces, under the name bive resmi, was collected from widows. According to the kâmînamê of Mehmed II (MOG, 28-9) every married non-Muslim was to pay 25 akces to his sipâhi, and if he had an adult son living at home he was to pay ispendjê for him too. The same amount usually is prescribed in kâmînamên of the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries (see Ö. L. Barkan, Kânînamân, Istanbul 1943, index); occasionally it is less (20 akces: Kerkiûk) or more (30 akces: Cyprus). A non-Muslim who embraced Islam became liable instead to bina rekim [q.v.].

The Ottomans regarded this tax as a poll-tax paid to the timarlord or as the counterpart of efî-i resmi [q.v.]. It is in origin very probably the same tax paid in the empire of Stefan Dushan and maintained under the Ottomans; the old kâpû-resmi of Hungary was treated as ispendjê by the Ottomans. The ispendjê was introduced in Anatolia only in the 10th/16th century as a characteristic Ottoman tax. Christian troops who ranked as 'askeri (voyukn, doghanâl, efîlû, etc.) were exempt from ispendjê, while peasantry serving miles or guarding passes were either totally exempt or paid 6 or 12 akces. Although usually belonging to the timarlord's revenue, it was occasionally payable to the Imperial Treasury.

Bibliography: H. İnalci, Osmanliîdar'da rây- yet rûşûmun, in Belleten, xxii (1959), 602-8, with full references. (H. İNALCIK)

ISRA'EE (see MI'RA'EE).

ISRAFIL, the name of an archangel, which is probably to be traced to the Hebrew Sarafîm as is indicated by the variants Sarafîl and Sarafîm (Ta'dîl al- 'Arâş, vi, 275). The change of liquids is not unusual in such endings. His size is astounding; while his feet are under the seventh earth, his head reaches up to the pillars of the divine throne. He has four wings: one in the west, one in the east, one with which he covers his body and one as a protection against the majesty of God. He is covered with hair, mouths and tongues. He is considered to be the angel who reads out the divine decisions from the well-kept Tablet and transmits them to the Archangel to whose department they belong. Three times by day and three times by night he looks down into hell and is convulsed with grief and weeps so violently that the earth might be inundated by his tears.

For three years he was the companion of the Prophet, whom he initiated into the work of a prophet. Gabriel then took over his task and began the communication of the Qur'an.

Alexander is said to have met him before his arrival in the land of darkness; there he stood upon a hill and blew the trumpet, tears in his eyes. If he is called Lord of the Trumpet, it is mainly because he continually holds the trumpet to his mouth in order to be able to blow at once as soon as God gives the order for the blast which is to arouse men from their graves. It is however also said that Isräîl will be the first one aroused on the day of resurrection. He will then take his stand upon the holy rock in Jerusalem and give the signal which will bring the dead back to life.

In Egypt, in Lane's time, it was said that his music would refresh the inhabitants of Paradise.


(A. J. WENSCICK)

ISRA'EL [see BANû ISRA'îL, FILASFIT, YA'ÂQÎB]. ISRA'ILÎYYAT, an Arabic term covering three kinds of narratives, which are found in the commentators on the Kur'an, the mystics, the compilers of edifying histories and writers on various levels.

1. Narratives regarded as historical, which served to complement the often summary information provided by the revealed Book in respect of the personages in the Bible (Tâvorî and İndîlî), particularly the prophets (Kisât al-anbiyay). 2. Edifying narratives placed within the chronological (but entirely undefined) framework of "the period of the (ancient) Israelites" (tak'â Bani Is'rá'îl). 3. Fables belonging to folklore, allegedly (but sometimes actually) borrowed from Jewish sources. The line of demarcation between this class and the preceding one is difficult to establish.

The prophetic legends appeared very early in Muslim literature, although few if any traces still survive which in fact go back, in the form in which we have them, to the first century of the Hijra.

The earliest sources of information were either converted Jews or, perhaps, Arabs who had had contacts, before their conversion to Islam, with the Jews and Christians of the Arabian peninsula and the neighbouring regions. Mention may be made of 'Abîd/ 'Ubayd b. Sharya al-Djurhummi [see İBN SHARYA], whose narrations concerning the ancient history of the kings of the Arabs and Persians and biblical
The practice of introducing folklore themes (such as the motif of the 'three wishes') into narratives set in the time of the Banū Isrā’āl is one which the moralists and men of letters readily adopted.

It was the works of pure imagination of this kind, and also the extravagant flights of fancy of the ṣūṣaṣ in their over-loaded, embellished versions of the histories of the prophets which have caused the Isrā‘īlyāt to be condemned by strict scholars such as Ibn Kāṭīr (cf. H. Laoust, in Ḥabaṣa, ii (1955), 75, where the reference should be Bidāya, i, 6), a condemnation repeated in more specific terms by al-Sakhāwī (I‘lān, trans. apud Fr. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, Leiden 1968, 335); however, the feeling of distrust and the warnings sounded on this subject go back to a very much earlier date; they certainly constitute part of the stock of edifying parenesis, at least from the time of Mūwaffak al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Kudama (K. al-Tawwābīn, ed. G. Makdisi, Damascus 1962).

The oldest of these descriptions we owe to the Chinese writer Hsūn-Chuáng (7th century A.D.); the Chinese name (Ze-Hai = warm sea; the lake never freezes) corresponds exactly to the Turkic Tschul (cf. the text in Barthold, Ta‘rīkh-i Rashidi, 1893; i, 458). The nearest modern equivalent is the Turkic Īsīk-Kul (Turkish 'warm lake'), the most important mountain lake in Turkistan and one of the largest fresh water lakes in the world, situated between 42° 11' and 42° 59' N. Lat. and between 76° 15' and 78° 30' E. Long., 1,605 m. (5,116 feet) above sea level; the length of the lake is about 115 miles, the breadth up to 37 miles, the depth up to 702 m. (1,381 feet), and the area 6,205 sq. km. (2,400 sq. miles). From the two chains of the Thien-Shan, the Kungey-Alatau (in the north) and the Terskey-Alatau (in the south), about 80 large and small mountain streams pour into the Īsīk-Kul, of which the most important, Tüpf and Djergalan, flow into it from the east. Of the others there may be mentioned: on the south bank, the Karakol, Kiali-Su, Djuka (or Zauka), Barskoun and Ton; on the north bank, the two Ak-Su and three Köi-Su. On the origin of the depression Kutemaldi, which now connects the Īsīk-Kul [see vu], views differ. It is said that the Koçekar, now the upper course of the Īsīk, previously flowed into the Īsīk-Kul and the latter had an exit in the Īsīk. At present the Koçekar sends an arm to the Īsīk-Kul through the Kutemaldi only when it is flooded; at other times there are only a few ditches there filled with water, without any definite current. The question is only of importance for geology and physical geography; in the historical period the Īsīk-Kul has, as all accounts show, always been a lake without an exit.

into the valley of the Çu. The most important market on the IsslK-Kul was Barskhan, the name of which is probably identical with the modern name of the river Barskoun. Gardizi gives a legend due to a popular etymology about Alexander the Great and Persians left behind him on the Isslk-Kul; this popular etymology makes certain the reading Barskhan against the form Nushdjan given by Yâkıpt, iv, 823. According to Gardizi, Barskhan could put 6,000 men in the field; according to Kudama, the principal place on the shore of the lake could itself raise 20,000 men (Barskhan, according to Kuolama, consisted of nine towns, four of some size and five small ones; cf. Huddâd al- İslâm, ed. Minorsky, 292 ff.; W. Barthold, Zwölf Vorlesungen, Berlin 1935, 94; Mappae Arabicae ed. K. Miller, Stuttgart 1926-9, Band IV = Arab II, 87, 89, 143, 145, 148 (al-Kâshgharî). Three days journey west of Barskhan lay Tîmk, the name of which obviously corresponds to the name of the river Ton. Between Barskhan and Tînk there were only to be seen tents of the nomad Dîkîl. Twelve farsaks west of Tînk was the town of Yâr, which could raise 3,000 men. In Huddâd al- İslâm, 90, there is further mentioned “a prosperous place, visited by merchants”, the town of Sîkül, on the border between the settlements of two nomad peoples, the Dîkîl and the Khallûkh (Karûk); the town probably bore the name of the river. A town “Ysicoût” on the north shore of the lake of the name is still given in Carta Catalana of the year 1375 A.D. There was said to be an Armenian monastery with relics of the Apostle Matthew (Notices et Extraites, xiv/2, 132 f.).

Of this civilization, which was probably destroyed about the same time (8th/14th century) and under the influence of the same causes as the civilization on the Çu [cf. ii, 66 f.], only a few walls and mounds of brick, and some cemeteries have survived, including a Muslim cemetery on the Küngêy-Asî in inscriptions of the 6th/12th century (Protokoll Turk. Krutka Ljub. arkh. xi, 5 f.) and a Nestorian cemetery discovered in 1907 on the Düka with inscriptions in Syriac and Turkish; one of these inscriptions (of 1303 A.D.) was published by P. Kokovtsov (Bulletin de l’Académie, etc. 1909, 774 f. 788 f.; cf. B. Spuler, Die Morgenländischen Kirchen, Lüden 1964, 155 [37] with note). The Turkish and Mongol nomads liked to use the shores of the Isslk-Kul as a winter resort on account of the favourable weather conditions (the snow here rarely lies to any considerable depth), so that the Isslk-Kul is several times mentioned in the military history of Central Asia. A fortress was built by Timûr “in the middle of the lake”, i.e., on an island, to which, amongst others, the Tâtars deported from Asia Minor were banished. It is probably the same fortress as is called Koî-su by Haydar Mîrzâ [q.v.], Ta’rikh-i Râshîdî, tr. Ross, 78. A Mongol amîr is said to have sent his family there in the 9th/15th century, to put them in safety from the inroads of the Kalmucks. At the present day there are no islands in the lake; the disappearance of the island mentioned, with the fortress upon it was probably caused by an earthquake. Connected with this perhaps is the fact that pieces of bricks and other fragments are frequently washed up on the shores of the Isslk-Kul. On the Isslk-Kul itself it is said that a great town here was overwhelmed by the waves of the lake and its walls and buildings can be seen in clear weather; but this story has so far not been confirmed and is probably based on folklore about sunken cities (which is to be found in the most diverse countries). The catastrophe, if there was one, can only have happened comparatively recently. Haydar Mîrzâ, to whom we owe the latest and fullest account of the Isslk-Kul in Muslim literature (Ta’rikh-i Râshîdî, 366 f.), knows neither of the disappearance of an island nor of rubble being washed up, nor of any sunken town. What Haydar Mîrzâ has to say about the ÎsslK-Kul corresponds in general to the facts, but there are a few peculiar assertions. He says for example that on account of the great proportion of salt in it the water is unsuitable for washing in; in reality the proportion of salt is very slight.

In the 17th and 18th centuries the shores of the lake were under the rule of Buddhist Kalmucks; Tibetan inscriptions in the country south-east of the lake still recall this period. The Mongol name of the ÎsslK-Kul was Temurtu-No, “iron lake”: many of the mountain streams flowing into the ÎsslK-Kul carry ferriferous sand; small knives, etc. are made from this iron by the Kirgiz. Even in the Kalmuck period the Kirgiz [q.v.] had grazing grounds here. The land remained in their possession after conquest of the Kalmuck kingdom by the Chinese; Chinese rule was never firmly established here in spite of several attempts. About the middle of the 19th century the Russians advanced across the Ilt. The ÎsslK-Kul was reached in 1856 by Colonel Khomentovskî. A part of the Kirgiz was forced to submit to Russian rule as early as 1855 and the rest in 1860. The Russians founded the town of Karakol, called Prêval’sk since 1888, so far the only town in the country round the ÎsslK-Kul (according to the census of 1897, 7,987 inhabitants, now about 15,000), and several villages. All these settlements are in the eastern part of the ÎsslK-Kul valley: the western part has been reached by the railway to Rîba’è since May 1948. There is steamer traffic on the lake. The settlements are still, as in the Middle Ages, called after the rivers on which they lie. The official Russian names are rarely used, even by the Russians; even the Russian peasant always says “Tûp” for “Preobraženskaya” and “Kîzlî- su” (which is corrupted to “Koîzeltî”) for “Pokrovskaya”. Thanks to the fertility of the soil, the villages are in a flourishing condition, in spite of the frequent earthquakes.


(W. Barthold - B. Spuler)

ÎSTÂBL and İSTABL (a.; pl. ıstâblâl and rarely ıssâıbîl, according to LA, s.v.), etymologically stable, that is to say the building in which mounts and baggage animals (equidae and camelidae) are kept tethered and, by metonymy, the actual stock of such animals belonging to one single owner. İstabl is the arabization of the low-Greek στάβλος/σταβλο/σταβλο (see Du Cange, Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis, Lyons 1688, s.v.), which
in turn derives from the Latin stabulum. This is one of the so-called terms "of civilization" which have been disseminated most widely, since it is to be found with the same meaning in all the western languages; well before Islam, Arabic had adopted it through the medium of the Ghassnids [q.v.] in Syria.

(i) The central Islamic lands: The practice of keeping horses under cover is peculiar to sedentary peoples, that is to say the idea of a stable was unknown to the nomadic Arabs, whose steeds were merely given the shade of a tent or bush to which they tethered them (marba'), incidentally this custom seems to be perpetuated even within the towns, in caravanserais [fanduk, khān [q.v.]] where the shelter of a roof was reserved for men and merchandise, while the animals remained tethered in the vast central courtyard. In the same way, the Muslim cavalry in their encampments extra muros (mu'nakar) provided their horses with nothing more than some sort of light shelter (misalla) made of palm-leaves, while the animals remained tethered in the vast fields. Thus, the term ištāl applied only to permanent constructions of solid materials, such as only rulers and high dignitaries who owned many horses were able to have built near their palaces. Even so, such buildings were rather rare, and the pre-Islamic Arabs had almost no opportunity of seeing them, except at Hira of the Lāḥmids [q.v.] or at Damascus, in the Byzantine period; but the presence of the imposing ruins left from vanished civilizations, both in Mesopotamia and all along the eastern Mediterranean, gave credence to the legend of sumptuous ancient stables as those of King Solomon which, in the light of recent archaeological discoveries, have proved to be merely vast granaries. The same is true, in an instance very much closer to us, of the stables of the sultan of Morocco, Mawlāy Ismā'īl (see below), which seemed to Fr. Busnot "the finest part of the palace, with their two lines of arcades extending for three-quarters of a league and the canal which provided them with water. The horses, tethered by all four legs to two rings by means of a hair cord, were tended by Muslim grooms and Christian stable-boys" (Ch. A. Julien, Histoire de l'Afrique du Nord, Paris 1911, 504; Eng. tr., London 1970, 260). The missionary's account gives a perfect idea of the stables as conceived in Antiquity and as adopted by the Muslim world in the Middle Ages. These cloister-like galleries of arcades (riwāk) housed the stalls (low Latin stallium from stalulum, Ar. shibāk pl. shibkāb), separated from one another by low partitions of wood or netting, and the animals tethered in these by three legs (not four), by means of a flexible halter (shibāl pl. shukhbā) passing through two rings fastened to the wall of a wooden cross-bar in the corner (shikhiyya pl. akhādat, akhāhāy and iry, iriy pl. awārī). Their heads being left free, they were given their feed of barley in nose-bags, while hay (sāfla), mixed with straw, was provided as litter; there seems to have been no knowledge of the fixed manger or the wall-rack, upon which so much stress is laid in the entirely theoretical descriptions of the model stables to be found in various Arabic treatises on hippotaxy and hippology (such as that of Ibn Hudhayl [q.v.], see L. Mercier, Parure, . . . 365-6), which merely repeat the Remarks of the Greeks on the subject (cf. Xenophon, On equitation, chap. iv).

The historians and chroniclers who wrote in Arabic in fact provided only the most scanty information regarding the stable buildings of the caliphs, sultans and high dignitaries of Islam. Among the very scattered and often lacunose particulars that may be gleaned on this subject there is one description of the highest importance, relating to the stables in Bagdad belonging to the 'Abbāsid Caliph al-Muktaḍar bi-llāh, which is contained in the Kitāb al-Dhakāh'ir wal-tuḥla (Kuwayt 1959), attributed to al-Kādī al-Muḥammad b. dc. Al-Muktadir bi-llāh (d. middle of the 5th/11th century), and of which al-Mirāḍī made use for his Kitāb. It deals with the visit of an embassy from the emperor Constantine VII to the caliph, in 959/1017, and the following passage occurs (Arabic, vii/3 (1960), 295, from the translation of M. Hamidullah who discovered and edited the manuscript): "... The envois from the Tāghtiya (the emperor of Byzantium) took horse, with their interpreter Ibn 'Abd al-Bākî, on the Thursday, the sixth day before the end of Muḥarram (that is to say, the 24th of the month) and entered by the corridor of the great public gate (of the palace), to make their way into the building known as the Stables (shīkān al-khayl). The building consisted of colonnades with marble pillars. On one side there were 500 horses, with an equivalent number of saddles (markāb) of silver and gold, of different kinds, and without cloths. On the other side there were 500 horses, all with trappings of patterned silk and veils. Each horse was held by a man of the shākīrīyya class (regular soldiers)".

For the fortified residences which were built on the edge of the desert, on the orders of several Umayyad sovereigns, insufficient archaeological study has as yet been made to determine in what manner the stables were laid out.

When Abl Ḫaḍar al-Maḥṣūr, the second 'Abbāsid
caliph, founded his "Round Town" of Baghdad [q.v.] in 146/763, there was no provision for including stables for the ruler or his dependents, perhaps owing to lack of space, and these had to be erected on the outskirts: "... Another quarter extended from the Khurāsān gate, on the one side as far as the bridge of boats over the Tigris, and on the other to the point opposite the Khudl (palace). It is in the last-mentioned place that the royal stables were situated, and also the parade ground and a palace looking out on the Tigris: Abū Dī'aTar always lived there, and al-Mahdī also, until he moved to his palace of Rusafā, on the east bank of the Tigris" [al-Ya'qūbī/Wiet, Les Pays, 31]. Further to the south, facing the square opposite the Kūfā gate "... was located the concession granted to Ya'sīn, the head of the dromedary staff, the dromedaries' stables being alongside it. On this side of these stables were the freedmen's stables" (ibid., 20).

Once caliph, and having by then settled in Rusafā, al-Mahdī organized a general removal of the administrative departments from the other side of the river: the stables also were transferred, and we then find them established in the Muḥarrim quarter, under the direction of the mawla Nāzī (ibid., 40), and containing horses, dromedaries and elephants. From the last of these the Dār al-fil was to take its name, and it was succeeded by a zoological park (Ikṣyra al-wuḥāq). These State stables remained in the Muḥarrim quarter until, apparently, it fell into ruin; al-Sūlī mentions them in his chronicle (Abūl-Ḥarîrā ar-Rādī, tr. M. Canard, 30 and n. 6) of the caliphate of al-Muttaḍī (332/940-333/944), in connection with the Daylamites' assault on Baghdad, under the leadership of Kūrānḵādī, their aim being to dislodge Ibn Rāālk, and it was in the stables that, in the end, the assailants and their leader were massacred, on 25 Dhu'l-Hidjādja 332/26 September 941. It appears that, in due course, the buildings were demolished in 448/1056 by the Saljuq Tughrī Beg, in order to make way for the rampart surrounding Muḥarrim and the Dār al-fil, one part of which became a cemetery.

When al-Muṭṭaṣīm, an excellent horseman (see Kushādūm, Māṣyād . . . , Baghdad 1954, 5 and trans. F. Vīrė, Art de volerie, in Arabica, ixxii, 2, 199), left Baghdad for Sāmarrā in 1342/1923/24, he was careful to take with him his own stables and those of his household. Thanks to al-Ya'qūbī (op. cit., 52), we know that these were established along the main avenue of Sarāḏa, the diecumanus of the city: "... It was also in this avenue that the stables of the Khurāsān officers were located . . ., that of Hūzām ibn Ṭahlīb. Behind Hūzām's concession were the stables for the caliph's horses, his own private horses and those for the government departments, the management of which was entrusted to Hūzām and his brother Ya'qūbī" (It is appropriate to call attention here to an error in the reading of the manuscript of al-Ya'qūbī, since it is in fact a question of one single personage, named Ḥāšmah, whose functions were continued by his son Ya'qūbī, as will be shown later; the misunderstanding is due to the "knightly" title Akhi [q.v.] and the reference borne by the Turk Ḥāšmah as "costable" (comes stabulis) at the base of the ladder was the stable-boy or lad (ghulūm), whose duty it was to keep the stalls clean and remove the dung; above him was the groom (sā'īs pl. sā'īs, sīyās and rāwī pl. rūwālī), who was responsible for the grooming (hass) of one or more animals; the daily outings to the paddock and to the water were, it seems, the special province of the harnessman (shad-dīd) who in addition prepared the mount when the east bank of the Tigris. In the 11th/12th century, Ibn 'Abīl Ṭālīb (d. 405/1017) left (in Mandkīb Baghdād of Ibn al-Djawf, Baghdad 1932), a description of this wealthy quarter, with its boulevard running from al-Tāb to the banks of the river: "... As for its streets, there is one that closely follows the Tigris. On one of its sides, it has palaces overlooking the river, and disposed in such fashion as to spread all the way from the Bridge to the beginning of the Zāhir Garden . . . On the other side of the street are the mosques of the caliph's servants and the dwellings of their soldiers, in between which they have their stables." (G. Maksidi, The topography of eleventh century Baghdād, in Arabic, vii, 1950, 186). The size of these stables may be judged when he notes specifically (idem, 187): "... and the castle of al-Wālī, whose horses every day consume about a thousand rations of forage". Now, in the same period, the anonymous author of the Kūṭāb al-hāyī, an actual record made for the use of taxation officials, evaluates the monthly consumption for one horse at 40 kāfī [q.v.] of forage (see Cl. Cahen, Problèmes économiques de l'Iraq byzide, in AIEO Alger, x (1952), 337).

In Cairo, the stables of the Fāṭimīd sovereigns were in no way inferior to those of the Baghdād rulers, and an idea of their extent is given in the description which Ibn al-Ṭawār (Nuska al-mubāltayn fi al-dawlatayn . . .), a source common to al-Makdisi (Kūṭāb, i, 416), Ibn Taghribirdī (Nūṣūm, iv, 79) and al-Kalkashandi (Subk, iii, 503), gave of the review of his own private horses held by the caliph, in the courtyards of the palace, on the eve of the procession at the New Year or that at the Ending of the Past (see M. Canard, La procession . . . , in AIEO Alger, x (1952), 376 f.); here too it was a matter of a thousand horses and more, which were made to parade before their sovereign. While we must allow for exaggeration, the fact remains that the stock of horses in these stables was considerable, and the same was true under the Ayyūbid and Sāliḏīkīd régimes. Often there was insufficient space to house so many animals, and the owners did not hesitate to tear down ancient palaces in order to build stables in their place (Kūṭāb apud De Sacy, Christomathie, ii, 14). Besides these great stables in the cities, there were also ʾiṣṭabāl in all the posting-houses (sīkka), which came under the department of Posts and Information (barīd [q.v.]), all along the main routes in the Muslim empire; this department, active under the Umayyads and ʿAbbāsīdīs, suffered a decline under the Ayyūbīdīs, but it was thoroughly reorganized by the Sultan Baybars [q.v.] who rebuilt its stables (see J. Sauvaget, La poste aux chevaux dans l'empire des Mamelouks, Paris 1941). Moreover, all the fortresses or citadels (bišn, ʾaʃaf) marking out the frontiers of Islam, and those in Syria which resisted the inroads of the Crusaders, contained their own stables of war-horses and pack animals (see Usāma b. Munkījīl, Ḥībār, 46, 66).

It will readily be seen that all these establishments called for a numerous personnel divided into a hierarchy based on competence. At the bottom of the ladder was the stable-boy or lad (ghulūm), whose duty it was to keep the stalls clean and remove the dung; above him was the groom (sā'īs pl. sā'īs, sīyās and rāwī pl. rūwālī), who was responsible for the grooming (hass) of one or more animals; the daily outings to the paddock and to the water were, it seems, the special province of the harnessman (shad-dīd) who in addition prepared the mount when the
The general responsibility for the working of this domestic system fell upon the “constable” or master of the stables (sahib al-ī斯塔بلى) and, according to the regions and periods involved, kāyīm-, mudābir-, mutawallī-, ustādā-, musfrī al-ī斯塔بلى), a high office which required its holder to possess a perfect knowledge of the study of the horse in all its aspects, besides skill as an administrator and controller in supervising purchases of provender, in regard to both quality and quantity, and also its correct distribution, since fraud and waste are vices common to all generations. If he was not himself qualified, the master of stables was assisted by a veterinarian (bayādīr [q.v.]) who must have been kept very busy with treating the various ailments from which horses suffer, the urgent surgical operations and the foaling of the mares. Every stable of importance in fact included a study-farm, to ensure the continuance of the line of thorough-breds [see PARAS] and the replenishing of the stock; the Muslim ethic did not permit the gelding of stallions, since the Prophet was formally opposed to purchases of provender, in regard to both quality and quantity, and also its correct distribution, since fraud and waste are vices common to all generations. For the financing of their private stables, their own experience, as in the case of the Khuttals (from the village of Khuttal, near Baghdad). The first of these to hold office, Abu Khazzám b. Ghālibī was constable to al-Mu'taṣīm, and in the same position we later find his son Abū Yusuf Ya'qūbī and then his two grandsons Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad and Abīnām, down to the caliphate of al-Mu'taṣīd (279/892-289/902). These members of one single family have left, as collective works, several remarkable treatises on the equestrian art, farriery and the handling of arms on horseback, which have been collected and published (see Brockelmann, I, 243-4 and S I, 432-3), which needs to be amended: L. Mercier, op. cit., 41 and note).

Management of the stables was a delicate and difficult task; for this reason, it could be entrusted only to specialists, some of whom succeeded in allowing their sons to benefit from their own experience, and, according to the regions and periods involved, P. de Alcalá recognized only this last word, pronounced with the Granadine imála [q.v.], riwī, pl. arwaṣa (ed. De Lagarde, 145, 245). In the form rawī and with various plurals (rawīya, rawādī), this word is still employed in present-day Arabic dialects in the Maghrib, from Morocco to Tunisia; in these countries it always denotes a covered place, intended to provide shelter for valuable mounts, whether horses or mules. For Spain under the Umayyads in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries, we possess some details about the royal stables intended for saddle horses and beasts of burden (al-ī斯塔بلى bi'il-sahr wa'l-kird'), Al-Hakam I had two stables built near his palace at Cordoba, each of which housed a thousand war-horses. Their riders were divided into quadrants of a hundred men, each commanded by an officer with the title of sarfī. The cavalry as a whole were under the command of the hā'id al-āhs, known also as the hā'id al-a'īsma. The famous al-Manṣūr, the “mayor of the palace” of the “roi finanças” Higham II, had 12,000 regular cavalrymen under his command.

The general controller of the stables or master of stables was called sahib al-ī斯塔بلى. Another official (sarfī) was responsible for the beasts of burden,
mules and pack-horses (zawdmil, khayl al-humldn).

A different official dealt with camels used for transport.

Stud-farms existed on the grassy islands in the Guadalquivir, above Seville. Horses were also imported from North Africa (khayl 'idwiyya), the famous jinotes which derive their name from that of the Berber tribe of the Zanata (q.v.).

For Granada in the Nasrid period, P. Alcalá (op. cit., 243) gives the title kāyld ar-rwd. On the famous stables built by Mawlay Isma'il for his horses and mules in about 1084/1678 at Meknès, see above.

Until the beginning of the 20th century, in Morocco, the outside staff of the palace included a special corps, known as the mudīn er-rauda "people of the stable," who were responsible for looking after the sovereign's horses and mules. Working with the grooms (sing. rūwwdy) were stable-men whose duty it was to clean out the stables (kennds) or to wash the animals in deep water (awmām). Certain stable-men (sāis or sīyyds) concerned themselves particularly with dressage. Throughout Morocco, the sovereign owned many vast stretches of pastureland, known as 'adhir, where his horses were put out to grass after operations against rebel tribes; some of these lands were used as stud-farms.

With the corps of grooms properly speaking there were combined: 1. the corps of muleteers (ham-mūra, sīc), with responsibility for the transport of baggage; 2. the corps of cameleers (jammdla); 2. the corps of cameleers (jammdla); 3. servants with the special duty of dealing with ceremonial carriages (kōdghī, from the Spanish coche, or 'arabā) and travelling litters (mhāffa), used by the sovereign and the women of the harem who accompanied him.


For the stables at Meknès, Ahmad al-Nasirī, K. I. Istiklāl, Cairo 1312, iv; idem, trans. Funney, 1, 72; Busnot, Histoire du règne de Moulay Ismaïl, Rouen 1714, 56-9; Sources inédites de l'histoire du Maroc, 2° série, France, iv, 189, 689; Windsus, A journey to Mequinez, London, 1725, 174.; — A. Aubin, Le Maroc d'aujourd'hui, 196, 200; Archives Marocaines, v/6, 308; W. Marçais, Textes arabes de Tanger, 314; G. S. Colin, Chrestomathie marocaine, 209.

Staatssurveillance der Grosskönigen und Großmächte (1938-1939), Wiesbaden 1954, 102; K. M. Rohrborn, Provinzen und Zentralgebielt Persiens im 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts, Berlin 1966, 27; Tadhkirat al-mulūk, ed. Minorsky, ch. xiii = tr. 51. The royal stables were further used as a source of mounts for the ruler's personal bodyguard which, of course, normally made up of his own military slaves or ghulāms (q.v.). Finally, a reserve of horses had always to be on hand, for fine horses (and in the case of some eastern Islamic dynasties, elephants) were often amongst the presents forwarded to other potentates or presented to governors, along with robes of honour, a standard, etc., as the insignia of office (see HIBA).

The officer in charge of the sultan's stables under the Ghaznavids (q.v.), the Ābkūr-Sālīr or Amīr-i Ābkūr, was usually a general of the palace ghulāms. Elephants were used extensively for military purposes by the Ghaznavids (see Pā). As beasts of war, and as well as stables for horses, there was at Ghaiza a pil-kāhān with accommodation for 1000 elephants and a staff of Hindus to attend them (Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran, 994-1040, 112, 113, 117). Officials from the royal stables were also to be found in the provinces of the empire, where horses were bred or sent out for pasture, for instance, in the horses-rearing regions along the upper Oxus in Khuṭṭal and Tukharistān, cf. Spuler, Iran, 392.

The Great Sālīdūs sultans had such towns as Ray, Isfahān and Marw as fixed centres of government even though the dargāh or court accompanied the sultan in his progresses through the provinces and on his campaigns (cf. Lambton, in Cambridge history of Iran, v. 222-3). Sandjar, and presumably other sultans, seems personally to have had extensive herds of horses (ibid., 326). The royal stables were doubtless located in these centres of government; certainly, Niẓām al-Mulk says that oversight of the stables was one of the duties of the Wahli-i Khās, Intendant of the Royal Household, although he complains that the office had fallen into desuetude in his time (Siyāsat-nāma, ch. xvi = text ed. Darke, 112, tr. 92). The Master of the Royal Horse in Sālīdūs times, usually designated Amīr-i Ābkūr, Ābkūr-Beg, etc., was frequently a ghulām commander of the sultan, e.g., the Ābkūr-Sālīr Kīzīl, Shīḫān or military governor of Baḥdād in 536/1141-2 and a former ghulām of Sultan Mahmūd b. Muḥammad (Ibn al-Athir, xi, 93; Šadīr al-Dīn al-Husaynī, Ābkūr al-dawla al-salīdūsīyya, 117).

It is uncertain whether a Turkish dynasty like the Karağhānsīds of Transoxania (see ILKH-KHANS), whose khāns seem to have led a semi-nomadic existence during the summer months at least, had a permanent royal stable. One khān, Shams al-Mulk Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm Tamghaʾ Khān (460/1068-472/1080), built a palace complex at Shamsābād outside Buḥkārā, and a continuation of Narshakhl mentions that adjacent to this was a walled enclosure (ghurūb, see Radloff, Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Turk-Dialekte, ii, 358-9) for the royal horses and other beasts (Taʾwīl-i Buḥkārā, tr. Frye, 20). Such royal preserves, ghurūbs of horses (cf. the old Arabian institution of hēr), were established later by the Mongol khāns, and the royal stables as a fixed building probably only re-appears after the Mongol interlude in Persian history.

The institution of the royal stables is certainly well-attested for Safavid times, both by European travellers like Chardin and Kaempfer, and by the late Safavid administrative manual, the Tadhkirat al-
Muḥl. This latter source (chs. xv, xvi, xc, xci = tr. 52, 87, commentary 120-1) distinguishes between two Masters of the Stables, the Mīr-Āhūr-Bāghi-yi Dīlaw and the Mīr-Āhūr-Bāghi-yi Ṣaḥrāḥ, the first official being the higher paid. The Mīr-Āhūr-Bāghi-yi Dīlaw (dīlaw = Mongol "rein, halter," see G. Doerfer, Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, in Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, Wiesbaden 1963, 296-7; hence dīlaw-dār, the groom who rides ahead of his master and holds his bridle) was in charge of the royal stables in the capital. Chardin says that there were three such stables in Isfahan, with a very numerous staff; these comprised the subordinate marshals (māz-āhūr-rādzān), grooms, watercarriers, farriers, saddlers, veterinary specialists, etc. Since the royal stables were an integral part of the court, appointments made by the Mīr-Āhūr-Bāghi-yi Dīlaw had to be confirmed by the Nāṣir Buyūlādih, the Chief Intendant of the Royal Household or Ḳāṣṣā. The second Master of the Horse, the Mīr-Āhūr-Bāghi-yi Ṣaḥrāḥ, was in charge of equestrian establishments out in the countryside, the ṣaḥrā, i.e., the royal stud farms. An important part of his duties was to make an annual inspection, in company with the Nāṣir-Daulāb dānd of the Animals, of the studs (the ṣar-i ṭuḥād), and also to keep an eye on affairs in the royal reservations (ṣar-khass). Also mentioned in tr., chs. xxiii, clx-Cl .10, were the Ṣāḥib Dīns, i.e., the ṣar-i ṭuḥūlāt (departments or workshops, of the royal household) of the saddlers (ṣin-khāna), and one of the stables (iṣṭābāl).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C. E. Bosworth)

(v) Muslim India: the term ḥāvāli is rather uncommon in Indo-Persian literature but is attested for the royal stables of the Indian Mughals (Abu 'l-Fadl, Aḥn-i Aḥkārī, i, 48-54) and for those of the 9th/15th-century sultans of Mālwa (Farīṣga, Taṛīḵī, Bombay 1832, ii, 474). In India stables are more usually designated by the Persian word pāygyāḏ, which is also used for non-royal establishments: e.g., the stables of a Ḳāḥānāhād where the travellers' horses are lodged (Ṣirhind, Fawd'īd al-fuṣd, ed. M. L. Mālīk, Lahore 1966, 344: cf. Barani, Taṛīḵī-i Fīrūz-shāhī, 212). The nomenclature and organization of royal stables in Muslim India reflect the earlier Persian tradition transmitted through the Ghaznavids [see section (iv) above], though Indo-Muslim stables also inherited a body of veterinary lore and knowledge of certain breeds of horses — e.g., the tangle from the north east of the sub-continent — from the large and diversified stables of earlier Hindu rulers (for those of the 1st/7th century ruler Tulsār Hāna, see Bana, Har- sa-caret, tr. E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas, London 1897, 50, 201). The main purposes for which royal stables were maintained were similar to those which prevailed in Persia — to mount the sultan and his dependants, including considerable numbers of royal mudāms or lelaḏ, to supply a service of postal couriers and to provide horses for distribution as largesse or despatch as gifts. The main body of cavalry at all times consisted of troopers who mainly took part in mounted independent of the royal stables (for the sultanate of Dīhil, see Barani, 303, 313; 'Affī, Taṛīḵī-i Fīrūz-shāhī, 220-1, 301; for the Mughal period, W. Irving, The army of the Indian Moghuls, London 1903, 47-51; see also iṣṭābāl).

In the sultanate of Dīhil [q.v.] the pāygyāḏ was an important department of state (kārkahānā: 'Affī, 339-40) presided over by the māz-āhūr (Dūḏžānī, Taba-hāt-i Nāṣīrī, 232, 242), Ṣabāh-nā-i Aḥkār (Dūḏžānī, 252) or aḥkār bēg (Barani, 274, 241, 434, 557): at times this office was divided between aḥkār bēg-i mashāra and an aḥkār bēg-i mayyama (of the left and right wings: Barani, 24, 454). The term pāygyāḏ embraced both the stables and the royal horses and might be said to accompany the sultan when he left the capital (Sīhrīndī, Taṛīḵī-i Mūḥarrākhādhī, 109). 'Ašā' al-Dīn Mūḥammad Shāh Ḳhūlijī (695/1296-715/1316) is said to have had 70,000 horses in his pāygyāḏ (Barani, 262). Circa 1340 A.D. the sāḥib bēg-i akhūr (sc. Mūḥammad b. Tughlūk) is said to have distributed 10,000 Arab horses annually to his retinue and given away countless others (al-'Umārī, Masālīk al-abṣār, ed. K. A. Fārīs, Dehli 1961, 28). Horses were presented by the sultan to visiting Mongol chieftains (Barani, 462) and to foreign potentates: e.g., 100 horses were dispatched by Mūḥammad b. Tughlūk to the emperor of China (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Rīḵā, Paris 1853-7, iv, 2); 500 Turki and Tāzdī horses were bestowed by Fīrūz Shāh Tughlūk on Sultan Sīkandar of Bengal in 761/1360 ('Affī, 159). Subject chieftains and provincial officers who were close to import routes despatched horses to the sultan ('Ayn-i Māḥrū, Inshā'-ī Māḥru, ed. S. A. Rāshīd, Lahore 1965, 111). In some cases money was paid from one of the diwāns for horses sent to the pāygyāḏ (Māḥrū, 204, 207). In other instances horses were to be sent as an annual tribute. When in 778/1376 Shams Dāmghānī took over the farming of the revenues of Gudja-rat (Sīhrīndī, 132) he undertook to send 200 horses annually. The Dīams of Thatta, Sind, agreed to provide every 5th year horses worth 100,000 lānakas (Māḥrū, 187).

In the later 8th/14th century the pāygyāḏ was divided into five physically separated establishments. The "large" pāygyāḏ and one other were probably more than 100 miles away from Dīhil in the east Pandjāb. The third pāygyāḏ was within the palace precinct of the capital (pāygyāḏ-i mahāl-i khāṣ); the fourth, with 1,200 horses, was attached to the royal falconry or department of the hunt (pāygyāḏ-i ṣhīkarahānā-yi khāṣ; while the fifth provided mounts for royal slaves and dependants (pāygyāḏ-i bārdīzārdān-i bandāgān-i Ḫāṣ: 'Affī, 318, 340). A modern reference to the breeding of horses in the Dīhil sultanate is found in the Jāsūrī rendition of the Hūrsā, which adapted a Sanskrit work on the subject (see section (v)).
gave an advantage in power struggles on at least two occasions (Mohibbul Hasan, Kashmir under the sultans, Calcutta 1959, 201). The sultanate of Mâlwa provides a possibly unique instance of a Muslim ruler turning horse-dealer. Around 825/1422 Sultan Hûchâng (r. 808/1405-838/1435) led a valuable string of horses across the difficult terrain of central India to trade them for war-elephants with the Rây of Jâlnagar (evidently Bhânnâ-andra IV of the Eastern Gangâ dynasty of Orissa; Nâdâm al-dîn Akbari, iii, 295-6; Farûqî, Ta'rikh, Bombay 1832, i, 466), but there may be mythical elements in this story. When Sultan Hûchâng of Mâlwa was on his deathbed, his son Ghânzîn Khân sent a demand for 50 horses from the istabâl; this was refused by the mir dâkhur and the demand gave offence to his dying father (Farûqî, ii, 474). We have no information regarding the stables of the Sayyid and Lodî sultans of Dîhil and of the sultans of Nâwânpûr and Bângal. Kîlî Lodî, father of Sultan Buhlû Lodî (r. 855/1451-894/1489), first rose to political power as a horse-dealer importing from the hills of the north-west frontier (Mu'âmmâd Khâbr, Fisânâ-yi shâhân-i Hûnd, B. M. Add. Ms. 24, 409, folgs. 7-9).

From the end of the 10th/16th century we possess a detailed description of the regulation of the istabâl of the Mughal emperor Dju'dâli al-dîn Mu'âmmâd Akbarî (Abu l-Fadl 'Alî, Fars.-Lat., i, 175). In 1562/1971, 28-62; W. Kirkpatrick, Select letters of Tîppoo Sultan, London 1881; W. Miles, A history of Hyderabad, 2 vols., London 1879). Bibliography: Given in the article. References to texts, where no date or place of publication is given, are to those in the Bibliotheca Indica series published by the Asiatique Society of Bengal, Calcutta.

ISTABÂL, a town in Pârs. The real name was probably Istâkhûr, as it is written in Fâhâvî; the version with the Attic vowel Ï is based on the Armenian form Sîmâr and the abbreviation S T on the Sânsânî coins point in the same direction. The form with prosthetic vowel is modern Persian; it is usually pronounced Istâkhar or Istâbar, also with inserted vowel Sîtâghâr, Sîtâkhâr, Sîtârâch; cf. Vullers, Lex. Pers.-Lat., i, 94, 97*, ii, 223, and Nödeke in Grundr. der Iran. Philol., ii, 192. The Syriac form is Ištâh (rarely Ištârî), in the Talmud probably Ištâbar (Ištâhâr, Megilla 13*, middle). According to the statements of Persian authors it must have received its name from the lakes or swamps there. Perhaps, however, it is better to be derived with Spiegel (Erdmische Altertumskunde, i, 94, note 1) and Justi (Grundr. der Iran. Philol., ii, 448) from the Avestan stákhrâ "strong, firm"; for the latter word cf. Chr. Bartholomäe, Altiran. Wörterbuch, p. 1591.

Ištâghûr lies in 29° 50' N. Lat. and about 53° E. Long., a short hour's journey north of Persepols, in the narrow valley of the Pulwâr or Murghâb (also called Siwand-Rûd). It may be assumed with certainty that its foundation took place very soon after the decline of the Achaemenid capital Persepols, which was caused by Alexander the Great. The ruins of the latter in any case formed a quarry which was much used for the building of the new town. Ištâghûr was at first merely the chief town of the district of Pârs, the centre of which had probably always been in this neighbourhood. A few decades before the collapse of the Arsakid kingdom, it figures as the residence of local chiefs. The Sânsânîs came from the region of Ištâkhr. Sâsân, grandfather of Ardašîr I, was superintendent of the fire-temple of the goddess Anâhîd in the town of Ištâkhr (Tabart, i, 814), the fire of which is said to have suddenly been ominously extinguished in the night of the birth of Mu'âmmâd. After the foundation of the Sânsânî kingdom this town was also considered its religious centre and
Iṣṭakhr was henceforth considered the official capital of the New Persian monarchy.

The inhabitants of Iṣṭakhr in particular opposed a stubborn resistance to the advance of the Muslims. The first attempt to take the city, undertaken in 28/649 by al-ʿĀlī b. al-Ḥārām, governor of Bahrain, with insufficient forces and against ʿUmar’s express orders, failed completely and it was not till 29/653 that ʿIṣṭakhr had to capitulate to an Arab army commanded by Abū Mūsā al-ʿAṣārī and ʿOthmān b. al-ʿĀs. But its citizens afterwards rebelled and slew the governor set over them. The governor of Bayṣra, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿĀmir ʿawl, whom the caliph sent against the rebels, was only able to take the town after severe fighting. In the suppression of the revolution many Persians met their death. This second capture of Iṣṭakhr probably took place in 29/649 (cf. on this question J. Wellhausen, Schätze und Vorarbeiten, vi (1899), III f. For other details of the Arab expeditions against Iṣṭakhr see: Bāqlābī (ed. de Goeje), p. 389, f., Tabārī, i, 2546 f., 2549, 2666 f., 2830; Ibn al-ʿAṣḥāb, ii, 420 f., iii, 30 f., 77 f.; Chronique de Tabārī (Pers. vers., by Bel'amī), trans. Zotenberg, iii, 452-3; Well, Gesch. der Chalifen, i, 86-7, 163, and thereon A. D. Mordtmann in ZDMG, vi, 455-6; Caetani, Annali dell’Islam, iv, 151 f., v, 19-27, vi, 190-20, 248-56).

Iṣṭakhr remained a fairly important place during the early centuries of Islam. However it gradually sank to be merely the chief town of a province and was the capital of the kūra bearing its name, the largest of the five districts into which the province of Fārs was divided, comprising its northern and north eastern parts. The heaviest blow suffered by the erstwhile Sāsānian capital was the foundation in 64/668 of Shirāz (a day's journey south of Iṣṭakhr), which soon became the capital of the province of Fārs and attained great prosperity, particularly from the 3rd/9th century. Henceforth Iṣṭakhr declined visibly. From the description of the geographer al-ʿIṣṭakhrī, a native of the town, it was about the middle of the 4th/10th century a town of medium size of the area of an Arab (= Roman) mile; the wall around it was in ruins. Al-Muḵaddasī, writing about thirty years later (985), praises the splendid bridge over the river in Iṣṭakhr and the fine park. Concerning the chief mosque, situated in the bazaars, he mentions the ruin of Iṣṭakhr. In a description of the province of Farās-Nāma, it is described as a modest village with barely a hundred inhabitants. As to the mint of Iṣṭakhr, coins struck here in the Sāsānian period bear the abbreviation ST (S) in Pahlavi characters: this certainly means Iṣṭakhr. Numerous specimens of these coins exist from the reign of Yezdegerd II (from 438 A.D.) to the end of the dynasty. In the Islamic period also the Pahlavi legend with the above abbreviation was retained for a considerable time. Such coins struck in the name of the caliph or of governors are known down to the year 58/679-8, cf. J. Walker, A Catalogue of the Arab-Sasanian coins (A Catalogue of the Muhammadan coins in the British Museum), London 1941, cxxix-cxxx, 116. Coins of post-reform type were struck at Iṣṭakhr during the Umayyad and Abbāsīd periods (see G. C. Miles, Excavation coins from the Persepolis region, Numismatic Notes and Monographs No. 143, New York 1939 and J. Walker, A Catalogue of the Arab-Byzantine and post-reform Umayyad coins, London 1956, 112-4).

The present system of ruins at Iṣṭakhr has been excavated in 1935 and 1937 by a team from the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (see: E. F. Schmidt, The Treasury of Persepolis (Oriental Institute Communications, No. 21, Chicago 1939), 105-21; idem, Flights over ancient cities of Iran (Oriental Institute, Chicago 1940), plates 8-10; and G. C. Miles, op. cit.). The remains of the town are mainly recognizable in the mounds of earth of varying height. Here and there parts of the surrounding walls still exist. The most remarkable seems to be a place lying towards the village of Hādīdīt-bādhīl — usually ʿArīm b. Djamāshīd — called Harīm b. Djamāshīd, “Djamāshīd’s Harem” (cf. below) by the travellers J. Morier and Ker Porter — where a column stands erect in the midst of an area covered with fragments of pillars. Its capital, composed of bodies of bulls, at once shows it to have been removed from Persepolis. The most detailed account of the ruins of Iṣṭakhr, aside from that of Schmidt, is that of Flandin and Coste, who spent two months in the neighbourhood about the end of 1840; cf. the pictures in the great volume of plates, Voyage en Perse, ii (Paris, 1843 f.), pl. 58-62, and the archaeological text accompanying it, p. 69-72, and also Flandin’s Relation du Voyage, ii, (1852), 137.

In the vicinity of Iṣṭakhr there are several other sites remarkable for their monuments of history. For example, about 700 yards north of the village of Hādīdīt-bādhīl, there are natural caves, one of which contains an inscription of historical importance of Sapor I (247-272 A.D.); it is usually called Shaykh ʿAll by the Persians, as a pious ascetic of this name is said to have ended his days in it; at the same time one hears it called Zīndān-i Djamāshīd, “Djamāshīd’s prison”. Prominent among the monuments of antiquity are frequently attributed to Djamāshīd, a mythical ruler of ancient Iran whom the Muslim Persians identified with the Solomon of legend.

Another place of historical importance is the Nāḵš-i Ṛastam, the former a short hour's journey south of Iṣṭakhr on the south bank of the Pulwar, the latter on the north bank of this stream about 1½ miles from Iṣṭakhr. The former is a ravine-like split in the wall of rock on the south bank of the Pulwar, which is adorned with three Sāsānian reliefs.

On account of their considerable remains from the ancient and mediaeval Persian periods, the best known sites are Takht-i Djamāshīd and Nāḵš-i Ṛastam, the former a short hour’s journey south of Iṣṭakhr on the south bank of the Pulwar, the latter on the north bank of this stream about 1½ miles from Iṣṭakhr. Takht-i Djamāshīd is the most usual name among Orientals for the complex of Achaemenid palaces at Persepolis. Besides Takht-i Djamāshīd one also hears the older name Chīl, or abbreviated, Čī Minār (also Menār), “the 40 pillars”, which is found as early as the Persian historians of the 14th century. This name is taken from the most noteworthy parts of the whole site, the colonnade of King Xerxes I with its pillars, originally 72, now only 13 in number. The Arab geographers of the Middle Ages from about the 3rd/9th century know the ruins of the Persepolitan
terrace by the name Mal'ab Sulaymān, “Sulaymān’s playing-ground”, with which we may compare the name Kursī Sulaymān, “Solomon’s stool (throne)”, found in the Persian history Mughāmil-i Tawārīḵ (beginning of the 5th/11th century), which in its turn may have been the model for the present synonymous name Taḵt-i Djamshīd.

The “Bench” or “Throne” of Djamshīd (Salomon) is an artificial stone terrace of polygonal, almost rectangular shape, which lies at the foot of a steep, dark grey mountain of rock. The latter, according to the reports of modern travellers, now bears the name Kūh-i Raḥmat, “hill of mercy”, but this is not to be found in literature; it apparently dates only from the post-mediaeval period (first mentioned by Sir Thomas Herbert in the beginning of the 17th century). The name still heard by Ouseley, Shāh Kūh, “royal hill”, might be older; it coincides with the Būdān xvii. of Dioscoros (xvii, 71). At the same time, according to the same authority, the inhabitants also use the name Kūh-i Taḵt, “hill of the throne (of Djamshīd)”. The section of the Kūh-i Raḥmat which forms the back wall of the platform contains three tombs of Achaemenid kings. The people know these by the names of the “mosque”, the “bath” and the “mill of Djamshīd”, according to Stolze (Verhandl. der Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde in Berlin, x, 1885, p. 273).

Iranian tradition varies regarding the founder of Persepolis-Īṣṭakhr; sometimes it is Kayūmarth, the mythical ancestor of the Persians, sometimes the builders or extenders are legendary rulers of the past like Kayūmarth’s descendants Hoshang (Uš-handā), Taihmūrāt, Djamshīd, Ka’i Khusraw. Solomon also is named, for whom the spirits (gīmān) subject to him carried out marvelously productive works. A legendary princess, Humāy, who plays the role of Semiramis as a builder in Iran, is also mentioned. Persian tradition transfers to Persepolis-Īṣṭakhr the residence of the old Iranian kings and makes them be buried there also. According to Firdawsī’s Shāhānūmā, the town was the residence of the reigning dynasty from the time of Kābūr, Muslims writers connect the origin of Persepolis with Solomon; the name given by them to the mountain, which lies at the foot of the above. According to their legend, this king dwelled alternately here and in Syria and was rapidly carried by the gīmān from one place to the other. Separate buildings on the terrace of Taḵt-i Djamshīd bear in Arabic writings the names “mosque” and “bath of Solomon” (cf. with these the above mentioned names of two royal tombs of Kūh-i Raḥmat). Solomon — so the story goes — shut the wind up in a room there; Persian sources of the 13th and 14th centuries still speak of a “prison of the wind” here (Zindān-i Bad) (cf. the reports in Ouseley, op. cit., ii, 381, 387).

Unfortunately the Arab accounts of the monuments of Persepolis are rather defective and moreover in parts distorted into fairy tales; cf. especially the accounts of the geographers al-Īṣṭakhrī, al-Muṣaddasi and al-Kaẓwīnī (see Schwarz, Irān); various not uninteresting information is given by Persian historians of the later Middle Ages, especially Hamd Allah Mustawfī and Hāfiz Abru (see Ouseley, ii, 380 f., 387 f.). According to these two, the pillars of the ruins there were celebrated as a source of zinc oxide (tā-

The caliph al-Manṣūr (754-775) wished to use the ruins of Persepolis, like those of al-Madā’in-Cesphi
don, as a quarry, but was persuaded against it by the advice of his vizier Khālid al-Barnamāli, who said that Persepolis was used as place of prayer by ‘All; see Fragm. Hist. Arab. (ed. de Goeje), p. 256.

Various Muslim rulers have perpetuated their visits to the ruins of Persepolis by having inscriptions incised. Here are to be seen three Arabic inscriptions in Kūfī characters by members of the Bāyād dynas
ties (4th/10th century), three inscriptions, two Persian and one Arabic, of Abu ‘l-Fath Ibrāhīm, a grandson of Tīmūr (9th/15th century), also three inscriptions (2 Arabic and 1 Persian) of ‘All b. Khālid, a grand
son of Uzūn Hasan (9th/13th century). These inscriptions were thoroughly discussed by de Sacy in his Mém. sur diverses antiquités de la Perse (Paris 1793), p. 139 ff.. Some emendations thereon were given by Nīldeke in Stolze, Persepolis, ii, 6. H. Petermanu, Reisen im Orient, ii, 188, also mentions an inscription of the Muẓaffarīd Muẓammād b. al-Muṣaffār b. al-Muẓaffar b. al-Manṣūr (d. 765/1365), see also V. Minorsky, Later Islamic Inscriptions at Persepolis, in BSOS (1939), 177-8. The various verses scratched on the walls show the high respect in which Persepolis has always been held among the Persians; their modern poets often make allusions to the ancient capital of the country.

As to Nakṣh-i Rustam, its primary significance is only the steep south wall of the long, high mass of rock, Ḥusayn Kūh, which has in niches four Achaemenid royal tombs and Sāsānian relics. But the name is often extended to the whole of Ḥusayn Kūh. The name Nakṣh-i Rustam is due to the popular idea that the sculptured figures there represent the Iranian national hero Rustam. Before the wall of the tombs there rises a remarkable towerlike building, now called Ka’ba-i Zardušt, “the Ka’ba of Zoro
arst”. Probably it has something to do with a former fire temple. Two other small buildings are perhaps to be similarly regarded, not far from the Ka’ba-i Zardušt on the summit of a rock called Sang-i Sulaymān, “the stone of Sulaymān”, cf. Ouseley, op. cit., ii, 300. We may also mention that the Sāsānian sculptures of Berme Delek 5 miles E.W. of Shīrāz are called Nakṣh-i Rustam. (But see now... E. F. West, Persepolis III, The Royal Tombs and other monuments (Oriental Institute, Chicago, 1970), 122 ff.; W. B. Henning, The Great Inscription of Sāpūr I, in BSOAS IX (1937-39); M. Sprengeling, Third-Century Iran. Sapor and Kartir (Oriental Institute, Chicago 1953); E. Houligan & A. Mariq, Recherches sur les Religions Divins Saporis (Mémoraries, Acad. Royale de Belgique, xlvii, Brussels 1952).

A stone platform in two layers on the south bank of the Pulwar (about 500 yards W. of Nakṣh-i Raǧīb) is called by the inhabitants of the district, Taḵt-i Rustam, “the throne of Rustam”. The latter, in view of its limited dimension, can only have served as the pedestal of a sepulchral monument or of a fire temple. Cf. Flandin et Coste, Voyage en Perse, ii, 72-73 (and Pl. 63). Instead of Taḵt-i Rustam, the name Taḵt-i Taḵūs, “peacock-throne”, is also used. The name Taḵt-i Rustam is found elsewhere in Iran also: cf. Ouseley, op. cit., ii, 522.

At a somewhat greater distance from Īṣṭakhr, about 3-4 hours journey N.W., on rocky peaks stand three forts within 1/2 to 2 miles of each other. All three, which lie practically in a straight line, are frequently comprised under the name Kālʿa or Kūh-i Īṣṭakhr, “the citadel” or “the mountain of Īṣṭakhr”, also Kūh-i Rāmāndār, from a district of
this name on the left bank of the Kur (into which the above mentioned Pulwar flows), Firdawsl in a distinct speaks of the Sih Diz-i Gumbadin-i Istakhr, "the three fortresses of Istakhr" (cf. Ouseley, op. cit., ii, 356). At the same time the separate castles have each their own names, which have however changed frequently in course of time according to the reports of the older historians and travellers. The most important of the three, the Kaß-i Istakhr in the narrower sense, is also called Miyan Kaß-'a, "the central fort" from its position between the two. Flandin and Coste hea.d it called Kaß-i Sarw, "the cypress castle", from a single cypress tree standing there. For the two other citadels Persian authors, for example, give the names Kaß-i Shikastah, "the broken (ruined) castle", and Askunawan (Sakunawan and similar names).

In the Muslim history of Fars, especially in that of Istakhr, these inaccessible fortresses played an important part. They were regarded as most essential military points d'appui for the holding of the surrounding country. The most prominent is the "citadel of Istakhr" proper, the origin of which Persian legend places in mythical times by assumming it was built by King Djamshid. The old Iranian ruler Gushasp is said to have deposited the Aesxis, written on cow-hides with golden ink, in the castle of Istakhr, after his conversion to the doctrine of Zoroaster; the citadel is therefore also called Diz-i Nibigd (Castle of the writing) or Kûh-i Nibigd (Hill of the writing; so in Ḥamd Allah Mustawfī); cf. Tabari, i, 676; and Ibn al-Athlr, i, 182,9, as well as the Persian reports in Ouseley, op. cit., ii, 344, 364, 370-1, 375, 384. Under the caliphate the governor of the province of Fars very frequently resided in this stronghold, which was easily defended by its natural situation. Thus the governor Ziyād b. Abīhī was able to hold out up here against Mu’āwiya for a considerable time after his death. Cf. Wellhausen, Das arabisch Reich, etc. (Berlin 1902), 76. The Būyids, who not infrequently stayed in the region of Istakhr (cf. the inscriptions dating from their time mentioned above, at Taḵš-i Djamshid; ʿIsmād al-Dawla [q.v.] was buried in Istakhr), paid particular attention to the citadel of Istakhr. ʿAṣūd al-Dawla [q.v.] in the 4th/10th century built on an existing fort, Flan- taking advantage of a natural pond already there, which could provide water for several thousand persons for a whole year and which aroused the admiration of contemporaries and of later generations. In 467/1074 the rebel Faḍlūya, who had seized the governorship of Fars, was besieged by the troops of Nīţām al-Mulk in the sultanate of Malik Shāh in the citadel of Istakhr. An earthquake which suddenly caused the cisterns to overflow forced the besieged to a pre- mature capitulation. Faḍlūya was then kept in a prisoner in the fortress and put to death next year after an unsuccessful attempt to escape. The castle was later much used as a state prison for high officials and princes. About 1590 the citadel was still in good condition and inhabited. Some time afterwards a rebel general of Fars took refuge in it and it was besieged by Shāh ʿAbbās I, stormed and destroyed. Pietro de’Ridola, who stayed here in 1621, therefore found it in ruins.

The citadel of Istakhr has so far been only rarely visited by European travellers, e.g., by Morier, Flandin (and Coste), and Vambėry. According to the account by Flandin and Coste, to whom we also owe drawings and plans of the citadel, it stands on a plateau 300 yards round, about 1300 feet above the plain. Of the old defences there have survived the powerful ramparts solidly built of stone; the great system of cisterns of the Būyids, among which a well hewn deep into the rock is specially remarkable, is still to be seen. All the ruins that survive seem only to date from the Muslim period. Cf. in the castles of Istakhr the accounts from Persian sources in Ouseley, op. cit., ii, 371, 376, 385 f., 380, 392-7, 399, 405-5, 407, 531; Ritter, viii, 863-5, 868, 877; Flandin and Coste, Voyage en Perse, ii, 71-72; Flan- din’s Relation du Voyage, ii, (1852), 140-2; Vambėry, Ñeine Wanderungen und Erlebnisse in Persien, Pest 1867, 250, 251; Huart in Revue sémitique, i, (1893), 250 f. and in Hist. de Bagdad (Paris 1901), 28, 31; G. Le Strange, op. cit., 276; Herzfeld in Sarre and Herzfeld, op. cit., 114-5 (Pl. xvi. and Fig. 45).


M. STRECK [G. C. MILES]

AL-İSTAKHRI, ABU İSMAİL İBRAHİM B. MUHAMMAD AL-FĀRISI AL-KARKHĪ, one of the first and most important representatives of the new trends adopted by Arabo-Muslim geography in the 4th/10th century. His biography is unknown, or almost so. If the various forms of his nisba are to be believed, he was a native of Fars and, more precisely, of İ斯塔khr. Following Yākūt, orientalism has in fact accepted the nisba al-Istakhri, but others, in particular Ibn al-Athlr, his direct continuator, designate him by the nisba al-Fārisi. Al-Mu‘addasī, who does the same, also adds the nisba al-Karkhī (ed. de Goeje, 475; compare with ibid., 5, n. 4), from which it might be supposed that, at some period in his life, the writer settled in Khūzistān or in ʿIrāk, and perhaps, to be more precise, in that of Baghdađ of that name (cf. Yākūt, s.v.).
One certain element at least in the life of al-Istakhri is his meeting with Ibn Hawkal. It is of little positive importance whether this took place in Sind, or in Baghdad, bearing in mind that this would be the most probable place for a meeting between the old master who had retired there and the young geographer who came to stay there (ibid., 336), completed his training and decided to set out on his travels (ibid., 3, 322).

The work of al-Istakhri, the Kitab al-Masalik wal-Mansalik (another work, a Risala, probably on Fars, is recorded in connection with the description of that country: cf. ed. al-‘Uthman, 67), at all events may be placed between that of al-Balkhi, by which it was inspired, and that of Ibn Hawkal, which continues it: as Kramers writes very justly (Analecta, 166), "the manuscripts of al-Istakhri and Ibn Hawkal represent one single standard original text, which was revised and corrected several times." Written towards the end of the first half of the 4th/10th century, the Kitab repeats, while it also develops, the "atlas of Islam" introduced by al-Balkhi. As in al-Balkhi, the isfum (loc. cit.) is no longer the "climate" of Ptolemaic geography but, in the Iranian tradition of the khorrens, is a geographical entity, a "country". As with al-Balkhi, in the Persian "national" spirit prevailing in Samanid Khurasan where the original work made its appearance, Iran holds afavoured position, by length of the passages devoted to it. Lastly, as with al-Balkhi, the spirit and methods of the cartography are very close to Persian models; far closer, in any event, than Ibn Hawkal was to be. This Iranism explains how it is that al-Istakhri's work, unlike that of Ibn Hawkal (and of al-Mukaddasi who represents the last link in the chain) was the subject of Persian translations (and also Turkish: cf. V. Minorsky, A false Jayhâni, in BSOAS, xiii (1949-50), 156-9).

A further relationship exists: so far as one can judge, the cartographical representation, which for al-Balkhi was the essential feature, in the eyes of his successor remained (as it is today) an essential element of the geographical work, even if the commentary on the map was expanded considerably. This fact explains the reservations expressed by al-Mukaddasi who described the Kitab as "a book with very carefully prepared maps, but confused in many places and superficial in its commentaries, and it does not divide the provinces into districts (wa-lâ haqawara 'l-ahdâlim)" (ed. De Goeje, 5, n. 4).

Al-Mukaddasi's severity towards his precursors is well-known. In essence, even if his basic principle is justified, it conceals the degree of progress between al-Balkhi and al-Istakhri. Thanks to the commentary, not only does one pass gradually, as has been suggested, from the atlas to the descriptive atlas; in addition the scientific method is refined by the exercise of a critical judgement and by the desire to preserve the information from oral or written sources, selected by personal observation (fyân). These two principles are so closely interwoven in the work, and the author's modesty is so great in respect of the journeys he had had to undertake, that the map of al-Istakhri's travels is difficult to reconstruct; in the case of Sind, for example, is the validity of the information provided due to the reliability of the informants or to travel notes? In any event, it is almost certain that al-Istakhri visited Arabia (at least as far as Mecca), Iraq, Khorasan, Daylam and Transoxiana.

Al-Istakhri's successors were not deceived as to the value of the work or the originality of his methods. Despite his criticism, al-Mukaddasi did not fail to make use of it, as did the anonymous author of the Huddy il-Qalim and Yafuti. Even more than these writers, however, it is Ibn Hawkal who appears as the privileged successor of al-Istakhri, even as his designated heir: "I have made about al-Istakhri al-Farisi," wrote Ibn Hawkal (trans. Wiet, 322); "this man had drawn this map of Sind; but he had made some mistakes, and he had also drawn Fars, which he had done extremely well. For my part, I had drawn the map of Azharbâyjân, which occurs on the following page and of which he approved, as well as that of Upper Mesopotamia, which he considered excellent. My map of Egypt however he commended as wholly bad, and that of the Maghrib as for the most part inaccurate. He then told me: 'I have made a careful study of your birth and have drawn up your horoscope. I ask you to make corrections in my work wherever you find any mistakes'. I made some alterations in more than one place, and wanted to publish them under his name. But I thought it good to leave my own name only on the edition of this work.'

Ibn Hawkal's decided views, and often his lack of constraint with regard to al-Istakhri, have played in his favour; in reading him, one slightly forgets what the pupil owes to the master. But, whatever the just merits of the work of Ibn Hawkal (loc. cit.), a careful study makes evident, on more than one page and far more than Ibn Hawkal would have us to believe, how much he owes to his precursor (see an example in A. Miquel, Geographie humaine, 367-90). Thus the greatest prudence is called for when one starts to read a work which, in the final analysis, is a collective one, and in which the merits of al-Balkhi, al-Istakhri and Ibn Hawkal cannot be dissociated from one another.

The text of the Kitab al-Masalik wa'il-Mansalik has been edited in part by J. H. Moeller (Liber climatum, Gotha 1839; trans. A. D. Mordtmann, Das Buch der Länder, Hamburg 1845); a partial translation (as regards to A. Maclay) by A. Miquel (1918-1924). Later came the edition of De Goeje (BGA, i, Leiden 1870 and 1927), and then that of M. G. Abd al-‘Al al-Hinl (Cairo 1931/1961).


ISTÂN [see ISTAN]
ISTANBUL, the capital of the Ottoman Empire from 20 Djumada I 857/29 May 1453 to 3 Rabî‘ II 1342/13 October 1923. In strict Ottoman usage the name is confined to the area bounded by the Golden Horn, the Marmara coast and the Wall of Theodosius, the districts of Ghalâta, Üskûdar and Eyyûb being separate towns, each with its own bâdî; occasionally however the name is applied to this whole area.

NAME. In the period of the Saltuk sultans of Anatolia (see Kamâl al-Dîn Âshkârî, Mu‘âzmarî al-âghhâbî, ed. O. Turan, Ankara 1944, index at p. 344) and under the early Ottomans (Die alsom. anon. Chroniken, ed. F. Giese, Breslau 1922, i, 8, 28, 33, etc.) the spelling of “Istînbul”, “Istanbul” or “Istambul” was used; the pronunciation “Istimboli” is attested by J. Schilletter (Pauly-Wissowa, s.v., Istanbul). The spelling “Istînbul” (“S(i)tinbul”, “S(i)stanbul”) occurs in Ottoman poetry (Laâfî [q. v., Evsdf-i Istanbul in Ms.]). Al-Mas’ûdî (Tanbih, 136) mentions, as early as the 4th/10th century, that the Greeks called the city “Bûlin” and “Stanbûli” towards the end of the 10th/16th century F. Moryson (An itinerary . . . ii, 97) notes that the Greek inhabitants called the city “Stimboli”, but the Turks “Stambol”. It is no longer in question that the Turkish forms (Stinbol/Istanbul > Istan(m)bol) derive from the Greek εἶς θν πολίν (for the arguments against the Greek identification see Oberhummer, loc. cit.; D. J. Georgacas, The name of Constantinople, in American Philological Association. Transactions, lxxxviii (1947), 347-67).

The punning name Istanbul (”where Islam abounds”) was, according to a contemporary Armenian source (see Siruni, op. cit., 173), given to the city by its conqueror Mehemed II (for similar “meaningful” names invented by him, cf. Boghaz-Kesen, Elbasan, Boghur-delen); it is found in documents of the 9th/15th century (e.g., Ayasofya Evkaf Defteri, Memoir, no. 15; Tanbih, i, 37); in the 11th/17th century the educated classes regarded it as the “Istâmbol” name of the city (Evliyâ Celebi, i, 55:6; and a firman of 1174/1760 decreed that it should be substituted for the mint name Koştantînîyâ ye on coins (text in A. Reﬂik, Istanbul hayati, 1100-1200, p. 185). In popular usage however the forms Istanbul or Istambul prevailed. The present-day official spelling is Istanbul.

From 130 A.D. onwards, the ofﬁcial name in the Eastern Roman Empire was Constantinopolis (for the various forms, see Oberhummer, loc. cit.). Adopted by the Arabs and the Persians as Ku’nistanîyya in ofﬁcial and literary usage, this name continued to be used in Ottoman educated circles and in the Ottoman chancery, and appears in ﬁrmans and wakﬁyyas and upon coins (cf. too Die alî. anon. Chr., ed. Giese, 28, 74, 78, etc.).

The original name Byzantion, of Thracian origin (Oberhummer, loc. cit.), is occasionally mentioned in Ottoman texts as the former name of the city, in various Arabic and Armenian forms: Byzantia, Byzandia, Buzantie, Puzanta, Buzantis (see Elî, i, 889; Evliyâ Celebi, i, 55; Siruni, op. cit., 164).

The names rumîyya al-kubrâ, Takht-i Rûm (cf. Meγəlsolosν) and Quâdi-l-i Rûm found in Muslim literary works (Evliyâ Celebi, loc. cit.) derive from the early Byzantine names (Novâ) Roma, (Nê) Rûm. In Islamic chancery usage, cities, like human dignitaries, were accorded particular epithets and benedictory formulae (dâva, salutation). They were used for Istanbul by the Ottomans reflect old Iranian and Muslim concepts of centralized authority: Pâytaht-i Saltanat, Takhtgâh-i Saltanat, Ma‘kâr-i Saltanat, Dar-i Saltana, Dar-i Khilâla; also, Dar-i Naṣr, Madinat al-Muwâlîhî dur (Islam-bol). In continuation of the traditional notions that the ruler’s authority and “fortune” are interlinked (cf. in Old Turkish titulature Kû, Kûl or Tûk) and that justice is dispensed at the gate or threshold of the palace, Istanbul is often indicated by such names as Der-i Sa‘âdet (Der-saadet) Âstînâ. The usual benedictory formula Istanbul is al-mâfiyya or al-mâfrûsâ, i.e., “the Well-Protected” (by God, against disaster; and also by the sultan, against injustice). A typical reference to Istanbul in chancery usage is: Dâr al-Khîlafa al-‘âliyya ve ma‘kâr-i Saltanat-i seniyyem olan mahmiyye-i Koştantînîyye“ (A. Reﬂik, op. cit., p. 110).

The kürâ‘ic phrase âıtîyâtî (XXXIV, 14, 15), a chronogram for the date of the Ottoman conquest (857/1453), and the phrase hâtat al-mulâk (Evliyâ Celebi, i, 33, 55) are used for Istanbul only as literary conceits. As in Greek, so in Ottoman usage Istanbul was frequently referred to simply as “The City” (“škhrî”) (see, e.g., Istanbul Vakıflar Tahrir Defteri, no. 727).

The following sections deal only with the Ottoman city. For Muslim attacks on the city before 1453, Muslim travellers’ accounts of Constantinople, etc., see Koştantînîyya. For the Bosphorus, see boγház-i rîc. For the townships closely associated with Istanbul, see Evlyûn (in Supplement), Ghalâta (in Supplement) and Üskûdar.

I. Results of the Conquest; Events up to 861/1457

The future development of the city was determined by the circumstances of the Ottoman conquest. When Mehemed II proclaimed the assault and promised his troops a three-day sack, he announced: “The stones and the land of the city and all its appurtenances belong to me; all other goods and property, prisoners and foodstuffs are booty for the troops” (see H. İnalcık, in Dumbarton Oaks Papers, xxi-xiv (1969-70), 232-5). The result was that the city was denuded of its former inhabitants and the charac- ter which it had possessed in the Byzantine period was radically changed. The Ottoman troops entered the city through the breach opened in the walls at dawn, on 20 Djumâda I 857/29 May 1453, and fought their way towards Hagia Sophia (Aya Soûfa), but some defenders continued to resist (the Cretan sailors in the towers of Alexius held out out until after midday, see Sphrantzes, tr. Ivanka, 80; cf. Braun- Schneider, Bericht, 32) and the fighting ended only towards the middle of the afternoon. Practically all the survivors were made prisoner and taken to the ships or to the Ottoman camp outside the walls (Tursun, 55; Cîrîboudou, tr. Riggs, 76; Tâdîl-Beg-zâde, 21). The sultan, wishing to prevent the further destruction of the city which he intended to be henceforth his capital, proclaimed that afternoon that the fighting was to cease and made a brief tour of the city (Ducas, ed. Grecu, 375; Sphrantzes records that the sack lasted for three days, but it is clear that from 30 May onwards there was no serious plundering or enslavement). On 30 May the sultan made his ceremonial entry (Tâdîl-Beg-zâde, 22); he
toured the city to inspect its buildings and visited
the harbour district. Entering Aya Sofya, he pro-
claimed that it should be the Great Mosque (djmami-i
kebir) (Tâdji-Beg-zade, 23; Tursun, 56-7), and
announced that henceforward Istanbul should be
his capital (labbi) (Inalcik, op. cit., 233). His first
and principal concern was to encourage the repopu-
lation of the city, so that on the third day after the
conquest he proclaimed aman: any fugitive who
returned within a specified time should freely re-occupy
his home and practise his religion, and the Greeks
were invited to elect a Patriarch as religious head
of their community (Sphrantzes, tr. Ivanka, 85; cf.
Zorzo Dolfin, ch. xviii).

Before returning to Edirne on 13 Dümâdâ II/21
June, the sultan appointed Karâşîdân Süleyûnmän
Beg as şubhâ (military prefect) of the city, with a
garrison of 1500 Janissaries, and Khîdr-beg Çelebi as
hâdî, and ordered the repair of the walls, the building
of a citadel (Yedi Kule) by the Golden Gate, and the
construction of a palace for himself at the Forum
Tauri in the centre of the city (later known as Eski Sarâî).
To commence the repopulation of the city, he setelled the fifth of the prisoners falling to him
as ruler, with their families, "along the shores of the
city harbour", i.e., along the Golden Horn. He
gave them houses and "freed them from taxes for a
specified time": immediately after the conquest he
had considered appointing the Megadux Lucas Nota-
ras as city-prefect and entrusting him with the task of
repopulation, but his viziers dissuaded him; Notaras
and the other Byzantine notables were executed (Inal-
cik, op. cit., 240). He permitted enslaved prisoners
who had paid ransom or who undertook to pay ransom
within a specified time to settle in the city, granting
them houses and a temporary exemption from taxa-
tion; he encouraged such slaves to earn their ransoms
by working on building projects (Critoboulos, 83, 93;
Sphrantzes, loc. cit.; N. Barbaro, Eng. tr., New York
1969, 72). Before the siege began, many inhabitants
had fled the city (Sphrantzes, 47); others had
managed to conceal themselves during the sack or
had fled to Ghalaâ. These, with the ransomed pris-
oners, formed the first Greek population of the city;
that they were numerous is shown by the census (tafrîr)
of 860/1455 (for which, see below), which further confirms the tradition that some of
these Greeks embraced Islam. (A great many of the
prisoners had been sold, at Edirne, Bursa and Geli-
bolu.) The aman did not cover any Venetians: the
baîlo Girolamo Minotto and his son were executed;
29 other Venetian nobles were ransomed, but their
male children were drafted into the corps of
sufli, two-storeyed (*ulvi) and "large", the "sumptuous (mkalelek) houses called by the Greeks drapes". Some houses are
noted as being split into three or four, or as inhabited
by more than one family. One- or two-storeyed
CARDAKS are noted, especially in the courtyards of
monasteries (for such habitations within monasteries,
see the plans of Buondelmonte and Vavassore; Ober-
hummer, Konst. unter Sultan Sulaiman, pp. 19, 22;
F. Babinger, Drei Stadtrnsichten . . ., 1959, p. 4).
Of 26 monasteries listed, only one is still occupied
by Greeks; the others are deserted or inhabited by
Muslim immigrants. Names of these Greeks are listed many of
them situated in monasteries. Only two still belong
to the Greeks, but the Greeks of the mahalle of Alt-
Mermer use a big house there as a church. Five
churches are inhabited by Muslim immigrants, one
has been converted to a mosque, most of the others,
having no congregations, are ruinous.

The first Great Mosque of Istanbul was Aya Sofya
and the first stages in the development of Istanbul
as an Ottoman city are revealed by the study of its
wkfs. These include, besides the mosque and medrese
of Aya Sofya, other Byzantine religious buildings now
converted to Muslim use: the Zeyrek Dâmî and its
medrese (Pantocrator) (see S. Eyyice, Istanbul, 57),
the Ghalaâ Dâmî/Arab Dâmî (St. Dominic) (see Schneider and Nomidis, Gatea, Istanbul 1944,
pp. 23, 28), the mosque in the citadel at Silivri, the
Eski Imaret Meşgûdî (St. Saviour Pantepoptes) (see
Eyyice, 68), the Mevlâvi mosque at the Republic Gate
(Schneider, Byzans, 51; Eyyice, 54; under Bâyezid II
it was made a medrese and then a mosque). Mehmed
II's Great Mosque ("Fatih") was completed only in
875/1471. The mosques constructed up to that date
(Rûme-Hisârî; the Yehi Kerbân-saray/Cukhadjî
Khnîî mosque; the Debbâghlar Meşgûdî at Yedi-
Kule; Yehiye Kâle/Andanolu Hisâfî) were all
attached to the wkfs of Aya Sofya.

In 861/1457 Mehmed II made over to the wkfs
of Aya Sofya the Byzantine buildings still standing in
the city; these are noted in the documents as "sultani"
and "mubâa'tîlîlî". In 898/1492 the total of these
mubâa'tîlî houses was 1428 (Aya Sofya Evkai Tahrîr
Dêteri, Maliye 19). (By this time many houses had
collapsed into ruin.) Since a survey of 898/1492 notes 1093 mubâa'tîlî houses in Istanbul and
Ghalâa "apart from the Byzantine houses occupied
by kuls of the Padishâh", these latter must have
numbered 335; it was the practice that mubâa'tî (in
effect "rent") should not be levied on a house held
by a kul, so long as the kul actually resided there.
Similarly, in the reign of Bâyezid II the attempt to
levy mubâa'tî on Byzantine houses granted as mâlîh
("freehold") before the wkfsiya for Aya Sofya was
drawn up (i.e., before 861/1457) was finally abandon-
ed; but under Mehmed II it had been imposed and
removed more than once (Inalcik, op. cit., 241). The 502 such houses in Istanbul itself were located in the mahalles of Aya Sofya, Sultan Hanım (near the Bedestàn), Hadidjî ʿAbdî, Hekmî Yaʾkîb, Şahîn Uskübi (between Üsküdar and Dîbâlî), Edirne-Kapîsî, Ustâd Ayâsî (at Surât-ı Ḫâne), Arslânlu Mahzên, and Top-Yikîhî (Topkapu), a distribution which gives an indication of the pre-Ottoman centres of habitation.

Apart from these Byzantine buildings, Mehemmed II was the continuance of the ancient Middle East tradition by which the city was created around a place of worship and the urban functions were harmonized with the religious obligations. Aya Sofya was the Great Mosque par excellence, where the ruler and the Muslim community met together at an accession and at every Friday prayer, where the ruler received petitions, and where the great religious ceremonies were held. The social and economic institutions and the establishments which fostered the life of the city and the well-being of its inhabitants came into existence first as vakîfs of this Great Mosque (cf. Middle Eastern Cities, ed. I. Lapidus, Berkeley 1969).

This "Islamic" character is demonstrated by the city's toponographic development: its first nahiye is the nahiye of Aya Sofya. The other nahiyes grew up around the mosques (dârs) built later by sultans and viziers, whilst the smaller units, the mahalles, constituting the nahiye each grew up around a local mosque (medresî). From the very first, also, attempts were made to give Istanbul the status of a sacred city of Islam. Immediately after the conquest, the holy region of Eyyub (Eyiîp) received its character with the building of the türbe of the Companion Abû Ayyûb al-Ansârî (M. Canard, Les expéditions des Arabes ... 70; its wahâfyya in Fatih Mehmet II. Vahfîyesîleri, Ankara 1958, 283-340. See also S. Üner, Istanbul-u ve Sakât-i Kaherîleri, Istanbul-Ankara 1953; P. Wittek, Ayvansaray, in Ann. de l'Inst. de Phil. et d'Hist. orientales et slaves, xi (Brussels 1951), 505-26). The profound Ottoman devotion to mystics and to dervish orders was already under Mehemmed II; of the name "Islam-bol" (the city "full of Muslims") in official records (Inalcik, op. cit., 246). Sporadically, under Mehemmed II and later sultans, Muslim fanaticism was aroused and pressure would be brought on the authorities to close the churches and synagogues on the grounds that the city had been taken "by force", so that the Shaykh al-Islâm himself would cast round for "evidence" to protect the şimmi status of the non-Muslim inhabitants (Inalcik, op. cit., p. 233, n. 11). For security reasons, Mehemmed III's policy here, as in other conquered cities, seems to have been to ensure that the Muslims remained in the majority.

The Islamic ideal, as reflected in the tolerant outlook of Ottoman society, was easily reconciled with social and economic reality, so that from the very beginning Muslims and non-Muslims worked side by side in the commercial districts and even (at first) lived intermingled in residential areas; non-Muslims, in commercial dealings among themselves, would resort to the kâddî, and a feeling of "fellow-citizenship" of the cosmopolitan capital transcended distinctions of religion and origin.

The "Ottoman" character of Istanbul sprang not only from the Muslim ideal but also from the traditional Middle Eastern view of state and society, a way of life characterized by the existence of a thriving class of merchants and craftsmen under the governance of a class of military administrators (see II. Inalcik, Capital formation ... in J. Ec. Hist., xxix (1969), 98-140). Thus the same patterns, based on the institution of the vakîf, which had been evident in all the cities of the Middle East began to appear in Istanbul. This tradition demanded the construction for the merchant class of a bezdizîn (Ottoman: bedestân), near which were the caravansarais (khân) where the merchants lodged. The members of the principal crafts were gathered in the shops which constituted the great târîh around the bedestân, each craft being concentrated systematically in one sâk or târîh (as was easily ensured when blocks of shops were built together as vakîfs). Various central "markets" for basic commodities were established to ensure the authorities' control of the importation and distribution of the raw materials needed by the craftsmen and of the foodstuffs to provision the inhabitants, and in order to facilitate the collection of the tolls and taxes due to the state. These "markets" were called kapân (< Ar. kâbâbân, a public balance, a steelyard); the yemish kapân, un kapân, bai kapân, yemish kapân (for oil, flour, honey, fruit), etc., and in Istanbul these were situated in the harbour area (elsewhere, by the city gates). For goods imported by sea, there was in the harbour a customs' post called Gümîrûk-kapân (later called, after the gümîrûk emini, Emnî-öñü), while goods imported overland paid duty at the Kara-Gümûrûk near Edirne-Kapîsî. The tannery and the slaughterhouse were outside the walls, while dye-works, fulling-mills, oil-presses, etc. were built near the appropriate craft centres; all these were set up as vakîfs by members of the "ruling class". Other provisions, usually also set up as vakîf or forming part of elaborate vakîf-complexes (see below), had in view the welfare of the populace in general—water-supply, paving of roads, public security, hospitals, street-cleaning, the shelter and feeding of the poor and of travellers.

The interpretation that Istanbul's development as an oriental city can be viewed as originating from a
single nucleus (Stadtkern), consisting of the market-
area, from which the main streets radiated and with the
mahalles stretching out in concentric circles (R.
Mayer, Byzantion, Konstantinopolis, Istanbul, Vienna
1943, pp. 9, 20, 254) is true of not only the city as a
whole but only of each individual nahiye growing up around
a "foundation". For in the Ottoman period, as in Byzantine
days, the city's development was controlled by the special characteristics of certain dis-
tricts and by its geographical features. The two basic
features of the Ottoman city (as in Bursa, Edirne, etc.) were a Great Mosque and a central market-
district, and these features appear in Istanbul at first
with Aya Sofya and the Bedestan; later however come the
Fâtih complex, with the Sultan Pâzârî and Sarrâddîhanî nearby; and thereafter the city was to develop as a series of such "foundation complexes" created by sultans and by leading statesmen; whilst
less prominent individuals brought into existence smaller complexes of the medîlid with its school
which was to serve as the centre of a new mahalle.
There was thus, as it were, a hierarchical gradation of complexes.

Nevertheless, whilst these complexes tended to
make Istanbul a series of semi-independent commu-
nities, two features preserved its organic unity: (1) the
harbour area on the western side of the city, with the
main thoroughfare, the Divân-yolu, along which
armies and caravans passed; it was along this thor-
oughfare that the principal complexes were built, and the
great commercial buildings and the main market
area were situated between this thoroughfare and the
harbour. It is evident that the location of the principal
complexes did not arise from any plan drawn up in
advance; hence, with the exception of the few main
thoroughfares, the network of streets grew up hapha-
azard, as a jumble of crooked alleys and culs-de-sac
(this confusion was not the result of fires, as is
sometimes suggested, but had existed from the
beginning).

iii. — THE FORMATION OF THE PRINCIPAL
URBAN INSTALLATIONS

Before the building of the Fâtih complex and the
Sultan Pâzârî, the two commercial centres of Istanbul
were (A) the Bedestan and Büyük Çarşı, and (B)
Takhtakale and the harbour area.

(A). As early as 1456 it had been decided that a
bedestan should be built in the mahalle of Câkîr Agha
(a subâz of Istanbul) (Critoboulos, 104). A bedestan,
where valuable imported wares were sold and which
was the centre for financial transactions, was the
centre of a city's economic life as being the place of
business of the leading merchants (termed at this
period kâyâdî). The Büyük Bedestan of Istanbul
(bazâristan, dâr al-baszârisyya; later Djeawhir-Bedestân
or İc-Bedestân) with its 15 domes, constructed with
the strength of a fortress to protect merchants' wares and wealthy citizens' fortunes against theft,
plunder and fire, is a supreme example of a genre of
Ottoman architecture which had flourished since the
building of the bedestan of Bursa at the end of the
8th/14th century (see E. H. Ayverdi, Fatih devri
minarisi, 404-7; S. Eyice in IA, art. Istanbul, p.
1214/114; idem, "Les ‘Bedestens’", in II Con-
gresso Int. di Arte turca, Venice 1963, 35-9). Neither
its design nor the references to it in the sources give
any hint to connect it with a Byzantine construction.

In the Muslim world, as in the Byzantine, such a solid
building for the storing and selling of valuable wares was a normal feature of the city (in the Byzantine
Empire basîlike, see Janin, Const. byz., 97, 99, 157; in
the Arab lands kayâsaryîya, see Lapidus, Muslim ci-
ties, 59-60). In the flourishing period of Constantin-
ople's history, this area, between the Forum Constant-
inii and the Forum Tauri, had been a thriving com-
mercial district with a basilike and the artopoleia of
the bakers' guild; it was the central site of the city,
the meeting place of the roads leading in from the
city gates and the roads leading up from the com-
mercial quays of the harbour (between Neorion/Babbe-
kapi and Pora Droungariou/Zindân-kapi). The main
road leading from here down to the Basilike quay in
Byzantine times (probably the Vasilikî Kapîsî fre-
cently mentioned in Mehemmed II's waâfiyya, later
Zindân kapî), the Markos Embolos Maurianon, was in
the Ottoman period, with the name Uzun Çarşî, to
be the busiest commercial district of the city.

The most detailed information on the Bedestan,
the Kapall Çarşî, and the tradespeople working there is
to be found in the registers of the waâfs of Aya
Sofya. In the Bedestan there were originally 126
sandak (in 893/1488: 140; a sandak is a shop with a
store-room behind it and having a safe for valuables,
cf. C. White, Three years in Constantinople, i, 174:
"strong fire-proof boxes sunk in a wall of masonry
under the floor") and 14 "kôge" shops (the rent for
the first was 20 akçe per month, for the second,
3, 5 or 15 akçe). In 897/1493 ten of the merchants
in the Bedestan were Armenians, five Jews, three
Greeks, and the rest Muslims. (For the Bedestan
in the 10th/16th century, see Ramberti, apud Lybyer,
241; Dernschwam, 93, 113; Schweigcr, 129-10; in
the 11th/17th century, Evliyâ Celebi, i, 613-18;
Mantran, 465-6; an excellent description for 1844 in
White, i, 3-34).

Some time later, but before 858/1453 (Evliyâ, i,
617; the waâfiyya ed. O. Ergin, in Fatih Marmesi,
Istambul 1945, 6), Mehemmed II built, at the south-
east corner of the Büyük Çarşî a "new" bedestan
(dâr al-baszârisyya al-dzâdîda) for silks, later called the
Sandal Bedestan (now the auction hall), which was
to remain the largest bedestan of the Empire;
it contained 124 sandaks and there were 72 shops outside
it, occupied by various craftsmen.

As in Ottoman cities created before the conquest of
Constantinople (see La ville balkanique, in Studia
Balcanaica, iii, Sofia 1970; D. Kuban, Anadolu Türk
şehri, in Vakflar Dergisi, vii (1968), 53-74), on
each side of the four main roads (şehri-kapi) leading away from the four gates of the Bedestan and of the
streets parallel to them, rows of shops were built in
a checker-board pattern for merchants and craftsmen.
In the 641 shops (dükân) there were, according to
the waâfi-register of 894/1489, 33 shoemakers, 33
slipper-makers, 44 cap-makers, 50 workers in felt
and tailors, 76 jewellers and other craftsmen (for
the description of a dükân, see Dernschwam, 93-4;
White, i, 174). Shops of Muslims, Armenians, Jews
and Greeks were not in separate streets but mixed up
together; the majority however, not only of the crafts-
men but of the jewelers and bankers (sarrdf), were
Muslim Turks.

This Çarşî was repeatedly extended, so that
finally it contained about a thousand shops; it was
roofed over, to become the "Kapallı" Çarşî, with
do large and 20 small gates, and since the Bedestan
regulations were enforced here too, it became in
effect an extension of the Bedestan (S. Eyice, in
IA, art. Istanbul, pp. 1214/114-5; S. Tekiner, The
Great Bazar of Istanbul, Türkiye Taring ve Otomobil
Kurumu Belleteni, no. 92).

The second great Çarşî in this region was the
blocked of shops known as Mahmûd Paşa Dükânları,
constructed near the 'Imaret of Mahmûd Paşa and containing, with the shops around and behind it, 265 shops. It was annexed by Mehremmed II to the waqf of Aya Sofya but returned by Bayezid II to the waqf of Mahmûd Paşa's foundation (Aya Sofya register for 894/1489).

Khâns. The khân, which served as a lodging for the merchant engaged in trade between different regions and provided him with safe storage for his goods in the upper rooms or in the store rooms on the ground floor, and where also bulk sales of merchandise were made, was an essential element in Ottoman commercial centres (for khâns, see Mayer, op. cit., 112-17; M. Erksan, İstanbul hanlarlari, Ist. Un. Edebiyat Fak., thesis, 1959). Mehremmed II promoted the construction of four khâns, two in the commercial quarter of Tahtakâlî, two near the Bedestân. The eldest is probably the so-called Bodrum Kerbansarayi near the Bedestân. With two storeys and 32 rooms, it had in its front wall 15 shops and 9 "küför" (i.e., a largish room used as a workshop or lodging (for its situation, see S. Unver, Suyolu hariâs, pl. 3). The annual income from the khân was 15,500 akçe and from the shops and "rooms" 3108 akçe. The dealers engaged in the sale of cotton- and linen-cloths imported into Istanbul used this khân (A. Refik, İstanbul hayatî, 1000-1100, Istanbul 1940, doc. 77).

The Beg Kerbansarây, the building with the Porta Paşa Odalari (after the beşbegleri of Rûmî, Khâlin Sûleyman) became in 894/1489 the Kerbansarây-i ıserât, commonly known as Esir Pazari. It contained 52 rooms on two floors, with an 8-room annex, a bath, and a large stable; it brought in an annual income of 19,500 akçe (about 400 gold ducats) on the Suyolu hariâs. It is marked on Divân-yolu, by the 'Atili 'Alî Paşa mosque; a good description in White, ii, 289.

The Cevâr, called Süleyman Paşa Odalari (after the beşbegleri of Rûmî, Khâlin Sûleyman) were located here in the sale of cotton- and linen-cloths imported into Istanbul and used this khân (A. Refik, İstanbul hayatî, 1000-1100, Istanbul 1940, doc. 77).

The Baghce-kapı, called Cevâr Paşa Odalari (after the beşbegleri of Rûmî, Khâlin Sûleyman) became in 894/1489 the Kerbansarây-i ıserât; commonly known as Esir Pazari. It contained 52 rooms on two floors, with an 8-room annex, a bath, and a large stable; it brought in an annual income of 19,500 akçe (about 400 gold ducats) on the Suyolu hariâs. It is marked on Divân-yolu, by the 'Atili 'Alî Paşa mosque; a good description in White, ii, 289.

The Rüstem Paşa, called Süleyman Paşa Odalari (after the beşbegleri of Rûmî, Khâlin Sûleyman) became in 894/1489 the Kerbansarây-i ıserât; commonly known as Esir Pazari. It contained 52 rooms on two floors, with an 8-room annex, a bath, and a large stable; it brought in an annual income of 19,500 akçe (about 400 gold ducats) on the Suyolu hariâs. It is marked on Divân-yolu, by the 'Atili 'Alî Paşa mosque; a good description in White, ii, 289.
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The Rüstem Paşa, called Süleyman Paşa Odalari (after the beşbegleri of Rûmî, Khâlin Sûleyman) became in 894/1489 the Kerbansarây-i ıserât; commonly known as Esir Pazari. It contained 52 rooms on two floors, with an 8-room annex, a bath, and a large stable; it brought in an annual income of 19,500 akçe (about 400 gold ducats) on the Suyolu hariâs. It is marked on Divân-yolu, by the 'Atili 'Alî Paşa mosque; a good description in White, ii, 289.

The Rüstem Paşa, called Süleyman Paşa Odalari (after the beşbegleri of Rûmî, Khâlin Sûleyman) became in 894/1489 the Kerbansarây-i ıserât; commonly known as Esir Pazari. It contained 52 rooms on two floors, with an 8-room annex, a bath, and a large stable; it brought in an annual income of 19,500 akçe (about 400 gold ducats) on the Suyolu hariâs. It is marked on Divân-yolu, by the 'Atili 'Alî Paşa mosque; a good description in White, ii, 289.

The Rüstem Paşa, called Süleyman Paşa Odalari (after the beşbegleri of Rûmî, Khâlin Sûleyman) became in 894/1489 the Kerbansarây-i ıserât; commonly known as Esir Pazari. It contained 52 rooms on two floors, with an 8-room annex, a bath, and a large stable; it brought in an annual income of 19,500 akçe (about 400 gold ducats) on the Suyolu hariâs. It is marked on Divân-yolu, by the 'Atili 'Alî Paşa mosque; a good description in White, ii, 289.
flar Um. Męb., p. 34), and build there a mosque, a khan, a bath and a market; he himself, selecting the site for the New Palace on Sarayburnu, also picked the finest area in the middle of the city for building a mosque "which should surpass Aya Sofya". Work on the mosque began only in the winter of 867/1462-3, the area (around the Church of the Holy Apostles) already having a large Muslim population. This construction encouraged the expansion of the city northwards towards the walls and north-east towards the Golden Horn.

(C) The mosque and 'imaret of Fâṭîh and its district (873/1470).

The mosque itself, begun in Diumâd II 867/February 1463, was completed in Radjab 875/January 1471 (inscription over the main door: 'Ayverdi, Fâṭîh dârî mîmârîsî, 143). The ancillary buildings were of two types: (1) Khâyûrât around the mosque (medreses, hospital, 'imaret (hospice), school, library, etc.), and (2) buildings of public utility to provide the income for the upkeep of the foundation. Such complexes had formed the nuclei of all Ottoman cities since Orkhan's foundations at Bursa (see O. Nuri, İmaret sistemî, İstanbul 1939; Ő. L. Barkan, Quelques observations sur l'organisation économique et sociale des villes ottomanes, in Recueil Soc. Jean Bodin, vii (1955), 289-311; Emel Esin sees their origin in Central Asia: IV. Int. Congress of Turkish Art, Aix-en-Provence 1970).

An area of about 100,000 m² is occupied by the following khâyûrât: the mosque, with an extensive outer courtyard entered by eight gates; on two sides of it, 8 large and 8 small medreses (the Themâniyye and the Tetimîne); to the east, in a separate court, a tahâkkâne, a hospice and a hân (later Deve Khânî); and in a further court, a hospital. Between the two front entrances to the mosque-court were two smaller buildings, a children's school (dar al-taHlm] and a book-store (A. S. Ülen and B. Kunter, Fâṭîh camii ve Bizans sarımı, İstanbul 1939; 'Ayverdi, op. cit., 125-71). There were also residences for the 'ulêmdâr employed in the medreses. The buildings of the second category were, principally, a great târîbi (Sultan Pâzarî), the Sarrâddîkhânê, and a bath (Çukur Hâmîn or İrgâtlar Hâmîn) north of the mosque. The Sultan Pâzarî, between the mosque and Sarrâddî Khân, on the site of the İdrîs-âdîîdîlî Church comprised 280 shops (so the register of 88/1493; in the wakîfâyê published by T. Öz: 286), and the Khârî-beg Celebi Odalarî 32 workshops and 4 storerooms. (On Vavassore's plan, the Sultan Pâzarî is shown surrounded by walls; in the registers it is called "bukîa"). Sarrâddîkhânê (also a "bukîa") comprised 110 shops within a wall (S. Unver, Sûluvî hâtûsî, Pl. 1); against its west and south wall were 35 shops and 19 "rooms", referred to as tâlîk dîkhânîlar ve odalar. The register of 88/1493 lists 142 saddlers, all Muslims (some of them Janissaries), working here. The saddlers formerly working near the Bedestân were all brought here, henceforward the sole centre for that trade (berât of 870/1469 publ. by Ç. UlucaYî in Tarîk Darîz sî, III/5-6 (1951-2), 151-2: renewal of 1119/1707 in A. Reñîk, İstanbul hâyiî, 1120-1200, pp. 42). To the north were the horse-market and stables; round about were concentrated ancillary crafts—stirrup-makers, furniers, etc. In time of war this district was thronged with troops equipping their horses. (Schweigner, p. 129, comments that the Turks surpassed all nations in leatherwork.) Only in the 19th century, with the growing importation of European products, did this commercial centre decline (White, iii, 255 ff.).

South of Sarrâddîkhânê, towards Aksaray, Mebem-ned II built new barracks for the Janissaries, the Yeşil Odalar in the Et Meydânî (replacing the Eski Odalar built probably in 864/1460); these, though often rebuilt after fires, remained the Janissary barracks until the destruction of the corps in 1826 (see also I. H. Uzunçarşî, Kapalıcu Ocaârlarî, 241-3).

The following summary, for the Fâṭîh complex, illustrates the financial position of such a foundation (after Barkan, in İht. Fak. Mecm., xxiii, 306-41). The income in 894/1489 and 895/1490 was about 1'1/2 million akçe (30,000 ducats, far exceeding the income of the Aya Sofya wâhîfî), arising from 12 baths in Istanbul and Gâhâlîa, the dîżyâ of these two cities, the tax-income from over fifty villages in Thrace and various rents. The expenses for the khâyûrât were:

- stipends 869,280 akçe
- food for the hospice 461,417
- expenses of the hospital repairs, etc. 72,000

The personnel of the mosque numbered 102 in all, of the medreses 168, of the hospice 45, of the hospital 30. There were further agents and clerks to collect the revenues (21), and builders and workmen (17). Besides these 383 persons, regular payments were made to indigent 'ulêmdâr and their children and to disabled soldiers; these charities amounted to 202, 291 akçe per year. 3300 loaves were distributed at the hospice each day and at least 1111 persons received two meals. Besides being a religious and educational centre, therefore, this complex—drawing some half of its revenue from outside Istanbul—was a nucleus for the economic and social prosperity of this area of the city.

IV. THE FORMATION OF NAHÎYES AND MAHALLES IN THE 19TH/20TH CENTURY

In accordance with Mehmed II's orders issued in 863/1459, the paçhas constructed complexes of their own in the various quarters of the city, each of which served to encourage settlement and prosperity, so that within seventy years of the conquest 13 nahîyes had come into existence and the Ottoman city had taken its shape. The whole city constituted one kadâ; each nahîye comprised a number of mahalles (represented by the imâm of its local mosque). The establishment of a djâmi or a meşîh, with its appurtenances, in a sparsely populated area served to encourage settlement and the creation of a mahalle (the process termed şençelendirmê). The meşîhîs, like the djâmi's, were supported by wâhîfs. The following table (after 'Ayverdi-Barkan, İstanbul wâhîflarîlarî defterî, Istanbul 1970) shows the number of wâhîfs recorded for each nahîye:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nahîye</th>
<th>number of mahalles</th>
<th>wâhîfs in 1853/1856</th>
<th>wâhîfs in 1885/1886</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya Sofya</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maçoûd Pasha</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 'Ali Pasha</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 İbrahim Pasha</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Bâyezid</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebu 'l-Vêfa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Mehemmed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Selim</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murâd Pasha</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvûd Pasha</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustaîfa Pasha</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topkapî</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 'Ali Pasha</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 219 1594 3180
These registers do not record *mahalles* of non-Muslims: the total was probably between 250 and 300, see below.

The first of these *nahiyes* to be established were presumably nos. 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, and 12. Of the *mahalles* within the walls in the 10th/16th century, some 30% were established under Mejemmed II, some 50% under Bayezid II, and some 15% between 1512 and 1546. This does not imply, however, that the population increase slackened in the 10th/16th century; for *mahalles* founded earlier became more densely populated, as is apparent from 15th and 16th century plans: Vavassore's plan, derived ultimately from a plan of the period of Mejemmed II (see Babinger, *Drei Stadtschichten.* . . .), shows the densest occupation east of a line drawn from the eastern side of the Langa Bostanlar to Unkapani (and along the southern shore of the Golden Horn); and by Ayverdi's map (*Istanbul mahalleleri*, Ankara 1958), the area east of the line contains 92 *mahalles*, and that to the west—twice as extensive—98. But in plans of the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries (that of Yevli-djân in the *Hünername*; of Pir Re's, Oberhummer, Tafile XXII), the area within the walls is all inhabited, with the exception of a strip within the land-walls by Yedikule, Bayram Pasha Doreni, the Yefî Baghcea area and the Langa Bostanlar. An increase in population density has to be deduced both from the increase in the number of *wakfs*, as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>857-927/1512</td>
<td>1163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927-953/1467-78</td>
<td>1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953-986/1578-91</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986-1005/1567-76</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1005/1596-7 3180 *wakfs* were in existence (some having been extinguished). The first seventy years after the conquest saw the establishment of 1163 *wakfs*, the next 28 years (927-1005) 2858 (Ayverdi-Barkan, pp. 42-5). The first seventy years (927-1005) 2858 (Ayverdi-Barkan, pp. 42-5). The *mahalles* were all consolidated in a single *wakf*, as is apparent from 15th and 16th century plans, and the establishment of six further *nahiyes* was formed. Ebu 'l-Vefî *Nahiyesi* (V on the plan). Even in early days thickly populated, it was situated between the Eski Saray and Unkapani Caddesi, extending to the Golden Horn. A mosque and *zâyiye* were built by Mejemmed II for Sheykî Abu 'I-Wafâ (d. Ramadân 896/July 1491). It was a residential area, with *mesjidâs* built especially by the *'ulama* of the day (Molla Ahusrev, the first *âkîf* of Istanbul Khalîf Beğ, Molla Gûrânî, etc.), but also by wealthy merchants. Under Bayezid II many members of the *'askeri* class established rich *wakfs* (among them Bayezid's daughter Ayse Sultan and her husband Sinan Pasha).

The reign of Bayezid II saw much economic expansion, and the establishment of six further *nahiyes* (nos. 3, 4, 5, 10, 11 and 13 in the list above). The areas of habitation stretched out from Fatih and Istanbul towards the landwalls, so that several Byzantine churches and monasteries in this region were now converted to mosques (see plan). Sultan Bayezid *Nahiyesi* (V on the plan). The mosque, on the Forum Tauri south of the Eski Saray, was built between 906/1501 and 912/1505; there was also a medrese, a school, and a hospice, together with a *hamam* and a *khân*. The *zâyiye* in the same area (Vavassore's plan shows the area before this building work was undertaken). This complex was the centre of a *nahiye* embracing 23 *mahalles* and extending from the modern Bayezid Meydani to Kum-Kapi on the Marmara (the complex of Nishandji Mehmed Pasha, nearer the sea had previously been a second nucleus in this area) and along Dîvân-yolu from the Büyük Çarşî to Sarrâdîkhâne. In the reign of Mejemmed II, Bayezid Meydani had been surrounded by the *mesjid/mahalle* foundations of Çakr Agâ (mâhiyye dated 864/1459), Dîvânı Âl Beğ (866/1462) and Balaban Agâ (888/1483), while to the south of the modern road to Laleli were the *mahalles* of Emin Beğ (868/1463), Sîgbân-bashî Ya'kûb and Mî'mân Kemâl. Many new *mahalles* were established under Bayezid, mostly by members of the *'askeri* class but some by craftsmen. The Eski Odalar (see above) were in this *nahiye*, as was the shipyard for galleys (Kadîra Tersanesi); the Byzantine port of Sophia was used as a naval base immediately after the conquest (for its use as a galley harbour in the days of the Palaeologues, see Janin, *Const. Byzantina*, 223-4), and between 1459-61 Mejemmed II made a shipyard here (Ciritboulos, 140, 177). The *tabârî* register of 860/1455 shows that the *zâlebs* [*q.v.*] were living between Yeşi-kapî and Kum-kapî, a district originally called *'azebs* [*q.v.*] and between 1459-61 Mejemmed II made a shipyard here (Ciritboulos, 140, 177). The tabârî register of 860/1455 shows that the *zâlebs* [*q.v.*] were living between Yeşi-kapî and Kum-kapî, a district originally called *'azeber* Mahalles. The shipyard, with its great gate, built around the enclosed harbour is clearly shown in the plans of Vavassore and of Veli-djân. Later, probably in the 18th cent., the harbour silted up to become the modern Cümbi Meydani and Kadîra Bostani. A very important building, of the Conqueror's time, in this *nahiye* was the mint [see *Dâr al-Darb*, pp. 117], in the *mahalle* of Sîgbân-bashî Ya'kûb, the principal mint for silver and gold coins (later known as the *Şrîmekât*/*Şrîmekât khânê*); a small *târîf* of 8 shops was built near it.

*All Pasha Nahiyesi* (III on the plan). *Khâdim*
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(Atik) 'Ali Pasha [p.p.], twice Grand Vizier and killed in 927/1521, founded on Divân Yolu in part of the Forum Constantii a mosque (902/1496), a medrese, a school, a hospice and a ḥānakāh, with a bigān and shops. The nābiyye (no. 3 above) contained 5 mahalles (see S. Eyice, in Tarikh Dergisi, xiv/19 (1964), 99-114; R. E. Koçu, in Istanbul Ansiklopedisi, iii, 1281).

The same 'Ali Pasha constructed a mosque (later Zindilli-kuyu Dâümî) near the Edirne Kapî and converted the Khora monastery church into a mosque (Kilise Camii/Kariye Camii) (see S. Eyice, op. cit.). This nābiyye (no. 13 above, VIII on the plan) embraced an extensive and sparsely populated area of 22 mahalles. These khāyraât were supported by a large bigān and a “kirdâr” near his hospice at Čemberli Taş (see S. Eyice, Elçi Hanî, in Tarikh Dergisi, no. 24 (1970), 93-130; in the early 10th/16th century this bigān brought in a revenue of 13,000 akçe per year; a bath at Yeþi-bağhî; 278 shops, 246 “rooms”, one bakehouse and one breadstore in the commercial districts of Istanbul; 44 villages, 7 baths, 7 mills and various shops in Anatolia and Rûmeli; and a bedestân at Yanbolu. The annual revenue (mostly from outside Istanbul) was 471,998 akçe (over 8000 ducats) in 915/1509. Most of the mahalles (13) in this nābiyye were established under Bâyezîd II in the Balat-Edirne Kapi-Bayram Pasa Deresi area.

İbrahim Paşa Nâhiyesi (IV on the plan). Çandrağl Ibrahim Paşa (hâdi‘asker in 890/1485, Grand Vizier for one year from 904/1498) built at Üçün Carshî a mosque (the roofed building shown in Lorichs, Tafel 1X), a medrese and a school, supported by a bath, a slaughterhouse of 14 shops at Eyüpûb, 5 shops, 28 houses and 40 “rooms” (together with 3 villages and 3 mills in Rûmeli and Anatolia, a bedestân at Sereç, etc.). Although the foundation was relatively poor (annual revenue 135,880 akçe), the nābiyye included the busy commercial district between the Büyük Carshî and the harbour, and some of its mahalles had been established by wealthy merchants in the reign of Mehmed II.

Dâvûd Paşa Nâhiyesi (X on the plan). "Kodja" Dâvûd Paşa (Grand Vizier from 887/1482 to 902/1497) built a mosque, a hospice, a medrese, a school and a public fountain (inscription dated 890/1485) near the Forum Arcadî, with an extensive carshî of 108 shops and 11 “rooms” around the mosque. He also brought into occupation the area now named after him on the Marmara coast (west of the former Port of Eleutherios), building there a palace, a bath, a bosako, 11 shops and a landing-stage (Ayverdi-Barkan, p. 345). Six baths, in Istanbul and elsewhere, a bedestân at Manastîr, shops at Usküb and Bursa, and the revenue of 12 villages brought in an annual income of 378,886 akçe (ca. 7,500 ducats). Although some mahalles had existed here before, it was particularly this foundation which promoted the growth of the area, 8 mahalles being set up under Bâyezîd II.

Kodja Muḥtâfâ Paşa Nâhiyesi (XI on the plan). It is evident that towards the end of Bâyezîd I’s reign the Muslim population was increasing in the region towards Sîlîvri Kapî, and here, 895/1489 (inscription), the later Grand Vizier Mustafâ Paşa converted the church of St. Andrew in Kristî into a mosque. According to the wakf-iyya, the complex comprised also a hospice, a medrese, a ḥānakāh, a school, and houses for the imām, etc. (for his ḥāyrat at Eyüpûb and elsewhere, see Ayverdi-Barkan, pp. 366-9), supported by a large kamâmûn (annual income 65,000 akçe) and 81 shops near the complex, by numerous shops and two bigāns in various parts of Istanbul, and by 27 villages in Rûmeli (details in Ayverdi-Barkan, 365-7). The annual income was over half a million akçe. No fewer than 17 mahalles were formed under Bâyezîd II.

The mahalles in the four nābiyyes bounded by the landwalls—Mustafâ Paşa, Dâvûd Paşa and Topkapî—were relatively large but their wakfs were few, an indication that the population was sparse and many of the mesdīds had to be supported from the sultan’s treasury. Most of the new mahalles established under Sûleymân at Edirne-Kapî (mosque, medrese, school and fountain, supported by a bigān and a carshî) promoted the settlement of the area (see below). The establishment of the mosques of Kara Ahmed Paşa at Topkapî (ca. 965/1554) and Khâdîm İbrâhîm Paşa al Sîlîvri Kapî (958/1551) suggest a concentration of settlement near the city gates.

Nearly 90 % of the mahalles were named after the founder of the local mosque. The local people would make new endowments to ensure the repair of the mosque and the support of the mosque officials and teachers, but there are few cases where the local people clubbed together to build a mosque. Among the individuals who founded more than one mesdīd in the years after the conquest are the subaşî Câdkr Ağa, the Khâdîm Mollâ Khûseîv, and some merchants (Eyîn-zâde Khâdîa Sinân, Üskûbî Hâdîdî İbrâhîm, Khâdîa Üveys, Khâdîa Khâlîl). According to the wakf register of 953/1546, 65 % of the founders of mosques belonged to the “ruling” ‘askeri class (palace officials, army officers, ‘ulämä and “bureaucrats”). The distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>merchants and bankers</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradesfolk</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aghas of the Palace</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>begs</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pashas</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officers of the Kapi-Kulu</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“bureaucrats”</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architects</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High-ranking members of the ‘askeri class were, in fact, far richer than merchants and craftsmen, and were more inclined to found wakfs, partly perhaps for reasons of social and political prestige, but also as a means of retaining within the family’s control capital derived originally as income from the Public Treasury (see İnalcık, Capital formation . . . , 133-40).

V. DEVELOPMENTS IN THE 10TH/16TH CENTURY

The 10th/16th century sees a rapid increase in the population dwelling within the walls, so that old mahalles become more densely populated, some mesdīds are replaced by bigāns, new mesdīds are built, and new complexes are erected and new mahalles are created in formerly deserted areas, especially towards the landwalls, along the Bayram Paşa Deresi (the Lycus) and even outside the walls; whilst around Gâlata the inhabited area extends up the Golden Horn and down the slopes to Topkapî, and the new districts of Flndbûl, Dîhângîr and Kâsîm Paşa come into being. The demand for new buildings which this increase in population produced led to a period of great activity by the Palace department of Khâdîa mi‘mârî, already directed by the great
architect Sinan [q.v.]. (In 932/1525 the department had 13 architects, all Muslim; in 1013/1604 there were 23 Muslims and 16 Christians; for its organization see Ş. Turan, in Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi, i/1 (Ankara 1965), 157-202), so that the finest monuments of Ottoman architecture and art belong to these years. The mosque of Rüstem Paşa [q.v.], twice Grand Vizier, was erected over warehouses and shops on the site of the meşjid-i Hâdiji Khâhil (see A. S. Uğen; Rüstem Paşa kasıeti, in Mimarlık Dergisi, ix (1944), 23-31). Piş Memed Paşa (Grand Vizier 933/1525-937/1529) established an extensive waqf with a mosque and medrese in the Zeyrek district, a mosque at Merdjen, a mosque and a khanăkhâ at Molla Gârun, and a complex of mosque, medrese and hospice at Silîvri, supported by the annual income of 6,000 ducats from a khan near the Bedesten, another khan in Çhalâta and shops at Tahtakaflê and Ballık-Pâzar, while his garden north of the Golden Horn was the origin of the later quarter of Piş Paşa (Evliyâ, i, 411).

In 946/1539 the sultan, Süleyman, built in the name of his wife Khurrem a complex of mosque, medrese, hospital, hospice and shops at Avret-Pâzar (the "women's market") in Aksaray, which was becoming an important market area (for this market, round the Column of Arcadius, and its prosperity at this period, see C. de Villanovo, 306, and cf. Sanderson, 77); a khan, a hammâm, a wood-store, a slaughterhouse, and various shops and warehousesc in different areas of Istanbul brought in an annual income of half a million akçe (8,400 ducats). In memory of his son Mehemed, the sultan built on Divân-yolu, between Vefâ and Sarrâджihâne, a truly imperial (Evliyâ, i, 162) complex (952/1544-955/1548; mosque, medrese, hospice, school, türbe; also a kerbînsaray); whilst for his son Dîhadîr he built at Findikli the mosque and school which gave its name to the Dîhadîrî district (Evliyâ, i, 442).

Finally, exploiting an area cleared by a fire in the centre of the city, Süleyman entrusted to Sinân the construction, on a hill overlooking the harbour, of the most elaborate building-complex of the capital. This, the Süleymanîye (mosque begun Dümâdâ II 957/July 1550 and completed Dhu'l-Hijjâ 964/ October 1557; for the inscription see C. de Villanovo, in Kanunt Armağanı, Ankara 1970, 293), is composed of no fewer than 18 elements (S. Eyice, Istanbul, pp. 49-52, bibliography). Within the court are the mosque, the tombs of Süleyman and of Khurrem Sültân and the house of the türbedar; outside, on two sides of the mosque are four medreses and the dâr al-badîth, the highest institutes of learning of the Empire; the other large buildings are a hospital, a dâr al-dâîفة and a tâbâhhane: smaller buildings are a college for müalims (students preparing to enter a medrese), a library, a pharmacy, and a children's school. The complex is completed by several houses near the mosque for teachers and mosque-servants, a khan, and shops in front of the medreses, which constitute a târîkh. According to Evliyâ Çelebi (i, 157) the Palace of the Aghâ of the Janissaries (later the office of the Sheyhül-Islâm) belonged also to this complex. (For the Süleymanîye and the Aghâ's palace, see M. Lorichs, Tafel X).

The registers of expenses for these constructions are valuable evidence for the procedures followed in such a major enterprise (see O. L. Barkan, "Organisation du travail dans la chantier d'une grande mosquée à Istanbul au XVIIe siècle," in Annales. Économies, sociétés, civilisations, xvii (1962), 1903-1106; for similar registers relating to the Mosque of Ahmed I, see T. Öz, in Vahefsür Dergisi, i (1938), 26; cf. also Taşlık-i Diyanet-i Şerif-i Nür-i Şehârânî, "Iliâve to TOEM, no. 49). Materials and craftsmen were gathered from Istanbul and from other parts of the Empire, the workmen being kept under strict discipline. Of the craftsmen receiving pay over the whole period of 5 years and 7 months, 29 % were from Istanbul, 14 % from Rûmeîli and the Islands, 13 % from Anatolia (with no indication for 44 %), 51 % of the 3,523 craftsmen were Christians, 49 % Muslims. The builders of walls, the ironworkers and the sewermen were mainly Christian, the stonecarvers, carpenters, painters, glassworkers and lead-workers were mainly Muslim. Of the total workforce 55 % were free men receiving a wage, 40 % were "şademi oğlanlar" and 5 % were galley-slaves.

All the waqfs of Süleyman (besides the foundations already mentioned, the medrese of Sultan Selim and the sarâye in the mahalle of Fil-damul) were consolidated in one waqfsîyya (ed. K. E. Kürkcüoğlu, Ankara 1962). According to a taâbir made in the reign of Murâd III (Ayverdi-Barkan, op. cit., xvi, n. 31), the annual income was then 5,277,750 akçe (88,000 ducats); it may be noted that 81 % of this income arose from the taxes of 230 villages in Rûmeîli. The whole complex had a staff of 748, whose stipends amounted to nearly one million akçe a year.

Foundations made during this century near the wall gates and in the Lycus valley testify to an increase of population in these areas. In the region of Edirne-Kaplî, besides the Mihrumân foundation (see above), there were the mosque-complex of Mestî Paşa between this gate and Fatih (inscription: 994/1586; see T. Bozkurt, Mestî Paşa Külliyesi, İst. Ün. Ed. Fac. thesis, 1964), the mosque of the dragoman Yûnus Bog at Balât (948/1541); the mosque of Ferhâ Fethîhâd (970/1562); and the mosque of Kâdi Süâdî.

At Topkapî the Kara Ahmed Paşa complex, the work of Sinân (962/1554: mosque, medrese, dâr-al-kerrû, school, fountain; see Ş. Yaltkaya and Ali Saim Ügen, in Vahefsür Dergisi, ii (1942), 83-97 and 169-71), was an important factor in promoting the district's prosperity. The Arpa Eminî (Deventîr) Moustâfa mosque should also be mentioned. The district of Yeşîû, see C. Uğan, in Kanunt Armağanı, Ankara 1970, 293), is composed of no fewer than 18 elements (S. Eyice, Istanbul, pp. 49-52, bibliography). Within the court are the mosque, the tombs of Süleyman and of Khurrem Sültân and the house of the türbedar; outside, on two sides of the mosque are four medreses and the dâr al-badîth, the highest institutes of learning of the Empire; the other large buildings are a hospital, a dâr al-dâîفة and a tâbâhhane: smaller buildings are a college for müalÎms (students preparing to enter a medrese), a library, a pharmacy, and a children's school. The complex is completed by several houses near the mosque for teachers and mosque-servants, a khan, and shops in front of the medreses, which constitute a târîkh. According to Evliyâ Çelebi (i, 157) the Palace of the Aghâ of the Janissaries (later the office of the Sheyhül-Islâm) belonged also to this complex. (For the Süleymanîye and the Aghâ's palace, see M. Lorichs, Tafel X).

The registers of expenses for these constructions are valuable evidence for the procedures followed in such a major enterprise (see O. L. Barkan, "Organisation du travail dans la chantier d'une grande mosquée à Istanbul au XVIIe siècle," in Annales. Économies, sociétés, civilisations, xvii (1962), 1903-1106; for similar registers relating to the Mosque of Ahmed
works of Sinan (see R. M. Meric, Mimar Sinan, Ankara 1965).

Indeed the period from 947/1540 to 996/1588 may justly be called the "period of Sinan", for he and his subordinates constructed in Istanbul, for the sultans and notables, 43 dömsüs, 52 mesджds, 49 medreses, 7 dâr al-kûrâ, 40 hamмâmas, 28 palaces and kâşks, 3 hospices, 3 hospitals, and 6 hânns. Other important constructions attributed to Sinan in the outlying districts are at Eyyûb, the mosque of Zâl-rahîl Mahbûb Pasha (fountain dated 958/1551), the mosque of Defterdâr Mâhmed Celibi (948/1541) and the mosque of Shâh-Sultan; at Topkâhpâ, the mosque of Kâlle ʿAli Pasha (988/1580), and the mosque of Muhûydîdîn Celibi; at Flindîlpâ, the mosque of Dîshângîr, and the mosque, school and hamмâm of the Kâdîcâser Mîhmed Vušûl (Mollâ Celibi) (973/1565); at Bâşkhatash, the mosque of Sinan Pasha (983/1575), at Sûltûnî, the Cavûş-basîl mosque; at Usküdâr, the mosque of Mîhrûmâh Sultan (954/1548), the mosque of Şemsî Ahmed Pasha (988/1580) and the Eski Vâlide (Nûrûlî) Sultan mosque (901/1593); at Kâşîm Pâhâ, the Kâşîm Pasha complex of mosque and medrese (the value of the wâbû being 2,630,000 akçes in cash and 117,000 akçes in real estate); and towards Omâyâyîn the Piyâle Pâsha complex of mosque, medrese, school, tekke, fountain and hamмâm (wâbîfîyas dated 981/1573).

The quarter of slaughterhouses and tanneries outside Yedikule grew considerably: originally consisting of 27 shops of tanners, 32 of butchers, and 5 of catgut-makers (wâbîfîyas of Mehemmed II and the Aya Sofya register of 988/1485), it was in the middle of the following century, according to Evliyâ Celebi (i, 391), a "fLOURISHING TOWNSHIP" with one dömsû, seven mesджds, 300 tanners' shops, 50 glue shops and 70 catgut-makers. These tanners claimed the right to buy the hides of all animals slaughtered in Istanbul (see O. Nüri, Medîlî-i umûr-i Belediye, i, Istanbul 1922, 830-2; for a list of the Istanbul slaughter-houses in 1610/1667: A. Refik, Istanbul hayatı, 1000-1100, Istanbul 1931, pp. 30-1).

In the second half of the 16th/17th century and the first half of the 17th/18th, the inhabited areas extended outside the landwalls. This area, of 17.2 km.

The most important of such foundations are those of Kösem Vâlide Sultan (mosque, medrese, hospice, bath, kânh; for the wâbîfîya see W. Caskel, in Documenta islamica inedita, Berlin 1952, 251-62) and of Gülûngh Sultan ("Yeni Vâlide", of 1120/1710-1122/1720: mosque, fountain, shops, bakhouse; see O. Nüri, Medîlî-e, i, 1054-5). Another characteristic of this period is the foundation of new complexes, on the model of the old, in sparsely populated areas of the city (e.g., that of Hekim-oghîl ʿAli Pasha in the nahiye of Kodja Mustafa Paha, of 1146/1733-1147/1735) or in newly settled districts at Usküdâr and along the Bosphorus.

By and large, until the 17th century practically all the expansion of Istanbul took place within the walls. This area, of 17.2 km.

The last great mosque-complexes to be constituted in the classical tradition of Ottoman architecture are those of Ahmed I on the Golden Horn and the Vâlide Nişâbûrî (Yeni Nişâbûrî) at Eminönü.

The former, built between 1018/1609 and 1026/1617 at a cost of one million and a half gold pieces, comprised a mosque, a medrese, a hospital, a food-kitchen, a dâr al-dişâfâ, lodgings (miş rifkânî), a school, a public fountain, and an ârâsta-type carşî (see Evliyâ Celebi, i, 270-19; Tahsîn Ür, in Yakûflar Dergisi, i, 25-8; S. Eykice, in IA, art. " İstanbul", p. 1214/59). The ûbûyû of the inhabitants of Ghalata was made over as wâbîfî for this mosque.

The Yehei Nişâbûrî was begun in 1006/1597 by Safiyye Sultan [q.v.], but the work was suspended for many years and completed only in the years 1071/1660-1072/1663 by Türkûn Sultan [q.v.], to comprise the mosque, a dâr al-kûrâ, a school, fountains, the tomb of Türkûn, and a market (mîrâ carşî) and shops (see S. Ulgen in Yakûflar Dergisi, ii, 387, and S. Eykice, p. 1214/59; detailed engraving of the area in Grelot, p. 285).

The 12th/18th century saw the construction of the Nûr-ı Othmânîyye complex beside the Büyük Carşî (1161/1748-1176); mosque, medrese, library, public water-point (sebhî-kânh); (see Tâvi-dî Nişâbûrî-i Nûr-ı Othmânîyye, supplement to TOF.M, Istanbul 1937; Doğan Kuban, Türk Barok Minar里斯i, Istanbul 1954) and of the Lâli complex (1174/1760-1175/1764; mosque, medrese, fountain): these are in a hybrid style influenced by European baroque, and no longer belong to the classical Ottoman tradition.

It is not without significance that in this period of decline hospices and hospitals, requiring a substantial annual expenditure, tend to be replaced as elements of a complex by libraries and fountains. This tendency is evident in the foundations of the Grand Viziers. Three viziers of the Köprülü family built complexes along Divân-Yolu (Mehemmed Paşa: tomb, medrese, library; Kara Mustafa Paşa, 1101/1690: mosque, medrese, school, fountain; 'Amîjâzâ Hüseyn Paşa, 1112/1700: mosque, medrese, library, fountains). Here too were the foundations of Çorlu ʿAli Paşa (1120/1708: mosque, medrese), of Dâmûd İbrahim Paşa (1132/1720: dâr al-hadîth, fountain), and of Seyyid Fâsân Paşa (1158/1745: medrese, school, fountain, shops, bakhouse; see O. Nüri, Medîlî-e, i, 1054-5). Another characteristic of this period is the foundation of new complexes, on the model of the old, in sparsely populated areas of the city (e.g., that of Hekim-oghîl ʿAli Paşa in the nahiye of Kodja Mustafa Paşa, of 1146/1733-1147/1735) or in newly settled districts at Usküdâr and along the Bosphorus.
bayân). So too (note the names) there were wide open spaces at Ağhya-rayrî (between Silivri Kaplû and Yedi-Küle), in the extreme southern corner of the city around Yedi-Küle, at Bostân-yeri on the Mar-\[\ldots\]t to form distinct districts (for clashes between Muslims and Christians in a “mixed” mahalle, see A. Refik, $\ldots$ 1289, in). In 1285/1868 certain mahalles were obliged to pay two or three street-cleaners (firmân of 1111/1718, in Medîelle, i, 965). In 1285/1868 certain mahalles were obliged to maintain fire-fighting equipment and some of the young men of each mahalle were appointed to create a new “type” in the life of Istanbul, the colourfull $\ldots$ 1289, in). The $\ldots$ mahalles in all dealings with the authorities. The sultan’s decrees were passed on to the imâm of the kadî’s court or proclaimed by criers (mûnâddî) in the streets, and the imâm was responsible for seeing that the mahalle fulfilled all its obligations to the government: he could appeal to the authorities, particularly to the kadî, for assistance in dealing with refractory members of the community. The election of a muhâfîr for each mahalle in 1242/1826 was the first step towards the “secularization” of the local authorities.

As time went on, the tendency increased for co-religionists and co-sectarians to settle together in separate mahalles, and for these mahalles to form distinct districts (for clashes between Muslims and Christians in a “mixed” mahalle, see A. Refik, $\ldots$
ISTANBUL

bul hayati, 1000-1100, doc. 100; idem, Istanbul hayati, 1053-1591, 53; for the formation of distinct Greek, Armenian and Jewish districts, see below.) This tendency was encouraged by government action. Thus when the Church of the Pammakaristos was converted into a mosque in 999/1591, attempts were made to create a Muslim mahalle around it, by selling the vacant site in lots, each sufficient for building a house, exclusively to Muslims (A. Refik, Istanbul hayati, 1000-1100, doc. 14; cf. also Stolpe's plan).

The tendency for each district to have its own traditions, occupation, even style of pronunciation, is reflected for the 11th/12th century by EviLyâ Celebi and Eremeyâ Celebi (see Bibli.), and in the 19th century by such novelists as A. Midhat, Mehemmed Tewfik and Huseyân Rahni; see M. Kaplan, in IA, s.v. Istanbul, 1214/157-68.

Vavassore's plan shows quite broad streets leading to each region of the city, but these have disappeared in plans of the next (10th/16th) century (Hüsûrûnâme) (the street plan is shown clearly only in the map by the dragoman Konstantin of 1228/1813: Topkapî Sarayı no. 1858). Indeed in the 19th century, Didân yolu, the most important street of the city, was only 3.5-5.5 metres wide (Medjelle, i, 1067).

The streets of Istanbul were typical of those of a mediaeval Eastern city (Mayer, op. cit., 4-32), twisting and full of blind alleys, so that the delimitation of the mahalles, far from being planned in advance, was a matter of pure chance (Mayer, 9-24, 104, 254). A study of the detailed city map of 1293/1876 (Ayverdi, 19, asırda İstanbul hariçisi, Istanbul 1938) shows that streets still preserve the alignment they had had under Mehemmed II, for the mi'mâr-bâșhi during rebuilding after fires, would try to preserve the old street-plan (Medjelle, i, 1066, 978). Occupants of property on a street, however, persistently attempted to incorporate areas of the highway into their properties and would, by erecting upper storeys projecting far over the street, cut down the light and air at ground-level. These difficulties of communication in the narrow streets meant that goods were usually transported by sea, from the various gates and landing-places on the Golden Horn.

Documents of the 10th/16th century attest that streets were paved (A. Refik, Istanbul hayati, 1553-1591, 67), and EviLyâ Celebi claims (i, 446) that the streets of Istanbul, Eyyûb, Topkâşhâne and Kâşîm Pasha were all completely paved in the middle of the 12th/17th century. The construction and repair of the paving was carried out by contract with the kâthûddâr of the guild of paviours (A. Refik, op. cit., 60), the work being supervised by the şehr-eminî, the mi'mâr-bâşhi or the su-yolu nâşiri. For main roads the cost was met by the government, by side roads by the householders, shop-keepers and mütevellis whose properties benefited (a document of 1087/1676 in Medjelle, i, 1147; A. Refik, Istanbul hayati, 1100-1200, 930).

The cleaning of the principal squares and streets was carried out by the şadârîn orghânlarî and other military units under the authority of the Yeşİîeri ağgaşî, while each property-owner in a side-street was responsible for keeping the area in front of his property clean; street-sweepers (süprîndîjî) were later employed in the mahalles. The removal of rubbish was the responsibility of the çopîshk subaşghâsil (also termed şâhir subaşghâsil), who let out the work on contract to a group known as CAPITAL ("searchers", 500 in number; EviLyâ Celebi, i, 574). These would collect rubbish in baskets and throw it into the sea, after sifting through it for anything worth keeping; the usual area for the disposal of rubbish and rubble was Langa, or, on the TağiItkafe side, at the place near Odun Kapîl known as Bokluk (see Oberhummer, Tafel XXII). Firmans repeatedly forbade the throwing of filth into the streets, the breaking-up of paving and the building of steps or stairways in front of houses (A. Refik, Istanbul hayati, 1000-1100, docs. 25-58).

Except during Râmaşîn, everybody had to be within doors after the bed-time prayer (Derschwan, 70; Medjelle, i, 964). There were no arrangements for lighting the streets, and anyone obliged to be out had to carry a lantern (Medjelle, i, 956; White, iii, 250). The first street to be lit by gas was Beyoghlu Dâjdâsi in 1273/1856, the main streets of Istanbul being lit by gas in 1879 (Medjelle, i, 971).

Inhabitants of Istanbul and foreign observers unite in reporting the neglected and dirty state of the streets in spite of the stringent decrees periodically issued. In 1839, for the first time, various plans were drawn up for modernizing the city by (e.g.) opening up blind-alleys and creating broad interesting streets and squares, but such measures began to be carried out only after the great "Khodja Pasha" fire of 1865 (details in Medjelle, i, 987-991).

(c). Building regulations.

Regulations issued to control building-styles, the streets, and the city's cleanliness had their effect on the appearance and plan of Ottoman Istanbul. Such regulations were issued by the şehr-eminî (e.g.) and his subordinates the kâhîsa mi'mâr-bâşghi and the su-yolu nâşiri, and put into effect through the kâdî and the subaşghi. In 1834 these duties passed to the emîye-i kâhîsa Müdbîllü (Medjelle, i, 981-3).

In the first place, all building was being under the control of the state. Before building could begin, the right to the site had to be acquired by an approach either to the public treasury (mirî) or to the appropriate wâkhf and by the payment of the idjâr-i mütedîjîle. If the freehold was held by a wâkhf, the consent of the state authorities was necessary. The mi'mâr-bâşghi would grant permission for construction of the building according to the current regulations and the permitted dimensions, and check that these were observed (for an example of an istidjâtâ made when a wâkhf was being established, see S. Eyice, Eci Han, TD, no. 24, plate 1 opposite p. 130; Medjelle, i, 1044-8). In 1156/1742 it was decreed that builders who erected buildings for non-Muslims without obtaining a firman of permission should be put to death (Medjelle, loc. cit.).

The government intervened in these matters for various reasons: to regulate land-tenure, to prevent fires, to avert water-shortage, and to protect the walls, mosques, and other public buildings. According to building regulations of 966/1559 (the time of Sinân), houses were not to be more than two storeys high, the upper storey was not to project over the street, and balconies and eaves were not to be made (A. Refik, Istanbul hayati, 1553-1592, 58-9). That these prohibitions had to be repeated so often (A. Refik, op. cit., 66; Medjelle, i, 1052-4) shows clearly that they were not observed. After great fires it was ordered that houses, especially those adjacent to public buildings and kâhîs, should be constructed of stone or brick (A. Refik, Istanbul hayati, 1100-1200, doc. 34) (yet after earthquakes construction in wood was decreed).

Thanks to its cheapness, most of the houses of Istanbul were always built of wood. To limit the danger of fire and to facilitate approach to the city's gates and
landing-stages, orders were issued in 966/1558 to demolish all houses and shops abutting on the walls (an order later re-issued, *Istanbul hayati, 1100-1200*, 67), leaving a clear space of 4 *d coraz* (in 1131/1728, five *d coraz*, i.e. 3.25 m.; see Oberhummer, Tafel XXII). To conserve water, the construction of new palaces and baths needed the sultan’s permission; sometimes indeed the building of baths was forbidden. To prevent overcrowding, the building of ‘bachelors’ quarters’ (*bekdr odalari*) (see below) where newcomers would stay was strictly controlled and sometimes forbidden (*Medjelle*, i, 1052).

These regulations were rarely followed. The increase in population from the second half of the 10th/16th century meant an increased demand for housing, so that palaces with extensive gardens were pulled down to be built over with contiguous wooden houses and shanties (A. Refik, *Istanbul hayati, 1100-1200*, 67-8).

Non-Muslims were subject to severer regulations: they could not build or occupy houses near a Muslim place of worship (*Medjelle*, i, 1072); their houses were not to be more than nine *d coraz* high or built of freestone, and they could not construct baths (*Medjelle*, i, 1056, 1090); it was forbidden to Muslims to sell houses or building-sites to *dhimmis* or to non-Muslim foreign residents (*Medjelle*, i, 1072-4) (but a legal device (*hilti*) could usually be found to circumvent this). By the code of regulations of 1233/1817, the permitted height of houses for non-Muslims was increased to 12 *d coraz*, and for Muslims to 14 (in the 5th and 6th centuries A.D. the maximum height permitted in Constantinople had been about 33 m.: Mayer, 81). The old ban on building more than two ‘storeys’ led to the construction of all sorts of ‘extensions’ upwards—*tardak*, *bialakhane*, *takhlipash*, *dikhanunn*, *cat-tara* (see the views in M. Lorichs). After the Taqılmât, the height limitations were abolished, for Muslims and non-Muslims alike. It is very probable that these building restrictions—together with fear of plague—were the principal cause for the settlement of non-Muslims outside the walls, on the northern side of the Golden Horn and along the Bosphorus: as their houses grew in number, in 1160/1747 it was forbidden that non-Muslims should build on empty sites in these areas (A. Refik, *Istanbul hayati, 1100-1200* 213).

(d). Domestic architecture

The types of houses in Istanbul can be considered under five heads: (1) ‘Rooms’ (*oda, hudjra*). Houses of one room only were built either detached, in rows, around a court (*mushawwaha*), or in the style of a *bham*; they were often built over a shop. Such houses were usually built by a *waqt*, to be rented out, and since they were generally occupied by unwed men who had come to Istanbul in search of employment they were termed *bekdr odalari*. Sometimes ‘bachelors’ quarters’ were not encouraged in a *mahalle*, where only married households were permitted ( firman of 1044/1634 in *Medjelle*, i, 1053). Unmarried workmen frequently used a single room in a *bham* or a caravan-serai both as a workshop and as living-quarters, a *bham* occupied only by such residents being called *muğferderler bhami*. In 950/1543 a ‘room’ brought in an annual rent of about 100 *akles*. In 1083/1672 there were reckoned to be 3,200 *bham odalari* in Istanbul (Hezarfen, *Talkhs*, Paris Ms., f. 13b; for the areas concerned see Evliyâ Celebi, i, 326).

(2). *Mahalles* (mahalle) houses. Poor craftsmen and people in humble circumstances usually occupied primitive one- or two-storeyed houses of wood or mud-bricks (Ramberti, *apud* Lybyer, 239; Dernschwam, 63; Schweigger, 105; Alberi, iii/I, 393: ‘Le case delle cittâ sono per la maggior parte di legno e terra’). In less densely populated areas the typical house, as in the towns of Anatolia, was a small wood and brick building, with a courtyard and garden shut off by a wall from the street (see Mayer, 106-12 and bibliography, 381-4; S. Eldem, *Türk evi planı tipleri*, *Istanbul* 1955); such a house covered about 400 square archin (A. Refik, *Istanbul hayati, 1000-1100*, 14) and in the middle of the 10th/16th century cost about 100 gold pieces (*Istanbul vakiflar tahrir defteri*, no. 1346).

(3). Houses with gardens, walled about. The court of some of such houses was divided into two, an inner and an outer court; the residence comprised one house, or more than one, and also perhaps a ‘room’ or more than one; there might also be a belvedere, a privy, a stable, a bakehouse, a bath, a shed, an arbour, a storehouse, a ‘cool room’ (*serdâbi*), a mill, quarters for servants or slaves, a hen-coop, a pleasure garden, a well, a fountain, and a *tenâgdir* (a fire kept constantly burning); most newcomers would stay was strictly controlled and sometimes forbidden (*Medjelle*, i, 1052).

In 950/1543 a ‘room’ brought in an annual rent of about 100 *akles*. In 1083/1672 there were reckoned to be 3,200 *bham odalari* in Istanbul (Hezarfen, *Talkhs*, Paris Ms., f. 13b; for the areas concerned see Evliyâ Celebi, i, 326).

(4). Palaces and villas (*hars*). The palaces of statesmen and rich merchants consisted of a large mansion in an extensive court with numerous subsidiary buildings; they are therefore merely a grander version of type (3) above. They usually had two courts, the whole site being surrounded by a high wall (Schweigger, 106) (*Sandan Pasha bought up and demolished 300 houses to build his palace; see C. de Villalon, *Viaje de Turquia*, 74). The mansion, divided into *harem* and *şelâmih*, was usually built of wood and contained numerous rooms (there were 300 rooms in the famous palace of Siyavush Pasha, cf. *Ta*rih-i *Ghiâmâni*, 66).

In the courts of such palaces there would be, beside kitchens, bakehouses, baths and stables, also a school for the dignitary’s *çocuklar* (see *qhulam*, p. 1090), workshops for the craftsmen employed to supply the numerous household, and even shops (Evliyâ Celebi, i, 322-4) (for the organization of *Kara Ahmed Paşa’s palace at Topkapı see *Vakiflar Dergisi*, ii, 88). The villas (*bokâh, *hars*) in such a palace’s gardens were monumental specimens of architecture (S. Eldem, *Köşkler*, *Istanbul* 1969; K. Altan, *Siyavuş Paşa Kasrî*, in *Arkeoloji*, v, 268). Palaces built by viziers usually passed on death into the ownership of the sultan, who would present them to princes or to other dignitaries. It was estimated in the middle of the 11th/17th century that the palaces of members of the royal house and of viziers numbered about 120 (*Ta*rih-i *Ghiamâni*, 66, 69) and those of other notables and of merchants about 1000 (Hezarfen, *loc. cit.*; Evliyâ Celebi, i, 322-4).

The greatest and most famous palaces were built under Süleyman in the Ayasofya and Süleymaniye districts (listed in Evliyâ, *loc. cit.*).

(5). The villas and *yâlîs* of sultans and dignitaries, built outside the land walls of Istanbul (at Khalkali, Flovya, Davud Paşa’s on the northern side of the Golden Horn (at Kara aghaçı, Piri Pasha, Kâşm Pasha, Kâğıdîkhâne), along the Bosphorus and at Uçküdar, situated in extensive and well-tended gardens and woods, became very numerous, and later formed the nucleus of select residential *mahalles*. They served for recreation, as hunting-lodges, and as summer residences, and also as alternative accommo-
dation after a fire or during an epidemic (details in the registers of the bostandı-bashi, see R. E. Kocu, in Istanbul Etnisik Dergisi, iv, 39-90; Fatih Libr., Ms Ali Emri 1033; for the royal palaces and gardens, the Köşşa Bagıche Mabûnlâ detterleri in the archives of Topkapı and of the Başvekâlet. See further Evliya Celebi, i, 391-486; Ereyma Celebi, 34-58; P. Inciciyân, Istanbul, tr. H. Andreasen, Istanbul 1956, 95-113; Melling, Voyage pittoresque de C., Paris 1834; von Hammer, in Konstantinopel und der Bosporus, ii, Pest 1822; M. Ra‘if, Mirât-i Istanbul, Istanbul 1314; T. Gokbilgin, in IA, art. “Boğaz-îli”; series of articles by H. Sehsuvaroglu in the newspaper Cemhur yet, 1947-9). In the 12th/18th century, sultans created new mahalles by giving or selling sections of their gardens and woods as building sites (e.g., Muşatâl III, at İshâniyê and Beşlerbeği). (e) Fires

The frequent conflagrations in this thickly populated city, with its narrow streets of houses mostly built of wood, had as great an effect on social and economic life as they did on the physical configuration (for fires in the Byzantine period, see F. W. Unger, Quellen der byzantinische Kunstgeschichte, i, Vienna 1879, 74 ff.; Mayer, op. cit., 102). The number of fires was indeed abnormally high: Ergin calculated that in the 53 years between 1853 and 1906 there were 229 fires, with the destruction of 36,000 houses (Medjelle, i, 1333). The dates of the greatest fires are: Radiâb 977/1569, 27 Şafar 1043/2 September 1633, 16 Dhū ‘l-Ka‘de 1070/24 July 1660, 3 Shawwâl 1104/7 June 1693, 18 Şabân 1130/17 July 1718, 13 Râmâdân 1156/22 August 1782, 27 Dhū ‘l-Hijja 1241/2 September 1826, 14 Rabî‘ II 1249/31 August 1833, 27 Rabî‘ II 1282/19 September 1865 and 1 Râmâdân 1336/10 June 1918. (See A. M. Schneider, Diebedjis, i, Vienna 1879, 74; Mayer, i, Vienna 1879, 74; Melling, i, 349; and the Grand Vizier, the agha of the Janissaries, after a fire in the Misr Carshî alone in the fire of 1102/1690 were worth three million gûru [c. 2 million gold pieces]; after a fire in the Bedestên in 922/1516 many merchants went bankrupt.

Fires caused various political, social and economic crises in the life of Istanbul. Many fires were deliberately started by dissident Janissaries and aş Şefi: given the risk of the rife of the city); two thirds of the city in 1070/1660, 3 Shawwâl 1104/7 June 1693, to Corlu, Edirne, İzmit, etc.; see Cezar, 330, n. 6). Those made homeless would take refuge, with the goods they had managed to save, in mosque-courtyards, medreses, and open spaces such as Langa Bostân, but even here sometimes they could not escape. After a fire there would be shortages both of food and of building materials, with consequent rises in prices, compelling numbers of people to move away to neighbouring towns (e.g., after the fire of 1106/1782, to Çorlu, Edirne, İzmit, etc.; see Cezar, 365). Even buildings of stone, though not destroyed, would be made uninhabitable, involving the government in heavy expenditure and obliging wakfs to draw on their reserve funds. A sultan would often instruct notables and wealthy individuals to undertake the repair of public buildings. In the period of decline, the poor could not be prevented from converting named David, were recognized to be of great value (Rashîd, v, 306; Kuâ-i-6elebi-zade Asîm, 255), and “fire-brigades” were formed: a unit of tulumbâdâs, attached to the Janissaries in 1132/1719, tulumbâdâs for each mahalle in 1285/1666, and a regular fire-brigade in 1290/1873; fire-insurance began only in 1890 (Medjelle, i, 1170-1219).

(f). Earthquakes too had their effect on the city’s general appearance (Mayer, 98-101; Istanbul is one of the cities most subject to earthquake in the world, suffering 66 shocks between 1711 and 1894). Besides the great earthquakes of 1099/1688, 1180/1766 and 1854 (Cezar, 380-92), there was the major disaster beginning on 6 Dümâdâ I 913/22 August 1599, called by the chroniclers “Kütük Râyâmât”, when the shocks continued for weeks. The walls were seriously

In the fires at Tahtakaî‘e and round the Carshî stock and goods of great value were often lost. It was estimated that the goods lost in the Mişr Carshî alone in the fire of 1102/1690 were worth three million gûru [c. 2 million gold pieces]; after a fire in the Bedestên in 922/1516 many merchants went bankrupt.

Fires caused various political, social and economic crises in the life of Istanbul. Many fires were deliberately started by dissident Janissaries and aş Şefi: given the risk of the rife of the city); two thirds of the city in 1070/1660, 3 Shawwâl 1104/7 June 1693, to Corlu, Edirne, İzmit, etc.; see Cezar, 330, n. 6). Those made homeless would take refuge, with the goods they had managed to save, in mosque-courtyards, medreses, and open spaces such as Langa Bostân, but even here sometimes they could not escape. After a fire there would be shortages both of food and of building materials, with consequent rises in prices, compelling numbers of people to move away to neighbouring towns (e.g., after the fire of 1106/1782, to Çorlu, Edirne, İzmit, etc.; see Cezar, 365). Even buildings of stone, though not destroyed, would be made uninhabitable, involving the government in heavy expenditure and obliging wakfs to draw on their reserve funds. A sultan would often instruct notables and wealthy individuals to undertake the repair of public buildings. In the period of decline, the poor could not be prevented from converting named David, were recognized to be of great value (Rashîd, v, 306; Kuâ-i-6elebi-zade Asîm, 255), and “fire-brigades” were formed: a unit of tulumbâdâs, attached to the Janissaries in 1132/1719, tulumbâdâs for each mahalle in 1285/1666, and a regular fire-brigade in 1290/1873; fire-insurance began only in 1890 (Medjelle, i, 1170-1219).

(f). Earthquakes too had their effect on the city’s general appearance (Mayer, 98-101; Istanbul is one of the cities most subject to earthquake in the world, suffering 66 shocks between 1711 and 1894). Besides the great earthquakes of 1099/1688, 1180/1766 and 1854 (Cezar, 380-92), there was the major disaster beginning on 6 Dümâdâ I 913/22 August 1599, called by the chroniclers “Kütük Râyâmât”, when the shocks continued for weeks. The walls were seriously
damaged, all the minarets collapsed, and 109 mosques and 1070 houses were destroyed; estimates of the killed range from 5000 to 13,000. Many Byzantine buildings (e.g., ʾIsā Kaplı) were badly damaged. The authorities took emergency action to carry out the re-building, one person and a qaḍārī [q. 22 akṭe] being levied from each household in Istanbul, and workmen were conscripted from outside (57,000 from Anadolu and 29,000 from Rûmeli), so that the work was quickly completed (Čezar, 38).

vii. — The Inhabitants: Re-population; Religious Minorities; the Military; Epidemics; Population Statistics.

(a) Re-population.
Throughout his reign, one of Mehemmed II’s main preoccupations was to re-populate Istanbul. Various methods were employed, particularly and especially in the early years, the deportation [see SÜNCDX] of households from every part of his dominions; later, the useful elements of newly-conquered cities—the nobility, craftsmen and merchants—were transferred to Istanbul; and, always, immigrants of whatever religion or race were encouraged to come from anywhere in the empire. In 1453, Inalčık, in Dumbarton Oaks Papers, xxii-xxiv, 237-49.

The census of 860/1455 shows that many of the Muslim immigrants brought from Kodia-eli, Sanrūkan, Aydın, Balksesir, etc. had fled en masse, to be replaced (e.g.) in the mahālles of Kir Nikola and Kir Martas by immigrants from Tekirdağ and Çorlu. One of the reasons for this “flight”, besides the general difficulty of making a living in a ruined city, is certainly the sultan’s attempt to levy mukāla’ās on the immigrants’ houses, as related by ʾAşıkpaşazade (H. Inalčık, op. cit., 242-3). In about 860/1455 a numerous group of Jewish deportees from Rûmeli was settled in the city: 42 families from Izdin (Lamia) in houses at Samatya abandoned by Muslims from Balksesir; 38 families from Filibe in houses in the mahālles of Top Yikughl abandoned by immigrants from Faphagnia and Tekirdağ; others came from Edirne, Niğbolu, Trıkalla, etc.

Among the Muslim immigrants there were tradesfolk (tailors, blacksmiths, etc.) and many men of religion, including adherents of dervish-orders. Soldiers (Jauniasries, Doghandis, etc.) often became householders in various mahālles; the ʿaṣrāb of the navy settled together in ʾAtteker mahālles. Groups of immigrants usually settled together in one mahālles or monastery (though occasionally Greeks. Jews and Muslims are found living in the same building; and in 860/1455 there were at Samatya 42 Jewish, 14 Greek, and 13 Muslim families). The register shows that at this date the mahālles which it covers were sparsely populated, with only a few shops, the churches and monasteries deserted, and the houses empty and ruined. Soon afterwards, it seems, the sultan took up permanent residence in the newly-completed palace and began the active promotion of building activity, of economic prosperity, and of new settlement. In 861/1456 he commanded all the Greeks who had left the city before or after the conquest to return (Inalčık, op. cit., 237-8). It was in these years too that, with the aim of making his capital the centre of a world-wide empire, he appointed an Orthodox patriarch (6 January 1454), an Armenian patriarch (865/1464) and a chief rabbi (see below); and in line with old Islamic tradition he encouraged the settlement of craftsmen and merchants.

Enslaved peasants were settled, as the sultan’s serfs (khāṣṣ, kul, ʾostakīs kul), in the villages round about in order to restore their prosperity. In the 16th century, by now being ordinary raʾīḍāʾs, they would form an important element of the population of the so-called khāṣṣ-kūls (for which see Ō. L. Barkan, in Ḫī. Fak. Mecm., 1, 1940, 29 ff.). In 904/1498 of the 163 villages in the Kadaʾ of Eyyûb (which was known as Khâṣṣar Kâdeli), 110 contained about 2000 adult khâṣṣ kuł (the rest of the inhabitants being ordinary raʾīḍāʾs or särgûns). The khâṣṣ kûls covered the area from the Çekmejélis and Bakr-kûy to the Black Sea coast and to the Bosphorus and Beşiktaş (but there were no khâṣṣ kułs actually in Istanbul).

The deportations from conquered cities are shown in the following list (see A. M. Schneider, in Belleten, xvi/61, 41-3; Inalčık, op. cit., 237-8; Jorga, Byzance après Byzance, Bucharest 1972, 48-62):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>863/1459</td>
<td>Armenian and Greek merchants</td>
<td>from the two Foças and Amasra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864/1460</td>
<td>Greeks from the Morea, Thasos, Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865/1461</td>
<td>Greeks from Trebizond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866/1462</td>
<td>Greeks from Mytilene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867/1463</td>
<td>Greeks from Argos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873/1468-879/1474</td>
<td>Muslims, Greeks and Armenians from Konya, Larenda, Aksaray, Ereğli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875/1470</td>
<td>Greeks from Euboea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880/1475</td>
<td>Armenians, Greeks and Latins from Kaffa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1542 Greek households whose djizya was made over by Mehemmed II to his waḥīf (Başvekâlet arşivi, Tapu defteri 240) are listed in "djemāʿats" (of people from Foça, "from Midilli, etc.").
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<td>Greeks from Euboea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Armenians, Greeks and Latins from Kaffa</td>
<td></td>
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</table>
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<td>Greeks from Mytilene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867/1463</td>
<td>Greeks from Argos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873/1468-879/1474</td>
<td>Muslims, Greeks and Armenians from Konya, Larenda, Aksaray, Ereğli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875/1470</td>
<td>Greeks from Euboea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<th>Year</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>863/1459</td>
<td>Armenian and Greek merchants</td>
<td>from the two Foças and Amasra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864/1460</td>
<td>Greeks from the Morea, Thasos, Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Greeks from Trebizond</td>
<td></td>
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<td>866/1462</td>
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</table>
This total does not include soldiers, medrese-students, or slaves. Barkan, estimating these to amount to one-fifth of the population and taking five persons to the household, considers the total population to have numbered about 100,000 (JESHO, i/1, 11; Schneider, op. cit., p. 44, estimates 60-70,000; Ayverdi’s estimate, Istanbul mahalleleri, p. 82, is 167,175,000).

Later sultans continued the policy of settling deportees from newly conquered regions. Bayezid II settled 500 households from Akkerman at Silivri Kapsı (Schneider, p. 44; the dziyaa-registers of 594/1489 show the settlers from Akkerman as 670 households, see Barkan, in Belgeler, i/1, 38, table 2). The Ottomans’ readiness to welcome Jews expelled from Spain, Portugal and Southern Italy in 1492 and the following years led to an increase in the Jewish population of the city (estimated at 36,000 by von Harff, p. 244). Selim I brought 200 households of merchants and craftsmen from Tabriz (Lufti Paşa, Ta’ir-iğ, 237) and 500 from Cairo (some of whom were permitted to return by Süleyman). After his capture of Belgrade, Süleyman settled Christians and Jews near Samatya Kapsı (later Belghrad Kapsı) to form the Belghrad mahalleyı (Hammer-Purgstall, iii, 14; Uzuncarsılı, Osm. Türki, ii/4, 317; see also U. Heyd in Oriens, vii, 306). One other immigration deserving notice is that of the Moriscos from Spain after 978/1570 (ref. to in Ottoman records as Endülüsli or Mudejdijel (read mudejdijen); see Dozy, Suppl., s.v. and mudejaresı) Arablar (see A. Hess, The Moriscos, in Amer. Hist. Rev., lxxiv/1); these settled together in Ghalata around the Church of S. Paolo and S. Enduluslil (see A. Hess, in JEH, xx, p. 239). The deportees enjoyed a special status. They were exempt from 'awarid for a certain period, but could not leave the city without the permission of the Subaşlı. For some time after their arrival—either because of their own inclinations or because of their special status — each group was treated as a distinct dğemâ’t, living together and named after their native region. Hence in the various censuses of the city new arrivals are separately listed as dğemâ’ts, not included in the residents of mahallels. Thus the immigrants from Kafra and Karaman are dğemâ’ts in the census of 882/1477, but have been absorbed in the general Christian population by 1489/984; in that year only the immigrants from Akkerman are listed as a dğemâ’t. In the 11th/17th century there are listed besides 292 mahallels, 12 Muslim dğemâ’ts, referred to as “of Tokat, of Ankara, of Bursa”, who are presumably arrivals from those places (M. Aktepe, in Istanbul Enstitüsü Dergisi, xi, 116-24). The dğemâ’t is either absorbed into mahallels of its co-religionists or forms a new mahalle under a different name (usually that of the founder of the mahalle’s mosque). This process of assimilation worked most quickly on the Muslims, and most slowly on the Jews (U. Heyd, in Oriens, vi, 305-14).

In the first half of the 16th century the population increased considerably, mainly for economic reasons. Registers of wabhs show that many merchants and craftsmen immigrated from Edirne, Bursa, Ankara, Konya, Aleppo, Damascus, Cairo and even (though they were not numerous) from Persia; but the chief increase was caused by the immigration of young men or of whole peasant families (termed evginı from the poorer regions of the empire who had left their holdings to work in the city. Coming from central and eastern Anatolia, and from Rımelı (especially Albania), they worked as porters, water-carriers, boatmen, bath-attendants, hawkers and labourers. Some returned home after saving a little money, but the majority stayed on.

In the 16th century the population of Ottoman cities in general increased by 80% (Barkan, op. cit., 25-31), and Istanbul probably showed a still higher percentage. The authorities tended to be aware of the problem of over-population in the middle of the century (yet as late as 938/1532 the laws encouraging immigration and granting exemptions to Christian settlers were still in force; see Barkan, Kansülär, 24). The reasons they found for the movement from the countryside into Istanbul were these (see A. Relik, Istanbul hayati, 1525-1591, 145; idem, Istanbul hayati, 1100-1200, 110, 131, 199; Rıshd, iv, 120; Medjelle, i, 355; M. Aktepe, in TD, ix/13, 1-30 (1) the better facilities for making a living; (2) the absence of ra’siyet taxes [see Çift resmi]; and (3) freedom from exposure to the illegal lehâif-i şâbka and other exactions levied at all periods by soldiers and officials and in later times by a’yan and derebeğis [see Inalcik, A双边nâmeir, in Belgeler, ii/3-4). These peasant immigrants built houses for themselves in the outlying areas of the city (chiefly Kâşım Paşa and Eyyüb; see A. Relik, Istanbul hayati, 1593-94, 140) or lodged within the city in bekâr odaları or bekâr kâşlari (see above). When the provinces were suffering abnormally dearth or disorder, the extent of the movement into Istanbul seriously alarmed the authorities. During the Djeâlâl disturbances of 1005/1596-1610 many thousands of families fled to Istanbul (40,000 (?) families of Armenians alone, see Polanya’s Sime’vun Seyahatnamesi, tr. H. Andrea- syan, Istanbul 1964, p. 4; most or many of these were later sent back to their homes).

Not only was life more secure in Istanbul, no-one need starve. The religious foundations naturally attracted immigrants, and thousands lived on doles of food from a hospice (the hospice of Fâth alone fed a thousand people a day) or on a minute income from a wab else a medrese student or as a “bedesman” in a mosque or at a tomb (see Ramberti, apud Lybyer, 240; Barkan, in IFM, xxii, 281). A foreign visitor observed that if it were not for the hospices the inhabitants would be eating one another (Dernschwam, 67). When in 1026/1617, as a result of the disturbances created by medrese students (sukbi) in Anatolia, it was decreed that medrese education should cease except in a few principal cities and the provincial hospices were closed (C. Ulucay, Saruhanı
The students flocked to Istanbul, where they offered a fertile soil for the incitements of bigoted preachers (the number of these students ranged at different times from 5-8,000). Beggars and dervishes were always a problem: particularly in Ramaḍān thousands of them came to Istanbul to thong the streets (A. Refik, *İstanbul hayatı*, 1553-91, 139); and under Suleyman measures of control were taken at Alexandria and Damietta to prevent Egyptian beggars from travelling to Istanbul (Mühimine Defteri, no. 16, p. 193).

Among the floating population of the city were, for example, qaṣb troops coming from the provinces to serve in the fleet, deportees from various districts come to carry out local business, to lodge complaints about their local authorities or to appeal against taxes, and bodies of workmen brought in to build ships or do construction work for the state (Harun in *Annales*, xvii (1962), 1098, 1105).

The authorities considered that this over-population caused three principal problems: (1) the water-supply was becoming inadequate, it was more difficult to ensure the supply of food, and the cost of living was rising (Selânikî, 4; *Međjelle*, i, 1052); (2) security was breaking down, with an increase in robbery and murder (A. Refik, *İstanbul hayatı*, 1553-91, 145), and frequent fires and lootings; (3) as the number of unemployed vagrants increased in Istanbul, tax revenue from the provinces declined.

From time to time therefore, and especially after the crisis of a riot, a fire or a food-shortage, the authorities would take such measures as these: (1) Since unmarried labourers were the chief cause of the troubles, all those who had come to Istanbul within a prescribed period (five years, ten years) were rounded up and expelled; similarly beggars were occasionally rounded up and set to work in nearby towns (A. Refik, *op. cit.*, 145; *İdem.*, *İstanbul hayatı*, 1100-1200, 110, 131, 194, 199). Since Albanian vagrants had played a main part in the rebellion of Patrona Khâlî in 1143/1730, stringent repressive measures were taken against them (A. Refik, *İstanbul hayatı*, 1100-1200, 110-12). In 1629, during a food-shortage, it was decided to expel unmaried men who had come to the city within the past ten years, and 4000 were removed (Lüfî, li, 63). (2) Anyone proposing to come to Istanbul for a court case had to receive first a certificate of permission from his local kâdi, and deputations were riot to be too numerous. (3) Check points on immigrants, particularly on the ev-göbî, were set up on the roads and at the entrances to the city (A. Refik, *op. cit.*, 80-105). (4) The inhabitants of a mahâle were ordered to stand surety for one another (A. Refik, *op. cit.*, 145) and Đams were instructed to keep strangers out (A. Refik, *op. cit.*, 139-40). (5) No one was admitted to a kâdî or to a bekâr odâsi unless he had a surety. (6) The construction of new "bachelors' quarters" was forbidden.

But it was all in vain, as effective control was impossible; and in later years the defeats and losses of territory in Europe brought new waves of refugees to Istanbul (see A. Refik, *İstanbul hayatı*, 1100-1200, 80-105), the last being the great migration of 1912 during the Balkan Wars.

(b) Non-Muslims.

The non-Muslims of Istanbul were in 1001/1592 classified in six groups: Greeks (*Rûm*), Armenians, Jews, Karamanlı, Franks of Ghašâta and Greeks of Ghašâta (A. Refik, *İstanbul hayatı*, 1000-1100, 4). Only the Orthodox and the Armenian churches and the Jewish rabbinate were officially recognized. The only Roman Catholic group within the walls were those families brought from Kaffa in 880/1475 (numbering, with the Armenians, 267), who were granted the churches of St. Nicholas and St. Mary at Edirne Kapîsl. Over the years they dispersed or moved to Ghašâta, and the churches were converted to mosques, to be called Kefeli Đâmići (in 1038/1629) and Odâlar Đâmići (in 1050/1640) respectively (Belin, *op. cit.*, 112-19). Thereafter Catholic churches were found only in Ghašâta, protected by the Capitulations, and "Franks" were permitted to live only in Ghašâta: when some of them set up in business as doctors and drapers at Baghâne Kapî and on Divâné Yolu in the early 19th century, the sultan ordered their premises to be closed (*Medjelle*, i, 649).

The areas particularly inhabited by Greeks and Armenians were the Marmara coast of the city, the Feurer-Balat district, and the Rûmeli side of the Dôosphorus. Non-Muslims usually formed distinct mahâles, each with its own church or synagogue; Muslims were reluctant to allow non-Muslims to settle among them, finding it repugnant to have to observe their practices (see A. Refik, *İstanbul hayatı*, 1553-1591, 46, 48, 50, 52; 1000-1100, 29; 1100-1200, 10, 88).

Occasionally popular feeling among the Muslim populace would show that it wanted Istanbul to be an exclusively Muslim city, and the sultans were obliged to enforce the various regulations and restrictions imposed on dhimmis (distinctive dress: see Djewdet, vii, 277; *Međjelle*, i, 502; A. Refik, *İstanbul hayatı*, 1593-91, 47, 51; 1000-1100, 20, 53; 1100-1249, 182; not to ride horses or employ slaves: *İdem.*, 1553-91, 43, 50; demolition of churches improperly built: *İdem.*, 1553-91, 44, 45; 1100-1200, 81, 139; not to sell wine: *İdem.*, 900-1000, 49). Mistrust of and hostility to non-Muslims was brought to the surface by various incidents: the question of the occupation of mîrî houses under Mehmedm II (İnalcık, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 240-9), fear of an attack by a Christian fleet (in 941/1537, 979/1571, 1066/1655), Austrian and Russian attacks after 1094/1683, and the Greek revolt of 1821. Such tensions, together with fires and the building of mosques near non-Muslim mahâles, encouraged non-Muslims to move away and settle in the outlying mahâles along the Marmara Coast and the Golden Horn and near the walls (A. Refik, 1000-1100, 53-4).

On the other hand, Muslims and non-Muslim tradesmen and artisans, whose activities were controlled by the same kiswa regulations, worked side by side in the bazaars; protection of non-Muslims was in the financial interest of the treasury and of the state dignitaries; and above all, the authorities appreciated their obligation to observe the tolerance prescribed by Islam. The government would therefore intervene to prevent attacks on non-Muslims by medresê-students, *adžemi-oghânîları* or the mob (Derschwan, 116; Charrière, iii, 262; A. Refik, *Rafî fidîn*, in *Edeb. Fak. Médj.*, ix/2, doc. 11). The non-Muslims, particularly the Armenians from Anatolia, were strongly influenced by Turkish culture. Although each community used its own language, the common language of Istanbul was Turkish. For motives of political or social prestige non-Muslims would try to live and dress like Turks. Conversely, however, the Turkish of Istanbul and its folklore were influenced by the minorities (see W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, Oxford 1929; M. Halit Bayrî, *İstanbul Folklore*, repr. Istanbul 1972; *İdem.*, *Halk âdetleri ve inançları*, Istanbul 1940; R. E. Koç, *İstanbul Antiiklopedisi*, passim).

The Greek Orthodox, the Armenians and the Jews
were regarded as separate millets or tdöves, under the authority of the Greek patriarch, the Armenian patriarch and the chief rabbi respectively, and enjoyed autonomy in their internal affairs [see MILLET; PATRIARCH]. The Greek patriarch and the Rüm milleti ruovesi took precedence over the two other groups of dignitaries (A. Refik, 1100-1200, 28). The three religious leaders were elected by their communities but their authority derived from their berdis (which had to be obtained, by payment of a "pishkesh") granted by the sultan. The community could petition the sultan to dismiss its leader (C. Orhunlu, Telshiler, Istanbul 1970, 161) and the leader could ask the sultan to give effect to his commands (for the Greek patriarchate, see S. Runciman, The Great Church in captivity, Cambridge 1968; Rüm Patrikligi nissamati, in Duklar, i, 902-38).

Until the 12th/18th century there were some 40 Greek churches in Istanbul, only three of which had existed before the conquest (listed in Schneider, Byzanz, 38-49). When the question was raised how it was possible for these churches to exist in a city taken by force, the fiction of a willing surrender was accepted to legalize the situation (see Inalcik, in Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 233; Runciman, 153, 157, 199, 204; for the Jews, see A. Refik, 1100-1200, 13). The patriarchate was obliged to make itself responsible for various civil matters relating to the Greeks of the city, and its duties increased as the treasury resorted more and more to the collection of taxes from the community en bloc (matba}). The patriarchate's bureaucracy therefore became increasingly influential (for the influence of the Logothete, see A. Refik, 1100-1200, 13).

Economically the Greeks were far better off than they had been in the last decades of the Byzantine Empire (Jorga, Byzance aprs Byzance, repr. Bucharest 1971; T. Stoianovich, op. cit.; The Greek Merchant Marine, 1453-1850, ed. S. A. Papadopoulos, Athens 1972; A. E. Vacalopoulos, Origins of the Greek Nation, 1970-72; Inalcik, in Isi., xiii, 153-5), and were satisfied with their lot (Runciman, pp. 180, 394). They held an important share of the islasim contracts, they had supplanted the Italians in maritime trade in the Black Sea and the Aegean, and they controlled a large part of the city's food trade. In Fener, the new seat of the patriarchate, there grew up a genuine Greek aristocracy of eleven families made rich by trade and by islasim-contracts, who claimed descent from the great families of the Byzantine Empire; they increased their power and influence by supplying the sultans with personal physicians and commercial agents and by filling the posts of Chief Interpreter of the Divan and of the Fleet in the 11th/17th century; and from them later the hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia were chosen (Jorga, op. cit., 226-47; J. Gottwald, Phanariotische Studien, in Leipziger Vierteljahrschr.: Sudosteuropa, v (1941), 1-58). In the census of 1833 the Rüm millet numbered 50,343 males in Greater Istanbul.

A group of Orthodox Christians deported from Kastoria, a Turkish-speaking and ignorant of Greek (Derschwam, 52), were under the authority of the Greek patriarch but preserved the character of a separate djemadist. In the middle of the 10th/16th century they were settled near Yedikule, but a century or more later Eremya Celebi reported them as living at Narlikapi, inside and outside the city wall. They were skilled goldsmiths and embroiderers, and were rich (N. de Nicolay, Navigations ... Anvers 1577, 239).

The Armenians first elected a patriarch, on the sultan's orders, in 1461. He made his residence the Church of Surp Kevork (Salumanastri); F. Babin, Ein Besitzstreit um Salum Manastir, ... , in Festschrift fur Jan Rypha, Prague 1956, 29-37) at Samatya, where the most important Armenian community then dwelt (and where later Eremya Celihi (p. 3) mentions over a thousand Armenian families living alongside Greeks). In the 11th/17th century the Armenians were most numerous at Kunukkap, and in 1571/1641 the seat of the patriarchate was transferred here, to the Church of Surp Asudazdadin (H. Andreasyan, notes to Eremya Celebi, pp. 87-90). The Armenians were concentrated particularly at Yeilikkap, Kumkap, Balat and Topkap. Many of the Armenian families of Galata had been settled there since Genoese times. There were Armenians living among Jews at Beshiktash, Kuruçeşme and Ortaköy (Eremya Celebi, 43-52). In the 11th/17th century the Armenians controlled the silk trade between Persia, Turkey and Italy (see Harir, 214), and many of them made fortunes from islasim-contracts and banking (V. Çark, Türk DEVLETI HISMETINDE ERMANLilar, Istanbul 1953). From the early 19th century they ran the mint and came to control the state finances (see Djewdet, xi, 28: White, iii, 188, 287). Attempts by the banking families to control the patriarchate and the Armenian tradesfolk led to serious dissensions in the community (H. D. P.CH. CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY, London 1854, 131-2). Earlier, the activity of Catholic missionaries had aroused dissensions, which prompted vigorous action by the Porte after 1696/1108 (A. Refik, Istanbul hayat, 1100-1200, 21, 32, 35, 160; Djewdet, ii, 93; xi, 8, 34); yet later a Catholic (Uniate) community was established composed particularly of the wealthier and educated Armenians: according to the census of 1826 (Lutfi, 275) they numbered about a thousand (L. Arpee, The Armenian awakening ... 1820-1860, Chicago 1909). In the census of 1833 the Armenian millet in Greater Istanbul numbered 48,099 males.

The Jews of Istanbul, numbering 1647 households at the end of the reign of Mehmed II (see above), consisted of the following main groups: those that had survived the conquest; Karaites brought from Edirne and the Sea of Azov area; and from them later the Karaites and Karaite communities later brought, usually by force, from various towns of Anatolia and Rμneli where they had been living, known as Ronaniotics, since Byzantine times (see Ankori, Karaites in Byzanium, New York 1959, 140); the djissya registers for the nahufs of Mehmed II (Başvekâlet Arşivi, Tapu defteri no. 240 and no. 210) give the numbers and original homes of each. It seems that Mehmed II granted aman to the Jews living in Istanbul at the conquest (see Ankori, op. cit., 59-64) and left them in their homes (for an alleged agreement, see Schneider, in Belleten, xvi, 61, 40; Heyd, p. 305; A. Refik, 1100-1200, 11). A djiysya-register (Tapu defteri no. 240, 10) notes them as numbering 116 families. As a result of Rabbi Isaac Sarfati's letter urging the Jews of Europe to settle in Ottoman territory, some families migrated from Germany, Austria and Hungary (H. Graetz, Gesch. der Juden, Leipzig 1881, viii, 214; Heyd, 300), but the register just cited notes the djomāl-the Eshinas-i Alaman as numbering only 26 families. By 894/1489 the number of Jewish households had risen to a total of 2027.

Jews settling in Istanbul were organized in djomāl, each with its own synagogue, as a spiritual and administrative unit (A. Galanleti, i, 75, 99-101). In the middle of the 10th/16th century there were 40-44 synagogues and djomāl (Heyd, 393;
Dernschwam, 107-11 [42 schools, and further important details; total Jewish population, 15,035]). In 959/1552 the Marranos settled in Istanbul under the sultan’s protection, and the Marrano banking family of Mendès acquired a dominant position in the state finances and in commerce with Europe (see Inakik, Capital formation, JEH, xxix, 121-3; S. Schwarzhuchs, Annales, xii, 1957, 112-18). Jews from Spain and Italy brought various new techniques with them (Ramberti, 241; Villalon, 116; Dernschwam, 111).

The Romanioi, Sephardic and Karaites communities retained their separate identities until the 11th/17th century; but as a result of the changes of residence caused by the fires of 1043/1633 and 1071/1660 the communities became mixed (Hediy, 313) and finally there was only a single community; the Sephardim, being economically much the strongest, assumed responsibility first for the Ashkenazim and then for the Romanioi. Already in 990/1582 the three communities made a joint application to the sultan to open a new cemetery at Khaşköy (A. Refik, 53). The Jews of Khaşköy became very numerous (Evliya Celebi, i, 413). In 1044/1634 there were in Istanbul 1255 Jewish sivrâd-khânesi (Aktepe, 110) and at the end of that century 3000 Jews paying ginya (for their makâsîl, see Hediy, 309-12).

When construction of the Valide Dâmiî was begun (925/1519), the Jews of Eminönü (about 100 houses, see Ereneya Celebi, p. 164) were transferred to Khaşköy (Evliya Celebi, i, 413-4). In 1139/1727 Jews living outside the Balk wall pazarı gate near the mosque were ordered to sell their properties to Muslims and move to other Jewish makâsîl (A. Refik, 1100-1200 88-9). Khaşköy became hereafter the main residential centre for the Jews of Istanbul (Galante, 54). In the 19th century the Jews were estimated to number 39,000, in 12,000 households (White, ii, 230; official figures in 1833, 1,413 males; cf. L. A. Frankl, Nach Jerusalem, Leipzig 1858-60, 194-5, whose estimates are supported by the 1927 census figure of 39,199).

Individual conversions to Islam were frequent, new converts being particularly zealous to promote conversion (Villalon, 72; Dernschwam, 111). The Divân suspended funds (4,100,000, or 12,800) to provide the converts with new clothes, and he was parted on horseback through the streets. But the principle of abstaining from forced conversion was carefully observed, and the authorities appear to have taken little interest in promoting conversions. One example of a mass conversion is that of the Armenian gypsies at Topkapî (Ereneya Celebi, 23). Muslim men often married non-Muslim wives (this was regarded as commendable), and this led to much conversion. Slaves usually embraced Islam. Not only were there, as a result of the ghulâm [q.v.] system, numerous slaves in the palace and in the houses of great men; anyone of any means owned one or several slaves for various domestic duties. To own slaves was a profitable investment: slaves or freedmen (âdâliâ, ââli, mu’tâb) were used also as commercial agents or as an industrial work-force, and were often hired out. The principle of muktaâb [q.v.] was common. For the treatment of slaves see esp. Villalon, 56 f.; Dernschwam, 121, 129, 140-2, 161).

(c) The tâskeri class.

Since they paid no taxes, the personnel of the palace and the kapîl-kulu troops do not figure in the various registers providing statistics for the population of Istanbul; but in numbers and in view of their duties, they played an important part in the life of the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Palace personnel</th>
<th>Kapîl Kulu Fleet and Total troops</th>
<th>Arsenal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>880/1475(5)</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920/1514(4)</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>16,643</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933/1520(5)</td>
<td>11,457</td>
<td>12,689</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018/1609(5)</td>
<td>12,971</td>
<td>77,523</td>
<td>2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080/1670(6)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090/1679(6)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: (1) Iacopo de Promontorio-de Campis, ed. Babiner, Munich 1957, 48; (2) Barkan, IMF, xv, 312; (3) Barkan, IMF, xv, 300; (4) Aynil Ali,İstâda, Istanbul 1280, 82-98; (5) Barkan, IMF xvii, 216, 227.)

The above figures show that the number of kapîl-kulu increased in the century after 920/1514 by about five times: this increase was mainly in the members of the Janissaries, and occurred particularly between 1001/1593 and 1015/1606 with the demand for infantrymen (see CH Isl., i, 344-50); only 15,000 Janissaries took part in the campaign of 1006/1597, but there were 37,000 Janissaries by 1018/1609. Some of the Janissaries lived in Istanbul, some were stationed in provincial towns and on the frontiers, of 49,500 Janissaries, 20,468 were in Istanbul in 1076/1665 and 37,094 in 1080/1669 (IMF, xvii, 216). The Köprülus attempted to reduce their number, so that in 1083/1672 the Janissaries numbered only 18,000, and the total kapîl-kulu force only 34,825 (Silâdbâr, l, 499, 580). In the 12th/18th century, the Janissaries numbered 40,000, but it was estimated that throughout the empire 160,000 men were, or claimed to be, Janissaries (the distinction must be borne in mind, for many individuals who entered the corps to obtain its privileges were not effective troops). Conversely, as early as the reign of Mehmed II some Janissaries had been absorbed in the general population as tradesmen and artisans, and the numbers of these increased, for with depreciation a Janissary’s daily pay, never more than eight akçes, became practically worthless, so that more and more of them became esnâf. At the end of the 10th/16th century the authorities had great difficulty in mobilizing these “trading” Janissaries for service (Selaniki, passim; Orhonlu, Teltäsker, docs. 15, 19). In the 11th/17th century, with the open encounter in Istanbul (as elsewhere) many individuals called “Janissary” (râdžî, bekhe or “sipâhi” (djûndî) who are in fact very wealthy and influential. The penetration of Janissaries and other kapîl-kulu into the economic life of the city was to have important effects, especially since they regarded themselves as outside the kısba jurisdiction.

Janissaries were widely used to supply the “police” forces of the city, with the duties of maintaining order and of providing guards in the markets, at the quays and in other public places, and this authority enabled them to impose various illegal exactions and even sometimes attempt to corner a commodity; the lives and property of non-Muslims were in effect at their mercy. During the ever more frequent Janissary mutinies after 1600 the city was in complete anarchy with the populace terrified, the shops shut, and the military mutinies after 1600 the city was in complete anarchy (see Porter, Observations, p. xxviii).

The ademî-ogluânlar [q.v.] also had a significant place in Istanbul social life. Those in the Istanbul barracks numbered at first 3000 (Usuncârphih, Kapîl-kulu ocakları, i, 793), 7000 in 1555 (Dernschwam, 65).
They were an important labour force, employed in public works (Barkan, L’organisation du travail..., Annales, xvii, 1094; A. Belki, in Edib. Fak. Mejdum. v/1, 6-10, 12) and in the sultan’s gardens (Dernschwam, 64-5). Their daily pay was very small (1/2-2 aktal in 1555). Since they enjoyed the immunities of the sultan’s slaves, they were a turbulent element in the population, over-bearing and always ready to make trouble.

Practically the whole palace and kaplhulu establishment accompanied the sultan on campaign. At such a time, the life of the markets was completely disorganized: prices rose, commodities were cornered and shortages appeared (Selanlik, Ms.). Janissaries engaged in trade were obliged to close their businesses; a proportion of the members of various guilds were conscripted to accompany the army as orduidji (Medjelle, i, 619-620); so that a fair proportion of the townsfolk too left the city. This, of course, occurred practically every year until the reign of Selim II; and the consequent disruption was one of the reasons why the statesmen became reluctant that the sultan should campaign in person (cf., for 1570, Hill, iii, 892; for 1596, Selanlik, Ms.).

(d) Epidemics.

Just as fires repeatedly destroyed habitations, so too great numbers of the inhabitants were frequently carried off by epidemics — plague, cholera and smallpox. In the plague of 871/1466, 600 people died each day, and many fled the city for good: “the City was emptied of its inhabitants” (Critoboulos, tr. Riggs, 220-2), and four years later plague again put a halt to trade (W. Heyd, Hist. du commerce du Levant, ii, 341). Later serious epidemics occurred in 917/1511, 922/1526, 969/1561, 992/1584, 994/1586 (see C. de Villal6n, Viaje de Turquia, 1660, 1013), 1063/1653, 1084/1673 (Galland, ii, 178), 1096/1786, 1179/1765 (H. Grenville, Observations, ed. S. Ehrenkreutz, Ann Arbor 1965, 74, 106, 1207/1792 (Djweted, x, 94), 1812 (Andreossy, 178-84), 1817 (Memoire de Mrs. Elisabeth S. Dwight, New York 1840), 1845-7 (M. P. Verrolet, Du cholera-morbus en 1845, 1846 et 1847, Constantinople 1848), and 1865 (H. Leach, Brief notes..., London 1866). These outbreaks lasted for months and sometimes, becoming endemic, for years, giving rise to thousands of deaths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Muslins</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1245/1829</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245/1830</td>
<td>5,255</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Notes: (1) See above, p. 238; (2) Barkan, Belgeler, i, 39; 447 mixed Jewish and Christian khânes are included in the total for Christians; (3) Barkan’s estimate in JESHO, i, 20; (4) Topkapı Sarayı Archives no. 4007, suburbs included; (5) Mantran, Istanbul, 46-7: a further 14,653 persons are exempt; (6) L:lffli, i, 279; (7) L:ffli, ii, 62; (8) Topkapı Sarayı Archives no. 750; (9) Istanbul rehberi, 1934, 163, foreigners excluded; (10) the first census.)
While therefore the increase in the population of Greater Istanbul is proportional to that in the whole country, the increase for Istanbul intra muros is relatively less.

Bibliography: A. Ottoman Documents. (i) Documents relating to waqfs. 1. Wafikyyas. Published: facsimile of the original wafikyya for Eyyub, dated 861/1457, in Fäidh Mehmed II vakfiyesi, publ. by Vakîflar Genel Müdürülüğü, Ankara 1938, 326-40; for Kaledir ankâhine (Church of Akâalepte), in Zwei Stiftungsurkunden des Sultans Mehmet II. Fatih, ed. T. Öz, Istanbul 1935, 1*.-15*. Individual wafikyyas such as these were all combined in a single wafikyya after the completion of the mosque and complex of Mehemmed II. The oldest copy of this, in Arabic, originally preserved in the türbe of Mehemmed II, is now in the Türk-İslâm Eserleri Müzesi (old no. 1872, new no. 667); it belongs to 877/1472 or 878/1473, and has been published in (poor) facsimile in O. N. Ergin, Fâidh Imameti vakfiyesi, Istanbul 1945, 1-68. Later in the reign a new comprehensive wafikyya was drawn up, and an official copy (tugra of Bâyезд II) has survived; facsimile in Zwei Stiftungsurkunden ... pp. 1-149. In the mid 10th/16th century (see Ergin, op. cit., 29-34) this wafikyya was translated into Turkish (with some rearrangement and estimation of the income of the properties that supported a wakf). The oldest known is the Dibât yet register for Ayasofya of 895/1489 (Başvâkî let Arşivi, Mileyîden müdevver no. 19, 56 ff., in Arabic; some of the leaves out of order; drawn up by the hâdis Yusuf b. Qhall); a similar register had existed, drawn up in 874/1469. A similar detailed register was drawn up by Mehmed b. 'Ali al-Feniî, hâdis of Edirne, in 926/1519 (Belediye Libr., Ms Cevdet O 64, 444 ff.). Registers for all the waqfs of Mehemmed II in Istanbul: Başvâkî let Arşivi, Tapu defteri no. 210 (947/1540) and no. 240 (952/1545).

2. Registers of inspection (leftifât) and rents (dâbiyet). These registers, drawn up to record the income of waqfs and to be used by rent-collectors (dâbi), are of great importance as detailing the properties that supported a waqf. The oldest known is the Dibât yet register for Ayasofya of 895/1489 (Başvâkî let Arşivi, Mileyîden müdevver no. 19, 56 ff., in Arabic; some of the leaves out of order; drawn up by the hâdis Yusuf b. Qhall); a similar register had existed, drawn up in 874/1469. A similar detailed register was drawn up by Mehmed b. 'Ali al-Feniî, hâdis of Edirne, in 926/1519 (Belediye Libr., Ms Cevdet O 64, 444 ff.). Registers for all the waqfs of Mehemmed II in Istanbul: Başvâkî let Arşivi, Tapu defteri no. 210 (947/1540) and no. 240 (952/1545). Other similar registers refer to the waqfs of ordinary citizens. The most important of these (Başvâkî let Arşivi, Tapu defteri no. 251) has been published: Istanbul vakîflar Tahrir defteri, 953 (1546) tarihî, ed. Ö. L. Barkan and E. H. Ayverdi, Istanbul 1970. Two similar, unpublished, registers are: Başvâkî let Arşivi, Tapu defteri 670, drawn up by Hasan b. Yusuf between 986/1578 and 988/1580, and Tapu ve Kadastro Umum Müdürlüğü, Ankara, Eski Kayitlar nos. 542 and 543, drawn up after 1005/1596.

Registers of annual accounts also survive. The summary balances (içâmîdî) for the mosques of Fâidh and Ayasofya for the years 894/1491-895/1492 have been published by Ö. L. Barkan (IFM, xxii (1962-3), 342-79; see also, idem, Sûleymânîye Camii ve imareti tâskârînin ait yûslu bir muhasabe bildirînâ, 993/1584, in Vakîflar Dergisi, ix, 109-62.)
are of three main types: 1. regulations, lists of fixed prices; 2. registers of rüşûm-i ihtisâyîye; 3. registers of guildsmen made for various purposes.

talîn Institüt, Ms. 1954). Firmans relating to tîhsâb are preserved in records of daily business (see (iii) below) and price regulations (nârâkî) in kâdisî registers; for examples of the latter, see O. Nûrî Ergin, Meşelî-i Umûr-i Belediyye, Istanbul 1922. 2. These registers list the tradespeople of Istanbul in 15 sectors, giving for each the location of his business, his trade, the owner's name and the amount of tax payable. They give similar information regarding the ships importing provisions are found in later codes (Atîr Ef. Libr., det B 2 (of 1092/1681), B 10 and B 23; Basvekâlet Arşivi, Malîyeyen müdevver nos. 514 and 526. Partial publication of such a document by R. Man-
tran, in Mélanges Louis Massignon, Damascus 1957, iii, 127-49; see also Nihat Göl, 1763 tarihli esnaf tazir defteri göre, Istanbul University, Edebiat Fakültesi, tesi. 701. 3. Register of the watermen (kayıkçılar): Belediye Libr., Ms. Cevdet B 8; of the bakers: Topkapı Arşivi, D 958.

(iii) Numerous documents relating to Istanbul are to be found dispersed in various collections in the Ottoman archives. As examples only, the following may be cited: 1. Mühimme Defterleri. Many documents in this series have been published by Ahmet Refik [Altunay], in the series Hicri Omundu aşrada Istanbul kaydâs, 961-1000, Istanbul 1933 (2nd ed., Istanbul 1953): 1100-1200, Istanbul 1931; 1100-1200, Istanbul 1930: 1200-1225, Istanbul 1932. Many documents from the Mühimme registers are given in Ergin's Meşelî, i.

2. Malîye akhâm defterleri. Nos. 2775 and 9824 in the Malîyeyen müdevver series are especially important for Istanbul.


4. Registers of the kâdisî. Most of the registers of the kâdisî of Istanbul, Ghalata and Uskûdar are lost, but some important examples survive in the archives of the Istanbul Müftûlûgû and of Topkapı Sarayı. Some docs. published by Ergin, in Meşelî, i.

5. Muḥâda'ar registers (recording the income of the State Treasury). For an important example from the reign of Mehmed II, see JESHO, iii (1960), 132. Customs registers: Basvekâlet Arşivi, Malîye no. 312 (of 992/1585), no. 5227 (of 1098/ 
1689), no. 3129 (of 1102/1690), no. 918 (of 1108/ 
1696), no. 5164 (of 1133/1723); no. 2996 (of 1206/ 
1791); also Kâmil Recep tefsir nos. 4241-4368, 5207-66.

The Muḥâdbâ'ar idâmî defterleri (the oldest is Belediye Libr., Ms. Cevdet O 91) record the expenses for official institutions in Istanbul.

The affairs of Istanbul fell within the purview of the Şâhîk-i Sânî Defterdâr, so that documents emanating from his various offices, especially the Istanbul muḥâbah'asî salâmî, are of importance.

The most important assemblage of individual documents is that made by Cevdet, under the heads Belediye, İktisat, Şehriyeye, Saray, Zaptiye and Maarif (see M. Sertoğlu, Mütevâlî bahkamsından Başvekâlet Arşivi, Istanbul 1955, p. 71).

Further sources for the later history of Istanbul are the official yearbooks (sâhinâmî) and various publications of the municipal authorities (Belediyye), e.g., Sâhinâmî series, 1847-1918 (see A.A, art. Sâhinâmî); Istanbul Belediyesi inciyyât-ı meşelî, 1328-1335; i. B. Belediyya's, 1930-7; Istanbul Şehri istatistik yılığı, 1930-34; Belediye yılığı, Ankara 1949 (pp. 341-69 relating to Istanbul).

B. Ottoman narrative and descriptive sources.


— C. General works.

K. M. Bazili, Očerni Konstantinopol', Sofia 1933; Besim Darkot, Kuyûdî-i ahkâm al-shikîyâtî, Istanbul 1916; Peter Fors, Grossenvor, Constantinopol 2 vols., London 1895; E. Oberhummer, Constantinopolis, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyc. des Class. Altertums, vii (Stuttgart 1900), 963-1023 (important); W. Kubitschek, Byzantium, in Pauly-Wissowa, v, 1115-58; Djelal Essad, Constantinople, de Byzance à Stamboul, Paris 1909; Robert Mayer, Byzantium, Konstantinopolis, Istanbul, eine genesistische Stadtgeographie (important); Akad. der Wiss., Wien, phil.-hist. Kl., Denkschriften 71 Bd., 3 Abhandlung, Vienna and Leipzig 1942 (Bibliography 267-90); A. H. Lybyer, Constantinople as capital of the Ottoman Empire, in Annual Report of the American Hist. Assoc., 1916; B. Lewis, Istanbul and the civilization of the Ottoman Empire, Norman, Okla-
homa, 1963, 1972; R. Mantran, Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIe siècle, Paris 1962 (Biblio-
ography 629-90); idem, La vie quotidienne à Con-
ischen Entwicklung, in Orisinenbücherei, Heft 4, 1915; Muhîîn Efthim, Der Hafen von Stambul und seine Organisation, Leipzig 1929; E. Oberhummer, Aufgaben der Stadtgeographie von Istanbul, in Festschrift A. Schirchhoff, Sofia 1933; R. Busch-
Zantner, Zur Kenntnis der osmanischen Städte, in Geographische Zeitschrift, No. 38, 1932, 1-13; Doğan Kuban, İstanbul'un tardir yazısı, in Mi-
marlık, 705/1790; Mehmed Ziya, İstanbul ve Boghazicî, 2 vols., Istanbul 1336; Mehmed RA'M, Mürdî-i Istanbul, Istanbul 1324 (unpublished second volume in Turkish Hist. Soc., Ankara, especially important for inscriptions); O. N. Ergin, Istanbul'da imar ve iskân harekâtleri, Istanbul 1938; idem, Meşelî-i umûr-i Belediyye, Istanbul 1922; idem, Cumhuriyet ve İstanbul Mahallî İdaresi, Istanbul 1938; idem, Türk şehirlerinde iimaret sistemi, Istanbul 1939; idem, Türkiye'de şehir-
ciliğin iimaret inşaâtı, Istanbul 1936; Refik Ahmed [Sevenigli], Istanbul nasi eglénıyordu?, Istanbul


— F. Ottoman Period: topography and monuments. Huseyn Avânsarayî, Îshârâ'î al-nâserî, Istanbul 1938; ii, 228; abstract published as Zamaninda Topkapi Sarayı, Istanbul 1938; R. M. Meric, Hümâînname minyaturleri (Ms. Hazine 1523) of about 988/1580 is re-published in colour in Hümâûnname minyaturleri ve sanatçuları, Istanbul 1969, 37; 18th century plan in Hâşili Khalifa, Fikrînâmât, ed. Ibrahim
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Müteferrika, Istanbul 1145; for the plan of Istanbul in some Ms. of Piri Re'is's Kitâb-i Bahriyye, see Oberhummer, Suleiman, Tafel xxii.

Plans of the aqueduct and water-installations are found in: Chester Beatty Library Ms. 414 (Süleymânamesi), fols. 228b-23a; Topkapı Sarayi Library, Ms. Hazine 1016, 1815 and 1816; K. O. Dalman, Der Valens-Aquädukt, Tafel 13-17; Faith Library, Ms. Ali Emin 1282. See also S. Öner, Fâtih'in oglu İlyas'ın ev-i hüsnu kurtlarası dolayısında 140 seni once İstanbul, Istanbul 1945.
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Mosque of Sultan Ahmed and Hippodrome.
Süleymâniyye mosque with the medreses.

View of Rumeli Hisarı on the Bosphorus.
Interior of the mosque of Rüstem Pasha. (Photographs by courtesy of the Turkish Ministry of Tourism and Press)
Sałam Muh. Hārūn, Cairo 1367/1948, iv, 55 [but cf. i, 153]; idem, al-*Hayawan, ed. Hārūn, iii, 58-9; and the saying by 'Attābī (d. beginning of third/ninth cent.) reported in Marzubānī, al-*Mawādakhākh, Cairo 1343/1923, 271). In the sense of “metaphor” it is reported to have been common already with such early philologists as Abū 'Amr b. al-ʿAẓīl (d. around 154/770) (see Hātimī, Ḥūṣayt al-muḥādūhā, Ms Fes, Karawiyyīn, 2934, f. 4b; Bākīlīnī, ʿAṣīrā, ed. ʿAlī, Cairo 1374/1954, 108 [= G.E. von Grundhöfen, A 4th century document ..., Chicago 1950, 77]; Ibn Ṣahlīkhī, al-*Umda, Cairo 1353/1954, i, 239). Hāmmād (d. 155/772 or 156/773), Abū ʿUbayda (d. 209/824-5), and ʿAṣmāʾī (d. 213/828) (see ʿIṣāʾī, 108), but since ʿAṣmāʾī is also said to have used the term mauthal in speaking of the metaphor (see al-Muḥaddasīyāt, 855, l. 13) it may be suggested that the term istīʿārā was substituted in later versions of these reports for some other expression. However that may be, it appears already in what is probably the first systematic treatise on poetics in Arabic, the Kāwūd al-ghīr (ed. Raḍāmān ʿAbd al-Tawwāb, Cairo 1966, 75-60) of Ṣaḥlab (Ṣaḥlab lived from 200/815 till 291/904; there is no date of composition of the treatise is unknown and there is a question about Ṣaḥlab's authorship) and there defined as “to borrow for something the name of something else or [to attribute to it a characteristic that is its own] (as yuṣṭaʿfar ʿl-li-ʿl-shārī ʾīsmu ṣuḥayrīkaw maʾnaṣ al-waṣīdū). The definitions offered by Ibn Kūṭayba (d. 276/890) in his Taʿwīl muḥākī al-ʿUrank (ed. Aḥmad ʿAbū Ṣalāḥ, Cairo 1373/1954, 102) and by Ibn al-Muṭṭazz (wrote 274/887) in his K. al-Baḍāʾ (ed. Kratchkovsky, London 1935, 43) are hardly more precise. In fact the two last authors quote examples which later critics would have qualified as “trope” (maḥāzī), “simile” (taṣḥīḥī), or “metonymy” (kāʿa), though the majority of the examples would also be istīʿārās according to later definitions of the term and are often repeated in later handbooks. The same is true of Kūdāmā b. Dīʿafār (d. after 320/932) who, moreover, in his Naḥd al-ghīr (ed. Bonebakker, Leiden 1956) gives examples of the metaphor under the headings tamṭil (pp. 90-2) and istīʿārā (pp. 104-5) without making sufficiently clear how the two figures are related. He sees the acceptable istīʿārā as a simile and that of the use of a figurative expression (mathal) to convey the idea the poet has in mind (see also the definitions and examples in the Diwāḥīr al-alaẓāf, Cairo 1351/1932, 5-7, attributed to Kūdāmā). The metaphor is originated from the proverb of the poet Iμrūʾiʾ b. ʿAbbād, “shackles upon the legs of wild animals”, for a horse that overtaxes wild animals in chase is quoted (p. 88) in Kūdāmā's chapter on the “metonymy” (irḍāf). The same confusion exists between the chapters on istīʿārā and muḥāṭāla (= tamṭil) in the K. al-Ṣināḍātayn, Cairo 1371/1952, 268-306, 353-6) of Ābū Ḥiliāl al-ʾAṣkārī (d. after 395/1004). Ābū Ḥiliāl, however, offers a more detailed explanation of the mechanism of the metaphor pointing out frequently, especially in examples taken from the ʿUrank, how the metaphor expression is related to the concept the author wishes to put into words and why the metaphor is more effective than the conventional expression. His discussion of ʿUrankic metaphors closely resembles that of his contemporary, Rummānī (d. 384/994), in his K. al-Nuḥat fi ʿaṣīrā al-ʿUrank (ed. Muḥ. Ḥakīf Allāḥ and Muḥ. Zahrālīl Ṣaḥām in Ṣaḥām al-Ṣalām, Cairo n.d. 79-87), though Rummānī's formulations are somewhat more accurate. Both authors also indicate that the metaphor makes it possible to illustrate abstract concepts with concrete analogies and insist that a metaphor is acceptable only if it is more striking than the conventional expression. This last question is also the subject of a discussion by Hātimī (d. 388/998) who in his al-Risālah al-maʿṣūbah fi ḍhīrī sarībāt Abī ʿl-Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbī... (ed. Muḥ. Yūsūf Naḍīm, Beirut 1385/1965, 69-73, 90-4) distinguishes three types of istīʿārā: The first type conforms to the above standard and consists of metaphors that can be justified. He calls this type the “elegant metaphor” (istikārā mustahkāṣa). The second is characterized by the use of terms applicable to animals instead of the corresponding terms in speaking of human beings, e.g., bāḥīr, “hoof”, for “foot”, misḥaf, “candles’ lip” for ʿaṣafī, “lip of a human”, etc. He calls this the “ungainly metaphor” (istikārā mustaghīṣa). The third type which he considers less ugly than the second consists of using terms applicable to human beings instead of terms specifically used for animals (cf. the discussion of terms belonging to the second type in Ibn Kūṭayba, Taʿwīl muḥākī al-ʿUrank, 116-7; the discussion of the term muʿṣāla in Kūdāmā, Naḥd, 103; Ibn Durayd, Dīmākhā, Haydarābahād 1344/1925, iii, 489b-91a; ʿAmīdī, al-Muwaṣṣalāna, i, 43-4: Ābū Ḥiliāl, K. al-Ṣināḍātayn, 301; and ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīf al-Dijrānjī's views on this type of expression below). In what appears to be a fourth category he mentions cases (like “my thoughts stumble [while reflecting] on your glory”) where the metaphor is “obscure and far fetched” (khāṣiya baʿdīa). Probably the first to distinguish carefully between the taṣḥīḥī and the istīʿārā is the latter and to formulate a close definition of the figure is ʿĀlī b. ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīf al-Dijrānjī (d. 392/1001). In a passage in his al-ʿAwāla (Cairo 1320/1951, 41) he makes clear that the line by Abī Nuwāṣ: “Love is a mount and you are its rider; turn its bridle and it will obey you” is not an istīʿārā, but a simile (taṣḥīḥī) or a proverbial saying (darb mauthal). In a proper istīʿārā the borrowed term (al-ism al-mustaʿār) completely replaces the proper term (al-asl). The istīʿārā, according to him, is “based on establishing a close similarity, on the existence of an affinity between the proper and the borrowed expression, on the blending of the [new] term with the concept [to which it is applied]”; etc. (m-mišlakī, ṣakhrābā ʿl-ṣaybakī wa-l-maʿṣūmah li-ʿl-mustāʿār mina wa-miṣṣādā ʿl-lafzi bi-ʿl-maʿnd, etc.; a different reading and interpretation in Ritter's translation of ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīf al-Dijrānjī's Asrār, 429; cf. also al-*Umda, i, 240). He condemns (pp. 429-33) the anthropomorphism in an istīʿārā by Mutanabbī: “Many schemes are found together in the mind, though one of these would be [large enough to] occupy the mind of [this time] and compares this with an istīʿārā by Ibn ʿAbīnā in which the wind is characterized as “having no constancy in its mind” (laysa li-ḥūbīkī ʿl-sābūr). In the second example the istīʿārā is based on the similarity between the wind blowing from different directions and the erratic behaviour of a person of unstable character. In the case of the first example no such similarity suggests itself to the hearer. The only way to make such istīʿārās to some degree acceptable is to think of the frequent occurrence of personalizations of the time or fate, or to assume an ellipse (“this time” for “the people living in this time”), though by expecting his audience to do so the poet goes beyond what is aesthetically or grammatically acceptable (the lacunae in the text should be completed from the quotations in Khsafājī, Sīr, 144 ff.; Khsafājī does not agree with ʿĀlī al-Dijrānjī's qualified acceptance of these and similar examples).
Ibn Rashik (d. 456/1063-4 or 463/1070-1) in his K. al-'Umda (Cairo 1353/1934, i, 239-50) shows himself familiar with the definition of 'All al-Djurđānī, but nevertheless draws no clear distinction between simile and metaphor in his examples, and, like his predecessors, fails to explain the exact relation between this last figure and the tamghī, though he classifies tamghī as a type of isti'dāra (p. 247; cf. however p. 245, l. 4-5, and on pp. 247 bottom and 249, l. 15 his observations on the absence of the comparative particle in both tamghī and isti'dāra). He prefers metaphors that can be easily understood, like “Daybreak carried away the Pleiades in its yellow (or white) cloak” for “Daybreak made the Pleiades fade away” in which, he says, the metaphor is based on a simile (the poet’s comparison of the bright cloak with the light of daybreak), to metaphors that are less easy to understand, like “The reins of the morning had come into the hands of the north wind” for “The north wind held sway over the morning” where the poet gives to the morning and to the north wind each an attribute that cannot be associated with it (mā taysa minhu wa-lā sīyaḥ). He does not accept the view of some “radical” (?) (muṣla'ākhī) theorists who prefer the second type of metaphor (which is based on personification and analogy) and consider the first type inferior because it is based on an (easily understandable) simile. He further illustrates this principle, but fails to analyse it properly, and also points out that the same kind of metaphor may be fitting in one context and ugly in another.

Khāfādji (d. 466/1073-4) in his Sīr al-Fāṣakha ( Cairo 1372/1953, 134-69) bases his discussion of the isti’dāra on Rumānī and ‘All al-Djurđānī. He does not, however, accept as isti’dāras sentences like, “She dropped pearls from narcissi”, etc. which he classifies as tāṣbikh. He does not offer an explanation. What he has in mind is perhaps that because asbalat, “she dropped”, in this context only allows us to take “pears” and “narcissi” as standing for “tears” and “eyes” a simile is forced upon the hearer and it becomes impossible to argue that the two words are not to be understood in their proper sense (but cf. Ibn al-Aṣḥāb, al-Mathal, i, 359). In ‘All the head is abāza and to “fire” (al-mustāṣ’ār lāḥā) is compared to “fire” as the notion from which it is derived (al-mustāṣ’ār minhu), but the fire is not mentioned, only one of its attributes, and there is good reason to qualify “to be ablaze” as a term used in an improper way (Sīr, 134-6). He prefers isti’dāras that are immediately apparent to the hearer to those that cannot be justified as based on intelligible similarities or are derived from expressions that are themselves metaphors. One may speak of “the eye of a flower” since there is an obvious similarity, but not of “the eye of faith that finds consolation”, since there is nothing in faith that could be compared to an eye. The metaphor in “the saddle feeds on (= takes away) the fat of the hump of the camel” is more obvious than that in “the horses and riding animals of passion have become unharnessed”, since the latter example derives from another, more common, metaphor: “He rode his passion and ran on its race track”. As usual the distinction between isti’dāra and tamghī is not clearly defined (see the examples on pp. 166 below and 167 above repeated as tamghī on p. 325).

The most important discussion of the isti’dāra is found in the Aṣrār al-balāgha (ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1954; German translation H. Ritter, Die Geheimnisse der Wortkunst des 'Abdalqāhir al-Curūnī, Wiesbaden 1959) of 'Abd al-Kāhār al-Djurđānī (d. 477/1082). In his Dala'il al-Iṣrā'īl (Cairo 1367/1947-8, 331-49) which, according to Ritter (see the Introd. to this ed. of the Aṣrār, 6) was probably written earlier than the Aṣrār, ‘Abd al-Kāhār takes his predecessors to task for defining the isti’dāra as a transfer (nabī) of terms. He argues that the isti’dāra is a claim (iddī‘a) that something is identical to something else. The very effect of the figure depends on this claim and consequently there is a transfer of a concept before there is a transfer of a term. In the Aṣrār, however, he describes the isti’dāra as generally speaking (fi 'l-djumla) the incidental use (nabī ghayr lāsim) of a term in a sense different from its original sense (i.e. the well-known sense supported by literary evidence), so that it appears like a loan ('āriya) (p. 29 = tr. p. 46; cf. p. 379-81 = tr. p. 441-3) and recognizes that his concept of the figure is essentially that of his predecessors among whom he mentions Āmīdī (d. 370/980) and ‘All al-Djurđānī (p. 298 = tr. p. 348, p. 368 = tr. p. 429, p. 370-1 = tr. p. 431-2). They differ from him in that they did not offer a detailed analysis of simile (tāṣbikh), analogy (tamghī), and metaphor (isti’dāra), and were content to offer a few examples of these figures without a proper definition. (p. 26-8 = tr. p. 43-5). For ‘Abd al-Kāhār the isti’dāra is one of various types of trope (istisdrā) inasmuch as there is always an association (mulahāqa) with the normal sense of the term (p. 325-6 = tr. p. 378-80, p. 365 = tr. 425-6). However, in the case of the isti’dāra there must exist some property common to the object to which the term is normally applied and to the object to which it is applied metaphorically. He draws attention to the etymology of the term isti’dāra as derived from 'āriya, “borrowed good”, “loan”. The owner’s claim to his property does not cease to exist, but the borrowed goods perform in the hands of the borrower the same function as in the hands of the owner (p. 372-3 = tr. pp. 434-5; cf. pp. 300-2 = tr. pp. 350-2). If one says: “I see a lion”, meaning a courageous man, what one has in his mind is to attribute to the man the most striking property of the lion, its courage; but if one uses the word yad, “hand”, in the sense of “favour” in “I have a humour” (lāhi 'indī yadun), one has no intention to describe a property of the hand. It becomes possible to argue that “favour” and not “hand” is the original meaning of the word yad, though upon closer examination one finds that there exists a reference to an activity originally involving the hand (cf. also p. 326 ff. = tr. p. 380 ff.). ‘Abd al-Kāhār makes a further distinction by pointing out that the isti’dāra is more striking than the conventional expression (and as such has an aesthetic function): When a poet uses the term ḍhafa, “lip” in speaking of the lip of a horse (gīhal) or the lip of a camel (mīṣṣār) there is only a free use of near synonyms or the use of a general instead of a specific term (p. 30-1 = tr. p. 48-9, p. 373-4 = tr. p. 434-5), but when he uses “horse’s lip” or “camel’s lip” in speaking of a human being one already has a borderline case, since one can easily imagine that what the poet is trying to say is that the man’s lips are thick or that he is as miserable as an animal (p. 34 ff. = tr. p. 52 ff.). ‘Abd al-Kāhār distinguishes three types of metaphors:

(a) metaphors based on a comparison of notions that show a close affinity and in any case belong to the same category: “flying” for “running”.

(b) metaphors based on a comparison of objects that share certain qualities: “sun” for “beautiful face”.

(c) metaphors based on a comparison of notions that share certain qualities: “beauty” for “beauty”. 

Theistārā
(c) metaphors based on a similarity that can only be understood intellectually, the metaphor consisting of (1) things sensually perceived for intellectual concepts: "light" for "convincing argument"); (2) things sensually perceived for other things sensually perceived though the similarity remains a matter of the intellect: “green plants on a dung-hill” for “beautiful women of evil character”, and (3) intellectual concepts for other intellectual concepts: “death” for “ignorance”, “meeting death” for “facing a serious crisis”. For metaphors based on abstract similarity, as well as for the various types of explicit similes that would correspond to them, he uses the term tamthil. The similarity can only be established by analysis (ta'awnun), since the metaphor or simile is not based on a common property (as in the comparison of a rose with a cheek), but on something conditioned by a property (it is as difficult to deny the existence of the sun as to deny the truth of a convincing argument).

In some cases there is “a similarity between two groups of objects in each of which there exists an inner relation between, not only a simple coordination of, various elements, a relation which can only be expressed in the form of a sentence” [or its equivalent (Asrdr, Introd., 14), and the tamthil is therefore closely related to the proverbial sentence (mutaḥal): “There is this in the bow-cutter’s (masūd) hand which has been entrusted to a competent person” (p. 94 = tr. p. 120). According to 'Abd al-Kahir such sentences owe their peculiar effect to the fact that the mind accepts a not so familiar concept more readily if the author can illustrate it with a situation with which it is thoroughly familiar, such as when one uses an old friend to introduce a newcomer (Asrdr, Introd., 15). In such sentences the terms themselves are, of course, used in their proper meaning, and hence it becomes possible to explain apparent anthropomorphisms in the Kur'an like “The whole earth is in the grip of his hand on the Day of Resurrection” (Kur'ān XXXIX, 67) as analogies for intellectual concepts (p. 331-2 = tr. p. 386-7; Introd., 11), though he warns against arbitrary explanations (p. 363-4 = tr. p. 422-4).

'Abd al-Kahir al-Djurđjan also examines the use of metaphors to create fantastic aetiologies such as are common in post-classical Arabic and Persian poetry. In “Be not surprised that his shirt is torn: He buttoned it in moonlight” the poet assumes that the hearer is that he does not accept as metaphors sentences based on the assumption that the hearer has already accepted that the subject of the poem is a special kind of moon, so that the poet can attribute to this moon some unusual qualities (p. 305 ff. = tr. p. 355 ff.; for a more detailed discussion of 'Abd al-

Kahir's theories see Asrdr, Introduction, from which some of the above definitions and translations have been taken).

The compendiums based on 'Abd al-Kahir al-Djurđjan, beginning with the Nihāyāt al-idāţa fi dīrāyat al-īdāţ (Cairo 1317/1899) of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (q.v. d. 606/1209) and the Miṣfāh al-Īlām (Cairo 1356/1937) of Sakkālī (q.v. d. 916/1282-9), together with the numerous commentaries on these compendiums, among them completely superseded the Daštāl al-īdāţ and the Asrār al-balāgha. In the Nihāya, which contains a useful summary of Djurđjan's ideas, Fakhr al-Dīn attempts to clarify the two opposing viewpoints expressed by Djurđjan on the character of the istišāra. After offering interesting arguments in favour of the theory outlined in the Daštāl he declares himself in favour of Djurđjan's later theory as presented in the Asrār. By calling a man a "lion" one attributes to him the lion's courage, not his physical qualities, which means that the word asad is used in a more restricted sense (p. 84-5; cf. Asrār, 379-81 = tr. 441-3). Hence the metaphor has to be considered a "trope of the language" (mutādās lughwā; cf. however Djurđjan's observations on the mutādās 'ālī, the "trope of the intellect" in the relation between a verb and its agent in Asrār, 342-5 = tr. 399-402, 4, for "The matter has been entrusted to a competent person") (p. 94 = tr. p. 120). According to 'Abd al-Kahir such sentences owe their peculiar effect to the fact that the mind accepts a not so familiar concept more readily if the author can illustrate it with a situation with which it is thoroughly familiar, such as when one uses an old friend to introduce a newcomer (Asrdr, Introd., 15). In such sentences the terms themselves are, of course, used in their proper meaning, and hence it becomes possible to explain apparent anthropomorphisms in the Kur'an like “The whole earth is in the grip of his hand on the Day of Resurrection” (Kur'ān XXXIX, 67) as analogies for intellectual concepts (p. 331-2 = tr. p. 386-7; Introd., 11), though he warns against arbitrary explanations (p. 363-4 = tr. p. 422-4).

'Abd al-Kahir al-Djurđjan also examines the use of metaphors to create fantastic aetiologies such as are common in post-classical Arabic and Persian poetry. In “Be not surprised that his shirt is torn: He buttoned it in moonlight” the poet assumes that the hearer is that he does not accept as metaphors sentences based on the assumption that the hearer has already accepted that the subject of the poem is a special kind of moon, so that the poet can attribute to this moon some unusual qualities (p. 305 ff. = tr. p. 355 ff.; for a more detailed discussion of 'Abd al-

Kahir's theories see Asrdr, Introduction, from which some of the above definitions and translations have been taken).

The compendiums based on 'Abd al-Kahir al-Djurđjan, beginning with the Nihāyāt al-idāţa fi dīrāyat al-īdāţ (Cairo 1317/1899) of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (q.v. d. 606/1209) and the Miṣfāh al-Īlām (Cairo 1356/1937) of Sakkālī (q.v. d. 916/1282-9), together with the numerous commentaries on these compendiums, among them completely superseded the Daštāl al-īdāţ and the Asrār al-balāgha. In the Nihāya, which contains a useful summary of Djurđjan's ideas, Fakhr al-Dīn attempts to clarify the two opposing viewpoints expressed by Djurđjan on the character of the istišāra. After offering interesting arguments in favour of the theory outlined in the Daštāl he declares himself in favour of Djurđjan's later theory as presented in the Asrār. By calling a man a "lion" one attributes to him the lion's courage, not his physical qualities, which means that the word asad is used in a more restricted sense (p. 84-5; cf. Asrār, 379-81 = tr. 441-3). Hence the metaphor has to be considered a "trope of the language" (mutādās lughwā; cf. however Djurđjan's observations on the mutādās 'ālī, the "trope of the intellect" in the relation between a verb and its agent in Asrār, 342-5 = tr. 399-402, 4, for "The matter has been entrusted to a competent person") (p. 94 = tr. p. 120). According to 'Abd al-Kahir such sentences owe their peculiar effect to the fact that the mind accepts a not so familiar concept more readily if the author can illustrate it with a situation with which it is thoroughly familiar, such as when one uses an old friend to introduce a newcomer (Asrdr, Introd., 15). In such sentences the terms themselves are, of course, used in their proper meaning, and hence it becomes possible to explain apparent anthropomorphisms in the Kur'an like “The whole earth is in the grip of his hand on the Day of Resurrection” (Kur'ān XXXIX, 67) as analogies for intellectual concepts (p. 331-2 = tr. p. 386-7; Introd., 11), though he warns against arbitrary explanations (p. 363-4 = tr. p. 422-4).

'Abd al-Kahir al-Djurđjan also examines the use of metaphors to create fantastic aetiologies such as are common in post-classical Arabic and Persian poetry. In “Be not surprised that his shirt is torn: He buttoned it in moonlight” the poet assumes that the hearer is that he does not accept as metaphors sentences based on the assumption that the hearer has already accepted that the subject of the poem is a special kind of moon, so that the poet can attribute to this moon some unusual qualities (p. 305 ff. = tr. p. 355 ff.; for a more detailed discussion of 'Abd al-

Kahir's theories see Asrdr, Introduction, from which some of the above definitions and translations have been taken).
of the "substratum" (dhâl) of the istisâra (Asrâr, 42-7 = tr. 63-3), these authors furthermore distinguish an istisâra takhyîliyya or "fantastic istisâra", as in the famous line by Abû Dhû'ayb al-Hudhâl: "When fate plunges its talons in its prey, you find that no amulet will help", where the attribution of talons to fate suggests that fate is a wild animal. Since "fate" is here still indicated by its proper term, the istisâra is achieved "metonymically" (bi-'l-khindâ; Sâkîk's) a point of view as expressed in the Mi'tlûkh, 178, 1-5 differs from that of Kâzâmî, al-Idhâ, v, 165 ff. and Suyûtî, 'Ukhud al-djumân, [46x570] al-Iddh, v, 165 ff. and Suyûtî, is achieved "metonymically" proper term, the result of the views of some of his predecessors, Ibn al-Athîr's own definitions of the istisâras are obscure and his choice of examples shows inconsistencies. Similar inconsistencies exist in the K. al-Tîrât (Cairo 1332/1914, i, 197-206) of Yâbyâ b. Hamza al-'Alawi (d. 747/1346), though otherwise this book offers a useful summary of the views of some early as well as some later authors (Ibn al-Athîr and the followers of Abû al-Kâhir al-Djurjânî). The author inclines towards considering expressions like sayyud asadun as metaphors, but sayyudîn 'l-asadu, as well as expressions that make use of particles of comparison, as similis (pp. 202-9), a question much debated by Abû al-Kâhir. His substitution of the term istisâra muwâshâhah, "ornamented istisâra", for istisâra murâshâhah is no doubt the result of a misreading. Chapters on the istisâra in later handbooks likewise offer no mean syntheses of earlier definitions and repeat or elaborate the essential elements of the theories of Abû al-Kâhir and his school along with some refinements, such as the observation that in "Those are they who have purchased error" over paternity if she became pregnant later. It is obvious and therefore easily recognizable the "freedom", that is the "emptiness", of the earth wept over them" (Kur'ân XLIV, 28) and the period of sexual abstinence imposed on an unmarried female slave whenever she changed hands or her master set her free or gave her in marriage. Literally, istisâra* means to make sure that the "emptiness", of the womb. In this fact, the period of abstinence was imposed to avoid confusion over paternity since—as there is hardly need to mention—female slaves, especially young ones, were nearly always the concubines of their masters. Nevertheless, the majority of fubâhâ* often lost sight of the point of this institution and imposed istisâra? in hypothetical cases where, by the very nature of things, there was no danger of confusion over paternity.

1) When a female slave passed from the ownership of one person to another, for whatever reason—sale, gift, cancellation of sale, exchange, succession, division of spoils or legacy—she had to observe istisâra?. In theory, all female slaves came under this institution over paternity if she became pregnant later. It is obvious and therefore easily recognizable the "freedom", that is the "emptiness", of the womb. In this fact, the period of abstinence was imposed to avoid confusion over paternity since—as there is hardly need to mention—female slaves, especially young ones, were nearly always the concubines of their masters. Nevertheless, the majority of fubâhâ* often lost sight of the point of this institution and imposed istisâra? in hypothetical cases where, by the very nature of things, there was no danger of confusion over paternity.

2) They sometimes offer copious examples of istisâras in the work of post-classical poets.

from *istibra*° (Ibn Hazm, *Muhallä*, x, 315). A classical example is a good illustration of the irrational demands of *fišk* in this matter. Suppose that a female slave had been sold by a woman or a eunuch (in such cases *istibra*° was “recommended” but not obligatory), the sale having been rescinded by mutual consent (*ikdla*), she returned to the woman or the eunuch. In this case there could be no possible doubt at all about the origin of a possible pregnancy, yet this female slave had to observe *istibra*° after the dissolution of the sale, even though this took place before the buyer had taken possession of her. Only the Hanafis avoided such an absurdity by waiving *istibra*° except when the dissolution of the sale, by common consent, took place after the buyer had taken possession.

2) Every female slave had to observe *istibra*° at the time of her manumission, including an *umma wula\\d\

* C* al of the month of her marriage. Here too the Hanafis deviated from the solution common to the three other schools by demanding in the case of the *umma wula\\d\*

* C* al that the *istibra*° of one menstruation but an *idda* of three inter-menstrual periods, as for a free woman, whether the manumission occurred during the lifetime of the master or was a consequence of his death (al-Zayla\\d, *Tabyin*, iii, 30).

3) Finally, a slave whose master gave her in marriage to a free man or to another slave had to observe *istibra*°, as it is defined below, except in Hanafi law where the position on this point seems, moreover, curious.

In spite of their tendency to insist on *istibra*° on the occasion of any change in the juridical status of a female slave, the *fukahd* avoided carrying their system to absurd lengths. Thus exemption was granted to the slave who had had intercourse with her master and was then freed when he married her after manumission. In this case *istibra*° would in fact have had no purpose. Such a hypothetical case should not be confused with one where a man buys a female slave whom he frees on the spot and seeks to marry without *istibra*°. In this case, and with good reason, the Mālikī, Ṣa\h \d and Ḥanballi schools insist that there must be an *istibra*°. Their scholars explain that if Hanafi law says otherwise this is because Abū Yūsuf was wishing to oblige the new owner to come near her the slave who should observe *istibra*° into the hands of a trustworthy person, preferably a woman, who forbade the new owner to come near her until the period of abstinence had elapsed. This system was known as the *munudda*°, from *wa\d*°, a trust.

Sanctions for default in *istibra*°. The man who acquires a new female slave and has sexual relations with her without respecting the waiting period of *istibra*° commits a grave sin (*idān*); although purely religious, this sanction was somewhat awkward for a man who was a believer but also impatient. For his benefit, Ḥanafi jurisconsults invented a *bi\d*°, or legal expedient, which permitted the law to be evaded but not infringed. This *bi\d*° consisted of marrying the newly acquired slave to a man of straw, often the dealer himself, who repudiated her then and there, that is before consummating the marriage. In this way she was not *istibra*° by the new master, and so she had been married *istibra*° did not apply to her. The schools who condemned *hiyāl* in principle, such as the Ḥanball and Mālikīs, rejected this expedient without hesitation. (Ibn Kudāmā, *Muh\d*°, vii, 513; Khallī, *Muh\d*°sas, ii, 123).

Yet the acquirer who had not respected *istibra*° could suffer indirectly the consequences of his negligence. Supposing, for example, that the slave gave birth to a child less than six months after she had been bought; this was proof that she had been pregnant by her previous master and therefore an *umma wula\\d*

in the case of termination of slavery. In all cases when a female slave changes master, it is incumbent on the man who acquires her (by sale, gift, inheritance etc.) to see that the said slave fulfils her obligation; in other words he must abstain from sexual intercourse with her until the time of *istibra*° has expired. The four schools are unanimous on this point and, apart from a few isolated jurists, only the Zāhirīs imposed this obligation on the vendor (Ibn Hazm, *Muhallā*, x, 315). Mālikī law worked out an ingenious system that enabled all the pertinent regulations of *fišk* to be both effective and easily workable. It entailed giving the slave who should observe *istibra*° into the hands of a trustworthy person, preferably a woman, who forbade the new owner to come near her until the period of abstinence had elapsed. This system was known as the *munudda*°, from *wa\d*°, a trust.

Bibliography: The works on *fišk*, generally in the chapter on *idda*, especially *Marqānī*, *Hīdāya*, Cairo 1936, iv, 65 ff.; Ramli, *Nih\d*° y al-*Muh\d*°dā (Ṣā\\d), Cairo 1938, vii, 154-62; Khallī, *Muh\d*°sas, tr. Boussquet, ii, 123-8; Ibn Kudāmā, *Muh\d*° Cairo 1367, vii, 500 ff. For a comparison between the schools see Dima\dshī, *Ra\dmat al-
umma on the margin of Şahrazur's Mizan, ed. Halabi, ii, 88-9; Santillana, Istituzioni, Rome 1925, i, 252-3. See also 'Abd, 'Isda and 'Umm Walad.

(Y. Linant de Bellefonds)

ISTIBSĀR (kitāb), an anonymous geographical-historical work of which the full title is K. al-Istibsār fi 'ajḍāb al-amṣār. The text does not provide any precise information about the author, who is most probably a Moroccan living in the second half of the 6th/12th century. Indeed it seems likely that the original text is the work of a writer referred to as mu'allif or wa'dīʾ, and that it was subsequently revised and brought up to date by a nāṣīr, who states (p. 226) his intention of writing a history of the Maghrib together with a composition which he had offered to the sovereign in 580/1185-5 (probably Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr, 580/1185-99). Although the author states that he was writing in Rādān's 587/September-October 1191, events occurring after this date are also related, which suggests that the "reviser" restricted his activity to making additions without deleting conflicting facts. The work is dedicated to a certain Abū 'Imrān ibn Abī Yābāy b. Wākūn, who is otherwise unknown.

The K. al-Istibsār is divided into three parts, which contain respectively a detailed description of Mecca and Medina, some more or less legendary information on the history and geography of Egypt, and finally a description of North Africa and of the Bilād al-Sūdān interspersed with historical information; the work is of uneven value, fantastic stories being related side by side with contemporary documents of undeniable interest.

It was the subject of a partial edition by A. von Kremer, Description de l'Afrique par un géographe arabe anonyme du 1er siècle de l'hégire, Vienna 1852; thanks to the Miss. Algiers 1560 and Paris, Bibl. Nat. 2225, E. Fagnan was able to fill in some gaps in the rather incomplete text of von Kremer and to give a French translation of it, L'Afrique septentrionale au XIIe siècle de notre ère, in Recueil de notices et mém. de la Soc. archéol. de Constantine, xxxiii (1899), Constantine 1900; finally, Saad Zaghoul Abdel-Hamid published the complete text, based on the E.M. Bibl. Nat. 2225 and Algiers 1560 and 3216, together with a translation into French of the section relevant to the Holy Places and to Egypt, under the title Kitāb al-Istibsār, etc., Alexandria 1958.

Two manuscripts, identical to those used by von Kremer and Fagnan respectively, are in the Bibl. Gén. of Rabat, nos. 415 and 415 bis. It is probable that the manuscripts so far used still contain gaps, because the one author who quotes from the work, Ibn Abī Zakar (Kiṭāf, 24), reproduces a passage which is not in the text as it has been preserved.

Bibliography: In the article. (Ch. Pellat)

ISTIDJĀ, ECJJA, a town in the centre of Andalusia, to the south-west of Cordova, which today contains 50,000 inhabitants; it is situated on the banks of the river Genil, which was formerly navigable as far as its confluence with the Guadalquivir. Of Iberian origin and colonized by the Greeks, the town was occupied by the Carthaginians, who left no trace of their stay there, and then was fortified and embellished by the Romans who, at the time of Augustus, made it a conventus, the juridical centre of the district. Nothing is known of it under the Visigoths. The town surrendered to the Arabs after the defeat of Don Rodrigo at Lago de la Janda, and the whole surrounding region submitted to the victors without resistance. In the reign of the amīr al-Ḥakam I, a dispute over the succession broke out between the ruler and his two uncles, Sulaymān and 'Abd Allāh, sons of 'Abd al-Rāhamān I; Sulaymān attempted to seize Cordova, and continued to struggle for two years before being defeated in the neighbourhood of Ecija and in the valleys of the Genil and the Guadalquivir; he was finally overcome, captured and put to death, while his brother 'Abd Allāh went to Aix-la-Chapelle to seek support from Charlemagne.

Ecija remained comparatively peaceful until the time when the rebellious amīr al-Mu'āwīyāb, sons of Ibn Ḥāfṣūn invited the inhabitants, who for the most part were Mozarab, to rise against the government of Cordova, an action which caused Ecija to be regarded as a cursed city inhabited solely by enemies of the Umayyad regime. The amīr 'Abd Allāh attacked it, and his successor 'Abd al-Rāhamān III, on coming to the throne and launching his decisive campaigns against Ibn Ḥāfṣūn, sent against Ecija his ḍālīb Badr with an army which dismantled the town and destroyed its bridge (later rebuilt by al-Maṣūr Ibn Abī 'Amr).

On the fall of the caliphate, Ecija was for a time ruled by the Jihāwārīs of Cordova, but it then passed under the domination of the Banū Bīrzāl who had made themselves independent in Carmona; but al-Mu'taṣiḏīd of Seville, who had seized all the small Berber states, from Morón to Ronda, mercilessly attacked the territories subject to the petty ruler of Carmona, and this town, together with Ecija, Osuna and Almodovar, came under the rule of Seville. Later, at the beginning of the siege of Cordova by Hernando III, al-Mutawakkil Ibn Hūd attacked to oppose the besieging army; he took his troops as far as Ecija, but did not dare to engage in battle; he withdrew to Almeria, and the Cordovans, running short of supplies, surrendered on 22 Shawwal 633/29 June 1236. The Muslims who wished to leave did not leave the town until 63/1228, when they were expelled and replaced by Christians. From then onwards, Ecija formed one of the bases from which the reconquest of the kingdom of Granada was organized.


ISTIDĪLĀL (see MANTIK).

ISTIFI'A (see MUSTAFAWĪ).

İSTİFAN B. BASIL (STEPHANOS), the first translator of the Materia medica of Dioscorides. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a speaks of him in two passages in his book: in the first he is cited along with Mūsā b. Khdalīd as one of the experienced scribes (kuttāb naḥārī), skilled in the art of translating, whom the caliph al-Mutawakkil placed at the disposal of Hunayn ibn Iṣḥāk (q.v.), who was responsible for checking (yatasaffah) their work; the second and more important reference to him is derived from information provided by Ibn Dūdūl in his lost book on the Explanation of the names of simples according to the treatise of Dioscorides. The translation of the Materia medica from Greek into Arabic, he says, was made in Baghdad in the time of al-Mutawakkil by İṣṭifan b. Basîl (al-turdūm), under the supervision of Hunayn ibn Iṣḥāk (al-muṭāqīm) who authorized it (adīzāhu). İṣṭifan gave the Arabic equivalents for the Greek names of the drugs with which he was familiar in his day. Those names for which he knew of no Arabic equivalents he left in Greek, "trusting that God would later send someone who would know
them". It should be noted that this first translation was made directly from the Greek, without any intermediate Syriac version.

Bibliography: M. Steinschneider, Die griechischen Aertze in arabischen Uebersetzungen, in Virchows Archiv, ccix (1891), 480-3; Max Meyerhof, Die Materia medica des Dioskurides bei den Arabern, in Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaft und der Medizin, iii/4 (Berlin 1933). (R. Armanloz)

ISTIFAN AL-DUWAYHl, Maronite cleric and historian, born in Hidn, in the northern Lebanon, in 1629. He studied at the Maronite College in Rome from 1641 until his graduation in 1655, then returned as a priest and missionary to serve his community in Mount Lebanon and Aleppo. In 1668 he was promoted to the rank of bishop and appointed to the diocese of Cyprus; two years later, on 20 May 1670, he was elected to succeed as Maronite patriarch.

As head of the Maronite church, Duwayhl proved an efficient reformer and reorganizer. His administration was notable, among other things, for the establishment of the Maronite order of the Antonines in 1670, he was elected to succeed as Maronite patriarch.

While certainly remembered as a great patriarch, Duwayhl is even better remembered as a historian of the Maronite church and community and of Syria, his three principal historical works being a history of the Maronites (Ta'rikh al-fā'la al-mārūnīyya) which argues for their perpetual orthodoxy (the Maronites are known to have been originally Monothelite), a chronicle of the Maronite patriarchs (Sūsīlat bāfārikat al-fā'la al-mārūnīyya), and a chronicle of the history of Syria from the first Crusade until 999 (Ta'rikh al-asmina) which is valuable particularly for the period following the Ottoman conquest in 1516, and for its references to the history of the Maronites and the northern Lebanon in the earlier centuries.

In general, the historical work of Duwayhl reflects his own exceptional intelligence and his careful Roman training, and even the polesmic in his history of the Maronite church, which clearly stand out for what they are, do not detract from the scholarly quality of his work.


(R. Salibi)

ISTIFHĀM (a.), inf. of the verb istaṭhāma "to interrogate", a technical term in Arabic grammar signifying interrogation.

Interrogation can be indicated simply by the intonation of the sentence, particularly in prose that is close to the spoken language. Arabic generally uses two interrogative particles: a- (negative a-lā, a-mā, a-lam), hal. The second (hal) is more energetic than the first (a-), and is more of restricted use (Reckendorf, Arabische Syntax, 19, 10). Sibawayhi (i, 434, line 19-435, lines 1-2) represents the difference between a- and hal thus: "If you say: hal tadribu Zaydān? "do you hit Zayd?", you are not implying that the act of hitting Zayd is a reality in your mind; you can say: a-tadribu Zaydān?, and then you are implying that the act of hitting is a reality". This amounts to saying: a- for interrogation concerning a reality, hal concerning an act or a possibility, without the implication of any opinion about their realization (cf. Reckendorf, loc. cit., 35 n. 2). W. H. Worrell (in ZA, xxi, 126) sees the essential difference as being one of emphasizing the interrogation in the case of the use of hal, that is to say that an emotional element is introduced. It is then of use to consider the usages of a-, hal and am found by G. Bergsträsser, at least in the Kurān, in Verneinungs- und Fragepartikeln und Verwandtes im Kurān (Leipsiger semitische Studien, vi/4 (1914), §§ 68-9). Besides, a- can be followed by -wa- or -fa-(stronger expressions): a-wa-tadribu?, a-fa-tadribu? a- can be followed by the inversion of the direct object complement: a-Zaydān tadribu? All these constructions are prohibited with hal.

Disjunctive interrogation: the 'arabisyya of the desert used: a...am (called al-multaqša "the joined up"), or aw: a-Zaydān 'indaka am 'Amr? or aw 'Amr? "is it Zayd or 'Amr that is with you?"; a-Zaydān laḥīta am Bishr? or aw Bishr? "did you meet Zayd or Bishr?". "In the course of its development, the language did not preserve this lack of distinction and reserved aw for non-interrogative sentences and am for interrogative sentences" (M. Gaufroy-Demobynnes and R. Blachere, Gr. Ar., 470, lines 1-4). The Arab grammarians make a subtle distinction between aw in interrogative sentences and am: see Sibawayhi, ch. 281; al-Zamakhshari, Muḥāṣṣal, § 542 and Ibn Yaṣīf, 113-4; this doctrine was reported by Wright, Ar. Gr., 308 D and Reckendorf, Ar. Synt., 311, lines 16-1. This distinction is subtly invented a posteriori to bring order to a lack of distinction, as Gaufroy-Demobynnes and Blachere state (loc. cit., 470, n. 1).

On the use of hal...aw or hal...am, more frequently hal am, see Sibawayhi, ch. 280, Wright, ii, § 167, Reckendorf, Ar. Synt., 311; am "but rather" is then called al-munkāštā "the separated" by the Arabic grammarians. This am al-munkāštā is also found in am of: a...am (see Bergsträsser, loc. cit., §§ 73-4).

Remarks: a) For a negative answer to one of the two terms of a disjunctive interrogation, see Reckendorf, Ar. Synt., § 160 c.

b) a-lā is very frequently an exclamatory particle: "well, now! come on! look here!" a-mā is also found in this sense. See examples: Wright, ii, § 168; Reckendorf, Ar. Synt., 39.

c) ḥal (hal = a-lā, less strong than the preceding one), hal-lā, are used as exclamatory particles exhorting someone to do something (with the imperfective), or reproaching someone for not having done something (with the perfective); see Wright, ii, § 169, Reckendorf, Ar. Synt., 39.

d) In dialect ka is found for a-: a-halā for a-mā, and vice-versa: al for hal, alla for ḥallā (Wright, i, 284 C and 288 A).

Bibliography: in the text; in addition, Arab authors: Sibawayhi, i, ch. 28-9, 46 (for indirect interrogation that has no other peculiarity than that of being dependent), 277-81, 283-4, ed. Paris; Zamakhshari, Muḥāṣṣal, §§ 541-2, 581-4, 2 ed. Broch and Sharb of Ibn Yaṣīf, 151-4, 1201-4, ed. G. Jahn; Ibn Hishām al-Ansārī, Mughni 'l-labbih, i, 13-16, ii, 340-53, ed. Muḥyī Ḥ'l-Dīn ʿAbd al-Hamīd; Rādī Ḥ'l-Dīn al-Astārabādī, Šarḥ al-Kāfiyya, ii, 362-2, ed. Istanbul 1275. For a critique of the Arab sources (in particular Mughni 'l-labbih), see: W. H. Worrell, The Interrogative Particle hal in Arabic, according to Native Sources and the Kurān, in ZA, xxi (1908), 116-50. (H. Fleischer)

ISTIHSAN and ISTIẞLAH, two methods of reasoning much discussed in the books on the-
Istihsān and Istislah

Usul al-Fiqh [q.v.] in connection with the doctrine of kiyyās [q.v.]. The two conceptions as a result of their close relationship are sometimes confused (cf. Shāfi‘ī, iv, 116-118; Ibn Taymiyya, v, 22). But no one ever seems to have reached a clear and lucid definition of their mutual relationship.

I. The authorities for istihsān which the following of this method quote from the Kur'ān (XXIX, 18, 55), hadith (ma ra’dūkī ‘l-muslimūn rasa‘atun min hukūmā ‘inda ‘llāh āhadān”) and iṣgām (going to the bath without previous arrangement about payment etc.), are easily deprived of weight by the opposition and therefore need not be further discussed. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that istihsān already leaves its literary impress in ḥadīth, thus going back to the first half of the 8th century A.D. (see Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, 59). For example we already find in Buḥārī (Waṣâyā, bāb 8) the expression istaḥṣānā in the meaning of “to make a decision for a particular interpretation of the law as a result of one’s own deliberation”. Half a century later, Mālik (d. 179/795) uses the expression in connection with legal decisions for which he cannot find authority in tradition (Mudawwana, Cairo 1933, xvi, 217; similarly xiv, 134): “This is a matter on which I have received no instruction from my predecessors. It is rather our custom that we have despised according to opinion” (see-in-namā kunā shay’ān istaḥṣānāt). About the same time Abū Yūsuf (d. 182/798, Hanafī) says: al-kiyyās kāna an . . . iš'ārā annā istaḥṣānā tu. . . (“according to the kiyyās this and that would be prescribed but I have decided according to my opinion” [Kitāb al-Kharājāt, Būlāk 1302, 117]). Iṣgām is thus contrasted even more distinctly with the usual method of deducting legislation (kiyyās). The term, in later centuries also, means a method of finding the law which for any reason is contradictory to the usual kiyyās.

It is noteworthy that Shāfi‘ī (d. 820), the founder of the science of the Usul al-Fiqh, fundamentally rejected istihsān, because he feared that in this way going by beyond the methodically secure and generally recognized principles of legal interpretation a loophole would be made for arbitrary decision. “God has not permitted any man since his Messenger to present views (kawālīf) unless from knowledge that was complete before him” (Risāla, 70). If any one in spite of this uses istihsān he is bungling the work of God, the highest legislator (man istaḥṣānā fa-bad shara‘a‘a‘ [quoted in Ghazālī, i, 274 and pass.]). Ghazālī (d. 504/1111) and Bayādī (681/1282 or later, also a Shāfi‘ī) resumed and developed the discussion initiated by Shāfi‘ī in a more comprehensive and systematic fashion. Iṣgām in their view can only be approved in so far as it can be traced to the principle of takhsīs (the preference of a particular to a general prescription). But as takhsīs is already contained in the doctrine of kiyyās, istihsān has really no special part to play. Later Shāfi‘ī authorities like Subki (d. 1370) and Māhāfīl (864/1451) express similar views.

The supporters of the doctrine of istihsān—they belong for the most part to the Ḥanafī school (Pazdawī [d. 482/1090], Saṣāḥī [d. 483/1090], Nasāfī [709/1310] etc. down to Bahār al-Ulūm [1225/1810])—make every effort to deprive these objections of their force. To the assertion that the arbitrary opinion of the individual legist is given too much scope, they reply by defining and systematizing istihsān more accurately. Their principle of diverging in certain cases from kiyyās and using istihsān is—they say—not decided by personal inclinations or by a lack of methodical thinking but on the contrary by purely material considerations provided for in the law. It is a “concealed kiyyās” (kiyyās hāṣāfī), a divergence from an externally obvious kiyyās to an inner and self-conditioned decision. The reason for the preference of istihsān might be given in the Kur’ān, in the Sunna, in the iṣgām or in the principle of darāra, but in any case it is sanctioned by generally recognized methods of proof. Nor is it true that istihsān can be traced back to the principle of takhsīs and thus be lager within the sphere of kiyyās proper. It really lies outside of this narrow sphere and must therefore be recognized as a special form of deduction. For the rest, if we investigate more carefully, we can assert that the form of istihsān represented by the Ḥanafīs is also used by representatives of other madhāhib. It is in practice the common property of all legists.

If we consider the very minute work of systematization which the later Ḥanafīs (e.g., Ibn al-Humām [d. 861/1457]—Ibn ʿAmīr al-Ḥadīḍī [879/1474] and Bihārī [1120/1708]—Bahār al-Ulūm [1225/1810] have done on istihsān, we may actually agree with this last deduction. This method of reasoning, which originally aroused such misgiving because it was undefined, is given a place in the casuistic stepladder of the ‘ilm usul al-fikhr, and its possibility of application thus limited to a few fairly defined cases. If nevertheless discussion continued on whether it is justified or not this can only be explained by the fact that the followers of the Shāfi‘ī school felt themselves bound from a certain traditional principle not to drop the polemic against istihsān which had long ago been originated by their master—under different conditions and with more justice.

II. Istislah is, as regards its negative side, closely connected with istihsān; here we have again a question of principle by which the otherwise usual method of deduction is to be excluded in the preparation of legal decisions. The difference from istihsān is seen only when we enquire into the guiding idea which forms the positive foundation for this principle which is negative in its effects. We then see that istislah is more limited and more closely defined in content than istihsān in so far as it replaces the, in itself only formal, “finding-good” of the latter by the material principle of maṣlahā. It argues with the demands of human welfare in the widest sense. It might therefore be contrasted with the more comprehensive and more indefinite general conception of istihsān as a more exactly defined or subordinated species, as indeed al-Iṣbālī (Mālikī, d. 546/1151) already pointed out (Shāfi‘ī, p. 117). It is just through this greater definiteness that istislah gains in force compared with istihsān. For it is evident that such a plausible idea as that of anxiety for human welfare carries much more conviction in the derivation of legal decisions and can be more readily established than the formal and empty criterion of istihsān. In this way it is probably to be explained why the principle of istislah was on the whole not so strongly disputed as that of istihsān and why it occasioned much less polemic than the formalists of the usual kiyyās, even questioned the validity of legal principles emanating directly from the Kur’ān, Sunna and iṣgām (see below).

Relying on the ḥadīth ʿāl darāra wa-lā darāra fi ‘l-iṣlām (in Islam there is no injury or malicious damage) and on other testimony from the Kur’ān, Sunna and iṣgām, later representatives of the ‘ilm usul al-fikhr championed the principle that the whole Shāri‘a’s furthers or is intended to further the welfare of man (rī‘āyat al-maṣlahāt). This however does not
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Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV
without his knowledge or it is a question only of an imaginary, and not a real maslaḥa.

In the foregoing it has already been mentioned that the Mālikis are regarded as the principal champions of istiṣlāḥ. But too much stress should not be laid on this general opinion. It is of course true that Mālikī legal theorists like Ṣāḥibī (d. 590/1194) and Karāfī (684/1285) took up the discussion of masalīḥ mursalā and carried it further. But on the other hand Ibn al-Hājībī who was also a Mālikī, reckoned one of the opponents of the principle (see above). On the contrary, the circle of those who recognise the principle of istiṣlāḥ in practice extends far beyond the limits of the Mālikī school. Karāfī even points out that "if one looks carefully, it is in general use in the madhāhib" (p. 170). Ṣāḥibī’s and Hanafīs—although with certain limitations and in part under other names—have adopted it and developed it further. The most radical upholder of maslāḥa (istislah) is however a certain Nadjm al-Dīn al-Jawfī (d. 716/1316). He is considered a tafsiʿī but in reality (riḍyat al-maslajia) he is in general use in the madhhabs.

In order to strengthen the principle of riḍyat al-maslajia—precisely on account of his attitude to mudjāhid (Tawfi’s) method of aflat—Tawfi quotes evidence from Qur’an, Sunna, and the principles applicable to it. In any case however, the riḍyat al-maslajia represents the highest court of appeal.

In order to strengthen the principle of riḍyat al-maslajia and justify placing it above nasq and ijma’ Tawfi quotes evidence from Kur’ān, Sunna, ijma’ and nasq (reasoning), of course giving first place to the saying attributed to Muhammad: "there is no injury or malicious damage" (īāda wa-lā ādirā). He further points out that the legal texts are of different kinds and contradictory while the idea of maslahā is an integral base, and thus gives a better clue to the solution of legal problems (reference to Kur’ān III, 172: "I hold fast together to the cord of Allah and do not split into parties!"). He takes this opportunity to comb the assertion that the variety of legal interpretation is a special advantage of the Muslim religion (cf. the hadith: ikhtilāf ummās raḥma'īn raḥma'īn). The disadvantages which result are greater than the advantages: simply because there are such different interpretations, it is sometimes possible to find a lax interpretation to suit one’s own wishes and to neglect the more rigorous injunctions. Besides, many non-Muslims, who would readily adopt Islam, are prevented from taking the final step by the multitude of opinions held by jurists and the resulting lack of uniformity in the legal system of Islam.

The author is well aware that his views go beyond the istiṣlāḥ of the Mālikīs (p. 60 f.). He is reproached with abandoning by his thesis the path that has been taken by the bulk of the Muslim community (al-sawād al-‘a’lam) and attention is called to the words of the Prophet: “Follow the majority! He who takes his own way will go his own way to Hell also” (sitābī’u al-sawād al-‘a’lam, fa-‘inna man ghadhha ghadhha fī ‘l-nār”). But this would mean reducing every new view and every new method ad absurdum. The majority which has to be followed according to the words of Muḥammad is rather the path of clear demonstration. And the latter condition is fulfilled in his (Tawfi’s) method of riḍyat al-maslajia.

in the latter, the two latter terms are sometimes used by astronomers in place of istikhāā and idgīmatā. Other astrological aspects are sextile (tasdis), quartile (tarbi) and trine (taṭīgā) at elongations (variably computed) of 60°, 90°, and 120° respectively.

Bibliography: For the astronomical usage see C. A. Nallino, Al-Batānī, ii, 29-32, 205-9, and 306-7. For the astrological usage the most convenient reference is al-Birūnī, Kitāb al-tahfīz, s.vv. cientifico arabo-islámico (DAVID PINGREE)

ISTIKHĀRĀ (A), deriving from a root ḥ-y-r which expresses the idea of option or choice, consists of entrusting God with the choice between two or more possible options, either through piety and submission to His will, or else through inability to decide oneself, on account of not knowing which choice is the most advantageous one. To the first category belong the akhyār or “chosen”, who regulate their lives according to the model inspired by God in the Kurān and the Law; to the second belong the mustakḥīrān, those who seek to escape from indecision with the help of divine inspiration. The divine voice expresses itself either by means of a ru'ya [q.v.] or dream, or else by kūrā [q.v.] or rhapsody. As a result of its affinities with the ancient practice of incubation, used especially in histomy or medical divination and in necromancy, istikhārā is abhorred by Muslim orthodoxy (cf. A. Fischer, in ZDMG, lxxvii (1914), 325), but it is fairly widespread in popular circles, where it is sometimes found in conjunction with the casting of spells and, in effect, the use of ordeals (cf. L. Massignon, in Annuaire du Collège de France, 36th ann., 1940-1, 86). To prevent the return to pagan customs, Islam fixed the rules under which the rite of istikhārā might be practised. A tradition of Diābīr relates that the Prophet taught his disciples istikhārā in all things, as though he were teaching them a sūra of the Kurān. The practice followed by the Prophet consisted in two ra'ās, followed by a prayer, emphasising the omniscience and omnipotence of God and including a reference to the subject of the consultation (cf. al-Shawkānī, Nāṣir al-aʿwāq, quoted by Muhammad al-Abānī, al-Tāhāfī fi 'l-Itstām, Cairo n.d., 180). Neither time nor place is fixed for a consultation of this kind. The inspiration revealing the decision to be taken is immediately perceived, or, if the response is insufficient clear in the consultant’s mind, he has recourse to a drawing of lots from the various possible solutions, written separately on pieces of paper (cf. Doutté, Magie et religion, 143 f.).

This orthodox practice is generally interpreted in a sense which makes it comparable with incubation. After the invocation, the formulae for which are of different kinds and varying in length (cf. al-Buḵārī, Taḥfīz, no. 10, and Daʿwāt, no. 48, ed. Krehl-Juynboll, iv, 202 and 450; al-Tirmidhī, ed. Būlāk 1292, ii, 266; al-Nawāvī, Ḥijyāt al-aṣbār, ed. Cairo 1300, 56), the devotee goes to sleep, and it is in a dream that the revelation is made to him. This procedure is observed universally, especially in North-Africa, although it is considered to go beyond the letter of the Law (cf. Ibn al-Hāḍījī, al-Madhkhal, Cairo 1320, iii, 54).

A further step in the direction of incubation is taken by those who insist that the efficacy of this rite is dependent upon its being performed in a mosque. According to al-Awīl, Lūbāb, i, 210, 1, 12, one goes into the mosque to perform the namāz 'isātīhārā. The practice of sleeping in the sanctuary is sufficiently well attested before Islam, just as in the time of the
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Prophet. It was by the Ka'ba, where he slept that night, that 'Abd al-Mu'ttalib is said to have had the dream concerning Zamzam (cf. Divination, 262 f.); again, it was by the Ka'ba, where Mu'ammad slept, that for the second time (?) there apparently took place the rite for the purification of the heart and entrails (dak' al-batin and fa'ah al-ya'd), performed for him by the two angels (cf. al-Tabari, i, 157); it is even said, on this occasion, that "the Kurayymites were accustomed to sleep beside the Ka'ba" (cf. ibid. and al-Azraqi, A'khbar Makka, ed. Wüstenfeld, 350). The isra? is also said to have taken place when the Prophet slept in the court (bidge) of the Ka'ba (cf. Divination, 338). This custom does not appear to be limited to the Ka'ba (for its permanence, see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii, 16, n. 3 and 150); the attendant of al-Dja'als, an oracular divinity, slept in the sanctuary (cf. J. Wellhausen, Reste*, 55 ff.; T. Fahd, Le panthéon de l'Arabie centrale à la veille de l'hégire, Paris 1968 (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, lxxviii, 84-7).

Orthodox is opposed to this practice, apparently out of regard for ritual purity (cf. Ibn al-Hādji, Madžkal, Cairo 1348, ii, 215, 241); but a short work in manuscript of Muhammad al-Shawâl al-Shaf[i] al-kuft(âb (d. 954/1644), entitled Risâlat 'al-lâhây tman mana'a l-na'um fi 'l-masâdîd min al-agâr, which we have consulted in Bursa (Ulucami 3496, fol. r-20), refutes the arguments put forward in support of the prohibition of this custom (cf. details in Divination, 365 ff.).

In North Africa, where istikhâra is very close to the ancient incubation (cf. Doutté, Magie et religion, 414), and more especially in Morocco, people go and sleep in the grottoes, the refuge of the spirits, or beside ancient tombs, or, which is more usual today, in the sanctuary of a marabout, in order to elicit a response to the prayer of istikhâra (ibid., 411 ff.). There even exists magic recipes to ensure the success of this rite (cf. al-Bûnî, Shams al-madrif, ii, 8). One of these, for example, is utilized in the search for a thief; a magic formula is written on one's hand, and one then goes to sleep, with this hand placed under the right cheek; the thief is then revealed in a dream (Doutté, op. cit., 337). But there is also characteristic of that of hâlma? al-tâbî' al-tâmî, mentioned by Ibn Khaldûn, Muhammadi, i, 190, when referring to the Ghâyat al-bakim of the Pseudo-Madjriti (cf. ed. Ritter and Flessner, Leipzig 1933, 187 ff.; German trans. by the same authors, London 1962, 199 f., in which the term hâlma? does not occur), and which is a technique consisting of obtaining, in a dream of "perfect nature", a response to a question posed at the time of lying down to sleep, after purifying one's conscience, concentrating one's intention, pronouncing the following gibberish words: Tamâghis baghdtsawdd, wâzghds, mu'nâmaghadî, and formulating one's wish. During sleep, the answer to the question is given. Ibn Khaldûn states that he had tried this himself and obtained good results (cf. Divination, 364 f.).

The istikhâra procedure seems to have been followed by some mystics, such as Ruzbâhân Bâkî, Ibn 'Arabi and Tîpû, sultân of Mysore. Their progress along the mystical path of perfection is marked by dreams, recording the passage from one stage to the next (cf. L. Massignon, Thèmes archétypiques en onirocôlric musulmane, in Eranos-Jahrbuch, xii (1945), 245). Some authors claim, in their introductions, to have written their works after an istikhâra (e.g., apud al-Nawawî, Tahâhîî, ed. Wüstenfeld, 257). In literary texts, however, the term istikhâra is merely a pious formula for a request to God for aid and advice, with no ritual character (cf. for example Aghâni, xviii, 72, xix, 92).

Bibliography: In addition to the sources named in the text, see: T. Fahd, Divination, 263-7; Doutté, Magie et religion, 410-4. According to Nawawî, Tahâhîî., 744, i, 3, 'Abî 'Abd Allâh al-Zubayrî (F. Segrîn, Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums, i, 493) is said to have written a K. al-istikhâra wa-l-tahall (cf. Tahâhîî, 237). (T. Fahd)

ISTIKLÂL [see TAWRIYYA]

ISTIKLÂL, an Arabic verbal noun, from the tenth form of the root k-l-l. In Classical and Middle Arabic this form is used with a variety of meanings (see Doxy and other dictionaries), and especially to convey the notion of separate, detached, unrestricted, not shared, or sometimes even arbitrary. It occurs occasionally in a political context—e.g., of a dynasty, a region, a people or a city quarter not effectively subject to some higher authority. Such occurrences are, however, rare, and the word was in no sense a political technical term. In Ottoman official usage, it acquired the meaning of unlimited powers, e.g., in the terms of appointment of a provincial governor or military commander. It seems to have retained something like this meaning in the early 19th century. Then, in the Turkish translation of Bott's Historia Italiae (Italia ta'rikhî, (1878, ed. Wiistenfeld, 306). But the most characteristic is that of wedjî-i serbestî, with free government (ber wedjî-i serbestî), and is commonly linked with rubhî to denote the arbitrary authority of a ruler.

It was in this sense, the independence of the holder of power from restraints by either subjects or suzerain, that istiklâl is commonly used in both Turkish and Arabic in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. During the same period, under the influence of European political thought and practice, it began to acquire the modern meaning of political sovereignty for a country or nation (for examples, see the Turkish texts of the treaty of Kâşık Kaynarja of 1774 concerning the "independence" of the Crimean Tatars (cit. above S.v. HURRIYYA ii) and of the London Protocol of 1830 on the independence of Greece (istiklâl-i hâmî; text and most characteristic of this form are given by A. Eifl, British Interests in Palestine 1800-1901, London 1961, 147-8, citing a British consular despatch of 1858).

The following article deals with political movements for independence in the Arab countries.

ISTIKLÂL. In Arabic istiklâl is a fairly recent addition to the political vocabulary. Despite its use in common parlance, viz., and mustakhîl ("I am independent!", that is, free or un fettered), or sometimes to refer to economic independence, that is, autarky (istiklâl istiklâlî), it is primarily associated with the national independence movements among the Arabs of this century. It is with these movements that this article is concerned.

After World War I, the peace settlement regarding the Ottoman dominions imposed by the Allied Powers in 1919-20 gave Britain and France wider control over the Arab territories in the Fertile Crescent, in addition to the existing arrangements in Egypt, North Africa, South Arabia and the Gulf. Without these developments and the consequences of the Arab Revolt, 1916-18, the term istiklâl might have had only a limited use, or probably remained obscure, for in the period immediately preceding World War I, Arab political agitation against the Ottoman state was centred upon the attainment of autonomy within
the framework of the political arrangement of decentralization, al-tawqahiyah. In fact, istiklāl had no meaning or import in Islamic political thought and vocabulary. It is strictly a modern, imported political notion, which became common and acquired significance with the establishment of European control, or tutelage, over much of the Arab Middle East and North Africa.

Fāyṣal's short-lived Arab Kingdom in Damascus in 1920 marked the appearance of two variants, or strands, of istiklāl in Arab political thinking and agitation. One, which originally centred around the Fāyṣal, or Arab Revolt, establishment and, after 1920, was represented in Syria, Transjordan, Palestine and 'Irāk by the Istiklālists, or Istiklāl party, tended towards a pan-Arab orientation. It deplored the destruction of Fāyṣal's kingdom in Damascus and opposed the mandates in the Fertile Crescent. The other comprised the several, separate independence movements against British or French mandatory and other control in such countries as Egypt, 'Irāk, Syria, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria, as well as Transjordan and the Sudan, though movements in the latter two areas were less tumultuous. Palestine was a special case. In that country the Palestinian Arab movement for independence failed, and instead Zionism succeeded in founding Israel as the successor state to the British Mandate. After 1922, therefore, istiklāl referred specifically to the aspiration of ending the mandatory or other tutelary relationship between the newly established Arab political territories, or entities, and Britain or France.

Rather differently in the case of Egypt, el-istiẖlāl al-tawqahiyah (complete independence) became the political slogan of at least two parties: the National (Wafā'ī) party and the Wafād. The first objective was attained by the greater independence than had been achieved under the unilateral British Declaration of February 1922 with its Four Reserved Points. It became the slogan of practically every political party and the avowed priority, if not foremost policy, of every government in Egypt. At the outset, it aimed specifically at changing the terms of the particular relationship with Britain. Later it sought to sever that relationship altogether. The first objective was attained by the Wafād with the signing of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty on 26 August 1936. The second, which became a bitterly contested area of Egyptian politics from 1936 to 1952, was not achieved until the signing of the Evacuation of British Forces from Egypt for assistance towards and recognition of independent status. The outbreak of World War II in 1939 circumscribed by Britain's control of the conduct of 'Irākī foreign relations and retention of her air bases at Shaẖrūayba (Bahra) and Ḥabbānīyya (Baghdād). Efforts at further istiklāl which led to the signing of the Portsmouth Treaty on 15 January 1948 were nullified by violent protests against its terms, which led to its rejection by the 'Irākīs. The accession of Britain to the Baghdad Pact in 1955 led to a rearrangement of the basis of relations between the two countries. However, the secession of 'Irāk from the Pact under President Kāsim may be considered the final act in the severance of the forty-year-old relationship with Britain. Political and psychologically at least, the attainment of istiklāl tawqahiyah.

Syria and Lebanon too in the interwar period sought to move from limited autonomy under French tutelage to independence. Istiklāl became the slogan and political umbrella for the activities of practically all political groups and parties in those two countries. In fact, it became the contentious issue between rival groups. An uncompromising stand for its attainment became the mark of patriotism and political respectability. In any event, both Syria and Lebanon existed as autonomous republics under French Mandate from the mid-1920s. The November 1936 Treaty between Lebanon and France constituted a step towards independence within three years. Earlier in the year, the Syrians had rejected a similar treaty with France. These treaties provided a special relationship with the metropolitan país under which France promised aid and for assistance towards and recognition of independent status. The outbreak of World War II in 1939 intervened, and it was not until 1941 that the Free French declared publicly their intention of granting their two wards independence: thus the Free French General Catroux's proclamations regarding Syria and Lebanon in September and November 1941 respectively. Difficulties and disturbances over the transfer of power continued until 1945. The last French forces departed both countries by the end of
1946, at which time they became fully independent.

As a semi-independent emirate under 'Abd Allah Ibn al-Husayn, after World War I Transjordan remained ultimately under the control of the British High Commissioner in Jerusalem. By an agreement in 1923, Britain recognized it as an autonomous constitutional state under Amir 'Abd Allah with British tutelage. The activities of the Istiklalisists with their Arab nationalist demands for complete freedom from British control indirectly helped 'Abd Allah to secure greater legislative and administrative autonomy for his fledgling state in a treaty concluded with Britain in 1928. In 1934, he was permitted to establish consular representation abroad, and in 1939 his Legislative Council was transformed into a cabinet. The Treaty of London, concluded with Britain on 22 March 1946, recognized the independent Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan and 'Abd Allah was proclaimed its first king. The treaty, which was followed by another in 1948, was modelled on the 1936 Egyptian treaty in the sense that Jordanian independence was circumscribed by a special relationship with Britain. This last vestige of dependence was severed on 13 March 1957.

As far as the decades of the 20s, 30s and 40s are concerned, istikblal belonged to Egypt and the Fertile Crescent. With the waning of British power overseas generally and the consequent withdrawal of its presence or influence, heralded by the voluntary dissolution of the Indian Empire in 1947, istikblal movements erupted elsewhere in the Arab East. Similarly, the winding up of the French Empire after World War II, first in Indochina and later in Africa, undermined the French position in the Maghrib. In the 50s istikblal reached Libya, the Sudan, Tunisia and Morocco. Kuwait in the east and Algeria in the west followed suit in 1961 and 1962 respectively. Unlike all the other Arab countries, Algeria only attained independence after seven years of bitter war against the French armed forces.

Despite the long historical connection between Egypt and the Sudan, after 1924 the latter was governed in practice solely by Britain, thus ending the Anglo-Egyptian condominium devised in 1899. Greater Sudanization of the country's local administration followed. The 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty led to the rapid evolution of Sudanese nationalism and a movement for an independent Sudan, especially after World War II, not without British encouragement. It proved a much stronger current than the Egyptian plan, backed by Egypt's political protégés in Sudan, for an independent united Nile Valley comprising Egypt and the Sudan under the Egyptian crown, or after 1952, under the Egyptian Republic. As part of the Anglo-Egyptian settlement of 1953-4 for the British evacuation of the Canal, the Sudan, after a three-year transition period, became independent on 1 January 1956.

Paradoxically, Libya, the least developed North African country, was the first to attain istikblal on 24 December 1951. Any independence movement during the Italian occupation (1911-42) was no more than the desire of the Sanūsī brotherhood under Idrīs to rid itself of Italian rule. It was also largely a Cyrenaican affair, closely linked in the 30s and 40s with Egypt, where Idrīs, together with his main political lieutenants, had taken refuge. This is not to say that Tripolitians were not involved in the struggle for independence, but they were more oriented towards the Maghrib and, in the Arab East, towards Syria. It was the British, however, who restored Idrīs to power in Libya in 1949-50. As they were abandoning their positions in Egypt and the Fertile Crescent, the British introduced the old pattern of special arrangements with Libya, which they had helped to independence: this time with a bases agreement concluded in 1952-3. Like other Arab states before it, however, by 1964 Libya demanded the removal of foreign (British and American) bases from its territory in the name of istikblal al-lāmm, and in response to pressures generated by inter-Arab state conflict as well as a more radical Arab nationalist movement. An army coup d'état on 1 September 1969 overthrew the Sanūsī monarchy, proclaimed a republic and pressed for the immediate removal of all vestiges and semblances of foreign encumbrances on istikblal: bases, foreign enterprises and other interests, as well as the large Italian community.

Tunisia and Morocco became independent in 1956. Istikblal in Tunisia was led by a combined Western—that is French—educated, secular, bourgeois élite in the Destour party and a more conservative Muslim Arab leadership whose antecedents went back to the constitutional reform movement of Khayr al-Dīn al-Tūnisī (q.v.). There being no specific term for independence in Arabic, the expression istikblal dakhili (internal) was used to describe an intermediate stage which would have provided the substance of independence. Unlike Tunisia, where the Beys of Tunis were not associated with Western modernity and its institutions, in Morocco the Sherifian Alawite sultan Muhammad V was recognized as the leader of the struggle against the French protectorate. Yet the battle for istikblal fought by both Morocco and Tunisia differed from that of Algeria because although France controlled them by earlier protectorate arrangements, they retained a measure of local autonomy. Indigenous Islam and its institutions survived in both countries under French tutelage. Algeria, however, was made an integral part of metropolitan France by legislation, so that the separatist, istikblal movement eventually developed into a bitter and bloody war. While the Alawite monarchy survived after independence in Morocco, the hereditary dynasty of the Bey of Tunis did not. The last Bey, Muhammad al-Amin, was deposed when the Constituent Assembly abolished his office on 25 July 1957 and proclaimed Tunisia a republic.

On the whole, over the past 50 years, the several Arab movements for national-state independence often co-existed and contended with the desire of some to expand the connotation of istikblal to encompass a projected wider entity, that of the Arab nation, cutting across existing state boundaries. The role played by this wider conception of istikblal in the radicalization of inter-Arab politics became apparent under the Ba'th party's central aspiration towards Arab unity in the 1950s. In individual Arab states, political parties wishing to advance a more pan-Arab and anti-Western national policy often adopted the name of istikblal, as for example, the Istikblal party of 'Irāq led by Muhammad Mahdi Kubbā, Šiddīq Šanghalī and Fā'iq al-Sāmarrā'ī, or that of Morocco led by 'Allī al-Fāsī. It is interesting to note that during a particularly intense period of inter-Arab state conflict in the years 1957 to 1967, istikblal acquired further ideological dimensions. In that period, the Arab states were polarized into a revolutionary Arab socialist, or radical nationalist, camp on one side, and a conservative or reactionary one on the other. The first camp, which identified with Nasser's leadership and in other respects with Ba'th ideology, comprised mainly those Arab states in which military coups d'état had over-
thrown previous regimes invariably associated with an earlier link with one or another of the European powers. By the late 50s many of these were veering in their foreign policy orientation towards the Soviet Union. Such was the case of Egypt, Syria, ‘Irak, Algeria and the Yemen after 1962. The second camp comprised mainly the traditional monarchies, some of them oil-rich, such as Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Kuwait and Jordan. The revolutionary camp argued that there was no genuine istiqlal in the adversary or rival Arab camp because the regimes within it were reactionary and still maintained commercial, economic and political links with Western European and/or American powers. In these circumstances they were considered “agents of imperialism and neo-colonialism” and therefore not “truly independent”. Much of this “cold war” between the states in the Arab East and Arab West subsided after the Arab-Israeli war of June 1967. The realization dawned upon most of the Arab states that even with istiqlal the economic, political and strategic facts of their environment and the requirements of their own survival forced them to maintain a client relationship with a foreign power.
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Philology, xiii (1885), 278; T. W. Davies, Magic divination and demonology among the Hebrews and their neighbours, London 1899, 44-7.

The second group of meanings was applied everywhere to the whole spectrum of cleromantic methods, understood as the essence of divination, in the sense of the Syriac šam, “to practise divination”, from which šayām, “soothsayer”, was derived (cf. ref. in Semitics, viii (1956), 73, n. 4). Initially, istiqlâm designated belomancy only (istiqlâm bīl-āsām), condemned in the Qurʾān (V, 3) along with maysir (V, 90), another type of belomancy. Because this condemnation was extended to all similar divinatory practices which were based on chance (cf. al-Ṭabarî, Taṣfîr, ii, 201, l. 3 ff.), istiqlām and maysir, roughly representing respectively the religious and profane aspects of belomancy, as I have attempted to establish in Divination (150 ff., 204 ff.), became the symbols of pagan divination.

This article deals with istiqlām in the strict sense of sacred belomancy only, as it was practised in association with certain Arab divinities. For other cleromantic methods, the reader should consult the following articles: dyama (plur. ādām), for lapi-dation, an article which, as far as the divinatory aspect is concerned, should be augmented by the section dealing with this practice in Divination (188-95); āaml for geomancy and lithomancy, originally grouped together under the word taraf (for the time being, reference can be made to Divination, 195-204); maysir for profane divination and games of chance (al-darb bi l-hišāb; cf. ibid., 204-14); kurra for rhapsodomancy (ibid., 214-19); ḍafar, malaḥim, ḥuruf, al-asma’ al-husna (as far as divination is concerned, the latter should be supplemented by Divination, 234-41). (II. 219-45, 221-30.) (P. J. VATIKIOTIS)

ISTIKSAM (A.), 10th form of the root b-s-m which embraces two groups of meanings, the one of a magical nature and the other divinatory. The first is applied to formulae and methods for conjuring up demons, for adjuration and exorcism; this latter is the meaning acquired by the 2nd and 4th forms, kassama and aškama, particularly in the Christian Arab world, clearly influenced by the Hebrew šāmēm (e.g. Deut., xxvii, 23), which has the same meaning. This usage is late, colloquial, and most frequently found among Christian Arabs, who also employ bišām, “adjuration, exorcism formula, priestly ordination”, takšīm, “conjuration”, and ushuf kāṣim, “ordinant bishop” (cf. Dozy, Supp., ii, 345 ff.; Fagnan, Additions aux dictionnaires arabes, 142). Such a usage does not appear in Classical Arabic, or at least is confined to the action of “having someone swear an oath” (istiṣkāsamahu) or “swearing by something” (istiṣkāsa biha) in the sense of aškama (cf. TA, ed. Bālīk, ix, 26; W. R. Smith in Journal of
firmative, the second in the negative, and the third with doubt; al-miyah (water), used to ascertain the presence of water in a specified place (cf. Ibn Hishâm, 97 f.). The people of Mecca consulted the opinion of the darts of Hubal, tossed by the sādīn in the quiver (kīhīn) of the god, in return for a hundred dīkhams or one camel, every time a serious dispute arose among them. The Sira recounts the story of two belomantic consultations made by the Prophet's grandfather, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, at two important moments of his life: the first to decide to whom to return the precious finds he had made when clearing out the well of Zamzam (Ibn Hishâm, 94); the second to discover which of his ten sons should be sacrificed at the Ka'ba in fulfilment of a vow he had made to sacrifice one of his sons should their number reach ten (ibid., 97-100).

Pilgrims too could not have refrained from the practice and belomantic consultation must have been one of the many attractions of the great metropolis of Arab paganism. Numerous texts indicate that the practice of consulting the throw of darts was very widespread. Alongside those attached to the sanctuary, there were others, manipulated either by the kāhīns, the elders or the notables (see the examples in Divination, 189 f.). Al-Nuwayrī, Nikāyā, iii, 112 f., supplies a longer and more diversified list of darts that were used outside the sanctuary, tossed in a madārā (a skin stitched into a bucket) by a kāhīn wherever there was one to be found or by any other person who held some rank in the tribe or city. To the na'am, la and muṣlaḥ known to Ibn Iṣḥāq and his abridger, Ibn Hishâm, al-Nuwayrī adds ten darts with the following names: ṣā'īf (dog), ṣā'īf al-dōnīn (don't!), kāhīr (good), khārīr (evil), bāḥī (slow), sarīḥ (fast), ḫādar (presence), safār (journey), and sarīḥ (equivalent to Ibn Hishâm's mīnkuμ). Finally, white darts (kīdād bāyādā') were prepared that could bear more precise and detailed inscriptions or equivalent meanings inscribed by explicit agreement between the kāhīn and the man consulting him. In this way the field of consultation was enlarged and belomancy adapted to the demands of any sphere in which it was practised.

Bibliography: Apart from the sources cited in the article, Azżāk, Aḥḥāb Makka, ed. Wüstenfeld, 73-4; Tabāt, i, 1074-8; Ibn al-Athīr, ii, 2-4; T. Fahl, Une pratique cérémonielle à la Ka'ba préislamique, in Semitic of II, 1958, 54-79: in spite of its many defects of form, this monograph will give the reader the basic information about belomancy. It should be supplemented by T. Fahl, Divination, 180-8. (T. Fahl)

ISTIMMĀR [see ISTIṢQĀ']

ISTIṢQĀ', from ista'na'afa (to recommence, to renew), means in modern Arabic appeal, because the case is examined again from the beginning when brought before the court of appeal. In classical fiḥk the word is used with this sense of recommencement with regard to the isbādāt, the religious duties, especially prayer.

Iṣtiṣwā' (the Mālikis call it isbiṣdā') occurs when the entire prayer, which has been interrupted by the occurrence of a ritual impurity, ḫuṣūd [q.v.], has to be begun again.

In certain circumstances the fuḥāḥā' decided that the continuation (binā') of the prayer from the moment when it was interrupted by a fact independent of the believer's will, and which does not, strictly speaking, constitute a ritual impurity, e.g., a serious nose-bleed, is permissible to complete istiṣwā'. The schools, and scholars within the same school, do not always agree upon the circumstances which give rise to istiṣwā' or, on the contrary, to binā'.

Bibliography: Marghānīn, Hīdāyā, Cairo 1937, i, 39-40; Zayla', Ṭabyīn, Cairo 1933, i, 145. Khallī, Mukhtāsir, tr. Bousquet, i, 46-7; Dardir-Dasūkht's commentary on it, al-Shār al-ḥabīr, Cairo, ed. Hālabī, i, 204 ff. See also Ibn Hazm, Mukhālā, Cairo 1347, iii, 202-3 and iv, 153. 177. (Y. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS)

ISTINBAT [see m2 and ṢIVĀṆA']

ISTINDJĀ', purification incumbent upon the Believer after the fulfilment of his natural needs. This practice, which is described in detail, is obligatory (recommended only according to Abū Ḥanīfa) and must be carried out either immediately, or before performing the ṣāliḥ or any other act which requires a state of ritual purity.

Bibliography: All the works of fiḳh, iṣṭiṣlaw, etc. deal with this subject in the chapter on ḥahāra; similarly Ghazzālī, Iḥyā', in the same chapter (iii = 22 of Bousquet's analysis). (Ed.)

ISTINSHĀK, the inhaling of water through the nostrils at the time of the wudu' and qhul. This practice is recommended by the various rites (obligatory according to Ibn Ḥanbal). In practice this is not really important since the Believer always performs it during his ablutions, etc. in the same way.

Bibliography: See ISTINDJĀ'. (Ed.)

ISTINZĀL, a term denoting hydromancy, according to Doutté, Magie et religion dans l'Afrique du Nord (Algiers 1909), 389; but in Ibn Khaldūn, Mukhaddima, iii, 137 ff., istinzial rūḥānīyyāt al-ajlāh is a technique belonging to siyrād [q.e.], natural or phantasmagoric magic (cf. T. Fahl, Divination, 45, n. 1). The Pseudo-Madjriti prefers to use istidādī (cf. Sources Orientales, vii, (1966), 170 ff.). Elsewhere, in al-Būnī and Ibn al-Muwaqqitī, istinzial al-arwād wa-tirhdārūhi fi bawālid al-arshāh denotes the techniques of spiritism, although these are generally denoted by the name 'ilm al-istikhdār.

According to Hādīdī Khallīfa, this art consists in invoking the presence of jinn or angels and making them perceptible to the senses; only the prophets can achieve this result with the celestial angels; with regard to terrestrial angels, the question is in dispute. It is distinguished from 'ilm al-'aṣā'm, the talismanic art, by the fact that the latter calls upon jinn and angels for the performance of some project, without the need for incarnation, whereas their incarnation is the principal aim of istikhdār [see siyrād].

Bibliography: Hādīdī Khallīfa, i, 275 f.: definition with reference to the encyclopedia of the sciences of Tāṣkhpurūzāde, Mīṣāḥ al-taṣāda. Among the works devoted to this art, he mentions K. ḡalā ad-dawādīr wa-l-sawūr, "illustrated book on the invocation of jinn and their subjection (to man), a according to Aṣā'm b. Berekhyā, vizier to Solomon ..., this is no doubt a falsehood" (i, 276, and iii, 324); Iḥām al-Fattāh bi-hikmat insāl al-arwād wa-balāqkhā ḡaf 'l-arshāh of Kamāl al-Dīn al-Mubnām b. All b. al-Wafā', known under the name Ibn al-Muwaqqitī, d. 1165/1748-9 (i, 453; cf. Brockelmann, S II, 982; al-Bustān li-istikhdār arwād al-dīn al-walā-shayānīn fī 'ilm al-sā'āl fārābī al-Kif fī wa-l-'Arab, anonymous (ii, 50); Tansīl al-arwād fī bawālid al-arshāh of Abūd al-Būnī, d. 622/1225 (ii, 440). We have not succeeded in seeing any of these writings, which have not yet come to light among any of the manuscript collections which we have at present been able to consult. The 'ilm al-istikhdār cannot be properly
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and registration of soldiers; and the keeping of up-to-date registers of the troops' fighting qualities, their weapons and their mounts, could only be ensured through regular reviews. A careful recording of the physical features of soldiers (the $hula al-$rugjâ) and the brands or marks of mounts (simâl) was necessary to prevent intruders or substitutes entering the ranks or good horses being switched round or removed from the stables. Such malpractices led to the $divân being cheated over unmerited pay issues, and there was also a fear lest enemy spies insinuate themselves into the ranks. So it is natural that writers like Kudâma, Hilîl al-$Sâbi', Miskawâyih and Mâwardi should stress the prime importance of these identificatory procedures, cf. W. Hoenenbach,

Zur Heeresverwaltung der $'Abbâsiden: $divân al-$gârî, in IST, xxix (1949-90), 268 ff. These reviews and inspections were also normal occasions for pay issues, when the financial aspect of the $divân was displayed.

Hilîl al-$Sâbi' gives the detailed analysis of a caliphal budget from the reign of al-Mu'tâdîd (probably to be dated to Mubarram 280/March-April 893), and in the course of this he describes the $'ard procedure under that ruler. Al-Mu'tâdîd made the whole army muster before him personally in the "Lesser Square" in Baghdâd, whilst he sat overlooking it from the galleries of the Hasani Palace. Below him were positioned the secretaries responsible for pay arrangements ($uttâb al-$'$âli'). The commanders and their $ghulâms (q.v.) or military slave troops were drawn up prior to the caliph. The review now began, with the individual officers presenting registers of the names and pay entitlements of the men under them. The vizier 'Ubayd Allah b. Sulaymân b. Wahb summoned each man separately, and he was tested for his proficiency at the game of birdîs, in which the contestant had to get his lance-point through a metal ring fixed to the top of a wooden column, thus revealing his skill or otherwise in controlling his horse and aiming his weapon (four or five centuries later, tilting at the $birdîs was a prominent feature of the $furâisiyya (q.v.) exercises and training of the Mamlûk cavalrymen). According to the man's performance, the Mu'tâdîd graded him in the register (djardî) by a $djîm (= $djajyûd, excellent), a $jâ' (= muwatassî, moderate) or a $dâî (= $dâm, inferior). After this part of the $'ard, the secretaries responsible for practical military matters (kuttâb al-$djajyûd) came forward and examined the physical features of the men to check that they corresponded with the details set down in the registers; they were thus able to detect and eject intruders and substitutes (duskhadâ, budîlâ). The registers with the caliph's marks were handed back to the vizier, and the secretaries then prepared a fresh series of registers on the basis of the threefold proficiency grading. The $djajyûd soldiers were formed into the caliph's "Personal Army", 'asâhar al-$bâsâya, with a pay-period (ra'sa) of 90 days. The muwatassî soldiers were placed under the command of the $shâb al-$shurja or Police Commandant of Baghdâd, Badr, and used for garrisoning strategic points on
the routes from Baghdad to Lower Irak and western Persia; these were called the "Army of Service", 'ashar al-abidma, with a pay-period of 120 days. The troops considered as dān were sent out to the provinces to help with the tax-collecting, were employed for horsebreeding and stable duties, or were attached to the police commandants of Baghdad, Wāṣif and Kūfa (Hīlāl, Wuzara', ed. 'Abd al-Sattār Abmad Faraḵī, Cairo 1958, 17-19). As was the case all through the Islamic lands at this time, the office of 'Arid was invariably held by the caliphate generally modelled their administrative institutions on those of the 'Abbasids in Baghdad. Amongst the Fātimids of Egypt and Syria, Kālākhanī speaks of the Dīwān al-Djaysh as one of three divisions of a general Dīwān al-Djaysh 'al-mūtadi. The other divisions of the Dīwān were concerned with keeping the registers of the troops and with the allocation of ikhtā'ī's. The Ṣāhib Dīwān al-Djaysh and his assistant ḥābiq had the duty of holding 'arḍs of the troops, in which the physical features of the troops and the marks of their mounts were scrutinised, and he was kept informed of the state of the military personal by a staff of representatives attached to the army commanders (Ṣāhib al-ṣābah, iii, 492-3).

In the Iranian lands, the designation of 'Arid for the head of the military affairs department gradually supplanted the more general 'Abbasids like Ṣāhib Dīwān al-Djaysh. The Ṣaffārīd brothers Yaḵtbā and 'Amr b. Layth built up a vast if transient empire which stretched from eastern Afghanistan to the fringes of Irāk; and a Dīwān al-'Arḍ must have grown up inevitably to control and pay the Ṣaffārīd forces. The 'Arid's duties comprised the usual functions, for purity of Daylamī or Dhīhl blood, the expulsion of intruders from the ranks was an especial feature of the Buyid 'ard, when experts on tribal genealogies were employed to assist the 'Arid in his work. The 'arḍs were also occasions when the allocation of šāths was reviewed or these grants converted into cash payments, but the amīr had to be able to act from a position of strength. It is not infrequently recorded, amongst the Buyids and amongst other dynasties, that the threat to hold an 'ard (at which financial and territorial privileges would be reviewed and possibly cancelled) provoked a storm for the whole topic of the Buyid 'ard and the 'Arid's functions, Bosworth, Military organisation under the Buyids of Persia and Iraq, in Oriens, xviii-xix (1965-6), 143-67, esp. 162 ff., and also Busse, Chalif und Grosskönig, die Buyiden im Iraq (945-1055), Beirut 1969, 341-5, 340-1. Little is known about the formal constitution of the military department under the Sāmānids of Transoxania and Khurāsān, although a Dīwān Ṣāhib al-Shurā, sc. for the Commandant of the Guard, existed in Bukhārā during the time of Nasr b. Ahmad (early 4th/10th century), cf. Narshaghi, The history of Bukhara, tr. Frye, 26; and Khūrāzimī mentions a special "black register" (al-dījarā al-saṣāna) in which the names and duties of the troops were recorded (Maǧīth al-maṣūm, 56, 64; see DAF'TAR). Hence the institution of the 'Arid very probably existed for the Sāmānid army (on which see Bosworth, An alleged embassy from the Emperor of China to the Amir Nasr b. Ahmad: a contribution to Sāmānid military history, in Yād-nāme-yi Minorshyk, Tehran 1969, 17-29), for the Sāmānid administration was the immediate model for that of their successors, the Ghaznavids, and the administration of the latter certainly included a Dīwān-i 'Arḍ as one of the five great departments of state. The Ghaznavid 'Arid's duties comprised the usual range of financial and military ones, and the office was accounted second only in importance to that of the vizier. 'Ard as the whole army, cavalry, infantry and elephants, were held annually on the plain of the Shābahrā outside Ghazna, and Gardīz states that at the 'Arid of 414/1023 54,000 cavalry and 1,300 elephants were reviewed; on occasions like this, the names of the troops were checked against the muster-roll or dījarā-yi 'ard, the troops received their pay and the whole proceedings often ended in a magnificent feast for all present given by the sultan. Subordinate 'Ārids were attached to each of the Ghaznavid armies stationed in the provinces, and these officials held local reviews of the troops and paid them with funds drawn from the provincial treasuries. As was the case all through the Islamic lands at this time, the office of 'Arid was invariably
held by a member of the civilian bureaucracy, Arab or Persian, and not by one of the Turkish soldiery, administrative expertise rather than prowess in the field being the desideratum. See on all these questions, M. Nāẓim, The life and times of Sultan Maḥmūd of Ghazna, Cambridge 1931, 137 ff.; Bosworth, Ghaznavid military organisation, in Isl., xxxvi (1960), 68 ff.; and idem, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040, 122 ff.

A particularly interesting account of how an 'ārīd should be conducted is contained in the treatise on kingship and military practice by the 7th/13th century Ghūrid author Fakhr-i Mudābbir Muḥārak-shāh, the ʿAbd al-mušūl wa-kīṣfayt al-mālshūkh or ʿAbd al-barb wāl-shādājāb (bāb 18 of the more complete India Office Ms 647, bāb 12 of the B.M. Ms Rieu, ii, 487-8 = 267-8 of the printed text by A. S. Khwaň-sārī, Tehran 1346/1967). There is clearly some factual basis for this account, however much it has been idealised, and it presumably reflects the institution as it developed on the eastern fringes of the Islamic world under such dynasties as the Ghaznavids and Gūrids, and probably in northern India under the Gūrids' slave commanders. According to Fakhr-i Mudābbir's account, the 'ārīd—described as "the mainstay, the very mother and father of the army, upon whom the strength and reliance of the troops rests"—was accompanied for the 'ārīd by his deputy and by the Naḵb, and they stood on an eminence and inspected the left wing, centre and right wing of the army, in that order. Within this framework of review, the heavy cavalry, the light cavalry, the regularly-salaried infantry and the auxiliary infantry were successively inspected, and the lists given to the Naḵb so that he could arrange these troops on the day of battle. The commanders themselves were all reviewed, and each ordinary cavalryman was written down under his superior officer. The 'ārīd is cautioned not to demand that horses and weapons be produced during a pre-battle 'ārīd, but he should encourage the troops with promises of rewards and promotions, so that they will be stimulated to feats of heroism. At the end of the 'ārīd, the 'ārīd brings the troops' leaders before the ruler and praises their soldiers. The fear of enemy forces; the 'ārīd should, accordingly, make his report to the ruler discreetly, and if cavalrymen already reviewed slip back and mingle with the unreviewed, the spies will become confused and acquire an exaggerated idea of the army's strength. From this passage of the ʿAbd al-mušūlākh, there emerge two vital and practical reasons for holding an 'ārīd: firstly, it provided a check on the condition and composition of the troops to set them out in their battle stations when they reached the field; and, as under the preceding dynasty of the Būyids, it was as much a financial as a military organ of government, with the responsibility, for instance, of overseeing šībās and reallocating them when they fell vacant. Till the death of Malik-Šāh, the ʿĀrīd al-dīwān-i ʿĀrīd-i Dīwān-i ʿĀrīd was usually a civilian official, but thereafter, the office was occasionally held by a Turkish amīr (Lambton, in Cambridge history of Iran, v, 233, 259-60). As well as the central military department, provincial offices doubted less. This last fact may be inferred from the text of an investiture diploma for an ʿĀrīd given in the second part of the collection of Rashīd al-Dīn Watāš's letters, the Wasāš al-rasāši' un-daš'ālī' wa-fādi'ālī' compiled for the Khwārizmshāh Djalāl al-Dīn's brother Ghiyāḥ al-Dīn Pirshāh or Shīrshāh; it thus reflects the common Saljūq and Khwārizmshāh tradition. In it, the appointee is described as ʿĀrīd dar ḍawīyān manšūkh, and his duties characterised as firstly, a care for the correct pay entitlements of the soldiers, and secondly, the proper conduct of 'ārīds, with due inspection of equipment and weapons (H. Horst, Die Staatsverwaltung der Grosselügen und Ilorazmākh (1038-1231), Wiesbaden 1964, 39-41, 109-10). 'Ārīds were held at such usual times as the opening of campaigns (e.g., before the expedition of Alp Arslan to Anatolia which culminated in the victory of Manzikert); but 'ārīds could still give rise to disaffection, for the 7,000 troops whom Malik-Šāh dismissed from his army after an 'ārīd at Ray in 473/1081 joined his brother Tekish in eastern Khurāsān, and the latter used them to rebel (Bosworth, in Cambridge history of Iran, v, 90).

Although the Great Saljūq empire disintegrated, the military traditions associated with the maintenance of a standing professional army lived on beyond the cataclysm of the Mongol invasions and were passed on to the later Saljūqs of Rūm in Anatolia and to the various Mongol and Türkmen dynasties which came to dominate the whole region from Syria to Afghanistan. Under the Il-Khānids, we find the office of ʿĀrīd or Amir-i ʿĀrīd still flourishing; his duties included oversight of the army's eqīdān and, probably, assistance to the khan at army reviews (cf. J. H. Uzunçarşı, Osmanlı devleti teşkilatına medhal, Istanbul 1941, 257). The 'Ārīd-nāma or account of a review written by Djalāl al-Dīn Dawāndī (d. 908/1502) [q.v.] shows the institution of the 'ārīd in common use amongst the Türkmen Kā Koynūlu under their greatest ruler, Uzun Hasan. In this document there is described an 'ārīd held by Uzun Hasan's son Sultan Šaĥīl, governor of Fārs, at Band-i Amir near Persepolis, which lasted three days and, says Šaĥīl, was always attended by the khan at army reviews (cf. M. Nakib). As under the Great Saljūq empire, the troops, comprising the provincial army of Fārs, presented themselves for inspection in the tripartite formation characteristic of Turkish armies, of left wing, right wing and centre. Members of the royal family headed the list; these were followed by the officers, including the elite group of the tawāqūf; and then successive detachments (kōhwān) of the rank-and-file, the nakūrāw, comprising armoured troops and archers, and the servants, the kullağāt (Mutawakkil, A civil and military review in Fārs in 888/1291, in BSOS, x (1940-2), 141-78; Uzunçarşı, op. cit., 301-12).

Amongst the Mamlūks of Egypt and Syria, the traditional occasions for army reviews figure, as one would expect, in the chronicles; thus when in 832/1428-9 Al-Asḥāf Barsbāy prepared his expedition against the Timūrid Shāh Ruhūk, the khalīf (q.v.) was reviewed in the Royal Square (al-hāshiq al-sullānī), and even the very young, the aged and the blind were required to go on the venture (D. Ayalon, Studies on the structure of the Mamlūk army. II, in BSOS, xv (1953), 455). The civilian head of the military department was the Nāṣir al-Dīwān, but the official whose duties corresponded in many ways with those of the earlier 'Ārīd as overseer of reviews was the military official called the Naḵb al-Dīwānā (also found with various other titles like Muḥammad al-Dīwānā, ...
Amir al-Djuyush, Naṣib Nuḥbā’ al-Djuyush and Atābakh al-ʿAsdkir), whose office in Cairo had two branches, one for Egypt and one for Syria. He exercised military police functions, being therefore something like a Provost-Marshall. It was he who announced to the army that it should get ready and parade for inspection before an expedition, and for this he sent round his subordinate officials, the nuḥbā’ adīndā al-balṭa, to Cairo and district, and despatched messengers of the ṭarīd or postal service, [p.6] to other regions of Egypt (cf. M. Guadet-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks d'après les auteurs arabes, Paris 1923, i1xi; Uzuncarsih, Medhal, 383; and Ayalon, in BSOAS, xvi (1954), 64 ff.).

In the early Ottoman empire, many administrative and military traditions stemmed from the Ottomans' predecessors, the Rūm Sağlūqs. The terms ṣard and ard were not generally used, but a similar institution of military reviews existed under the designation of yoklama, the officials charged with organizing these inspections and recording the results being known as yoklamačilar. This institution was certainly flourishing by the time of Selūmān the Magnificent. The yoklama can best be documented from the journals of campaigns, such as those found in Ferdiün Beg's Münše'd-i ardīndū. When a campaign had been set on foot, the muster lists were received from the provinces and were reviewed in the army camp in front of the sultan's tent; the state of the musters was then recorded in special registers or muster-rolls, yoklama defterleri, and these were then presented to the sultan or commander-in-chief. The yoklama was particularly important as a means of checking on absentees from the forces, since absenteeism became an increasing problem as a disincentive from the fighting grew after the 10th/16th century. Documents giving orders for the holding of yoklamas are frequently quoted in minatory language. In one document regarding the Janissary cavalry and sent to the front of the sultan's tent still extant in Delhi called the Bigūy mandal 'viewing area' seems to have been designed as a viewing platform for the ard. The sultans' Diwan-i ard was headed by an official called in the mid-7th/13th century the Rauwati-i ard (rauwi = Hindi "warrior") or the Ardī-šāhak, and there were subordinate officials called nābūš-i ard-i mulūk. One duty of these deputy Ardīs seems to have been that of accompanying military expeditions when there was a chance of plunder, and of then transmitting the sultan's share of the booty back to Delhi. The founder of the Khalidī dynasty, Djālāl al-Dīn Fīrūz (689-95/1290-6) held the office of Ardī-i Mamālik when he seized power (Barani, Ta'rīḫ-i Fīrūzhāhī, 114, 116, 197, 326, 450).

Almost nothing is known of the ard in Muslim India in the immediate post-800/1398 period, although it seems likely that the traditional processes of muster and review were preserved in the Indian sultanates rather than re-introduced de novo by the Mughals. The recording of the hulā ardījāl is said to have been revived by Shih Shāh Sūr of Delhi (955-5/1545-46); a Diwan-i Ard-i Mamālik existed in Mālā in the 9th/15th century; and the functions of the Ardī may have been performed in the Bengal sultanate of the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries by the official known as the Wāsir-i Lāshkar or Lāshkar-Wāsir.

In Mughal India, many of the functions inherited from the classical Ard devolved on the Mīr-Bakhsāhī or Bakhsāhī Mamālik (Bakhshī, originally "writer, secretary", a term stemming from Mongol administrative usage), assisted by a number of other Bakhshīs, which grew from one to three between the late 10th/16th century and the 12th/18th century; in addition, a Bakhsāhī-yi Lāshkar was sometimes temporarily appointed to accompany a specific expedition. The chief Bakhshī's duties were broadly those of an Adjutant-General and a Muster-Master; he was concerned with recruitment, keeping lists of the mansabdar or officers, arranging a duty roster for the palace guards, issuing grants of pay (tankhdh), and keeping registers of deserters and absentees from reviews. The Mughal army, like other Islamic forces, suffered from the evils of false musters and absenteeism. The Emperor Akbar revived the practice of the Delhi state of enforcing a system of descriptive rolls for men and horses and of brands for the animals. The soldiers' rolls were called ĉhira, literally "face", because as well as recording the genealogical and ethnic affiliations of the warrior in question, physical details were also noted; the rolls of the horses were likewise called ĉhira-yi aspān. Horses had normally to be branded by the Bakhsāhī's subordinate, the Dārā-ğā (q.v.), the procedure being known as dāggh u tašhīha "branding and verification". Only commanders of 5,000 and above were exempt from the branding requirements, according to a late 12th/17th century administrative manual, one of those with the title Dastūr-ī-amāl (B.M. Ms 6599, second work in the Ms), but they had to parade their horses for inspection when required (it is, however, known from other sources that high officers had their personal brand marks). It thus appears that the general process of tašhīha, requirement of the troops' appearing on parade and the checking of their equipment, is a direct descendant of the classical ard, and that it was carried out in peacetime at regular intervals, the precise period of time depending on the nature and rate of pay. Thus a mansabdar whose men were paid in dāggh or personal grants (see under 앍�) had to parade them for review once a year, whereas those paid in cash had to appear at rather
more frequent intervals. During a military expedition, the Mir-Bakhshi or Bakhshi accompanying the army was expected to lay before the emperor or commander-in-chief a detailed muster-roll on the morning of battle. It was also he who, like the ideal 'Arīd in Fākhr-i Mubaddil's Alāb al-mulūḥ, deployed the troops in the positions which had often been assigned to them before the actual campaign. In the absence of the emperor, the Bakhshi was not infrequently appointed commander of the force, and on many other occasions he commanded a division of it; but even the Mir-Bakhshi might serve beneath an ordinary amir as commander. See W. Irvine, The army of the Indian Moghuls: its organisation and administration, London 1903, 36-56, also in JRAS (1896), 539-55; Ibn Hasaan, The central structure of the Moghul empire, Karachi 1966, 77-9, 125.

Bibliography: Given in the article. There are no special studies devoted to the topic, but see Bosworth, Muster, recruitment and review in mediaeval Islamic armies, in War, technology and society in the Middle East, London, forthcoming. (C. E. Bosworth)

ISTI'RĀD (A), technical term of the Khaawāriḍī [q.v.], used, in a general sense, of religious murder, the putting to death in particular by the Azārla [q.v.] of Muslims and pagans who objected to their still rudimentary doctrine. However this meaning seems to be the result of a semantic evolution (even an innovation), the verb ista'rāda (tenth form) meaning "to ask someone to display his possessions" and, hence, "to give an account of his opinions"; the isti'rād is thus the interrogation to which the enemies of these sectarians were subjected on falling into their hands. There seems also to have occurred an overlapping with the eighth form 'ārada, which seems to mean "to examine one by one, to pass under review", but also "to attack someone" and "to strike in all directions, indiscriminately" (cf. al-Kāli, Amālik, i, 119). In al-Ṭabarī (i, 355, line 2) there is found, concerning Mis'ar b. Fadākī, the phrase abqala yātaridu 'l-nās which Mne. Vescia Vagliori, in AlUON, iv (1952), 63 translates "presero a far subire interrogatori alla gente", perhaps while fighting, since the verb could well have here the meaning of "attack"; another attestation appears more certain: al-Mubarrad (Kāmil, 616; Cairo ed., 1041; cf. Ibn Abi 'l-Iṣlah, ʿAṣrak Nādī al-balāgah, i, 382) says in fact of Nāfī that at al-Ahwāz yātaridu 'l-nās (i.e., he made them undergo an interrogation) and killed the children (ya$kūlūthum); since he adds al-Tabarī does the same. However, when, concerning ʿAlī, the verb might be used for the acquisition of new rights but also to permit the acquisition of new rights. Thus in this school a missing man whose death cannot be established may inherit, which is impossible under Hanāfi law; in the same way, in Shafi'i law a pre-emptor may avail himself of istiṣfrād in order to prove that he is a co-proprietor, which the Hanafs do not allow (al-Kāli, Badh, v, 14). Examples of istiṣfrād which might be used for the acquisition of new rights abound in al-'Isīfī's works. It should be noted that Zufar, among the Hanafs, upheld ideas which were very close to those of the Shafi'īs on this point.


ISTISHRĀK [see MUSTASHRIRŪN]

ISTIKSAK, a rogatory rite still practised at the present day (notably in Jordan and Morocco) and dating back to the earliest Arab times (?Adīte ac-
cording to Ibn al-Athir, i, 61; Abrahamic according to Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 22) which is a supplication for rain during periods of great drought. The rite must have been both astral and magical in nature. Obliged to retain it because of its great popularity, primitive Islam tried to remove these features. A precise ritual was established—as in the case of istiskhâra (q.v.), another custom deriving from pagan cultic practices—so that the faithful would have to submit to the temptation of returning to the ways of the Dâhilyya. With this end in view, istiskhâr was in the pagan manner, that is through the intermediary of the planets (al-istikhsâr bi 'l-kawâkib) is condemned in a hadith, where it features alongside hidjâd, insult by reference to genealogy, which was thought of as an action with magical results, and niyâkha, the use of hired mourners (al-Tabari, iii, 2444; Ibn al-Athir, Usâd, i, 299; T. Fahd, Le panthéon de l'Arabie centrale, xi, n. 2).

Pagan istiskhâr, or rather istimâr, required the use of fire; nár al-istikhdâr was one of the numerous sacred fires of ancient Arabia (cf. Panthéon, 9-18). It consisted of driving, onto a hilltop that was difficult to reach, oven with branches of wild grape (sala') and mudar plant ('ughar) attached to their tails and hocks. When they reached the top, these branches were fired. The bellowing of the beasts and the cries and supplication of the men rose clamorously towards the minbar, vii (1966), 187 f. (Le panthéon de l'Arabie centrale, xi, n. 2).

The magical nature of istiskhâr is also revealed in the manner in which it was practised by Ibn al-Hayyabân, a very pious Persianian Jew who arrived in Yathrib a few years before the advent of Islam. He lived among the Banû Kurayya, who applied to him every time a drought had lasted too long. He demanded that those who came to him place at their doors a pâdak consisting of one measure of dates or two measures of barley, and ask why he delayed (cf. Ibn Sa'd, iii/2, 50). Some of the martyr's of primitive Islam also enjoyed this privilege; because of this, the tomb of Abû Ayyûb, who died at the gates of Constantinople during the rule of Mu'tawiya and was buried in a spot that took his name (Eyyûp, at the base of the Golden Horn, was considered by the Byzantines as a propitious place to pray for rain (according to Ibn Sa'd, iii/1, 20)).

In later folklore the power to make rain fall was conferred on certain wells; an opening in the dome of their tombs symbolised this power. Their prestige among the people was so great that everyone wanted to number a "rainmaker" among his ancestors (cf. ref. apud I. Goldziher, Zauberlemente, 308 ff.). "Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb himself once officiated at the istiskhâr prayer by holding the hand of al-Abbas, the Prophet's uncle (Ibn Sa'd, iv/1, 19). Some of the martyrs of primitive Islam also enjoyed this privilege; because of this, the tomb of Abû Ayyûb, who died at the gates of Constantinople during the rule of Mu'tawiya and was buried in a spot that took his name (Eyyûp, at the base of the Golden Horn, was considered by the Byzantines as a propitious place to pray for rain (according to Ibn Sa'd, iii/2, 50)).

Still a small boy, Muhammad is said to have played a part in the rogations celebrated at Mecca as a result of a dream that the mother of Mahârama b. Nawfal al-Zuhari had: she had heard a voice announcing the imminent appearance of a prophet and describing to her a man, who, when he arrived, would bring about the rain. 'Abd al-Mu'ttalib convened the members of his family, including his grandson Muhammad, and one representative from each of the families of Mecca. They made their way in procession to Mount Abl Kubays. After a prayer uttered by 'Abd al-Mu'ttalib, rain swelled the streams. Recounting this story, Ibn Sa'd concludes (i/1, 54): "and they were refreshed because of the Messenger of God".

Even after his death the Prophet's is said to have demonstrated his attachment to this custom: he appeared in a dream to a chief of the Muzayna, during a long drought, to command him to go and see the Caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭâb and ask why he delayed in uttering the istiskhâr prayer. At once 'Umar assembled the people and recited a brief orison and two short prayers. Then he invoked God in these words: 'O God, our watercourses have dried up; our strength is exhausted; our souls are weary! There is no strength nor power but Thine, O God; send us water and revive the creatures and the earth' (al-Tabari, i, 2575-6; cf. Divination, 265; Panthéon, 11 f.).

Among the nomads, the prerogative of istiskhâr was allied to possession of the bayt or Bethel and the hâbâ or sacred tent; in the temples some divinities were famed in this role [see HURAK]. In Mecca the leader of the city held this prerogative, which had been transmitted by 'Abd al-Mu'ttalib to Muḥammad and thence to the caliphs (cf. H. Lammens, Le culte des Bétyles et les processions religieuses chez les Arabes préislamites, in BIFAQ (1919-20), 86). The Prophet's entire family inherited this prerogative (cf. ref. apud I. Goldziher, Zauberlemente, 308 ff.). "Umar b. al-Khaṭṭâb himself once officiated at the istiskhâr prayer by holding the hand of al-Abbas, the Prophet's uncle (Ibn Sa'd, iv/1, 19). Some of the martyrs of primitive Islam also enjoyed this privilege; because of this, the tomb of Abû Ayyûb, who died at the gates of Constantinople during the rule of Mu'tawiya and was buried in a spot that took his name (Eyyûp, at the base of the Golden Horn, was considered by the Byzantines as a propitious place to pray for rain (according to Ibn Sa'd, iii/2, 50)).

In later folklore the power to make rain fall was conferred on certain wells; an opening in the dome of their tombs symbolised this power. Their prestige among the people was so great that everyone wanted to number a "rainmaker" among his ancestors (cf. ref. apud I. Goldziher, loc. cit.). This phenomenon was particularly pronounced in the Maghrib, where, moreover, pagan rites dating from very early times survive among the Berbers (see Bibliography). For the saalat al-istikdhâr, see saalât.

Rain-making ceremonies among the Turks.

The magico-religious practices most generally employed in Turkey to produce rain are (with some regional variations) the following:

(1) Appropriate formulae are recited over a large number of pebbles, which are then put in a bag and sunk in a stream; care must be taken that not a single pebble falls loose in the water, for this would produce a torrential rainfall. When sufficient rain has fallen, the bag is withdrawn from the water.

(2) Collective prayer is offered led by a khodja, preferably by a sacred site upon an eminence. During the prayer, the supplicants turn their clothes inside out and stretch their half-open hands in gestures simulating the fall of rain. In some areas it is the custom to make babies cry and lambs bleat by separating them from their mothers. There exist in manuscript anthologies of popular poetry some ištadâ in Turkish composed to be sung during these collective prayers.

(3) Besides prayers addressed to God, attempts to procure the intervention of a saint and rites of sympathetic magic, there are found also collective meals provided for the poor of the community, with the same object of appeasing the Divine wrath by works of charity (drought being regarded as a punishment from heaven).

(4) Another group of ceremonies is found in the traditions of the children, which similarly belong to the domain of sympathetic magic. These are ceremonies with the character of games, when children go from door to door to collect money, singing appropriate words and carrying a doll usually representing a woman dressed in fantastic style. This doll is called by different names in different areas: Çömge-gelin "ladle-bride", Keşge-haden "strainer-woman", Yağmur-gelini "rain-bride". The children eat, all together, a meal bought with the proceeds of the collection. In some regions (Samsun, Sinop) this ceremony is called Gőde-göde ("frog-frog"); money is collected by children taking from door to door a bucket of water with a frog in it. The common feature of these "children's collections" is that the doll or the children themselves are sprinkled with water by the housewives as they pass in procession in front of the houses.

Some less common ceremonies, such as the immersion in water of a horse's skull, on which prayer is recited, are also found. The common feature of these ceremonies is that they are, especially for Anatolian Turkish practices, an act performed together in the performance of the act. — The Rafidî Shi'î Hisâbân b. al-Hakam enumerates five of these: health and integrity (physical); favourable circumstances; the desired time; instruments; motive (sabab). The act is produced, and it cannot be not produced, when all these elements are present (cf. al-Ash'ârî, Makâlâtı, ed. 'Abd al-Hamil, Cairo n.d., i, 110-2; and W. Montgomery Watt, Free Will and Predestination, London 1948, 116-7). With these tendencies may be linked the opinion of al-Nâjîdîr, already very close to the Ash'ârî line: "the capacity" does not last, it does not exist before the act, it is created by God for the act and at the instant of the act whose accomplishment it governs.

The use of stones which after a magico-religious ceremony acquire the power to induce rainfall is the most widespread method of all, and is probably the Anatolian form taken by the very old Turco-Mongol practice of inducing rain by the "yada-stone". For the data on this subject found in Chinese and Arabic sources, see the communication by Kopruliizade M. Fu'dîn, ed. Nyberg and trans. Nader, Beirut 1954, 62-72. — But for Dirâr, the capacity which precedes the act continues to exist during its performance.

3) The group known as Muğîbîn, to whom al-Ash'ârî, regarding them to some extent as his precursors, was to give the name Ahî al-ištâhâr, defined ištâhâr as the whole body of elements which join together in the performance of the act. — The Rafidî Shi'î Hisâbân b. al-Hakam enumerates five of these: health and integrity (physical); favourable circumstances; the desired time; instruments; motive (sabab). The act is produced, and it cannot be not produced, when all these elements are present (cf. al-Ash'ârî, Makâlât, ed. 'Abd al-Hamil, Cairo n.d., i, 110-2; and W. Montgomery Watt, Free Will and Predestination, London 1948, 116-7). With these tendencies may be linked the opinion of al-Nâjîdîr, already very close to the Ash'ârî line: "the capacity" does not last, it does not exist before the act, it is created by God for the act and at the instant of the act whose accomplishment it governs.

4) Al-Ash'ârî deals with ištâhâr from his own point of view in the Ibâna (ed. Cairo n.d., 53-5), and devotes to it a chapter of the Luma (ed. and English trans. R. McCarthy, Beirut 1953, 54-9, 76-9). The "capacity" is created directly by God "with the act and for the act". It does not pre-exist it, a point of difference from the Mu'azzini thesis. A man who does not have the requisite physical integrity is stroke with powerlessness (istadâ); he would certainly be incapable
of performing the act, but that is not the true conception of istitā'a. If, on the contrary, the power (kudra) to act fails him, and whatever his physical integrity may be, the power to act fails the man, it is because God has not created in him the corresponding "capacity"; in this way He has not attributed to him the kasb or istisāb which permits the subject to "acquire" the act, and which is the source of moral qualification. It is in this sense that one can say that God is "the creator of human acts", of any act whatever, whether good or bad. Must it thereby be concluded that man is "constrained"? On this point copious Ashārī discussions are to be found on the "acquisition" of acts. Al-Bākīllānī for example, who treats at length of istiṣā'ā in his Tamkhdīd (ed. McCarthy Beirut 1957, 286-95), is at great pains to distinguish it from "constraint" (istikdār q.v.), the trembling of the hand of the paralytic man is "constrained"; on the contrary, thanks to istiṣā'ā created by God, man chooses and likes the act which he elicits. One could not therefore call him "constrained"!, mudarr (ibid., 393). In his Irshād, al-Djuwaynī does no more than mention istiṣā'ā (ed. and French trans. Luciani, Paris 1938, 122/196, 125/201) as a quasi-synonym for the "power" which guarantees the kasb. And this power seems indeed to be in accord with the integrity of the means and instruments. The fact remains that, like every accident, it is dictated by God and that, like every accident, it does not "last". Therefore, it does not precede the act, as the Mu'tazīls would have it, but is concomitant with it (ibid., 125/201). Throughout the Ashārī treatises there are repeated affirmations, similar in their basis but with nuances peculiar to each author. Al-Djurđanī condenses these in his Ta'rīfāt (18-19), defining "capacity" as "the accident created by God in animate beings who, thanks to it, perform acts of free choice". He specifies that "real" capacity (hakikīya) is the perfection of the "power" which obligatorily determines the beginning of the act and is concomitant with it. To put it briefly, let us say that the notion of istiṣā'ā is at the very root of the Ashārī notion of kasb, the relationship or linking together of the effect produced and the agent.

6) We find a fairly closely related distinction in Ibn Hazm, but with different presuppositions: a) health and physical integrity, prior to the act; b) an accident directly and instantaneously created by God for the fulfilment of the act; it is, and is no more than, concomitant with this last. This second sense, says Ibn Hazm, is "the perfection of capacity". From this it ensues that the unbeliever has "the capacity to believe" according to the first meaning; but no longer so according to the second (Kitāb al-Fiqāl fi 'l-miśl, ed. Cairo 1347, iii, 21-6, 31).—It may be added that similar theses were maintained by some jurists or theologians whose line of thought was far removed from Zāhirism, for example the Hānafī al-Taḥāwī and the Imām al-Kulaynī. Moreover, a comparison may be made with the thinking of Ibn Taymiyya. It is true that he no longer referred to istiṣā'ā, but spoke rather of a kudra preceding the act, which conditions it without necessitating it, and of a kudra concomitant with the act and rendering it necessary (cf. R. Brunschvig, art. cit., 41).—Doubtless it is to the "antecedent" istiṣā'ā, accepted by al-Māturīdī and Ibn Hazm, that al-Djurđanī refers (Ta'rīfāt, 19) when he adds to the Ashārī definitions quoted above that the capacity is "healthy" if impediments such as sickness and other similar things disappear.

A multiplicity of further references could be given. These would emphasise that the notion of istiṣā'ā as a technical term varies with the different schools, and sometimes with the writers; and that it is always closely dependent upon theses founded on the intrinsic reality or non-reality of human freedom of choice.

Bibliography: In the article. (L. GARDET)

ISTIITHNĀ' (A.), inf. of the verb istathnd to "except"; a technical term in Arabic grammar signifying "exception". This assumes, first of all, a complete sentence; then (when the proposition has been stated) one or more beings are excepted from the functions exercised in the sentence. In English, except is used, e.g.: Everyone came except Zayed. Arabic uses means of expression of various origins (Sibawayhi, i, ch. 185): al-ghayra (a noun signifying "differently" created by God and that, if, like every accident, it does not "last"); see Fleischer, Kleine Schriften, 495); very much more rarely, as a substitute for illā: lā yahūmu, laya, followed by the accusative.

Al-ghayra, al-sūd, al-bāghā, as nouns, are the first term of an annexation and the second goes into the genitive; the English sentence above is rendered: al-ghayra l'kašmu alghayra, or al-sūd or al-bāghā, Zayd*; al-Farrā' and al-Mubarrad also accept the accusative after al-bāghā (see the account of Ibn Ya'qūb, 269, lines 2-9).

Illā, al-ghayra, 'adā, are followed by the accusative: al-ghayra l'kašmu illā, or al-bāghā or 'adā, Zayd*; Ibn Mālik (Alfiyya, verse 320) also accepts the genitive after al-ghayra and 'adā, as did al-Akhfash al-Awsat (for al-ghayra, see also al-Zamakhshari, Mufassal, 31, line 7 and Ibn Ya'qūb, 261, lines 16-20).

Illā is regarded as being added to a complete affirmative sentence; if this sentence is negative (or interrogative with a negative sense) the accusative can be used, or, preferably, the case of the preceding general term (Ibn Mālik, Alfiyya, verses 316-7 and Ibn 'Aqīl, i, 507): mā al-ghayra l'kašmu illā Zayd** (or Zayd***) (see Wright, ii, 336). If the thing excepted is different in kind from that from which it is excepted, the Hiḍjāz uses only the accusative after illā, and the Tamīm the accusative or the case of the preceding general term; thus, following the pattern sentence: mā al-ghayra l'kašmu illā 'alām*** (Hiḍjāz), illā 'alām*** (Tamīm) "the people did not come, only a donkey" (Ibn Ya'qūb, 264, lines 8-17). Nōdēke (Zur Grammatik, § 37) gives still further variations in the construction of illā.

In our opinion, if one wishes to account for the different constructions of illā, one should start with al-ghayra. This was a noun and the important word in the construction: al-ghayra Zayd*, literally: "with the difference of Zayd" (al-ghayra, in the acc., as indicating the state (the kāl) of the subject, or if one wishes, as complement of manner). Illā was a simple particle; by analogy, in view of the similarity of sense, the
construction of ghayra in the accusative was transferred to the noun following it. Thus it is a simple analogical construction. The non-observance of this analogy leaves scope for variations in construction, e.g., ma'dā'ā 'l-ba'amu illsa-Zayd'ī (analogical construction), illsa-Zayd'ī (construction merely ad sensum).

Remarks: a) The Arab grammarians (cf. Sibawayhi, i, 314, line 17; Ibn Ya'qūb, 260, line 17) see in illsa the substantive of the suffix illsa; but ghayra is frequently used, and illsa is not uncommon in the texts; khād, zadā, and particularly illsa are found less often. Detailed investigations by numerical analysis must have occurred in the Arab tribes.

b) Fleischer (Kleinesche Schriften, 734) sees in ghayr "difference" an ancient infinitive of a 1st form verb ghāra (i), now disappeared, which served as the basis of ghāyara "to change". Reckendorf (Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse, 146, Anm. 1) finds the etymology of ghayr obscure. Comparative Semitics gives no satisfactory explanation, so Fleischer may perhaps be right.—For the etymology of illsa, see Fleischer, loc. cit., 735, lines 131.

c) Annexation accounts for the construction of ghayr, illsa, zadā, and particularly illsa are found less often. Detailed investigations by numerical analysis must have occurred in the Arab tribes. For the Basrans, illsa and illsa were merely zarf; for the Kufans, they were illsa and zarf (Ibn al-Anbari, Kidāb al-Inšāf, ed. G. Weil, Discussion 39). In zadā the Kufans saw a verb (ibid., Discussion 37).

Discussion (37).—From the references in the text: W. Wright, Arabic Grammar, ii, 335-43; M. Gaudenz-Demombynes and R. Blachère, Gr. Ar. Classique, §§ 386-7; J.-B. Belot, Gr. Ar., a résumé: 293-5; Lane, Lexicon, the articles on the words concerned; Reckendorf, Arabische Syntax, § 252. Arab authors: Sibawayhi, i, ch. 185-202 (ed. particularly: ch. 185-7, 193, 199, 201-2; Zamakhshari, Muṣafar, 2nd ed. Broch, §§ 88-96, particularly: §§ 88-90; Sīwāl the Kufans saw a verb (ibid., Discussion 37). For the Basrans, illsa and illsa were merely zarf; for the Kufans, they were illsa and zarf (Ibn al-Anbari, Kidāb al-Inšāf, ed. G. Weil, Discussion 39). In zadā the Kufans saw a verb (ibid., Discussion 37).

Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV

The division of the globe into two hemispheres is not the only function of the equator. It also marks the limit of inhabited lands in their furthest longitudinal extent, from East to West, from the extremities of China to the Fortunate or Eternal Islands (al-Dirāt al-khālidāt [q.v.]). Mid-way, according to a conception inherited from India, an island is situated, at the same distance from the North and the South as from the East and the West: this is the dome of the earth (Ari, Usayn, Udīdāy [q.v.]).

Finally, the equator plays an essential part in the division of climates (ākālim, sing. iklim [q.v.]), and, through these, in the distinction between inhabited and uninhabited lands, this time in the North-South direction. Just as in the North, towards Thule, at a latitude of about 60°, life ceases to be possible on account of the intense cold, so in the South, at a latitude generally estimated at approximately 40°, life disappears on account of the excessive heat. On the whole from North to South, life extends merely over a latitude of approximately 80 degrees. Although certain authors attribute to the southern hemisphere seven climates corresponding to those of the northern hemisphere, it remains true that a parallel situation does not hold good in respect of life, which is thus limited to only one quarter of the globe—from 0 to 180 degrees from East to West and from +60 to —60 degrees in the South-North direction. In general, if, in the architecture of the world, it was perceived to be a line of equilibrium, in the description of inhabited lands the equator was always regarded more or less as a limit, with the risks which its crossing imply: reflecting this state of mind and this latent mistrust, the Arab geographical texts, even when describing the countries of the South, have nothing to say on the theme of "crossing the line", so dear to modern explorers.


ISTONI (ISTOJNI) BELGRAD (also Ust-elen, Usten Belgrad)—cf. Serbian: Stožni Belgrad; German: Stuhlweissenburg; Latin: Alba Regia; Hun-
ISTOLNI (ISTRONI) BELGHRAD — ITALIYA

The fortress was difficult to attack. It fell nonetheless to the Ottoman Turks in 950/1543.

The particulars furnished by Arab geographers and travellers in regard to Italy, both the peninsula and the islands, are not all equally complete and trustworthy. It need hardly be emphasised that, in their writings, Sicily (as will be made clear in the article Şİ Kitt,u,VA) was given a place of particular importance, in view of the fact that, for almost two and a half centuries, the island formed part of the Där al-İlām [i.e., among the remarkable output of Arab geographical writings, one work outstanding for the wealth and detail of the information it contains is the Nusihat al-muḳlakāţ, four sections of which are devoted to Italy—three to its mainland territory (3rd section of the 1Vth climate, 2nd and 3rd sections of the Vth) and one to its island territory (2nd section of the 1Vth climate).

Although it should sometimes be treated with reserve, the information furnished by al-İdresī is only rarely the fruit of pure imagination: a typical and perhaps unique example is the fanciful, legendary description of the city of Rome—three to its mainland territory (3rd section of the 1Vth climate, 2nd and 3rd sections of the Vth) and one to its island territory (2nd section of the 1Vth climate).

The fullest, but also the least trustworthy, descriptions of the city of Rome—transcribed as Ruma, Rumiya (which sometimes denotes Calabria alone), one finds the term (strangely transsliterated as al-Ankaburda) extends from Provence to Calabria.

Although it should sometimes be treated with reserve, the information furnished by al-İdresī is only rarely the fruit of pure imagination: a typical and perhaps unique example is the fanciful, legendary description of the city of Rome—three to its mainland territory (3rd section of the 1Vth climate, 2nd and 3rd sections of the Vth) and one to its island territory (2nd section of the 1Vth climate).

Although it should sometimes be treated with reserve, the information furnished by al-İdresī is only rarely the fruit of pure imagination: a typical and perhaps unique example is the fanciful, legendary description of the city of Rome—three to its mainland territory (3rd section of the 1Vth climate, 2nd and 3rd sections of the Vth) and one to its island territory (2nd section of the 1Vth climate).
Lastly Sawdán, also a Berber, who came to power in 243/857 and, more fortunate than his predecessor, after various mishaps (described by al-Baladhuri who was himself a contemporary), succeeded in securing from Bagdad an official investiture with his fiefl, the end of which came about in Rabî‘ 1 257/February 871.

Another city in Apulia, Taranto, was the scene of Muslim occupation for more than thirty years (approximately 231/846-266/880), but in Ibn al-Athir we find only a brief allusion, repeated by Ibn Khaldûn with some omissions (ibid., 470). The Arab chroniclers give no information about the numerous Saracen exploits in southern Italy, and particularly those which took place in the Garigliano valley, where a fortress, built in 269/883, enabled activities on a formidable scale to be maintained until 302/915; it may be supposed that the Saracen adventurers, operating in this sector as elsewhere, were encouraged by the news of the landing in Calabria in Shawwâl 289/September 902, under the Aghlabid amir Ibrâhîm II b. Abd (261/875-289/902); whereas the renewal of Muslim expansionist activity in southern Italy may be found, particularly in Ibn al-Athîr (in BAS, 242), al-Nuwayrî (ibid., 453), Lîsân al-Dîn b. al-Khâshîb (3rd chapter of Al-mâl al-dîlîm, ed. al-‘Abbâdî and al-Kâttânî, under the title al-Maghrib al-ihrîb fi l-lâr al-musîr); Casablanca 1964, 120). Ibn Khaldûn (BAS, 475-6) and some other sources of less importance.

From the beginning of 298/end of 910 and until 336/948 the Fâtimids, who had at first come up against a legitimist body of opinion, supported principally by the pro-Aghlabîd Ibn Kûrub, succeeded the Aghlabîds in Sicily; for this period the Arab historical sources give prominence not only to the Saracens’ constant offensives in Calabria and Apulia but also to the campaign led by Şâbir, a dîlîm of al-Mahdi’s court, who in 316/928 attacked the Lombard principalities on the Tyrrhenian coast and occupied several fortified places whose identity is not easy to establish on account of uncertain toponymy of the Arab texts (BAS, 170, 368). The Fâtimid imâm al-Kâsim (322/934-334/946) planned the daring invasion of the Ligurian coast, under the leadership of Ya’kûb b. Iâshîh who, in 322/934, made an attack on Genoa, which he conquered in the following year (BAS, 170, 254, 368, 437, 459, 478; Ibn Taghribîrî, ii, 267; in the Al-mâl al-dîlîm (53) we read that the expedition was entrusted to Djawhar [q.v.], the famous freedman of the Fâtimid imâm al-Mu’tazz).

From the middle of the 4th/10th century until the middle of the following century, Sicily was governed by amirs of the dynasty of the Kalbids [q.v.], and no acts of war of any particular importance took place, apart from the usual raids, noted by certain Arab chroniclers, in southern Italy and especially in Apulia and Calabria [see KILLAWRIYA]; for the invasion of Sardinia by Muğalîbî b. ‘Abbâd Allâh in 405/1015 see SARDANIA.

After the conquest of Sicily by the Normans, which began in 453/1061 and ended with the surrender of Palermo in 464/1072, the interest felt in a territory now finally lost to Islam diminished considerably, and the Arab historians restricted their references to Italy to the limited sphere of the relations of that country with the rulers of the Mashrîq and the Maghrib.

Bibliography: M. Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, Catania 1933-39, passim; ide m, Condizioni degli Stati cristiani dell'Oc cidente se-

ITALIA (ita, apparently a doublet of atâ) literally "gift", a general term met with, especially in pre- and proto-Islamic times, meaning a vague tribute or lump payment madâ', for example, to or by a tribe or other group; later the words des-ignate, sometimes in a denigrating way, a tip or bribe.

Bibliography: F. Lokkegaard, Islamic Taxonomy, index, s.v. (Cl. Cahen)

ITALIA (ita, a district in the south-west of Uttar Pradesh, India, lying between 26° 21' and 27° 2' N., 78° 45' and 79° 1' E.; and also the principal town of the old Dihâl sultanate left the district little disturbed thereafter. In the division of the lower Dôrâb territories between the first Lodî sultan, Bahûl, and Mahâmûd Shâhîrârî in 855/1451, Iâfwa passed to the Dijawnpur. A series of inconclusive disputes followed between Bahûl and the three successive Dijawnpur sultans Mahâmûd, Muhammad and Husayn, the last of whom seems to have made Iâfwa his temporary headquarters ("Bîbî Rââdî") the queen mother died here in 859/1456), and in 893/1487 Huzyayn's attack on Bahûl was repulsed and Iâfwa taken for the Lodî kingdom. It remained in Lodî hands until 1458 when, on Bâbur's invasion of the district, it was surrended to him. After the defeat of Humâyûn in 952/1545 the region passed to Shâh Shâh, who effected the partial pacification of the district by bringing in a force of 12,000 horsemen and by his efforts in opening up the country through a road-building programme. Neither he nor Akbar seems to have found its absorption into the state administration easy, although it retained some prestige when Akbar made the town of Iâfwa the chief town of a pargana; the town is mentioned in the A'in-i Akbari as possessing a brick fort, and some reference is occasionally made to Iâfwa as a banking centre. It seems never to have been settled by Muslims to the same extent as other towns of the Dôrâb, and after the decline of the Muqâil power fell into Marâha or Dôrâb hands, with Awadh sometimes powerful enough to gain control over it. Even after the district became part of the lands ceded by Awadh to the East India Company in 1810, many local chiefs retained a considerable measure of independence; the town had some prominence in the struggles of 1857.

Iâfwa town has an interesting Diwârî masdûd, built out of Hindu temple spoil, the western îwân of which has a massive central propylon-type arch similar to those of the Dijawnpur [i.e.] mosques; it has not been adequately studied, the only account
being C. Horne, Notes on the Jumma Masjid of Etwah, in *JASB*, xxxvi/i (1867), 74-5. The central square of Itawa is called "Humeani", the name commemorating A. O. Hume, the Scots collector of the district who played a prominent part in the foundation of the Indian Congress Party.

**Bibliography:** in the article.

**J. Burton-Page**

**ITBA** [see MUVADJA]

**ITTHABAT**, verbal noun of the fourth form of the root th-b-t, has the general meaning of to witness, to show, to point to, to demonstrate, to prove, to establish, to verify and to establish the truth, to establish (the existence of something).

For the Sufi, *ithbāt* is the opposite of *mahbūt*. This latter word means literally to efface. In the mystical vocabulary, it denotes the effacement of the "qualities of habit" (awādīʿ al-dāda) while *ithbāt* is the fact of performing one's religious obligations. It comprises three ways: to efface the degradation of appearances (dhillat al-zawdhir), to efface the negligences of the conscience, to efface all the deficiencies of the heart (according to al-Tahānawi, 1356, who quotes the commentary of 'Abd al-Lātiʿ on the *Maḥnawī*).

Other definitions are given: *mahbūt* consists of getting rid of the attributes of the carnal soul and *ithbāt* is this strengthening of the attributes of the heart so that he who casts away the bad and replaces them by the good is called *ṣāḥib mahbūt wa-*ithbāt. A further definition is given: *mahbūt* consists in putting aside the "vestiges" (ruṣūm) of actions by looking with an annihilating look at the carnal soul and all its emanations. On the other hand, *mithbāt* consists in maintaining the vestiges but in affirming that it is God who is their source; the Sufi is thus established in his faith, not in himself.

The origin of these two words is Qur'anic: "God effaces (yamīk) and confirms (yuṭḥbi) what He will" (XIII, 39); i.e., according to the Sufi commentary, God effaces from the hearts of the initiated all inattentiveness towards Him and all its mention of deities other than Himself, and He confirms on the lips of the beginners the mention of God. Above *mahbūt*, there is *maḥbūt*: while the first leaves a trace, the second leaves none.

**Bibliography:** Tahānawi, *Kashshaf*, 172 and 1356.

**ITHNA 'ASHARIYYA**, the name of that branch of *Shiʿi* Islam [see *Shiʿa*] that believes in twelve *Imāms* (*ṣīḥa* 'ashar meaning "twelve" in Arabic) beginning with 'Ali and ending with ʿUthmān al-Mahdi.

Within the whole body of Shiʿism the Ithna 'Ashari school is both the most numerous in terms of adherents and theologically the most balanced between the exoteric and esoteric elements of Islam. Other branches like the five-imāmī school of the Zaydis [q.v.] and the seven-imāmī school, known as Ismāʿīliyya [q.v.], are also of significance and continue to have adherents, while those believing in other numbers of *Imāms* or different interpretations of their functions have also existed during Islamic history but have been extremely small in number and have died out within a short period of their birth.

The religious history of Ithna 'ashari Shiʿism can be divided into four periods:

1. The period of the twelve *Imāms*: This period begins from the time of 'Ali to the major occultation [see *GHAYBA*] of the twelfth *Imām* in 329/940. The twelve *Imāms* are as follows:
   1. ʿAll b. ʿAbī Taḥlib (d. 40/660)
   2. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAll (d. 40/660)
   3. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAll (d. 61/680)
   4. ʿAll b. al-Ḥusayn (Zayn al-ʿAbidin) (d. 95/714)
   5. Muḥammad al-Bākir (d. 115/733)
   6. Djiʿfar al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765)
   7. Mūsā al-Kāẓim (d. 183/799)
   8. ʿAll al-Riḍā (d. 203/818)
   9. Muḥammad Djiʿwād al-TaḵĪ (d. 220/835)
   10. ʿAll al-Naṣrī (d. 254/868)
   11. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī (d. 260/874)

This period was unique in that it was one in which the *Imāms* lived among their followers and instructed them directly. They left behind not only a large number of disciples but sayings which were collected by their followers and became the basis of later Shiʿi intellectual life. In Shiʿism the *ḥadīth* literature includes the sayings of the *Imāms* in addition to those of the Prophet. Moreover, two major works survive which are ascribed to the *Imāms* themselves, the *Nahdi al-balāgha* to 'Ali and the *Ṣaḥīfa sadīqīyya* to Zayn al-ʿAbidin. The *Nahdi al-balāgha*, compiled from the sermons and orations of 'Ali by Sayyid ʿSharif al-Radī, remains to this day the most venerated book among the Shiʿis after the Kūrān and prophetic *ḥadīth*, while the *Ṣaḥīfa* contains prayers of such beauty that it has been called the "Psalm of the Household of the Prophet" (*Zābār-i al-ʿāl Muḥammad*).

Some of the followers of the *Imāms* like Hījah b. al-Ḥakam [q.v.], the disciple of the sixth *Imām*, and Abū Djiʿfar al-ʿUmārī, friend of the eleventh *Imām*, themselves became famous Shiʿī authorities, while the instruction of the *Imāms* reached even the Sunni segment of the Islamic community especially with *Imām* Djiʿfar, who had many Sunni students. This period terminated with the minor occultation (al-*ghayba al-sughrā*) and the major occultation (al-*ghayba al-kubrā*) of the Mahdi. During the minor occultation the Mahdi spoke to his community through his deputies or "gates" (bāb [q.v.]). The major occultation began when the last "gate" through whom the Mahdi spoke to the community, ʿAll al-Sāmarrī, died.

2. The period extending from the beginning of the major occultation to the Mongol invasion and Khalidīyya *Naṣr al-Dīn al-Ṭāīfī*: This was the period of the compilation of the major collections of Shiʿī *ḥadīth* and the formulation of Shiʿī law. This elaboration of Shiʿism began with Muḥammad ibn Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī (d. 329/940), author of the monumental *Ṣaḥīfa saḥīfa* compiled to Zayn al-ʿNahdi al-balāgha, to be followed by such figures as Ibn Bābīyūn, also called Shaykh al-Ṣaḥīfī (d. 381/991), Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022) and Shaykh al-Ṭāīfī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭāfī (d. 460/1067) with whom the principal doctrinal works of Shiʿī theology and religious sciences became established. This was also the period of other renowned Shiʿī scholars such as Sayyid ʿSharif al-Radī (d. 406/1015), who assembled the sayings of 'Ali, his brother Sayyid Muḥtaḏ al-Ḥamūd (d. 430/1044), Fadī al-Ṭabarī (d. 548/1153 or 554/1159), known for his monumental *kūrānic* commentaries, and finally Naṣr al-Dīn (d. 632/1237), whose *Tadżrid* marks the beginning of systematic Shiʿī theology.

3. The period between *Naṣr al-Dīn* and the *Ṣaḥīfīī* revival. During this rich period Shiʿī theology continued to develop in the hands of such men as Naṣr al-Dīn’s student Allāma Ḥillī (d. 726/1326) while a convergence took place between the Šīʿīsm of Ibn ʿArabi and Shiʿī theology and theosophy producing
such men as Radja b. BursI (d. around 774/1372), §a>in al-Dm b. Turka (d. 830/1427), Ibn Abi Diumhur al-Amulî (d. after 787/1385), author of the monumental Dīāms al-asrār. This period marks also the beginning of that wedding between Avicennan philosophy, the Illuminationist theosophy of Suhrawardî [see Râgha], the Şifîs of Ibn ʿArabî and Şifî theology which gave birth to the great treatises of the philosophical and gnostic figures of the Safavid period.

4.) From the Safavid period to the present. During this period Iran itself witnessed a remarkable revival of intellectual activity especially in the religious and philosophical sciences, while Şifîsm was spreading in the sub-continent and the influence of the Safavid thinkers of the “School of Işfaḥān” was felt ever more deeply among the Indian Muslims and even among some Hindus. This period began with such figures as Mtr Dâmâd (d. 1041/1631) and Mullâ Şadra (d. 1050/ 1640), masters of metaphysics with whom Islamic philosophy reached a new peak, Bahâʾ al-Din al-ʿAmîh, at once a Şifî theologian and a mathematician, and Mullâ Muḥsin Fayḍ Kâşânı and ʿAbd al-Razzâk Lâhzî, foremost among later theologians of Şifîsm. It also produced the two Mağlîlis, the second, Muḥammad Bâşir, being the author of the most voluminous compendium of the Shiʿî sciences, the Bihâr al-anwâr.

During the Kâḏârî period while the usûl and akhâbâr debates—between those who believed in the exercise of reason within the confines of religious scripture and those who relied solely on the Kurʾân and bâdîlah—continued, major contributions were made to the science of the principles of jurisprudence (usûl al-fâh), which in fact reached its perfection in the hands of Wahdî Bibbîhâni (d. 1205/1790-1) and Shaykh Murtâda Anşâri (d. 1281/1864/5). During this period Şifîsm was also witness to the establishment of the Shaykhî movement by Shaykh Ahmad Absârî, which continues to this day, and by the Bâbî movement, which prepared the ground for the Bahâʾî (q.v.) movement.

Religious Practices: Ithnâ ʿashârî religious practice does not differ in any essential way from that of the Sunnis. The fasting and the pilgrimage are the same while in the daily prayers two phrases are added to the call to prayer. There are also minor differences in other parts of the canonical prayers (salâh) but not much more than those between the different Sunni rites. The Şihîs, however, place a great deal of emphasis upon the pilgrimage to the tombs of the Imâms and saints (see İMÂMÎDÂ) so that Nâdja, Kârba, Mahâd, Kûm and other sanctuaries have gained a remarkable prominence in religious life. As for other questions of the Şarîa, the Şıfa differ from the Sunnis in demanding the “one fifth” tax, called khums, in addition to zakât, and in permitting temporary marriage or muṣaʿa (q.v.). They also condone hiding one’s faith (laḥiyâ) (q.v.) when its manifestation would endanger one’s person.

As far as the sources are concerned they are nearly the same as the Sunni, namely, Kurʾân, hadîth, tâjîmâ and biyâs, except that tâjîmâ is connected with the view of the Imâm and more freedom is given to biyâs than in Sunni Islam. In Şifîsm the gate of tâjîh and biyâs is open and in the absence of the Mahdî every Şifî must follow a living muṣtâjîh who in every generation re-interprets the Şarîa in the light of its immutable principles and the situation in which the community finds itself [see MARGA-i-TAクリーム]. The muṣtâjîh thus perform as representa-

tives of the İmâm a task which in reality belongs to the İmâm himself.

 Doctrine: The “principles of religion” (ṣāl al-arîn) as taught in Şifîsm include unity (laḥîhā), justice (ṣâdiq), prophecy (nubuwwa), immortality and resurrection (maʿâd). Unity, prophecy and resurrection are common to Şifîsm and Sunnism. Şifîsm considers the quality of justice as an intrinsic aspect of the divinity rather than an extrinsic one and its perspect isive is based more on intelligence than on will. As for the imamate, it is the cardinal doctrine which separates Şifîsm from Sunnism. According to Şifîsm revelation has an exoteric (zâhir) and an esoteric (bâsin) aspect, both possessed in their fulness by the Prophet, who is at once nabi and wali, the nubuwwa being connected with his exoteric function of bringing a divine law and the waliyya with his esoteric function of revealing the inner meaning of religion.

With the death of the Prophet the “cycle of prophecy” (dâʾîrāt al-nubuwwa) came to an end but the “cycle of initiation” (dâʾîrāt al-waliyya) continues in the person of the İmâm. The word İmâm itself means etymologically he who stands before, therefore, he is a guide and leader. In its specifically Şifî meaning it signifies he who possesses the function of waliyya. According to Şifîsm the İmâm has three functions: to rule over the Islamic community, to explain the religious sciences and the law, and to be a spiritual guide to lead men to an understanding of the inner meaning of things. Because of this triple function he cannot possibly be elected. A spiritual guide can receive his authority only from on high. Therefore, each İmâm is appointed through the designation (nâṣîh) of the previous İmâm by Divine command. Moreover, the İmâm must be inerrant (maṣlîsîm) in order to guarantee the survival and purity of the religious tradition. Seen in this light his function is clearly one that is concerned at once with the daily word of men as well as the spiritual and unmanifested world (ʿâlam al-ghayb). His function is at once human and cosmic.

This view of the İmâm can be seen clearly in the Şifî concept of the hidden İmâm, the Mahdî. He is alive yet not seen by the majority of men. He is like the axis mundi around whom the spheres of existence rotate and he is the guarantee of the preservation and continuation of the Şarîa. Finally he is the supreme spiritual guide (ṣub [q.v.]), literally “pole” and in Şifî Şûf orders the master is inwardly connected to the Mahdî as the supreme pole. Yet, the Mahdî remains hidden from the external eye and will appear to the outside world only in an eschatological event through which the inward will once again dominate over the outward and the outward is prepared for its absorption in the inward. The Hidden İmâm is for the Şifîs the continuation of the personality and baraka of the Prophet and the means whereby the Kurʾân is preserved and its true meaning based upon unity (laḥîhâ) revealed to men. Without the İmâm men would cease to understand the inner levels of meaning of the revelation. Also without him all temporal rule is marked by imperfection and only his reappearance can establish that ideal state based on divine justice which Islam envisages in its teachings.


ITYIBAR KHAN, a Khwâja-sarâ'î (eunuch) who ultimately rose to the high office of a provincial governor under the emperor Dâjângrî (q.v.). Originally in the service of a grandee of Akbar's court, on his death he joined the service of the Great Mogul who appointed him nâzîr (comptroller) of the household of Prince Salâm (later Dâjângrî) on his birth in 977/1569. He served the prince well and soon after his accession to the throne Salâm rewarded him by assigning to him the district of Gwâliyr as his âkîda. In 1031/1622 he was promoted to a high office, appointed as comptroller of the house of the Great Mogul, in recognition of his distinguished services, and the fort and the imperial treasury were placed in his charge. Having faithfully served Dâjângrî, who pays him a generous tribute (cf. Tuzuk, Eng. tr. ii, 285), for a long period of 56 years he died, over 80 years of age, in 1124/1712. His biography is in Ms. i. 351, 372, ii, 94, 231, 257-8; Shahnawâz Khan, Maf'ûthîr al-Imârat, Bib. Ind. i, 133-4; A'ín-i Akbarî, Eng. tr. by Blochmann, 433; Shaykh Farid Bhakhari, Dakhbîr-r al-Khânînîn, still in Ms. ii. (A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

I'TIKÂD, the act of adhering firmly to something, hence a firmly established act of faith. In its technical sense, the term denotes firm adherence to the Word of God. It may be translated in European languages by the words "croyance", "belief", "Glauben", with the proviso that this "belief" is not a simple "opinion" or "thinking" (pensée), but is the result of a deep conviction. As the root *â-k-d* indicates, the idea of a "knot", a bond established by contract, persists. The VIIIth verbal form carries with this a greater measure of firmness and coherence. I'tikâd recurs many times in chapters or works which treat of faith (see IMÂN, §1). It may be compared with and distinguished from two other technical words, Tasdîk and *'akida.

At first glance, as D. B. Macdonald has pointed out (EP, s.v. I'tikâd), I'tikâd seems to be synonymous with Tasdîk; both terms denote inner adherence to the fundamentals of faith. It must however be said that I'tikâd is the act of judging and I'tikâd the act of adhering. Tasdîk is then seen as an inner judgment of veridicity which affirms the reality and authenticity of the divine Word, a judgment which cannot fail to resolve itself in adherence. Let us say there could be no authentic I'tikâd without I'tikâd. It will then be understood that these two terms, each with the connotations belonging to itself, are sometimes interchangeable in definitions of Imân, in particular those of the Aṣâfersî school, which make inner adherence the "pillar" of faith. The majority of authors however prefer to explain faith by means of I'tikâd. Al-Djurqâni states specifically (Ta'rifât, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 41) that faith, Tasdîk of the heart from the lexicographical point of view, becomes the point of view of the Religious Law (şarî) I'tikâd of the heart.

In the Ḥaḍâ', to define faith, al-Ghâzâlî makes use of the term *'âd in the sense of adherence, and in his I'tikâd he uses the term Tasdîk. But in the actual title of the latter work, I'tikâd becomes religious belief in *gâb*, and therefore signifies not only the inner act which adheres but also the content of the faith. This meaning is common, both in Şî'î literature and also in Sunnism.

In this connection, I'tikâd is associated with another word from the same root, Ḥaḍâq (q.v.), pl. *'âd, articles of faith. Credos will be called Ḥaḍâq or *'âd. But the kur'ânic prescriptions which directly involve faith will alone be defined, in the ordinary way, as pertaining to I'tikâd (cf. al-Nasâfî, *Abâ'îd, ed. Cairo 1321, 7). According to the comments of D. B. Macdonald (art. cit.), they will be called "fundamental" (faṣliyya) or again Ḥaḍâ'dîyya; and distinguished from "derived" prescriptions concerning the action (āmâliyya), for example in the later manuals of al-Sanûsî of Tlemcen, al-Badârî, etc. Hence it will follow that the singular noun I'tikâd and the plural I'tikâdî will be used in the sense of Ḥaḍâq and *'âd. Finally, in some cases, I'tikâdî may have the meaning of "convictions rationally acquired". It is used in this way in the work of the Jewish theologian Sa'dâyî Gaon, Kûdâ al-A'mânî wâl-I'tikâdî.

It remains to state that the inner act denoted by I'tikâd connotes above all the idea of firmness in adherence. If some doubt should be felt, this would not be on account of the actual weakness of the act of adherence. It is, rather, that the motives upon which it relies are insufficiently elaborated, or are compounded with lack of knowledge not recognized as such. When on the other hand they are based on science or certain knowledge (i'nîm), they lead to an I'tikâd which can assume the quality of unassailable certainty (šahâbât). Here, on the other hand, the motive of inner adherence, we once more find an equivalent to the problem of the degrees of faith—faith of pure tradition, faith based upon science, faith of certainty (see IMÂN, IV, 2).

I'TIKÂD KHÂN, a Kashmiri of obscure origin, whose name was Muhammad Murâd, was originally in the service of Bahâdur Shân I (reg. 1119/1707-1124/1712), enjoying a rank of 1,000 and the title of Wakâlat Khân. On the accession of the throne of the ill-starred Farrukhshîyâr (q.v.) in 1125/1713 his name was included among those listed for execution but on the intercession of the Bârâha Sayyid brothers, 'Abd Allâh Khân and Husayn 'All Khân, known as king-makers (Bâdshâh-gar), he was spared, promoted to a high office, appointed as baânîn (barbinger) of the army, and given the title of Murâd Khân. Acting as a spy on the leading nobles, he soon won the confidence of the emperor who conferred on him the rank of 7,000 men and 10,000 horse and the grandiloquent title of Rukn al-Dawla Khân Bahâdur Farrukhshâh. Later he became closely involved in the political machinations and intrigues which were going on to depose Farrukhshâyâr. He was responsible for the clash between the emperor and the Sayyid brothers which resulted first in the emperor's being blinded and later in his cold-blooded...
murder in 1131/1719. On his patron, he was disgraced and thrown into prison, his house and property confiscated and his accumulated wealth and jewels seized. Subsequently he was released, his rank restored and he was given a financial grant; but all this fell short of his expectations. He died during the reign of Emperor Muhammad Shah (reg. 1131/1719-1161/1748).

Bibliography: ShāhAnaWāZ Khān, Ma`thir al-`Umara; (Bib. Ind.), Urdu tr., Lahore 1968, ii, 133; (Bib. Ind.), ii, 790 ff.; Ghulām Husayn Khān Ṭabātabā’ī, Siyar al-Mulā`a`khkhārin (Eng. tr. CALCUTTA 1789), i, 123 ff.; Elliott and Dowson, History of India . . ., vii, 469-73, 476-79; Mount-stuart Elphinston, The History of India, Allahabad 1966, 607; William Irvine, Later Maghils, i, 340-5, 381, 401, 406. (A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

I`TIKĀF, a particularly commended pious practice consisting of a period of retreat in a mosque, the vow for which stipulates a certain number of days in accordance with the believer’s own wish. He will there practise fasting, ritual prayer and recitation of the Qur`ān; with regard to other activities, for example the instruction given in the mosque, the schools are not in agreement. There is a divergence between the functions and his ablutions. He must there practise the vow for which stipulates a certain number of days in accordance with the believer’s own wish. He will there practise fasting, ritual prayer and recitation of the Qur`ān; with regard to other activities, for example the instruction given in the mosque, the schools are not in agreement. There is a divergence between the functions and his ablutions. He must there practise

The books of fiqh and sociological reality in that retreat is very seldom practised. I`tikāf can be undertaken at any time, but in particular during the last ten days of the month of Ramadan, when the Laylat al-Kadr [see ramadān] is presumed to have taken place. According to tradition, it was at that time that Muhammad is said to have engaged in it. It is therefore dealt with in books of fiqh immediately after the ritual fast. Popular traditions have widely exploited the theme of the wonderful occurrences which characterize this mysterious Night of Destiny, but this has no connection with sītkāf; pardon for sins, the bowing down of everything found on the surface of the earth including trees and mountains, the pardon for sins, i’tikāf: the books of fiqh and sītkāf, even though only of a general nature, deal with this question. Also Ghāzālī, Iḥyā’, book vi (analy-}

sis by Bouquet, § 36). (G. H. Bouquet)

ITIL (Etil, Idil), the river Volga, called Ītil by Kāshghārī, l, 30, line 17, and line 6 (= Brockelmann 244), Ītil by the Volga-Bulgars, Īdel by the Volga-Tatars, Rau by the Mordve, Īul by the Čeremiss and Īdel by the Čuvaş. (List of Turkish forms of the name in Ibn Fadlan, ed. Z. V. Togan, § 50 d and in D. M. Dunlop, The History of the Jewish Khazars, Princeton N.J. 1954, 91, n. 8). The largest river in Europe, the Volga is some 3,694 km. long but a descent, in all, of only some 229.5 m.: it rises at the village of Volgino Verkhovoe in the Vadday mountain range and flows into the Caspian Sea 28 m. below sea level; mouth of Astrakhān. The Ītil was called Qoqo or Pāg by the ancient Greeks (cf. Pauly-Wissowa vol. xvii, 1937, col. 1680 f.); Herodotus confused it with the Aras [see Al-Rass] while Ptolemy and Pomponius Mela took the Don and the Ītil for two branches of the same river.

The Volga-Bulgars and the Khazars [q.v.] came to its banks in the course of the Turkish tribal migrations of the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D. Their capital city Ītil or Īl [q.v.] was situated on both sides of the river, at its mouth, the site of the later Astrakhān [q.v.]. In the early Middle Ages, and to some extent up to the present day, Finnish peoples, predominately Mordve (Burtās [q.v.]), lived on the upper reaches of the river; here and there, Slav settlements reached it even then.

The Volga-Bulgars were the first to be touched by (Sunni) Islam in the form of an embassy of 310/922-23, described in detail by Ibn Fadlan. About 349/960, the Ītil is mentioned as the western frontier of the Turks who went over to Islam, at that time, as a result of intensive propaganda from the homelands of the Sāmānids (Ibn al-`Āthīr, ix, 355 ff.). The Byzantine sources, too, mention the river as the Ātīl (`Āṭīl, `Āṭā) cf. G. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, Berlin 1958, ii, 78 ff.

The Muslim geographers thought of the Kama as the upper course of the Ītil and hence increased its length still further (W. Barthold, Zwölf Vorlesungen sur Geschichte Mūsālima, Berlin 1935, 112 ff.; Ibn Hawqal, ii, 387, 389; Ibn Rusta, (B.G.A. vii), 141; Masʿūdī, Tanbih, (B.G.A. viii), 62; Mappae Arabicae, ed. K. Miller, Stuttgart 1926/29, i/3, 79, ii, 153-6, v, 118, 142, 145 (Kāshghārī), vi, Map No. XVI = Pl. 46-8).

Sunni Islam was further strengthened by the advance of the Mongols in the 13th century and the establishment of the Empire of the Golden Horde (Altin Orda [ivii]), whose capital was established at the mouth of the Oka, to be overtaken by Kazan in the course of time, as the central market of the middle-river region.

With the Muslim merchants acting as intermediaries, Kazan remained the centre for trade with central Asia until the 15th century. On the lower Ītil, Astra- khān took over the role of the Khaizar capital of Ītil as the centre for trade. The gradual advance of the rulers of Moscow at the expense of the Tatars brought with it the establishment of Russian fortresses and strongholds in the Volga region. Thus, under Vasilii III (1505-33) Vasil’ipursk was built at the mouth of the Sura for protection from the Tatars.

With the fall of Kazan (1552) and Astrakhān (completed by 1557) into Russian hands, the Slav settlement expanded by force into the Volga basin with the river acting as line of advance. Many of the towns on its banks with Turkish names (Kazan*: Cauldron; Saratov = Sari-Tau: Pale Mountain; Kamyshev: reed bank; Tsaritsyn (now Volgograd); Astrakhān) became Russian towns in which Tatars or other Turks were and still are only a small minority. The Russians took over many villages deserted by the Tatars and drove the Tatars completely away from the fertile river meadows and into the sandy and forested regions far from the water. In addition, new Slav villages and towns were established:

earlier as early as 1555, Sviyazh, later Ceboksar (now the principal town
of the Cuwash lands and called in their language Shupashkar) was founded. The state ... increase in the power of the wazir at the expense of the wakil [q.v.]. Under the Kadjars, the title Imam al-dawla founded in 1586 to protect the area, as later was Tatars, or those who were still pagan, by the Finns encouraged the Slav settlement and gave land over to the Slav peoples and the displacement of the Muslim Tatars, or those who were still pagan, by the Finns and Cuwash who were, at least nominally, Christian. Samara (officially Kuybyshev since 1935) was built in 1586 to protect the area, as later was Ufa to ward off the Nagay [q.v.] particularly. Alongside other smaller settlements, Simbirsk (after 1924 U'yanovsk) was built in 1648, and Sizran' in 1683.

The Muslims of the banks of the Itil were by no means happy with these developments. As early as 1669, a Turkish force from the Crimea tried to hinder the movement and make a way through for the Turkish fleet by means of a canal between the Don and the Volga at the point where there was least distance between them, at Tasirtsyn (Ewlyâ Çelebi, vii, 841 ff.; cf. bibliography for specialist literature). But the project had to be abandoned because of the season and the alliance of the tsar with the shah. Later the Tatars, though Sunni, turned to the Shi'i shah 'Abbâs the Great (1587-1629) for aid. On the Russian side, the first Ukrainian settlements (Slobodi) were founded in the 17th century. At the same time, the Orthodox mission won over part of the Muslim population including the Kreshchane around Kazan', as well as various noble families, so that the strength of the Muslim population on the Itil declined still further. The river became a route for traffic from central Russia to the south; the boatmen (Burlaki) became famous with their songs. The unrest on the Volga in the 17th and 18th centuries was an internal Slav problem, but, in 1667-71, Sten'ka Razin sailed over the Caspian Sea with his fleet and inflicted great damage on the Persian population on its southern shore. The revolt of Emilian Pugačev in 1773-4 found a positive response among the Tatars. The enslavement of the river regions was completed in the 18th and 19th centuries. Thus the attempt of the Muslims of the area between the Volga and the Urals to build up an "Idel-Ural" state in 1917/18 came to nothing. In view of the overwhelming preponderance of the Russo-Ukrainian population in the area by this time, the project found no support among the majority of the inhabitants along the banks of the river. The Itil, as a result of all this, has no longer any special significance for Muslims.


İTILMAD AL-DAWLA, literally: "trusty support of the state", a title of Persian waiz during the Safavid period and subsequently. The title itimâd al-dawla does not occur during the reign of Isma'îl I (907-30/1501-24), and first appears towards the end of the reign of Tahmasp I, ca. 976/1568-9 (see Türkisch-İranî Nasbânameh, B. M. Ms. Add. 23,513, fol. 480a). The introduction of this title reflected the growing importance of the bureaucracy in an increasingly centralized administrative and military structure and the increasing powers of the waiz at the expense of the waizl [q.v.]. Under the Kâdîjârs, the title itimâd al-dawla
was rarely used, that of sadr-i a'zam [q.v.] being preferred. For a discussion of the function and powers of the i'timād al-dawla, see wazir.

Bibliography: V. Minorsky (ed. and trans.), Tadhkirat al-Mulk, London 1943, index, s.v. (K. M. SAVORY)

**I'TIMĀD AL-DAWLA**, title of Mīrza Ḥiyyāth al-Dīn Muhammad Tebrūzī, commonly known as Ḥiyyāth Bāγ, son of Khādża Muhammad Sharīf, one-time minister to the Safawīd Shah Shahmād Khān, father of Nūr Ẓ̄ahān, wife of Ẓ̄ahān [q.v.]. Both his father and an uncle Khādża Ahmad, father of the historian Amlī-i Rāzi, author of Ḥafṣ ICAST, held high offices of state under Ẓ̄ahān. After the death of his father in 984/1576-7 he, for reasons not precisely known, left for India to seek his fortune. It is, however, clear that he was in straitened circumstances when he undertook this way to Akbar's new capital, Fathpur Sikrī, near Āgra, he had to content himself with only two mounts for a party of five persons including two women. His youngest daughter, Mīrza Ḥiyyāth al-Dīn Muhammad Tebrūzī, born during this journey. Of noble birth, he was welcomed by Akbar [q.v.] in whose service he gradually rose to the personal rank of vizier of his empire and conferred upon him the title of i'timād al-dawla with the rank of 1,500 (cf. i'timād). On accession to the throne in 1014/1605 Ẓ̄ahān appointed him joint vizier of his empire and conferred upon him the title of i'timād al-dawla with the rank of 1,500 (cf. i'timād al-dawla, see editor's preface); S. H. Hodiwalā, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, Bombay 1939, 618-9. (A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

**ITTAK** [see 'ABB].

**İ'TKNAΜE, İ'tknâmē, also İ'tkâhâmē, an Ottoman term for a certificate of manumission, given to a liberated slave [see İ'tak]. The document normally gives the name and physical description, often also the religion and ethnic origin of the slave, together with the date and circumstances of his manumission, and is dated, signed, witnessed, and registered. The issue of such certificates goes back to early Islamic times (for examples see A. Grohmann, Arabic papyri in the Egyptian library, i, Cairo 1934, 61-4; idem, Arabische Papyri aus dem Staatlichen Museum zu Berlin, in Isf., xxii (1935), 19-30). A collection of 18th-century Ottoman certificates was edited by K. Jahn, Türkische Freilassungsverkündungen aus dem 18. Jahrhunderts (1702-1776), 2 vols., 1963. Other and earlier examples are cited in Jahn's introduction. (K.D.)

**İ'TR** [see 'ANBAR, 'IMSK, etc.].

**İ'TTİHĀD, verbal noun of the VIIIth form of the root w-h-d. The first form wahīda and wahīda means to be alone, unique; the VIIIth ittihāda, means to be united, associated, joined together.**

Muslim theologians understand the word in five different ways; three of these are metaphorical (ālī sabīl al-isti'dāra), the two others are real (ālī sabīl al-ha'kā).
comes another while remaining itself. This is called real because it is the first meaning that comes to mind when the word is used in its absolute sense. This real sense comprises two categories: 1) Where two objects unite together in such a way that it can be said that one is the other and reciprocally. In this case, there are, before their association, two distinct objects and after it only one of the two continues to exist. 2) Where there is one object which, while remaining the same, becomes something other than it was before. In this real sense *ittihad* is considered necessarily impossible. From this comes the principle: *al-ittihad 1a yattahtidan*.

2. — In the second sense, the metaphorical sense, there are three meanings, depending on whether it means: a) that an object changes into another suddenly or gradually. Thus, for example, water becomes air: a substantial form is replaced by another; or black becomes white (in which case one attribute of an object disappears and is replaced by another). b) that an object becomes another by composition so that it gives birth to a third; thus earth joined to water becomes clay. c) when a being becomes another, for example when an angel takes on human form. All three sorts of metaphorical *ittihad* can be found in reality.

In the history of Muslim doctrines, the word *ittihad* evokes two problems above all: that of the Incarnation of the Word in the person of Jesus (ittihad al-lahut bi'l-nafs) and that of the "mystic union" of the soul with God.

Muslim apologists have always vigorously rejected the idea of the Christian incarnation. *Ittihad* and *hulul* are here generally taken as synonymous, and the concept of a "union" of divinity with humanity is rejected as contradictory. (Cf., for example, al-Bakili, who, in his *Tamhid*, enumerates the different Christian opinions concerning what he calls "al-ittihad" without further qualification, *ittihad* considered as *hulul*, or as *ittihad* and *imtazid* or as dwelling in a temple or as the appearance of the image of man in a mirror (ed. McCarthy, 75-103; A. Abel, *Le christianisme dans le "Tamhid" d'al-Bakili*, ed. Flugel, 6; Hujwiri,* Kasaf al-Mahdijab*, tr. Nicholson, 254; Ma&mud Shabistarf, *Gulshan-i Ras*, ed. Whinfield, 1, 452-5; Tholuck,* Sufismus*, 141 ff.; D. B. Macdonald, *Religious attitude and life in Islam*, 258; R. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic mysticism*, esp. 218-25, cf. also index iii, 279, s.v. *ittihad*.)

(R. Nicholson/G. C. Anawati)

**ITTITAD — ITTIIAD-I MUHAMEDI DJEMIYYETI**

generally translated as the "Muhammadan Union", was a politico-religious organization which acquired notoriety as the instigator of the insurrection in Istanbul on 13 April 1909. Its formation was announced publicly on 5 April 1909 (= 23 Mard 1325, by the Turkish "financial" calendar), though many Muslims sympathized with its stand against the modernizing policies of the Ittihad we Tera&kI DjemIyyeti [q.v.], usually known as the Committee of Union and Progress or (in works in English) C.U.P. Thus the activities of the Muhammadan Union were virtually restricted to the inflammatory articles in Volkan and other opposition papers such as Sadi-yi Millet, Serbetti and the British Embassy financed *Levant Herald*.

The doctrines and programme of action of the Muhammadan Union were explicitly clerical, and therefore hostile to modernization and reform. Its professed aim was non-political, namely to reform public morals and to bring them within the prescriptions of the *Shar'a*. Its members were strictly forbidden to participate in politics. Yet the writings in Volkan seemed to suggest that the Muhammadan Union's only commitment was to the destruction of the C.U.P. This commitment was shared by the Liberal opposition.

The foundation of the Muhammadan Union coincided with a mounting campaign launched by the opposition against the C.U.P. This campaign began immediately after the fall of Grand Vizier Kamil Pa&a [q.v.], on 13 February 1909. On 18 February Volkan announced that it was "the propagator of the views of the Muhammadan Union" (*Ittihad-i Muhammedi FirkaninI muewuwiidi-i efkarI*) (Tunaya, 265) and
Thereafter became the most virulent critic of the C.U.P. It called the constitutional regime the “régime of devils” (şeyhulislam dedesi) (Tunaya, 264), and by exploiting religious prejudice succeeded in mobilizing opinion against the C.U.P.

This propaganda became so alarming that the government decided to take precautionary measures. Press Laws and Laws of Associations were introduced in parliament, and on 6 April the Şeyhülislam issued, in the name of the Committee, a proclamation forbidding his troops to have any dealings with the religious bhodas and sofás. Kâmil Paşa’s exposition of C.U.P. politics, published on 6 and 4 April, and the murder and funeral of Hasan Fehmi [q.v.], editor of Serbest, on 7 and 8 April, inflamed passions and prepared the ground for the insurrection which broke out on the night of 12-13 April 1909. It was crushed by the Third Army from Salonika (Harçet Ordusu [q.v.]), and the İttihat-i Muhammedi was proscribed, while some of its adherents, including Dervîş Wahdeti, were arrested and hanged. On account of the religious overtones of the insurrection, the Muhammadan Union has been held mainly responsible for it; but closer scrutiny of this organization as well as of events suggests that many other forces were at work. This group only provided a religious cover for the activities of all those elements which were determined to destroy the Committee of Union and Progress.

The Committee had its immediate origins in a group responsible for the destinies of the Ottoman Empire (“Othmdnli called the “Ottoman Freedom Society” later known in Europe as the Committee of Union and Progress (C.U.P.), was the political movement founded in Salonika in August-September 1906. Spiritually, however, its antecedents went back to the conspiratorial activities of the Young Ottomans and their successors, both inside and outside the Ottoman Empire. (See T. Z. Tunaya, Türkiye’de siyasi partiler 1859-1952, Istanbul 1952; E. E. Rasmussen, The Young Turks: prelude to the revolution of 1908, Princeton 1957; and Bernard Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, revised ed., London 1968). The Ottoman Freedom Society began as a group of ten, numbered one to ten according to age: the eldest member, Bursali Tahir, being designated number one. A central committee (heyet-i lictediye, later merkez-i umûmi) of four—Meşmed Tağat, Rabmi [Evranos], Miḥdat Şükûr [Bleda], and İsmâ’il Djañbulât—was chosen from amongst the ten. (See Ziya Şakir, “İlhihât ve Terakki nasîl doğdu? nasîl ya§adi? nasîl âdetsi?”, in Son Posta, 8 and 9 February 1933 and passim). Seven of the ten had some connexion with the military though in the central committee only İsmâ’il Djañbulât was a soldier. While it is true that initially soldiers were numerically dominant in the C.U.P., the civilians were aware of the political threat this posed and therefore always tried to keep it under control. In the constitutional period the military-civilian rivalry became a constant political theme. In the organizational phase soldiers, and to a lesser extent administrators, played a vital role. It has been held mainly responsible for it; but closer scrutiny of this organization as well as of events suggests that many other forces were at work. This group only provided a religious cover for the activities of all those elements which were determined to destroy the Committee of Union and Progress.

Bibliography: T. Z. Tunaya, Türkiye’de Siyasi Partiler 1859-1952, Istanbul 1952; F. R. Unat, Ankara 1960; Meşmed Şadiik, Eyyüb Sabri and Djanbăl [q.v.], to mention but a few, were instrumental in founding the two groups, and since they alone were mobile and had communications with virtually every part of the empire. It is not surprising, therefore, that when the Rumelian branches of the Ottoman Freedom Society were set up in Monastir, Ohri, Kiracova, Vodina, Işkodra, Serez, Dram and Edirne, junior officers like Enver [q.v.], Meşmed Şadiik, Eyyüb Sabri and Djanbăl [q.v.], to mention but a few, were instrumental in founding the two groups. In 1907 the Salonika group made contact with exiled Young Turks in Europe. Later in the year Dr. Nâzım, a prominent member of Ahmed Rıdâ’s group in Paris, returned to Salonika and in September the two groups agreed to merge and adopt the older and more established name İttihat ve Terakki (Rasmussen, Young Turks, 121 ff.). This move had no practical significance because both groups remained autonomous and did not collaborate, since the centre of activity had shifted to the Ottoman Empire. However, in the minds of the exiles the merger created the illusion that they had a right to share the political power acquired by the C.U.P. as a result of the 1908 revolution. The Committee had no intention of allowing this and it soon destroyed the illusions of one such exile who returned to Salonika to be told: “Doctor… , this Committee of ours is not the one you worked with abroad. This Committee is the product of Monastir and Salonika. . . .” (Ibrahim Temo, İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyyetinin tâbukâtı ve hidemats vatansiyi ve inhâlâsı milliye dar hâsrâtım, Meclidiye 1939, 215).

If the Committee was unwilling to share power, it was not equipped, in terms of either organization or ideology, to exercise it alone. Its professed aim had been to restore the constitutional régime. Having achieved this in July 1908 the Committee had lost its raison d’être and many who had supported it in the struggle against the Palace were no longer committed to its policies. The extent of its power and organization was uncertain. There were no accepted or recognized leaders. Only the central committee exercised a collective leadership, in theory controlling the entire political machine, arbitrator, recommending and issuing directives, which were binding on all Unionist branches at various levels, from the wildyet to the nahiye. Furthermore, as representa-
tives of the newly emerging middle class, the Unionists lacked the social status to assume power in a traditional society which they were unwilling to overthrow by force. They therefore permitted the bureaucracy of the Sublime Porte to rule while they acted as guardians of the constitutional regime, hoping to subvert their society through established institutions.

The C.U.P. remained a secret organization with its headquarters in Salonika. It exercised its political influence through small deputations of two or three prominent Unionists like Ta'labat, Rahmi, Djawid [q.v.], Dr. Nâfil, Bahâeddin Shakir and Ahmed Rıdâ. These deputations visited the sultan, the grand vizier or foreign embassies and made known to them Unionist policies. This method was impossible to reconcile with the principles of constitutional government. It drew from the opposition the charge that the secret Committee was exercising power without responsibility and creating an imperium in imperio.

At the C.U.P. Congress of 1908 held in secret sessions in Salonika, the Committee did nothing to meet the opposition charges. Decisions relating to the internal organization were kept secret. It was announced that Unionists returned to parliament would work together under the name of the Party of Union and Progress (Ittihat ve Terakki Fırkası). A central committee of eight, elected by the Congress, was to continue to run the affairs of the C.U.P.

The Committee intended to maintain control through its parliamentary majority. But the independent behaviour of the deputies frustrated this scheme. After the parliament's abject surrender to the counter-revolutionaries on 13 April 1909, the Committee decided on active participation in government by having Unionist deputies appointed undersecretaries. When this measure was defeated in the parliament (May 1909) the C.U.P. had two of its members—Djawid and Ta'labat—appointed secretaries of Finance and the Interior respectively. (See F. Ahmad, The Young Turks: the Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish politics, 1908-1914, Oxford 1969, 50-53 and passim.) Internal dissension and conflict with the senior officers who had assumed control after crushing the counter-revolution continued to undermine the Committee's position. The discontents failed to be appeased and organized another opposition (see Hizb, ii and Hürriyet ve İttihat Fırkası). The Unionists responded to the new threat by having the Chamber dissolved (15 January 1912) and in the new elections, which they manipulated unscrupulously, they won an overwhelming victory. The opposition adopted extra-parliamentary methods and a group of officers intervened, bringing about the downfall of the Committee-backed cabinet of Sâ'd Pasha in July 1912. The Unionists made a comeback by staging a successful coup in January 1913 and by June they had suppressed the opposition and consolidated power.

The period from July 1908 to June 1913 was a period of intense political activity. In these five years the Unionists had learned from bitter experience that neither the country nor their Committee could be run along inflexible and centralized lines. At the 1913 Congress the Committee tried to rectify this. The programme of modernizing the entire political, socio-economic and administrative structure of the empire would henceforth be applied to a quasi-federalist, multi-national framework.

New regulations defined the powers and functions of the Committee's hierarchical structure, from the general assembly at the top to the local clubs at the bottom. Once again the Committee declared itself a political party which its headquarters in Istanbul, Sa


The war proved disastrous for Turkey and the C.U.P. By the middle of 1918 Unionists were considering establishing a political party not tarred with their brush, which could negotiate a peace treaty with the Entente Powers. The situation developed too rapidly for such calculated action. The 1918 Congress, scheduled to meet on October 1, was postponed on account of the new situation created by the Bulgarian armistice (Tanın, 30 September 1918). The Congress opened on November 1, after the signing of the Armistice of Mudros. Talât Pasha presided over the morning session and during the afternoon session he and the central committee withdrew from the Congress, escaping to Europe soon after. İsmâ'il Dânumlû, one of the founder members of the Ottoman Freedom Society, was left formally to dismantle the Ittihat ve Terakki Djemiyyeti and to reconstitute it under a new name, the Teşkilât Fırkası (Renewal Party).

Bibliography: Works by Tunaya, Ramsaur, Lewis and Ahmad cited in the text give extensive bibliographies. For the constitutional period it is essential to consult the contemporary press, especially newspapers like Tanin, Şehr-i Umret, İhdâm, Şabah, Taşvîr-i Efkar and Ahi to mention only a few. See also, Ahmed Nişâz, Ekfrâni-ı Nişâz, Istanbul 1932, Leskovikli Muhammed Ra'ûf, İttihat ve Terakki we idî?, Istanbul 1937; Albert Fua, Le comite d'union et progres contre la
ITTIHÄD WE TERAKKI DJEM'IYYETI — IWAD WADJÎH


FEROZ AHMAD

ITTIHÄD [see ITTIHÄD].

IWAD, exchange value, compensation, that which is given in exchange for something. In a very broad and generally accepted sense, the word is used in works of fîkâh to denote the counterpart of the obligation of each of the contracting parties in onerous contracts which are called "commutative" (mu*â'addâl), from the same root as imâd; that is, contracts which necessarily give rise to obligations incumbent upon both parties. Thus in a sale, the price (thaman) and the thing sold are each the compensation which is given in exchange for something. In a sale, the price (mua'dâl) is also used which is given to compensate someone for services rendered, for labour performed or for something that is exchangeable. In theory the donee is under no obligation whatsoever to give any. Two examples of this kind of contract are : to receive more than he has given.

stein of the other. Understood in this sense, commutative (mu*â'addâl, from the same root as imâd) contracts which necessarily give rise to obligations incumbent upon both parties. Thus in a sale, the price (thaman) and the thing sold are each the compensation which is given in exchange for something. In a sale, the price (mua'dâl) is also used which is given to compensate someone for services rendered, for labour performed or for something that is exchangeable. In theory the donee is under no obligation whatsoever to give any. Two examples of this kind of contract are :

In unilateral contracts, the word 'iwad (badal and tha*âb) are also used) is employed in a more restricted sense; it is applied to the compensation offered by one of the two parties who is not absolutely obliged to give any. Two examples of this kind of 'iwad are the oneros compensation and the definition. A husband has the right to repudiate his wife unilaterally and, of course, without defining the price or anything else. If he makes the statement of repudiation dependent on payment of an 'iwad, the compensation paid by the woman, the repudiation becomes khulî, but the 'iwad that the woman agrees to pay can have no more than an absurdly low value and be undetermined both in its total amount and even in its existence, all of which is quite impossible when the 'iwad constitutes an obligation corresponding to another obligation in a mu*â'addâl contract.


(Y. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS)

IWAD WADJÎH, a leading scholar and theologian, originally from Akhsîkat near Samarqand (19th century), was considered a genius in his day in both rational and traditional sciences. He received his education at Balkh in the "darî" of his namesake Mr Îwâd Tâshkhenti. After completing his education he returned to his native village where he began teaching. Later he moved to Balkh and was still teaching when that town fell to the Mughal army under AWRANGZÎB. He came to India in 1056/1646; he entered the imperial service and was appointed mu*âtîf of the army. In 1065/1656, soon after his accession to the throne, AWRANGZÎB appointed him censor of the imperial troops, with an annual salary of 15,000 rupees paid against the rank of 1,000 men and 100 horse. He could not, however, hold this office for long and by his over-strictness earned the displeasure of the emperor who, while returning from a visit to Ka*shnîr, replaced him by Khâ*âja Kâdir (on whom see extract from Mr Îwâd al-Tur изд. Muhammad Shiafi, Lahore 1953, 75), in 1073/1662 at Lahore. A year later he succeeded in regaining the favour of the Emperor, though not his office. He was appointed tutor to prince Mu*âmâb A*â'âm and his rank was restored. On the termination of this assignment he was appointed a teacher at the royal madrasa in Delhi, which post he held till his death. Held in high esteem, he was asked to act as a witness at the marriage of Prince Muhammad Sultan, AWRANGZÎB's son, to Dustdâr Bânû Begum in 1082/1672 along with Chief Kâdí 'Abd al-Wâhîb. He again seems to have lost his rank, for the Ma*â*'âhî-i 'Alamgîrî (cf. Eng. tr. 92) speaks of its restoration in 1086/1676 while he was living as a hermit. He spent the greater part of his life in teaching, "being highly honoured by the nobility".

A fanatical Sunni, he was against any execution of one Muhammad Tâhir, a Kâhirî who had slandered the first three orthodox caliphs, in 1082/1672. The criticism which his action aroused and the memory of his fall from grace twice during his life perhaps made him adopt the life of a hermit. No other work by him is known to exist except a glosso on ABA'Hî-Dî Nasafi which was preserved in the Berlin Library (cf. Brockelmann, G.L.S I, 760). Brockelmann incidentally transliterates the second part of his name as al-Wadîb which indicates that it most likely was his sobriquet. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that 'Alamgîr-nâmâ, the official history of the first ten years of AWRANGZÎB's reign, at places describes him as "Mullâ 'Iwâd" only. Farhâl al-Nâzîrîn, a Persian history of the times of AWRANGZÎB (only partially published; see bibliography), follows this practice.

His younger brother Mu*âmâm Tâhir was also a noted scholar. He was sent on a diplomatic mission to the court of AWRANGZÎB by SUBBÂN KULI KÂN, ruler of Balkh, in 1086/1675 only a year prior to the death of his elder brother. He was well-received at the court and presented with robes of honour, 21,000 rupees, a palîkî, an elephant and a jewelled stick before his return to his native land (cf. Ma*â*'âhî, Eng. tr., 92, 96). He died in 1088/1677 at an advanced age, and was buried in Delhi.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kâzîm, 'Alamgîr-

**IWÂN, also ÎVâN and at times in spoken Arabic** ÎWân, a Persian word adopted by the Turkish and Arabic languages and then by western travellers, archaeologists and art historians to refer to certain characteristic features of Near Eastern and especially Islamic architecture. Since there are notable differences in the meanings given to this term in mediaeval texts and in modern scholarship, the two must be clearly separated.

It has been suggested that the word itself derives from Old Persian *apadana* (E. Herzfeld, *Myths und Geschichten*, in *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, vi (1936), 68, n. 1; W. B. Henning in *Handbuch der Orientalistik: Iranistik*, Leiden 1958, 71, n. 6). This derivation, which has often been taken for granted, may not be as secure as has been believed but its investigation is not pertinent to Islamic times.

Four meanings can be given to the term when it appears in mediaeval texts; these meanings are probably all connected historically and typologically in ways which still require study. A first meaning is that of a chamber or of a hall which is open to the outside at one end, either directly or through a portico; it is similar in this sense to one of the meanings of *sufla* and it is curious to note that the architectural units known to art historians as *iwan* (cf. below) are at times called *sufîs* in texts, as in L Hunfarâr, *Gandjîna-i Âfâr ta‘rîkh-i Isfâhân*, Isfâhân 1344, 86 ff.; Lane’s *Lexicon* s.v. *swân*. A second meaning is that of an estrade or of a raised part of a floor; such a higher part could have been singled out because of its formal importance as a place of honour in an architectural composition or because of some purely functional need as in the case of the part of a bath in which one undressed (E. W. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, Everyman edition, London 1954, 344-5 (note existence of an attendant called a *hândiff*) and 12 for other meanings of the word). A third meaning is that of a palace or at least of some sort of very formal and official building; in this sense it appears to refer to a complete architectural entity rather than to part of a complex as in the instance of the first two meanings of the word. Thus a Mu‘azzafard prince built in Yazd gardens with a pool and an *iwan* with four storeys; Ahmad b. ‘Ali, *Ta‘rîkh gilâdî-i Yazd*, ed. I. Afshar, Tehran 1345, 86 ff. It is probably in this sense of palace that the term should be understood when it was used so commonly to refer to the celebrated Sasanian palace at Ctesiphon; for instance, Tabari, ii, 1056, comments on *iwan bisravã* (E. Herzfeld, *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum*: *Alep*, Cairo 1936, 391). In many texts dealing with the Ctesiphon monument it would appear that *iwan* and *fâkh* are synonymous or almost (cf. Max van Berchem, *Notes d’archéologie arabe*, in *JA*, 8th ser., xix (1892), 395 ff.) but in reality they are quite distinct since one refers to a form and the other to a function. *Iwân* in this sense is synonymous with *ḫâsir*, as for instance in the case of the Fâţimid palace in Cairo which could be called either al-ḫâsir al-kabîr or al-iwan al-kabîr. Also in the Shâh-nâma most instances of the word’s use appear to refer to palaces and not to some precise architectural form (N. V. Diakonova and O. I. Smirnova, *K soprosu ob istolkovaniy pendjikentskoy rospisi*, in *Sbornik v čest I. A. Orbelii*, Leningrad 1960). Finally a fourth meaning has been given to the word, mostly in contemporary interpretations of Mamluk descriptions of Cairo or of Damascus (Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum*: *Le Caire*, Cairo 1903, 95, n. 2). The *iwan* would be any one of the halls in a religious building, a *madrasa* or a mosque, which opens on a courtyard; it would be used most commonly for large units of the type implied by our first definition but by extension could be used also for other architectural forms such as the hypostyle. The *iwan kibî* would be the one such hall which is located in the direction of Mecca. While this particular meaning is (or was) certainly found in colloquial usage, there is some uncertainty as to whether the term is ever correctly used for the columnar wings of a mosque; none of the several meanings which can be given to the word *iwan* in the many instances of its use in texts such as the description of Damascus translated by H. Sauvare appears to apply to a hypostyle building (H. Sauvare, *Description de Damas*, in *JA*, 9th ser., iii-vii (1894-6), index by E. Ouéchék, Damascus 1954, esp. vol. vi, 260 as opposed to vol. v, 301 or 392).

Altogether then the word has clearly two formal meanings and one functional meaning with a second functional meaning somewhat less obviously ascertained. It is possible that the functional meaning of palace was the original one and that, through the Ctesiphon ruins which played such an important role in the formation of mediaeval architectural concepts and terminology, the references to forms developed more slowly, but this question requires a systematic chronological analysis of texts, which has never been done.

Art historians and archaeologists have given the term *iwan* a technically precise meaning, that of a single large vaulted hall walled on three sides and opening directly to the outside on the fourth. The formation of the form has been the subject of many discussions and theories; cf. F. Oelmann, *Ihiland Liwanhaus*, in *Bonner Jahrbücher*, Heft cxxvii (1922); G. Gullini, *Architettura Iranica*, Turin 1964, 326 ff.; J. Sauvageot, *La Mosquée Omeyyade de Me- dicine*, Paris 1947, 163 ff. These discussions and theories are fortunately not pertinent to the Islamic period, for it can easily be established that Sasanian architecture had consistently utilized such a unit of planning and construction as the main feature of its palaces in *Irâk* and in western Iran. Although some nuances may have to be introduced into this statement after further excavations and interpretative studies, this particular hall was the main audience and reception hall of Sasanian princes (as at Ctesiphon). But no evidence exists that it was actually called an *iwan* nor is it certain that an official function
was the only one associated with the form. On a number of occasions a domed room was just behind the iwán and in one instance (Kal'at Duğhtar near Frûzûbdâd), iwán and dome formed the only unit of a royal building.

This secular function of the iwán was carried together with the form into early Islamic secular architecture. It occurs in the Umaysîd palace at Kûfa, was transferred to the western part of the Fertile Crescent and was found at Fatihieh, and does not necessarily mean that this particular form was used—as had automatically been assumed by Creswell and Grabar in the abovementioned parts of the great 'Abbâsid palaces at Ukhâydir and at Sâmarrâ; in this last place it also occurs in simple house architecture; see K. A. C. Creswell, Early Islamic Architecture, 2 vols., Oxford 1932 and 1940; O. Grabar, Al-Mushatta, Baghhdâd, and Wâsîf, in The World of Islam, ed. J. Kritzek and R. B. Winder, London 1959; B. Frânis and Muhammad 'Ali, Jâmi' Abî Dulaf, in Sumet, iii (1947). Even minor modifications which may appear to have been of western origin such as the transformation of the iwán into a tripartite hall through colonnades have a background in the architectural vocabulary of Sasanian Iran. In the often quoted and discussed texts describing the palaces of Wâsîf and Baghhdâd, the use of the word does not necessarily mean that this particular form was used—as had automatically been assumed by Creswell and Grabar in the abovementioned parts of the great 'Abbâsid palaces at Ukhâydir and at Sâmarrâ; it is likely that it was, for the iwán became established quite early as the main form of palace and house architecture from Afghanistan to Egypt. In details of course there were many differences from one part of the Muslim world to another and from one period to another and it is not certain that the function of the form was always the official one of an audience hall. Secular architecture unfortunately has not been sufficiently well preserved or studied to allow for definitive conclusions and, since most of the sources for it are literary, the difficulty of interpreting correctly a mediaeval architectural vocabulary occurs constantly.

The appearance of the iwán in religious architecture is equally problematic, even though it is in religious architecture that the most celebrated examples of the form are found. The situation can be summarized in the following manner. With the exception of the rather peculiar mosque in Nîrh, it is not until the early 6th/12th century that a group of some twelve mosques in western Iran acquire what became the typical shape of a courtyard on which open four iwanâs; for a summary of the history of this form, for a list of examples and for bibliographies see O. Grabar in Cambridge History of Iran, iv (forthcoming) and v (Cambridge 1968). The four-iwanâ mosque became then the standard form for almost all buildings of religious inspiration in Iran until today and the changes which do occur are mostly stylistic, as the form reflected the modifications in taste which occurred over the centuries. The puzzling questions are those of the origins of the plan and of the reasons for its formation. On the first point, evidence exists to show that both 'Irâk and Central Asia used the form of four iwânâs around a courtyard in house and probably monumental architecture before the 6th/12th century (cf. Sumet, iii quoted above) and, among others, G. A. Pugačenkov, Iskusstvo Turkmenistana, Moscow 1967, 102; also A. Godard in Ars Islamica, xvi (1951)). Since the main direction of cultural and artistic influences in the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries was an east-west one, a north-eastern Iranian or Central Asian background for the form seems likely. It would then be from the example of the western Iranian mosques of the 6th/12th century that the type spread over the whole of Iran.

As to the reasons for the adoption of the plan, the main existing theory (Godard's, modifying Max van Berchem, but see critique by K. A. C. Creswell, Muslim Architecture of Egypt, ii, Oxford 1959, 132-3) is that it was connected with the spread of the madrasa as an official building from north-eastern Iran westward. The theory is far from being convincing and for a variety of reasons may be rejected either that the question is unresolved or that a form hitherto used primarily for secular purposes was adapted to the mosque as part of the imposition of a new Sâlîdâk taste all over Iran.

West of Iran the iwán, either singly or in a pattern of four, was rarely used for mosques but became the characteristic architectural feature of madrasas, ribâfs, hospitals, and of most of the numerous functions which were either introduced in Zângid and Ayyûbid times or acquired a new monumentality. The earliest use of an iwán in a madrasa seems to occur in the 530/1136 madrasa in Bosra (Creswell, Egypt, ii, 107) but the rather primitive construction and planning of this building makes it a rather doubtful witness. Without searching for an (anyway) accidentally "first" example, it may be simpler to conclude that, while the form was already fairly common in house architecture (as for instance in the private houses of Fustât), its use in monumental official architecture was a result of the general impact of Iran following the Sâlîdâk reconquest. In the Arab Near East, however, it never became the unique architectural feature it was in Iran, although in the monuments of Nûr al-Dîn in Damascus (N. Ellieder, Les Monuments de Nûr al-Dîn, in Bulletin d'Etudes Orientales, xiii (1949-51) or much later in the superb madrasa of Sultan Hasan in Cairo (among others L. Hautecoeur & G. Wiet, Les Mosquées du Caire, Paris 1932, 103 ff.), we have superb examples of the ways in which a form originally developed in lands of brick architecture was turned into stone.

Several attempts have been made in the past, especially by Max van Berchem and by E. Herzfeld (see for instance his Damascus, Studies in Architecture, in Ars Islamica, vols. ix ff. (1942 ff.), to suggest that the spread and development of the iwân-based plan, especially in madrasas, is to be related to precise functional requirements (teaching for instance) and even to symbolic ones as in the Sunnî oecumenism of a building like the Mustansîriyya in Baghhdâd. Suggestive and interesting though they may be, these arguments do not seem to be entirely acceptable and it may be preferable to consider the iwán as one of the several ways in which the mediaeval Muslim world sought solutions to the problem of architectural space without attributing to it concrete or symbolic meanings permanently attached to the form itself. Like the domed hall or the tower it was a form which could be used for a variety of purposes determined by the needs and tastes of society at any one time; cf. as an example of unique use of known forms, L. Golombek, The Timurid Shrine at Gâsur Gâh, Toronto 1969.

One last aspect of the iwán as it appears to the art historian may deserve attention. It is that, regardless of the functions which were given to it, it has a very precise aesthetic value. It is a strong, dominating feature which serves as the main axis of an architectural composition both in plan and in elevation. As a result it is generally the shape and the proportions of the iwán which determined the rhythm
and the relations between parts found in most later Iranian facades and in most interior decorations. While not as exuberant as the Islamic dome, the iwān served as a major vehicle for the growth and development of one of the world's most impressive vaulting traditions and its walls were covered with all the various types of decorative techniques and ornamental designs known in the Muslim world.

**Bibliography:** Most of the immediately appropriate bibliography will be found in standard books on Islamic and especially Iranian and Central Asian architecture. For textual information on the uses of the iwān, see D. Sourdel, *Questions de Cérémonial Abbaside*, in *REI*, 1960. For the development of the religious building with four iwāns in Iran recent investigations and discoveries have made the traditional interpretation far less certain; see, for instance, O. Grabar, *Notes on the Great Mosque of Isfahan*, in *Bulletin of the Asia Institute in Memory of A. U. Pope* (Shiraz, 1972).

(O. GRABAR)

**IYĀD**, an ancient Arab tribe whose ancestor Iyād is according to the genealogists the son of Nizar b. Ma‘add and the brother of Rabl b. Ma‘add. The Banū Iyād b. Sud were a clan of the Azad. **Bibliography:** In the article; see also al-Bakri, *Mu‘jam (Wüstenfeld)*, 44-51 and passim; ibn Kutayba, *Dhāt*, 977; ibn Durayd, *Ihkitab Aswād*, 104 f.; al-Hamdi (Wüstenfeld), 44-51 and passim (for a list of their settlements); see further the indices to Tabarī, Ya‘qūbī, Mubarrad, Sibawayh, Abū al-‘Azm and also W. Caskel, *Gamharat al-nasab* (indices by Mubammad Shafi'ī, Kāmil, ‘Abd Rabbih, al-‘Ikhd (indices by Muḥammad Shafi‘ī), Mas‘ūdī, Aḥṣā‘ī, Fihrist, ibn al-‘Ajlūn, Ya‘qūt, Mu‘jam and also W. Caskel, *Gamharat al-nasab*). The Banū Iyād b. Sūd were a clan of the Azad.

**Bibliography:** In the article; see also al-Bakrī, *Mu‘jam (Wüstenfeld)*, 44-51 and passim; ibn Kutayba, *Dhāt*, 977; ibn Durayd, *Ihkitab Aswād*, 104 f.; al-Hamdi (Wüstenfeld), 44-51 and passim (for a list of their settlements); see further the indices to Tabarī, Ya‘qūbī, Mubarrad, Sibawayh, Abū al-‘Azm and also W. Caskel, *Gamharat al-nasab*. The Banū Iyād b. Sūd were a clan of the Azad.

**Bibliography:** In the article; see also al-Bakrī, *Mu‘jam (Wüstenfeld)*, 44-51 and passim; ibn Kutayba, *Dhāt*, 977; ibn Durayd, *Ihkitab Aswād*, 104 f.; al-Hamdi (Wüstenfeld), 44-51 and passim (for a list of their settlements); see further the indices to Tabarī, Ya‘qūbī, Mubarrad, Sibawayh, Abū al-‘Azm and also W. Caskel, *Gamharat al-nasab*. The Banū Iyād b. Sūd were a clan of the Azad.

**Bibliography:** In the article; see also al-Bakrī, *Mu‘jam (Wüstenfeld)*, 44-51 and passim; ibn Kutayba, *Dhāt*, 977; ibn Durayd, *Ihkitab Aswād*, 104 f.; al-Hamdi (Wüstenfeld), 44-51 and passim (for a list of their settlements); see further the indices to Tabarī, Ya‘qūbī, Mubarrad, Sibawayh, Abū al-‘Azm and also W. Caskel, *Gamharat al-nasab*. The Banū Iyād b. Sūd were a clan of the Azad.
507/1115, to perfect his knowledge, not to the East—which he never visited, not even for the pilgrim-age—but to Spain. In the Shifa of Ibn Bashkuwā, (i, 446, no. 972, reproduced by al-Nawawī, Simil Ms. B. N. Tunis no. 11,936, p. 10), the expression bi'll-Magrib, which occurs in connection with the studies he made under the direction of Abū 'All al-Šaḍafī, denotes the east of Spain and not the Orient, as is made clear in the Mu‘ājam which Ibn al-Abbār had dedicated to the disciple of the last-mentioned master. The traditional travelling for study (riḥa) lasted about one year: in all ʿIyāḍ had about a hundred masters, to whom he dedicated his Qawām (still in ms.). These include Ibn Ḥamdīn (430/1042-508/1115), who had met al-Ghazālī in the East and probably introduced his Ḥiyā’ to Morocco and Spain in 493/1100; and also the celebrated traditionist Abū 'All al-Šaḍafī (d. 514/1120-2).

On returning to Ceuta, ʿIyāḍ was raised to the rank of qāʿa [q.v.] and then, in 515/1121-2, to that of kāf of the city of his ancestors. On 1 Ṣafār 531/29 Oct. 1136, he was entrusted with the office of kāf of Granada. He was already a great personage, and his new place of residence gave him a triumphal wel- come. The triumph was ephemeral. Being regarded as too censorious, ʿIyāḍ was discharged after some months at the request of Tāshfin, then governor of the city. Tāshfin’s death (26 Ramaḍān 539/23 March 1145) won back for him the favour of the now tottering Almoravids. Towards the end of 539/1145, he was again nominated by the short-lived Ḥibrānīn b. Tāshfin as kāf of Ceuta, where he was to play a political role of the first importance, in regard to which his biographers, unlike the historians, prefer to remain very reticent.

A convinced and militant Mālikī, ʿIyāḍ in effect constituted the centre of resistance to the Almohads in Ceuta. After the final triumph of the latter, he was at first exiled to Tadla, among the nomadic tribes, and then, together with other notables from the suspect city, was sent to forced residence in Marrākūsh where, deserted, dejected and exhausted, he died (29 Djamād al-Awwal 554/13 Oct. 1149). Legend, echoing the hostility which he incurred under the Almohads, attributes his sudden death while in the baths (hammām) to the incovocations of al-Ǧazālī, or else, with the accusation of secretly practising Judaism, allegations that he was put to death by the Mahdī Ibn Tūmārt.

ʿIyāḍ was not without literary talent, but he was pre-eminently a traditionist and faḥīk. He was a truly typical faḥīk of the Almoravid period, strictly orthodox, and for whom there existed only one single unique truth, that which had been taught by Mālik and his school. He wrote more than twenty works, not all of which have survived. His best-known published works are: al-Šāfī bi-ta’dīr ḥabīb al-Muṣafah, which enjoyed an enormous success and which still continues to play an important part in popular piety; Māṣārī ḥaḍīr ʿallā ṣīḥā mā ḥaḍār; Tawīl al-maddīr wa-taḥrīr al-maddīk bi-ma’rūfat al-ʿālam māḏḥab Mālik, which constitutes the best defence for and illustration of the Mālikī school.


ʿIYĀFA (א'ף), as opposed to faʿl [q.v.] which denotes human omens (cledonism), is applied in a general sense to animal omens (zoomancy) and, in the strict sense, to ornithomancy, that is to say the art of divining omens in the names of birds, their cries, their flight and their posture (TA, vi, 207, l. 24 ff.). With certain names of birds a fatal quality is associated, though why this is so is not always known; in general, black and greenish plumage and down constitute the only justification. This is the case with the crow, the roller, the jack, and with any animal or bird with a coat or plumage of dark colour interspersed with white, such as a she-camel, a she-wolf or a dove (for animals regarded by the Arabs as a subject of divination, cf. Divination, 498-519).

Even more than with regard to the nature of birds (that is to say, their consecration to some particular divinity of either a propitious or an ill-fated character) and their categories (that is to say, those whose flight and cries are the basis for divination), the rich ornithomantic and zoomantic documentation gathered from ancient Arab literature makes it possible to give a precise statement of the principles and rules of mantic interpretation of the flight and cries of birds, as well as of their posture, and of the movements of certain quadrupeds.

For the flight of birds, two techniques originally existed: lira and saḏīr. Lira is the observation and mantic interpretation of the spontaneous flight of birds. This was progressively extended, particularly with sedentization, to include all kinds of manifestations of animate or inanimate beings, and especially to domestic divinations which a man based upon the gestures and utterances of his wife, the inhabitants of the house, the utensils, or the animals in his service. Originally, it included divination of both good and ill; but Islam condemned it as a pagan practice, consigning favourable omens to faʿl, which is permitted, whilst it prohibited lira as an act of faith in the blind forces and the gods who represented these forces.

Saḏīr too lost its primitive meaning in assuming a wider significance, in the same way as lira, with which it is generally confused. Originally, saḏīr consisted in causing a bird to take flight by throwing a stone in order that its flight might be interpreted; if the bird flew to the saḏīr’s right, it constituted a good omen for him, if to the left it was a bad omen (cf. Divination, 438). But Ibn Khaldūn, Muḥammad, i, 195, already defined it as though it were a question only of lira. This also is a consequence of the change from nomadic to sedentary conditions.

Lira and saḏīr, the two techniques of ʿiyāfa, consist essentially in the interpretation of the direction of birds’ flights and their cries. The technical terminology used in this field derives from hunting and is applied to all zoomantic divination. It is not possible here to expatiate on these terms, which have been studied in Divination, 440-6; it will suffice to mention the two most commonly used terms, namely al-sānīḥ, “that which comes from your right, proceeding towards your left”, and al-bārīḥ, which is its antonym. These are not exact meanings, but they are sometimes found in the reverse sense, according to whether they are used in connection with ornitho-
mancy or hunting (cf. details in Divination, 440 ff.). In general, al-sdnih is favourable and al-bdrih is unfavourable; but here also there are numerous divergencies. According to Ibn Barril (quoted in TA, ii, 170, 24 f.), this depends upon local customs: "The inhabitants of Nadjd," he says, "regard al-sdnih as favourable, but it can happen that a Nadjdi may use the vocabulary of the Hujjazi". We believe, on the contrary, that these divergencies bear witness to a very ancient state of affairs, where the right side did not necessarily signify "favourable" and the left "unfavourable", as was the case in Assyro-Babylonian divination.

The interpretation of the cries of birds is widely attested in respect of the crow (cf. texts and translations in Arabica, viii (1961), 34 ff. and 49 f.); but the Arab also deduced omens from the cooing of pigeons, from the call of a bird, from the crowing of the cock, from the braying of donkeys, from the bleating of sheep, from the cry of the camel, from the barking of a dog, etc. (cf. details in Divination, 446-9).

For the Arab, the posture and behaviour of a bird provided material for divination. That a crow croaked on a withered tree, on a leafy tree or on a recently constructed wall would modify the meaning of the divination. That the bird shook itself, stretched its wings, pecked the ground, grubbed in the soil, wiped its beak—all these things are taken into consideration in the interpretation of the divination (cf. Divination, 449 ff., and Arabica, loc. cit.).

For the relations between fa‘il, tira and sa‘ir, see f.a.

Bibliography: T. Fahd, La divination arabe, Leiden 1966, 431-50 and 498-519, where the reader will find the main texts and their analyses; ibidem, Les présages par le corbeau. Étude d’un texte attribué à Gāhib, in Arabica, viii (1961), 30-58, where texts of Arab divinations are compared with texts of Assyro-Babylonian and Iranian divinations.

(T. Fahd)

1TYAR [see sirkah].

IYALA [see eyâlet].

IYALA B. MU‘AWIYA B. KUBRA AL-MUZANAH, Abū Wathila, was appointed kādī of Bayṣa during the caliphate of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz in 99/718 (the date 95/714 given by Waki‘ is incorrect, for ‘Umar did not succeed to the caliphate until 99, and also it was ‘Adī b. Artāt, governor of the town from 99-101, who chose Iyās for the post on the caliph’s orders); he did not accept this post very enthusiastically (see especially a anecdote related by Ibn Kutayba, Uyūn, i, 62, which shows incidentally that parallel jurisdictions were still in existence), and in fact gave it up in 101 or 102/720-1; he died in 121/739 or the following year, aged 76.

Iyās, who is considered to be one of the leading lights of Mūdjar (for his genealogy see Ibn Kalbī-Caskel, Djamhara, tab. 88), became proverbial for his perspicacity, to such an extent that one said 'Abū hilm of al-Abnā‘ī [q.v.].

Adab literature presents him as a kind of Solomon, and he is the hero of a large number of anectodes, probably originally borrowed from al-Madā‘inī, who had composed a Kitāb Al-fitūs (Fītūst, Cairo ed., 1592). However, he is criticized for his tendency to gossip, his pride and the confidence he placed in dubious traditions.

Bibliography: Dāhiṣ, Bayān, i, 98-101 and index; ibidem, Ḥayāyān, i, 149-51 and index; Ibn Kutayba, Ma‘arif, 457; Waki‘, Alkhbār al-būdā‘i, Cairo 1947, ii, 312 ff. (see D. Sourdel, in Arabica, ii (1955), 112); Ibn Sa‘d, Tabakāt, vii, 4-5; ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Abd al-Malik, Zādh, 157-8; Abū Nu‘ayym, Ḥiyāyān, iii, 123-5, no. 327; Sharīdī, Sharī‘, i, 113; Ibn Kaḥlīkān, i, 36; Samā‘nī, Ansāb, s.v.; Ibn Ḥadījar, Isbā‘, tab. 87, in Ibn Ḥadījar, Ta‘rīkh Dimashq, iii, 175-85; Ibn Nubātā, Sarh, 141-6, 231; R. Basset, in Recueil des trad. pop., vi, 67. (CH. PELLAT)

IZMAL [see ismā‘īl].

IZMID [see Supplement].

IZMR [see Supplement].

IZNIK, the ancient and Byzantine Nicaea (Νικεία in Ibn Khuradā‘ibih and al-Idrīsī), was besieged in vain by the Arabs in their first campaigns against Byzantium in 99-101 and 107 (Theophanes, ed. de Boor, i, 397 and 405 ff.) and fell at the beginning of 1018 (middle of 473) into the hands of the Seljuq Sulaymān, son of Kutlumush, who made his residence there. The first Crusaders under Walter Sans-Avoir were severely defeated before Nicaea in 1096 by Alp Arslān, son and successor of Sulaymān; next year, however, the town could not withstand the onslaught of the Crusaders, led by Godfrey de Bouillon, and surrendered on 5 June 1097 to the Byzantines in alliance with the Crusaders, in whose possession it remained till the Ottoman invasion. Sultan Oḥāmān I is said to have attacked Nicaea, but it was not till the time of Oṛghān that it was taken after a prolonged siege in 1947; the town was taken and devastated by a raiding body of Timur’s troops (Ducas, 72; Sharaf al-Dīn, Ṣafarnāma, i, 454), but it soon recovered from this blow, and it is described as flourishing and prosperous at the time of the rebellion of Prince Muṣṭafā (Leunclavius, Hist., 195; cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, iii, 508 f.). In 804/1402 the town was taken and devastated by a raiding body of Timur’s troops (Ducas, 72; Sharaf al-Dīn, Ṣafarnāma, i, 454), but it soon recovered from this blow, and it is described as flourishing and prosperous at the time of the rebellion of Prince Muṣṭafā (Leunclavius, Hist., 542, i, 469). Bayzīd II is said to have intended after the death of his father Muḥammad II, to renounce the throne and retire to Nicaea.

The decline of the town began about the middle of the 11th/17th century; the population, then estimated at 10,000 (Gretot), had sunk to about 1,500 by the end of the 19th century; in 1960 it was 6,590. Administratively Iznik is now the centre of an ilçe belonging to the il (velayet) of Bursa. The present town occupies a relatively small part of the area enclosed within the ancient city walls. The best preserved of the ancient buildings are the Roman and Byzantine walls consisting of a double rampart (best described by Prokesch and Texier; cf. thereon Köhte, Mitt. des Deutsch. Arch. Instituts, Athens xxiv, 398-409) with their monumental gateways and 238 towers (Texier). The Byzantine part of these defences dates from the time of Leo III the Isaurian, who had them built after the Arab invasion of 726 (Corp. Inscr. Graec., n° 8864); Michael III in 858, and later Theodore Lascaris (Corp. Inschr. Graec., nos. 8745-8747) completed and improved them.

The town is very rich in Islamic monuments, some of which date from early Ottoman times. Sultan Oṛghān, soon after the conquest of Iznik converted the Aya Sofya church into a mosque. It was redecorated in the early 11th/17th century, when its kibīl wall was covered with tiles for his tendency to gossip, his pride and the confidence he placed in dubious traditions.
to this mosque, which was the first medrese in the
Ottoman Empire (Dorn, op. cit., p. 10). Another
building erected by Orkhan is a small mosque, bear-
ing his name, outside the city walls some 400 m.
from the Yenişehir Gate. Previously it was believed
that it dated from before the occupation of the town,
but excavations there in 1963 and 1964 revealed an
inscription giving its date as 733/1334 (Oktay Aslanapa,
Iznil: Sultan Orhan Imeret Camii Kasrasi, . . .,
1956; also Aptullah Kuran, The Mosque in early
Ottoman architecture, 78-9, figs. 77-78). Another
mosque dating from the reign of Sultan Orkhan is the
Hâdişidê Ûbarg Dîjamî (also known as the Cârshî
Mesdijî). This is the earliest Ottoman mosque
where the original dating inscription has been
preserved, giving the date of construction as 734/1333.
(Otto-Dorn, 15-18, abb. 5-6, Tables 4-5; Kuran, 34-5,
figs. 6-8). The mosque and türbe complex of
Hâdişidê Hanza Beg were erected in 746/1345 and
750/1349 respectively (Otto-Dorn, 18-20, abb. 6,
Tables 5/3, 6/1-2). It is interesting to note that none
of these early mosques had minarets. Later mosques,
like the Yeşil Dîjamî (780/1378-794/1391), the Kütb
al-Dîn Dîjamî (c. 821/1418), the Mahmûd Celebi
Dîjamî (846/1442) and the Eşrefzade-i Rûmilî Dîjamî
(874/1469) have minarets built in the Seljuk style,
but excavations have shown that the faience tile decoration inside and on the minaret,
the most significant. The mihrâb is built of marble
and is richly carved, the earliest of its kind in
Ottoman mosque architecture (Otto-Dorn, 20-33, abb.
7-11, Tables, 6/3-17; Kuran, 61-33, figs. 52-7). It was
erected by Kâzîrân (see ûqar). The dating
inscription gives the name of the architect as a certain
Hâdişidê Müsa. The Kütb al-Dîn Dîjamî has no
date, but Otto-Dorn reckons it dates to 821/1418,
the year when Kütb al-Dîn died (Otto-Dorn, 33-5,
abb. 12, Tables 19-20). The Mahmûd Celebi Dîjamî
is well preserved and its minaret has glazed blue
and green faience tiles (Otto-Dorn, 35-9, abb.
13-15, Tables 21-2). The Eşrefzade-i Rûmilî Dîjamî is actually
part of a complex, which included a türbe and a
tekke (monastery). It was erected for Eşrefzade,
a holy man who lived for 120 years (779/1377-
899/1493). It is very much ruined and only its mina-
ret stands, giving the date of construction as 735/1334 (Oktay Aslana-
pa, op. cit., p. 103). Excavations revealed that the so-called
"Miletus ware", produced and manufactured in Iznik
by the so-called "Iznik potters", reached the town. It is not
known whether the Miletus potters also had a
brick factory, although this is often assumed.
Iznik pottery was exported to and consumed in many parts
of the Ottoman Empire (Dorn, op. cit., p. 10). Another
building erected by Orkhan is a small mosque, bear-
ing his name, outside the city walls some 400 m.
from the Yenişehir Gate. Previously it was believed
that it dated from before the occupation of the town,
but excavations there in 1963 and 1964 revealed an
inscription giving its date as 733/1334 (Oktay Aslanapa,
Iznil: Sultan Orhan Imeret Camii Kasrasi, . . .,
1956; also Aptullah Kuran, The Mosque in early
Ottoman architecture, 78-9, figs. 77-78). Another
mosque dating from the reign of Sultan Orkhan is the
Hâdişidê Ûbarg Dîjamî (also known as the Cârshî
Mesdijî). This is the earliest Ottoman mosque
where the original dating inscription has been
preserved, giving the date of construction as 734/1333.
(Otto-Dorn, 15-18, abb. 5-6, Tables 4-5; Kuran, 34-5,
figs. 6-8). The mosque and türbe complex of
Hâdişidê Hanza Beg were erected in 746/1345 and
750/1349 respectively (Otto-Dorn, 18-20, abb. 6,
Tables 5/3, 6/1-2). It is interesting to note that none
of these early mosques had minarets. Later mosques,
like the Yeşil Dîjamî (780/1378-794/1391), the Kütb
al-Dîn Dîjamî (c. 821/1418), the Mahmûd Celebi
Dîjamî (846/1442) and the Eşrefzade-i Rûmilî Dîjamî
(874/1469) have minarets built in the Seljuk style,
but excavation there between 1963 and 1966 have estab-
lished that the so-called "Miletus ware" was manu-
factured in Iznik. This ware had a red clay body and
the designs were painted in blue, turquoise-green and
white-bodied faience which resembled porcelain.
In colour). This red ware was suddenly replaced,
as a result of the influence of Italian Renaissance art
on them (third group). The Iznîk excavations
revealed shards, kiln-wasters and pottery kilns as
well, attesting that all these groups were manufac-
tured locally (Oktay Aslanapa, Pottery and kilns
from the Iznîk excavations, 140-6). Manufacture of
tiles and pottery still continued at Iznîk in 1736
(Otter, Voyage en Turquie, iii, 44), but it soon came
to an end and was forgotten. It seems that potters
moved to Kütahya, where they tried to revive the
old Iznîk traditions in pottery making.
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IISRÎ'IL (in European literature one also finds 'Azrâ'il), the name of the angel of death, one of
the four archangels (next to Djibrîl, Mîghânîl, Is-
râîl). Like Isrâîl, whose office of trumpet-blower at the last judgment is sometimes given to him, he is
of cosmic magnitude; if the water of all the seas and
rivers were poured on his head, not a drop would
reach the earth. He has a seat (sarîr) of light in the
fourth or seventh heaven, on which one of his feet
rests; the other stands on the bridge between paradise
and hell. He is however also said to have 70,000 feet.
The description of his appearance agrees almost
exactly with that in Jewish literature: he has 4,000
wings and his whole body consists of eyes and tongues,
the number of which corresponds with that of the
living. He, however, is also said to have four faces.
At first he was an angel like the others. When Allâh
wanted to create man, he ordered Djibrîl to snatch
from the earth for this purpose a handful of its main
constituents. The earth, however, stirred up by
Iblis, offered resistance, so that neither Djibrîl, nor
Mîghânîl nor Isrâîl could carry out the commission.
But Isrâîl managed to do it. Because of his pitiful
lessness (billat al-ratima) Allâh then appointed him
angel of death.
Because of his strength he is also master of death. When Allāh had created Death, he summoned the angels to look at him. When they saw his astonishing strength, they fell down unconscious and remained lying for a thousand years. Then they awakened and said “Death is the most powerful of creatures”. But Allāh said: “I have appointed ‘Izra’īl to be lord over him”.

Several angels of death are mentioned, as in Jewish literature; and it is said that ‘Izra’īl deals with the souls of the prophets while the souls of ordinary men are under his khālifa. Special stress is laid on the beginning of Sūra LXXIX, as authority for a number of angels of death: “By those who tear forth and by those who draw forth” etc. The former are said to be those angels who drag the souls of the unbelievers by force from their bodies, while by the latter are meant who have to separate the souls of the believers from their bodies. The explanation of the verse however is not certain. In Sūra XXXII, 11 mention is made of the angel of death (in the singular).

‘Izra’īl keeps a roll of mankind. But he does not know the date of death of the individuals. Whether one belongs to the blessed or the damned he sees from the fact that the names in the first category are supported by a bright and those in the second by a dark circle.

When the day of a man’s death approaches, Allāh causes to fall from the tree below His throne the basmala [g.v.]. ‘Izra’īl reads the name and has to separate the person’s soul from his body after 40 days. But there are some people who strive against the separation, and object that the angel of death is acting arbitrarily. The latter then goes back to Allāh and tells him his experience. Allāh then gives him as a credential an apple from paradise on which the basmala [g.v.] is written; when the man sees this, he yields.

Man also has other means of making it difficult for the angel of death to carry out his task. If the latter wants to creep into his throat to fetch out his spirit, he may recite a dhikr [q.v.] and thus prevents the entrance. The angel then returns to Allāh, who advises him to try to take the dying man’s hand. If the latter however is just making a sadaka [g.v.] the angel’s entrance is again impossible. Finally, however, ‘Izra’īl writes the name of God on the man’s hand. Then the bitter feeling of separation disappears and the angel can enter to fetch the spirit. It is also said that he pierces men with a poisoned lance. Another account is as follows: When a believer is on his deathbed, the angel of death stands at his head and draws his soul out as gently as water runs out of a leaf on which the man’s name is written. ‘Izra’īl then covers his hand on a cow, as many years are to be granted him as his hand covers hairs”. “And then?” asked Moses. “Death”, said Allāh. It is also related that the angel of death came to Moses with an apple from paradise; when he had smelled this, he died.

On an experience of Solomon’s with the angel of death, see al-Baydgawi on Sūra XXI, 34; on his visit to ‘Idrīs, see that article.


‘IZZ AL-DAWLA, an honorary title (lakab [g.v.], pl. alkāb) of the kind which came into being at the beginning of the 4th/10th century, conferred by caliphs and later also by other sovereigns. The first person to receive an honorary title composed with dawla was the vizier of the caliph al-Muktāfī (902-8), al-Kāsim; in 289/902 he was entitled Wall al-Dawla (Friend of the Dynasty). Originally dawla [g.v.] signified: turn, reversal (especially in battle), then it became the designation of the old Mahdī propaganda, and from the middle of the 3rd/9th century attainted the meaning still in force today: “dynasty, state”. With this meaning dawla became an element of those honorary titles which began to be granted shortly before the middle of the 4th/10th century, became customary at the time of the Buyids [g.v.] and are a marked characteristic of this period.

According to their meanings, concepts and words (muḏḏāfāt) linked with dawla can be divided into six groups: 1) verbal forms which describe an activity of the bearer in connection with the dynasty, e.g., Mu‘īn (helper) al-Dawla, Nāṣir, Mu‘izz, Muḥsharrīf, etc.; 2) metaphors, mostly weapons or parts of the body, e.g., Sayf, Ḥusām, ‘Aṣūd (and developed from these: Yāmīn, ‘Ayn) etc.; 3) concepts from the cosmos, e.g., Nūr, Diyā, Bahā, and Shams al-Dawla, Ẓāwīl al-Dawla (borne in this sequence by father and son, so that the development and intensification becomes especially clear); 4) concepts from architecture, e.g., ‘Amlī, ʿImād, Rūkn, Sanad, ʿUmda, Kawām, etc.; 5) insignia and titles of sovereigns, e.g., Ṭāqī (crown), and Sultan (a title which until then belonged only to the caliph), also Ẓā‘īm; 6) the concepts fame, glory, honour: Fāhûr, Ẓālīl, Maḥdi, Sharaf, ʿAlā, ‘Izīz.

In 348/959-60, while still crown prince, Bakhtiyār [g.v.], the son of the Buyid chief amīr Mu‘izz al-Dawla, was granted the title ‘Izz al-Dawla, clearly as a modification of the lakab of his father. This tradition was continued when Bakhtiyār named his son al-Murzūbān, governor of Baṣra, as his successor, and the caliph bestowed upon him the honorary title of ‘Izz al-Dawla. When ‘Adī‘īb al-Dawla appeared in Baghdad, decisively wiped out the Buyids of Baghdad in 977 and Bakhtiyār met with an inglorious end,
the tradition of the dawla title derived from 'izz and others also came to an end, at least among the Büyids. The later Büyids in Shīrāz and Baghdād, without exception descendants of 'Adud al-Dawla, chose other alkhāb from the six groups listed above.

Besides the Büyids, almost all contemporary rulers who acknowledged the 'Abbāsīd caliphate were recipients of alkhāb in the form discussed here: the Mawānīds, Mazyādīds, Mirdāsīds, Ghaznawīds etc. In addition, the Sāmānīds, who for a time did not acknowledge the caliph of Baghdād appointed by the Büyids, adopted the practice, bestowing such alkhāb on their own authority upon the governors of Ḵūrāsān in order to bind them closer to themselves. In Fāṭimid Egypt, on the other hand, alkhāb were chosen on a different principle. In North Africa and Spain dawla titles appear only occasionally. There, clearly by deliberate intent, only rare resort was made to this 'Abbāsīd practice.

The honorary title 'izz al-Dawla was evidently so compromised by the inglorious memory of the Büyid Bakhtiyārī that it reappeared only later, and indeed principally in Persia. In particular the following holders of the title can be taken as examples: 1) the Ghaznawī 'Abd al-Rashīd (1050-3); 2) the Baduspašā b. Nāmār (470/1080-1117 in Māzanbārān) and Rūk b. Shāh Ghaרצī (750/1350-801/1401); 3) the Sūfī and fākīh, Shams al-Dīn Makānī (496/1103), the Artūkīs from 538/1144, the Zengīs of Aleppo, the Dānishmendīs in Anatolīa, the Salghūrīs in Fārs, the Ghūrīs in east Iran and India, the Shāhs of Ḥwārizm, and the Ḥūdūls of Persia from 564/1170.

Later alkhāb with dawla are still found, though only occasionally; from Saldjuk times they were displaced by alkhāb with dīn as an element. In the time of the Ṣafawīs the dawla title was revived to some extent in Persia. The grand vizier took ex officio the title I'timād al-Dawla [p. 294]. Under the Kāḏjārs the title was deliberately continued the Büyid and Ṣafawī traditions, and again made frequent use of alkhāb in the form outlined here. All the compounds classified in groups 1) to 6) can be found, with the addition of several new forms. However, the title 'izz al-Dawla is infrequent. Under the Kāḏjārs princes only 'Abd al-Ṣamād Mīrāz, a son of Muhammad Shāh (1250/1834-1264/1848), held this title. It seems that the eulogizing irżāa wa-dawla (only used in association with dawla) was an expression of vanity, which expressed their view of themselves as rulers who were first converted to Islam with Ghazān Khan (694/1295-703/1304), the Mughuls in east Iran and India, the Shāhs of Ḥwārizm, and the Ḥūdūls of Persia from 564/1170.

The alkhāb 'izz al-Dīn, amongst others, appeared several times under the Zengīs of Aleppo and the Rūm Sulṭāns of east Iran and India. But the title as a phenomenon of the 12th/13th century, however, the alkhāb lost its status as an honour granted by the caliph or a local prince, and became simply a name which a man assumed himself or which was attributed to deserving people by contemporaries without any official procedure. Ibn al-Fūwāṭi (d. 723/1323-4) enumerates in his work Magīmī' l-dād bī muḍğām al-akhbā (ed. Muṣṭafā Dīwād, Damascus 1962) more than five hundred bearers of the alkhāb 'izz al-Dīn, covering almost all areas of the population: the sultan and the courtiers, officials in the capital, in the provinces and in the administration, holders of religious offices (judges, witnesses, professors at madrasas), theologians and jurists without official positions, and members of secular professions (poets, druzgists, doctors, merchants, etc.). The earliest datable bearers of the title belong to the first years of the 6th/12th century (e.g., a ḥabīl, no. 231). By the end of the Ṣalṭūn period, at the latest after the arrival of the Mongols, who were first converted to Islam with Ghāzān Khan (694/1295-703/1304), the alkhāb must have lost the character of an officially bestowed honour. Kalkashandī (d. 821/1418) in the Ẓub b l-A'zāb, vi, 38 ff., mentions in the list of alkhāb under 'izz only the alkhāb 'izz al-Islām as the title "of some mulābā." Like the dawla titles, the dīn titles remained confined to the eastern Islamic world. In the East Būrānī had already criticized the alkhāb, but on political and practical grounds: they were a sign of the decadence of the caliphate, an expression of vanity, and moreover too long for practical use. The Egyptian Ibn Taghribirdī mocked the Persians, amongst whom all things were connected with dīn. The Maḥqīb 'All b. Maymūn (c. 900/1495) designated the alkhāb simply as "diabolical innovation" (ḥidāya shaybāntīyya).

After Ibn al-Fūwāṭi and al-Kalkashandī, from the
beginning of the 10th/16th century at the latest, *din*
titles were no longer considered as *alkâb* in the true
sense, being reduced to mere proper names. In the
Ottoman empire, there developed a predilection for
double names composed of a *lakab* with *din* and a
proper name, as F. Babinger has noted. Quite apart
from absurd combinations which go as far as *'Umar
al-Dîn* (see J. H. Kramers), in more recent times a
downward trend in the choice of names with *din* may
be observed; in the biographical dictionary by Tuerk
*Meyhûnün*, 1'izzeddin appears only rarely. In Egypt
names originally ending in *din* are habitually short-
ened to the *mudâfa*, Kamâl, Djamal, etc. The Turkish
name Izzet may perhaps have arisen in the same
way (but cf. Hikmet, Fikret etc.; see also ISM).

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Fuwâti and al-Kâl-
kaşândî (referred to in the article); G. Flügel,
*Huwaam ed-Dîn*, in Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine
Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*,
Section II, Part 12, s. f.; F. Babinger, *Scheikh
Bedr ed-Dîn, der Sohn des Richters von Simâsîn*,
in *I., xi* (1921), 20, n. 3; J. H. Kramers, *Les
noms musulmans composés avec Din*, in *AO*,
v (1926/27), 55-67; Hasan al-Bâshâ, *al-Alkâb al-
sâlihîyya fi 'l-tarîkh wa 'l-walîddîh wa 'l-dîn*,
Cairo 1957; A. Dietrich, *Die mit ad-Din zusammen-
gesetzten Personennamen*, in ZDMG, cx (1961),
43-54 (with valuable supplements to the lists drawn
up by Flügel and Kramers); H. Busse, *Chaifî and
Grosskönig*, Beirut 1969 (*Beirut Texte und
Studien*, Vol. 6), (with chronological lists of the
daula and *din* titles until about 446/1055, pp. 167-
73). (H. Busse)

**1'IZZ AL-DÎN KAYKÂWOS II** [see KAYKÂWOS].

**1'ABAR 1'IZZET** [see Supplement].

**IZZET MOLLA.** Kâgızi-zaide (1200/1785-
1245/1829) Turkish poet, born in Istanbul, the
son of the kâbîs'seker Mehmendîlî. His family origi-
nated from Konya and took their surname from
Süleyman Efendi, the *imâm* of the Toprak Sokak
mosque who made his living as a felt-maker (*keçidi*).
His son Muştafa (d. 1181/1767) went to Istanbul for
his education and became a kâdi and trained his son
Mehmed Sâlih (the poet's father) for the same pro-
fession. 1'izzet was only fourteen when Sâlih Efendi
died and his two brothers-in-law, the kâbîs'seker
Hâmîd and the poet Es'ad, took care of his up-
bringing, and trained him for the *ûlema* profession.
But under the influence of the latter's too free and
easy life, 1'izzet soon took to drink, squandering
what little he had left by his father, and his
eenemies got his name struck off the register of the
profession. This ignominy, coupled with being in
straitened circumstances, brought him to the
verge of despair and he decided to commit suicide.
The strange circumstances in which this act was
being carried out and how he was dissuaded from it
and was eventually introduced to Hâlet Efendi
(*q.v.*), the powerful confidant of Maḥmûd II, are
told in detail in a biographical article by Reşâd Fuâ'd,
a great-grandson of his and with some variants by
İbnülemîn Mahmud Kemal (İnal) (see bibliogra-
phy).

Hâlet Efendi presented him with a house, secured
his livelihood and introduced him to the sultan (for
a discussion of this relationship see: A. H. Tanpinar,
*XIX. Asr Türk Edebiyatı Taribi*, Istanbul 1956,
p. 56, n. 1). Again thanks to Hâlet, he was ap-
pointed kâdi of Galata in 1230/1820. When Hâlet
fell into disgrace and was banished to Konya and
later executed there (1238/1822), 1'izzet, his favourite
confidant, was the only one of his entourage who
escaped the purge. But he did not resist the temp-
tation of praising his benefactor and denouncing his
enemies in private conversation. An indelent couplet,
(reproduced in Djezewd, *Tâ'rikh*, xii, 67), composed
to this effect, seems to have been the last straw. He
soon found himself banished to Keshan near Tekirdâg
(Rodosto) in Thrace, where he stayed about a year
(1238-9/1823-4) and where he wrote his masterpiece,
*Meyhûnün 1'izâr*. It was the new grand-vizier, Şâhîd
Paşâ, who, although he was a former confidant of
1'izzet, obtained his pardon from the sultan when
1'izzet sent to him a *kaşida* in submission. 1'izzet had
no difficulty in regaining the favours of Maḥmûd II.
He was successively appointed kâdi of Mecca (1244/
1825) then of Istanbul (1245/1826) and Inspector of
the Haramayn (Mecca and Medina). But his
prosperity did not last long. In a War Council,
which met in the spring of 1243/1828 in the
office of the Şâyîkh al-Islâm, to decide whether or
not to declare war on Russia, which had invaded
Turkey, following the destruction of the Turkish fleet
at Navarino a few months earlier, 1'izzet joined, half-
heartedly and reluctantly, the majority which fa-
voured war. But immediately afterwards, he com-
posed, together with Şâri Śâhîm Efendi, the treasurer of the Defterdâr, a memorial (*lâyiha*)
which he submitted through the Sultan to the
Silâhdâr Ağa. In it 1'izzet expressed in detail
what he did not dare to say publicly: he enumerated
the reasons why it was not advisable to wage war.
Maḥmûd II, who was highly angered, had his
memorial rejected by a countermemorial (*reddîye*)
and ordered that 1'izzet be banished to Cyprus
and ordered that 1'izzet's place of exile was
changed to Rhodes; 1'izzet's place of exile was
changed to Sivas. Nine months later, upon the
disastrous outcome of the Russian campaign of 1243/
1828, 1'izzet, who proved to be right, was pardoned,
but the ailing poet died a few hours before the sul-
tan's *fermân* reached Sivas. It was attached to his
breast at the burial (Safar 1245/August 1829). He
was forty-four years old. In 1916 his remains were
brought to Istanbul and buried in the family tomb.

1'izzet Molla married Hibet Allâh Kâhîmd, the
daughter of Isma'll Mâfâ BBC and sister of Muş-
taфа Paşâ as asserted by Fevziye Abdullah in *I A
s.v.*, a descendant of Kara Muştafa Paşa (executed
in 1905/1883). The eldest of his four sons was the
famous 19th-century statesman Fuâ'd Paşâ (*q.v.*).

1'izzet Molla is the last great representative of
*Dîwân* poetry. During the closing stages of the old
school, when many of his contemporaries repeated
themselves with interminable *cleshe* and hackneyed
similes, he showed comparative originality thanks to
his strong sense of humour, his penchant for satire
and hackneyed
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Except for the short biography of his father, where
he gives an example of the lofty ornate style (*inizâb*),
his prose, particularly his memorial on reforms
(*insha*), is simple, fluent and to the point. 1'izzet is
the author of the following works: (1) *Dîwân*
I, compiled in 1242/1825 under the title of *Bâhâr-i
E bánh*, contains most of his verse outside his 
*mahmas* (Bülâk 1255). His many chronograms have
unusual documentary value; (2) *Dîwân* II, compiled
under the title of *Khashâni-ı Ârûb*, contains his few
later poems (Istanbul 1257); (3) *Gülshen-i Ashb*,
completed in 1227, a short allegorical *mahmass* on
mystic love, on the lines of Şâhîd Dede's *Hüsân
u Ashb* and, like it, inspired by Djalâl al-Dîn.
IZZET MOLLA — IZZET PASHA

Rumi's Sufi theories. Izzet, who was a member of the Mevlâna order, appears himself as the leading character in the work. For a synopsis see Gibb, HOP, iv, 306-308 (lithograph ed. Istanbul 1265); (4) Mihran-Keshan ("The Sufferers") with a pun on Keshan, as the title could also be read Mihran-i Keshan ("The Suffering at Keshan"), his most important work, which immediately secured his reputation and which distinguishes him from many contemporary dervish poets. It is a narrative poem in mutahârib and in mâthnawi form of about seven thousand couplets, interspersed with many hasâdas, qashâls, murâba'ab and chronograms, which relate in great detail and with pungent humor mixed with vital realism, the circumstances of his arrest in a public bath, this adventurous journey to Keshán, the colourful life in this little provincial township, the many local characters he meets and all his experiences there. Many reminiscences of his earlier life and people he knew in Istanbul are added with the same joyful humour to this lively and very spontaneous narrative, which make it a unique documentary work for the last period of Ottoman society before the great reforms of the 19th century. Izzet wrote most of the Mihran-Keshan in Keshán and completed it on his return to Istanbul in Dümâda 1 1259/February 1842. It was submitted to Selim III, written in a flowery style of the best inşâd tradition, published in 1916 (TOEM, No. 41, December 1332); (6) Lâyîba, a remembrance on the line of many lâyîbas submitted to Selim I, written in 1287 by order of Mahmud II. It has not been edited (two Mss. are in the libraries of the Turkish Historical Society and of the University of Istanbul, İbnülemim Collection). The text of his other lâyîba, the famous anti-war memorial which he composed with Omer Râsim Efendi and their "rejection" (reddiyye) prepared by Akif and Pertev Efendis (later pashas), are given in ʿĀṭā, ʿarâ'ī, iii, 267-275.

Izzet helped to establish order within the capital as captain (1887), colonel (1918). In 1913 he was made the sultan's aide-de-camp (sâver-i ekrem) for life; from 1912 onward he was also a member of the senate (a'yan).

Upon graduation from the Hârbiye, Izzet stayed as instructor in military geography and aide to Col- mar Barûn von der Goltz-Pasha, inspector-general of Ottoman military schools. After advanced training in Germany (1893-94) and a brief assignment at al-Lāţihipiyyâ in Syria, he became military aide in the Ottoman high commission in Sofia (1895-96). When a court favourite became the next commissioner, he asked for a transfer. With the outbreak of the Greek-Turkish War, Izzet was appointed to the general staff of the army mobilized on the Thessalian front and to the office of war operations. His energetic stand against corruption and inefficiency led to his interroga- tion at the palace and, eventually, a punitive trans- fer to the reserve division at Damascüs (1897). There he proved his military and diplomatic talents in paci- fying the rebellious Djabal Durûk (1902), and his ad- ministrative skills in supervising work on the Bigâjûz railway near ʿAkbâ. From 1906-08 he served in Yemen, first as chief of staff to ʿAli Pasha, the later grand vizier, whose forces were dispatched against the rising of the Zaydû sect under Imâm Yahûy, then as commander of the division in Hûday- da (1907). The Young Turk Revolution interrupted his summer leave in Lebanon, and Izzet returned to Istanbul.

Izzet’s reputation as one of von der Goltz’s star disciples, his field experience in Yemen, and his rare courage in standing up against the Hamidian regime led to his appointment, following the 1908 revolution, as chief of the Ottoman general staff. For two and a half years he worked, often in conjunction with von der Goltz and Mahmûd Shewket Pasha, to reform the system of training for officers and non-commissioned officers, to create a reserve officer corps, to introduce new model regiments, to arrange manoeuvres and transport, and administrative and mobilization schemes for the defence of the European parts of the empire. During the April 1909 Counter- Revolution, Izzet helped to establish order within the capital as the Harchet Ordusu approached Istanbul. Differences with Mahmûd Pasha, the minister of war, and his old teacher von der Goltz contributed to Izzet’s desire for assignment. Izzet disagreed with Shewket’s method of handling unrest in Albania, and resented what he thought to be encroachment by the minister of war in matters of manoeuvres and personnel management. Meanwhile, Imâm Yahûy had resumed his revolt and laid siege to the Yemeni capital of Šaḥr. Upon the death of ʿAbd Allâh Pasha, commander-in-chief in Yemen, Izzet was dis- patched to take his place (February 1911-December 1912), while officially on leave from his post as chief of staff. He succeeded in relieving the besieged Yemeni capital of Šanân and in concluding a compromise peace at Daʾān whereby Imâm Yahûy was recognized as temporal and spiritual head of the Zaydû sect, with the prerogative of appointing local officials on the sultan’s behalf. In return, Yahûy acknowledged the sultan’s suzerainty and joined an alliance with Ottoman forces against the rebellious Sayyid ʾIdris to the north.

While in Yemen, Izzet was dismayed to learn that upon the outbreak of the First Balkan War, the new war minister, Nâzım Pasha, had acted in com-
plete disregard of Izzet's careful strategic plans by proceeding to the offensive before preparations were complete. Because of transportation difficulties, Izzet managed to return only as Turkish forces were withdrawing to Cataluğa, outside the gates of the capital. When members of the Committee of Union and Progress seized power in the coup d'état of 23 January 1913, Izzet was offered the post of generalissimo under the new cabinet of Mahmûd Şekvet. At first he declined, having opposed the Unionist plot and being profoundly shocked at the death of Naşım Paşa, who was shot during the coup. He subsequently reconsidered in view of the danger of renewed war on the Balkans and of the prospect that Enver [q.v.], whom Izzet considered impetuous, political, and less than competent, might obtain the post. Accordingly, Izzet on 30 January 1913 was named to the post of deputy commander-in-chief (baskhumandan wekili—the sultan himself being the nominal baskhumandan) and, following Mahmûd Şekvet's assassination by anti-Unionist conspirators in June, that of minister of war in the cabinet of Sa'id Hallîm Paşa. As generalissimo Izzet was in charge of the campaign resulting in the recapture of Edirne in the Second Balkan War (July 1913). Since he gave priority to his post as supreme commander, the minister, Mahmûd Paşa, frequently acted as interim minister of war, e.g., in concluding the agreement in the autumn of 1913 by which the German military mission under General Otto Liman von Sanders was brought to Turkey.

Izzet had some reservations about the far-reaching powers of that mission which, he believed, threatened the integrity of the Ottoman command structure. Subsequently, the purge of the incompetent officers after the Balkan Wars proved, for Izzet's taste, too sweeping in scope and too political in the details of its implementation, and these differences with the dominant Unionist party led him to resign his post of minister of war and deputy commander-in-chief around the end of 1913. He was succeeded in both posts by Enver Paşa.

According to Izzet's own account (Inal, 1979; Klinghardt, 231 f.), the Ottoman government about this time favoured making Izzet prince of Albania. Although the plan received some backing among Albanian leaders both in Istanbul and in Albania itself, Izzet rejected it out of fear that "Albania might suffer harm on my account" (yılümüzden Arnavutluğa fønîk gelisliği). Izzet spent two years in semi-retirement, but early in 1916 took command of the front against Russia with headquarters at Diyarbakr. The disastrous defeat at Sarıkamış, under Enver's personal command, had all but destroyed the Eastern front the year before. The best 'Izzet could do with his decimated and ill-supplied troops was to slow down the Russian advance through the Armenian and Kurdish mountains. When the revolution of February 1917 led to the collapse of the Russian armies, 'Izzet asked to be relieved of what was no longer an actual front command. He subsequently served as Ottoman military delegate to the peace conferences at Brest Litovsk, with Russia, and at Bucharest, with Roumania (December 1917-May 1918).

Following the collapse of the Palestinian-Syrian front, the resignation of the Ta'yfat-Enver cabinet, and Ahmed Tewfîk Paşa's fruitless attempt to form a government, the task was assigned to Izzet Paşa. He served as grand vizier (sadr a'şam), from 14 October to 11 November 1918, at the head of a government that included a few moderate Unionists, notably Dâjud [q.v.] at the Ministry of Finance; the parliamentary leader of the Unionist anti-war faction that had formed early in 1918, 'Ali Fethî [Okyar]; and various non-political figures, such as the naval hero Hüseyin Ra'ûf [Orbey] and the imperial historiographer 'Abd al-Rahmân Sheref. The most urgent task was the conclusion of an armistice, and Izzet tried to make contact with the Allied powers through a variety of channels. The successful one proved to be the dispatch of the British General Charles Townshend, captured at Kut in 1916, to the headquarters of Vice-Admiral Sir Somerset Arthur Gough-Calthorpe in the harbour of Mudros on the Aegean island of Lemnos. The Ottoman delegation that went to Mudros soon after was headed by Hüseyin Ra'ûf and Reşad Hikmet, under-secretary of foreign affairs. On the grand vizier's instructions, the delegates insisted on obtaining safe-conduct for the German and Austrian military personnel stationed in Turkey; but they yielded on such points as the Allies' right to occupy key cities, harbours, and railway junctions throughout what remained of the Ottoman Empire. Determined not to jeopardize relations with the Allies through disputes over the interpretation of the armistice, 'Izzet ordered that no resistance be offered by the Allied forces. As Curukulu Mahmûd Paşa, frequently acted as interim minister of war, e.g., in concluding the agreement in the autumn of 1913 by which the German military mission under General Otto Liman von Sanders was brought to Turkey.

When it became known that Enver, Ta'yfat, Dżemal, and other leading Unionists had fled Istanbul on 2 November 1918, thereby evading any criminal or political responsibility for their war policies, 'Izzet's political authority was seriously undermined. He had had no advance knowledge of the escape and indeed tried to get German and Austrian authorities to return the fugitives from Odessa (the co-operation he received probably being less than sincere). In view of the political pressures against him, 'Izzet resigned on November 8, and three days later the sultan replaced his middle-of-the-road government with a clearly anti-Unionist one under Ahmed Tewfîk.

In May 1919 Izzet briefly entered the second Dâmad Ferîd [q.v.] government as minister without portfolio as part of a show of national unity in view of the Greek landings at İzmir. In July he refused to enter Ferîd's next cabinet which undertook to mount a military campaign against the Kemâlist "rebels". In October 1920 he accepted the ministry of the interior in a cabinet under Ahmed Tewfîk that took a more conciliatory line. 'Izzet and Şâlih Khu'lî [Kerâk] Paşa were dispatched to Bileğik (midway to Ankara) in December to negotiate some arrangement with Muşafa Kemâl Paşa and his Grand National Assembly. But Kemâl refused to recognize the delegation as representing any kind of government in Istanbul or to let his guests return to their capital. Instead Kemâl detained them in Ankara, hoping that Kemâlist successes against irregular forces (under Çerkeş Edhem [q.v.]) and against the Greek armies would sufficiently impress them to join his side. Upon their steadfast refusal, 'Izzet and his colleagues were at last allowed to return to Istanbul, in March 1921, on promise of resigning their government offices there. When in June Izzet Paşa re-entered the next cabinet under Ahmed Tewfîk Paşa as foreign minister, he
reached a reproachful telegram from Mustafa Kemal; in reply he did not repudiate his earlier promise as having been extorted but rather pleaded patriotic duty and his manifest lack of personal ambition. He continued in his post until the dissolution of the sultan's government in November 1922.

Izzet Pasha was a soldier of outstanding talent and high-minded patriotism. Pomiankowski (p. 58), as other qualified military observers, considers him one of the most reliable observers of the late Ottoman military and political scene, refers to him on the occasion of his resignation in early 1914 as "in the best years of his many powers, an enlightened and experienced soldier, at various junctures, but he retained a lifelong long-distaste for factionalism and political maneuvering. It was his misfortune to have risen to the top of the military profession at a time when military and political questions were inextricably intertwined, both through domestic instability and through the empire's decline and eventual collapse under foreign pressure. His devotion to duty rarely allowed him to refuse a responsible assignment; his probity rarely allowed him to keep it for long. Thus he repeatedly saw others dissipate the fruits of his labors—only to find himself called back to retrieve or liquidate their mistakes. His political moderation and lack of party ambition typically kept him in the middle—between Unionists and anti-Unionists, or Kemalists and anti-Kemalists. A loyal servant of the Ottoman Empire until the very end, he lived under the Turkish Republic in quiet retirement in his home in Istanbul until his death.


stable differences were to be noted, affecting above all the intonation of phrases, occasionally the production of vocalic variants or the frequency of certain adaptations of adjacent phonemes. Insofar as the few clear data at our disposal permit us to gain a comprehensive idea of this phenomenon, it appears that in the greater part of the Arab East (Arabian peninsula, northern 'Irāk, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Jordan), the facts may be compared to the situation in Jerusalem; but different circumstances prevailed in southern 'Irāk on the one hand and the Maghrib on the other.

As far as the East is concerned, it is in Baghdād where the speech patterns of the various communities diverged most clearly. That of the Jews (J) before their emigration presented certain analogies with the dialect used by the Christians and on the other hand differed from that of the Muslims (M) in various essential points. On the plane of phonology the following correspondences between the speech of the Muslims (M), that of the Jews (J), and classical Arabic (C) may be observed: (C) kāf: (M) g: (J) k; (C) kāf: (M) š (in certain defined situations); (J) k; (C, M) r: (J) š (for a large number of people); to (C) l there often corresponds in (J) t, where the vowel is present (M) / but (J) l. (C) ū and ū merge in (J) ū: M keeps a distinction between the two sounds but with a distribution different from that of (C): (M) occasionally equals ū or ū to (C, J) a; more often than (M), (J) has -ā corresponding to (C) -ā; equally, (J) demonstrates the īmāla [q.v.] of ā that is unknown in (M); some differences in syllabic structure and accentuation may be illustrated by the following forms: (M) ẓabbī “my friend, ābī “my room”: (J) ẓābī, kubbī. On the plane of morphology, the most outstanding items concerned conjugation. For the perfect the suffixes were: (M) sing. i. -t, 3.ī; plur. 2.ī, -t, at; 3.ī: (J) -t, -tu, -tum, -u; for the unattached pronouns, compare (M) sing. 1. ānī, 3.ī: hūwā, plur. 1. nūn, 2. nīn, 3. humma: (J) ānī, hūwā, nūnā, nīnī, hummī; suffix pronouns: (M) sing. 1. -ī-ta, 2. m. -ī-t, 3. m. -ī-ta, 1. f. -ī-ba, 2. m. -ī-fa: (J) -ī-ta, -kā, -nī, -nī-t, -tūm. The feminine ending was (M) -āt but, frequently, (J)-i; to obtain the ānātina suffix the suffix -āt was added in Baghdād (M), -īnī in Baghdād (J). Lastly we must note the difference in value of the verbal prefix da- which constituted the mark of the jussive and the progressive present for (M), but only the jussive for (J), (M) utilised for the present the verbal prefix bād(ā), (M) had also, less frequently, a form gād for this purpose). On the lexical plane the following are particularly noteworthy: (M) batshīr “tomorrow”; (J) khādī; (M) ḥūway “much”; (J) kīf(ū); (M) ẖnā “here”; (J) hōnī.

In the Maghrib, although the phenomenon is not universal, Jewish speech forms which differ markedly from those of neighbouring Muslims were frequently encountered. At Fez for example, distinguishing features were numerous and important. The following, in particular, are noteworthy: the pronunciation of kāf (M k), t, ā (; ū in association with an “em-
phatic") of גים and גיו respectively; the form of the 3rd pers. fem. sing. of the imperfect in CCVC-t (קֶבֶל) identical to the 1st and 2nd pers. (M CVCCVt הקֶבֶל), the conjugation of an "unvoiced" verb in the perfect without the element -ו before the flexional ending (M בָּבִית, J בָּבִית); the perfect -CVCC- of the imperfect (יסָכִי "he is entering"); for the personal pronouns, the forms of the 1st pers. youna (after a vowel) and the alternating forms in -ן for the 3rd pers.: וָנוֹה and בָּינוֹ, נָהוְיָ and יָהוּ, נומָה and יומָה; the running together, in the form הנין, of the 2nd pers. sing. masc. and fem. pronouns; as far as lexicography is concerned, the use of דָּו "to see" (M שֵׁה). It must be added that the Jewish speech form used, in current speech, derived verbal patterns with the prefix או- to express the passive, and acknowledged a form with the prefix ה- with lengthening of the theme vowel: שִׁמַעְתִי.

Information about the speech forms of Jews in other Moroccan cities is rare, but one might note at Marrakesh the same assimilation of the prepalatal fricatives to the corresponding sibilants, i.e., כ for גים, ש for גיו, and the same treatment of the sibilants and palatal fricatives to the corresponding sibilants, but this time, as in some Tunisian areas, one noted once more the assimilation of sibilants and palatal fricatives to the corresponding sibilants, except in conjunction with "emphatics" which corresponded, accordingly to k, s, כ and ש, when articulated phonemes. To M שֵׁה it corresponded, according to context, either a lengthening of the adjacent phoneme. The voicing of J had reduced the former כ to כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ כ 짾
their linguistic influence had operated with much greater force on the Muslims than on the Jews. The clearest example is that of 'Irāk, where Muslim speech is of the Bedouin type, closely related to that of the nomads in lower 'Irāk, whereas Jewish speech was clearly allied to that of the ancient cities of upper 'Irāk, free from Bedouin characteristics. In some Maghribi towns also, the unvoiced articulation of $kh$ distinguished the speech of Jews from that of the Muslims who pronounce it like the nomads. This is so in Tripoli, Oran, Sidi Bel Abbes, etc.
b) Developments particular to Jewish speech forms may, on the other hand, have been provoked or precipitated by cultural contacts alien to or less intense for the Muslims. Doubtless there are particular contacts, maintained with more or less facility according to the period, between Arabic-speaking Jewish communities of nearby or relatively distant regions: the links between the Jews of Algiers and Tlemcen can perhaps explain the use by Jews from Algiers of the form $dābā "now", a western form not used by the Algiers Muslims. But the most decisive contacts, in known cases, seem to have been with non-Arabic speaking groups. Thus in the Maghrib the influence of Spanish-speaking immigrants operated, more strongly in the west than in the east, and was responsible notably for the introduction of a number of elements which in the few cases which it has been possible to study, seems to have been noticed in the speech of Maghribi Jews, Berber speakers, incidentally, as well as Arabic speakers. This deterioration is not everywhere, as is frequently stated, a lisp, the reduction of palatal to alveolar fricatives. Certainly this is the case in the speech of Fez or Marrakesh, and a tendency in this direction had been noted at Algiers. But it is the opposition, be it perhaps also at least partially for certain phonetic phenomena such as the treatment of sibilants.

Furthermore the influence of foreign colonies in Arab countries has often been more decisive for the Jewish community. Thus in North Africa French, which moreover finally supplanted Arabic almost entirely in some strata of the Jewish population, to a greater or lesser extent according to the time, had contributed in numerous instances to the changing of the Jewish speech forms, not only by the addition of a large new vocabulary, but also by the model it provided for new syntax patterns. On the phonetic plane, for example, a weakening of the "emphatics" or even their replacement by the corresponding simple consonants, as well as the back pronunciation of $r$, was common amongst the Moroccan Jews (Toghda) or those of certain Tunisian cities. The various ethnic groups, often taking up residence at different periods, may come from separate regions with linguistic habits already differentiated. An obvious example is that of the Christian population of Baghda'd which seems to have been made up largely of relatively recent immigrants from Mosul. This fact is reflected in their speech pattern which is of the sedentary type, similar to but not identical with that of the Jews whose arrival in Baghda'd took place at a very much earlier date, but very analogously precise to that of Mosul. (As has been pointed out above the speech of the Muslims is of the "Bedouin" type.) In this regard, the case of Tunisian speech patterns is also striking. All those of the Jews of the period of assimilation of the interdentals to their corresponding dentals, whereas the distinction is maintained in all speech patterns of Muslims, except at Mahdia. This last type doubtless represented the old koine of Kayrawān. Now it certainly appears that the Kayrawān area was the centre from which numerous colonies of Jews were dispersed to the Tunisian cities. It is interesting to note also from this same point of view, that the speech of the Jews of Tlemcen and Oran seems to have been of the same type as that of the Msirda and Trara hill Muslims, whereas that of the old sedentary Muslims of Tlemcen belongs to a different type.

These linguistic particularities of certain groups of Arabic-speaking Jews have, in general, no common underlying features, except that of being speech patterns related to old urban dialects in contact with dialects which have occasionally been "Bedouinised", and which have evolved in relatively autonomous forms. The traits which were most commonly cited as being characteristic, at least for the Maghrib: change from $h$ to $kh$ or velarized $k$, palatalization of $h$ ($k>tkh$) apart from the fact that they are sporadic in no way specifically Jewish; they arose from phenomena spread over vast areas, where they concerned Muslims equally. (See art. 'Arabiyya: the Maghribi dialects). In the same way the pronunciation $gh$ of $r$ and the weakness of $h$ are frequent amongst the oldest settled peoples. More characteristic, however, is the deterioration of the sibilants which has often been noticed in the speech of Maghribi Jews, Berber speakers, incidentally, as well as Arabic speakers. This deterioration is not everywhere, as is frequently stated, a lisp, the reduction of palatal to alveolar fricatives. Certainly this is the case in the speech of Fez or Marrakesh, and a tendency in this direction had been noted at Algiers. But it is the opposition, be it perhaps also at least partially for certain phonetic phenomena such as the treatment of sibilants, which has been ascertained among other Moroccan Jews (Toghda) or those of certain Tunisian cities (Tunis or Sousse for example). What is in question, therefore, is the tendency to assimilation of the two series which is produced according to different patterns in the various speech forms concerned. It is possible that there may be a characteristic of a particular group of Jews which was dispersed across the Maghrib. It seems, however, more realistic to see a sort of Spanishness which the Spanish-speaking immigrants introduced, as people with prestige, in the course of their Arabization.

Private language. A form of slang used by Jewish traders and artisans was spread across the whole area. It was normally called $īdašānī from the Hebrew word meaning "tongue, language". It is sometimes called from $yāzārānī which in the Bible is applied to the people of Israel. This slang was based on the utilisation of a basically Hebrew vocabulary in accordance with completely Arabic morphology and syntax.

Written language. The majority of the Arabic-speaking Jewish communities used Arabic as a written language (by means of Hebrew characters provided where necessary with diacritical marks). This use, which often depended upon a linguistic level superior to that of the spoken language, is not to be confused with the variety of Middle Arabic called Judeo-Arabic (see below under ii). At least in the few cases which it has been possible to study, in the absence of a more complete record, it was a question of using the local dialects, often purified of what was most strictly characteristic of them, taking as a general norm the Muslim processions of large cities. For instance, in the Maghrib the confusions between $sin, sād$ on the one hand, and $dāim, āsim$ on the other, and again between $bād$ and $hamza$, were avoided because these confusions are particular to certain forms of speech and, moreover, felt to be more or less ridiculous changes for the worse. In the same way an effort to restore $h$ could be noted everywhere, leading at times to hyper-correction. On the other hand the dental $n$ was rarely distinguished from the interdentals, since few urban speech forms, Jewish or Muslim, had retained this distinc-
tion. Often these kinds of koine had their own characteristics, absent from all or most Jewish speech patterns, and appeared as archaisms; thus to take as an example a koine current at least throughout the eastern Maghrib, one could see in it the distinction, relatively rare in the Jewish speech forms of this region, between the second persons masculine and feminine singular of the perfect, the formation of feminine plurals for adjectives in -at, the use of the relative 'id (read as 'adi), of the adverb 'aha, "thus, like that", of the conjunction 'an (read as an), at times 'an (read as sn), "ill", of the preposition mil (mat), "as", etc.


ii. Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic.

Judaeo-Arabic (= JA) as used by mediaeval Arabic-speaking Jews in their writings, mainly in those written by Jews for Jews, especially in the first half of the second millennium A.D. is one of the main branches of Middle Arabic (= MA; see 'ARA-BIYYA (3)). Since Jews, like Christians, were less inclined to use the Classical language in their writings than their Muslim contemporaries, their writings are especially apt for the study of MA. Like MA texts in general, JA writings are not written in genuine MA vernacular, but in what may be styled "MA Literary Standard", exhibiting a whole range of styles with infinitely varied mixtures of classical and MA elements. Accordingly, the phenomena characteristic of (MA in general and) JA (in particular) have to be collected from deviations from classical features. Yet even among these deviations one has to distinguish carefully between genuine MA and pseudo-correct (including hyper-correct) features. The latter are original MA forms which were "corrected" because of the author's desire to write classical Arabic. As a result of these "corrections", however, non-existent forms came into being; these corrected forms were, as a matter of fact, neither classical (because the author, lacking sufficient knowledge of classical Arabic, did not succeed in forming the intended classical feature) nor living vernacular (because the author had "corrected" them).

As to the linguistic character of (MA in general and) JA (in particular), it already clearly exhibits all the structural peculiarities that characterize modern Arabic dialects. Perhaps the most important event in the field of phonetics was the change in the nature of the vowels, partly, at least, caused by the accent becoming strongly centralized: they became more rounded. This was again liable to change and elimination. Final short vowels have disappeared (this being one, but not the only, reason for the disappearance of cases and moods). In the sphere of the consonants the most conspicuous change is the weakening and disappearance of the glottal stop. As to the linguistic structure, so far as such different and intricate features may be reduced to a common denominator, the most conspicuous deviation from classical Arabic was that MA detached itself from the syntactic type of MA and instead approached the analytic type, which generally indicates one concept by one word. The most striking outward sign of this phenomenon is the disappearance of the mood and case endings. The status constructus has been somewhat reduced. The dual is often replaced by the plural, and the relative pronoun allāhu has become invariable (in many cases apparently being a classical spelling for vernacular 'allāh, which is very rare in MA texts). The differences between relative clauses after determinate and inde
terminate antecedents, strictly maintained in classical Arabic, are blurred. Asyndetic clauses occur in every syntactic environment, both in coordination, especially after verbs indicating movement, and in subordination, particularly in object clauses. Indirect questions often take the form of conditional clauses. The most frequent negation is mā. The feminine plural is widely replaced by the masculine, and the passive, formed in classical Arabic by internal vowel change, by reflexive verbal forms. The most far-reaching changes have affected the numerals. Moreover, the fixed and accurate style of classical Arabic is largely replaced by an inconsistent and careless language.

Despite the basic linguistic similarity of JA and other branches of MA, there were important differences between them, though mostly not linguistic distinctions proper: Jews, as a rule, wrote Arabic in Hebrew characters, dealt almost exclusively with Jewish topics and made use of Hebrew (and aramaic) phrases, thus making their literature virtually unintelligible to gentiles. One has the feeling that Jews themselves regarded JA as distinct from other forms of MA, as one may infer from special literary traditions in JA literature.

Bibliography: The general background of JA and its main linguistic trends are dealt with in
The written language used by the Arabic-speaking Jews during the first centuries of their incorporation into Muslim civilization is that designated "Middle Arabic". [ Cf. 'ARABIYYA, and JUDAEO-ARABIC (LANGUAGE)]; at its various stylistic levels, this idiom does not constitute a deliberate and systematic break with the rules of "Classical" Arabic; free recourse to the dialectal is very rarely encountered among the Judaeo-Arabic writers of the Middle Ages. However, the rift between the Jewish minority and Muslim culture, which was accentuated from the 9th/15th century onwards, resulted, especially in the Maghrib, in the loss of the ability to understand the oldest texts in written Judaeo-Arabic. Some continuity of the literary tradition is barely affirmed only in the Yemen, a Muslim environment with a geographical area more impervious to external influences than the rest of the dār al-islām, and where there was never any sizeable settlement by Jews expelled from Spain. This continuity was no doubt due to the relatively small divergence between "Middle Arabic" and the spoken language and the conservatism and integration of the group concerned, bearing in mind the limits set by the irreducible differences of belief and the social repercussions resulting from them.

The rift between the Islamic literary tradition and the Arabic-speaking Jewish minorities did not put an end to the latter's use of Arabic as a means of literary expression. However, the literary output in Judaeo-Arabic in the course of the last five centuries differs, except to some extent in the Yemen for the reasons indicated above, from that of the early period (4th/10th-9th/15th centuries) in two respects, giving it a radically new character in relation to the former situation. On the one hand, the language used has a dialectal base, although it is too conventional to reflect faithfully the living speech in use in the many different areas of Arabic-speaking Jewish diaspora. On the other hand, this literature was produced solely in answer to the needs of the less educated strata of the population, whether the work in question is liturgical or paraliturgical poetry (epithalamia, balads etc.), religious instruction, edification, or, more recently, entertainment and general information (in the case of poetry there is a need for study of its formal relationship with vernacular poetry by Arabic-speaking Muslims; nothing significant has been done in this field). Henceforward the culture of the scholars was entirely in Hebrew; in this respect, it can be said that Judaeo-Arabic dialectal literature is essentially "popular", even in the case of a version, based on a mediaeval Hebrew translation, of a "classical" work, originally written in Arabic, such as the "Duties of the Heart" by Babya Ibn Pakūd. In short, despite its relative poverty and insignificance, this Judaeo-Arabic "popular literature" reveals some characteristics in common with the Judaeo-Spanish and Judaeo-German literatures, richer, more abundant and of a cultural importance far above that of their poor relation though they are. The whole spectrum of Judaeo-Arabic writing of the earlier period, however, though of greater cultural range, but most of the time lacking in aesthetic preoccupations, cannot be classified as literature in the strict sense of "belles lettres".

Given these conditions it is difficult to speak of "the history of Judaeo-Arabic literature". Therefore the present summary will be limited to recording succinctly, albeit with many omissions, the works composed in the Judaeo-Arabic literary language, mainly theological and philosophical, as well as devoting some space to the other disciplines: exegesis...
and biblical philology, ritual legislation and casuistry. The most important editions of texts will be indicated. References to works dealing with the popular literature in dialect will be included in the selected bibliography. For convenience and very schematically, even at times arbitrarily, the writings mentioned will be grouped under four headings: theology and philosophy; Hebrew philology and biblical exegesis; law and rites; miscellaneous. On the subject of the authors, and the works cited in general reference should be made to the paragraphs of M. Stein'schneider's old, but still fundamental and indispensable repertory, *Die arabische Literatur der Juden (ALJ)*, Frankfurt 1902 (republished Hildesheim 1964); to lighten the bibliography, reference will rarely be made (with the exception of the publication of texts) to information given in this work and in G. Vajda's *Jüdische Philosophie (Bibliographische Einführungen in das Studium der Philosophie, 19)* Berlin 1950 (*JP*, the figures referring to the corresponding issues).


The zenith of philosophical and theological activity among Arab-speaking Jewry was the work of Moses Maimonides (1135-1204), who was born and brought up in Andalusia: *Dašāt al-ḥaḍrīrīn*, "Guide of the Perplexed", ed. S. Munk, Paris 1856-1886, and with some additions, I. Joel, Jerusalem 1931; an edition transcribed and, when necessary, translated into Arabic by Hūsayn Atay is in the press in Ankara (1972); the complete text of his short treatise on logic, *Makābik fi sinā'a al-maḥmūk* (greatly influenced, as is all his philosophical thought, by al-Fārābī), which was discovered a short time ago by Mūḥābah Tūrke-Kūre, has recently been re-edited by J. Efros in *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, xxxiv (1966); corrections by L. V. Berman, in *JAOS*, lxxviii (1968), 340-2; see also the same author, *ibid.*, lxxix (1969), 106-11; a fragmentary, and probably apocryphal, treatise, ed. H. S. Davidowitz and D. H. Baneth, *De Beatitudine Capita Duo R.* Mori b. Maimon adscripta, Jerusalem 1939; cf. the article IN MAYMŪN, supra; G. Vajda, *La pensée religieuse de Moïse Maimonide*: uniditi ou dualité ?, in *Cahiers de Civilisation Médicale*, ix (1966), 29-49. His contemporary, Yosèf Ibn Ḥāqīn, who almost certainly never left the Maghīb (he should not be confused with Joseph Judah, a disciple of Maimonides, cf. D. Z. Baneth, *Tesoros de los Judíos Sefardies*, viii (1964), 11-20, also left important works, still not fully investigated: *ALJ*, § 170; on his ethical treatise *Ṭibb al-nafṣ*, see A. S. Halkin, *Classical and Arabic Material in Ibn ʿAqnīn's Hygiene of the Soul*,...
in Proceedings...., xiv (1944), 17-76; idem, in Harry A. Wolfson Jubilee Volume III, 93-111 (in Hebrew), and B. below. The Judaeo-Arabic work of Abraham (1327), the son of Moses Maimonides, is also considerable: AJL § 159: the remnants of his work which is at the same time both ritual and theological-spiritual (in sympathy with Sufism), Kifayat al-Salihin, have been edited by S. Rosenblatt, The High Watermark of Compatibility, AJL, New York 1927 and Baltimore 1938; cf. B and C and S. D. Goitein, Abraham Maimonides and his Pietist Circle, in Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 143-64; Gerson D. Cohen, The Soteriology of R. Abraham Maimuni, in Proceedings...., xxxv (1967), 79-88 and xxxvi (1968), 33-56. On a short treatise on spirituality composed by "Obadayah, son of Abraham" (AJL § 161), see G. Vajda, The Mystical Doctrine of Rabbi "Obadayah, Grandson of Moses Maimonides", in Journal of Jewish Studies, vi (1955), 213-25. Dwelling no further on other texts, little known and studied, of more or less Stoic and Neoplatonic inspiration (cf. F. Rosenthal, A Judaeo-Arabic Work under Sufic Influence, in Hebrew Union College Annual, xv (1940), 433-84), we will mention only three authors from Spain, and, for the second half of the 7th/13th and the first two-thirds of the 8th/14th century: Moses ben Joseph Halevi, cf. G. Vajda, Un champion de l'aviennisme, in Revue Thomiste, 1948, 480-508; Moses Ibn Crispin: AJL § 127, and G. Vajda, A propos de l'avrovokisme juif, in Sefarad, xii (1952), 3-21; Joseph ben Abraham Ibn Wajār of Toledo, an important treatise on the harmony of philosophy, astrology and the Kabbalah: AJL § 130 and G. Vajda, Recherches sur la philosophie et la Kabbale dans la pensée juive du moyen âge, Paris 1962, 116-297; Judah ben Nissim Ibn Malka, a Moroccan who expounded his ideas in the form of commentaries on the "Book of Creation" and the "Midrash of Rabbi Eliezer", which was believed to be very ancient: AJL § 134; G. Vajda, Judah ben Nissim Ibn Malka, Paris 1954 (cf. idem, in Homenaje a Millas Vallicrosa, ii, Barcelona 1956, 483-500). The philosopher Ibn Kammūna [q.v.], although he remained a Jew, belongs more to the history of Islamic philosophy.

The Karaite branch of Judaism in its turn produced theological treatises in Arabic in which the influence of Mu'azzazite halām [q.v.] prevails. The principal author is Yōšīf (Yūsuf) ben Abraham al-Baṣtīr (first third of the 5th/11th century): AJL § 50; P.J. 7. 15, 21, 22, 25; Z. Anorki, Ibn al-Ḥāṭem and the Chronology of Joseph al-Ṣāliḥ the Karaite, in Journal of Jewish Studies, viii (1957), 71-81; G. Vajda, La démonstration de l'unité divine d'après Yūsuf al-Ṣāliḥ, in Studies in Mysticism and Religion presented to Gershon D. Cohen, Jerusalem 1960, 285-345; idem, L'unité divine de la loi divine dans la pensée juive, in REJ, 1963, 152-201. Of the work of his disciple, Joshua ben Judah, little has been preserved in Arabic (these fragments, moreover, pose unresolved questions of authenticity); the bulk of it has come down only in a Hebrew version: AJL § 51; P.J. 7. 22. Cf. also B and C.

B. Philology and Biblical Exegesis. The all too brief outline given here may be amplified from H. Hirschfeld's concise manual, Hebrew Grammarians and Lexicographers, Oxford 1926 and above all with the help of the introductions to the scholarly editions cited below. One of the first of the Judaeo-Arabic authors who wrote on these disciplines is Judah Ibn Kuraysh of Tahert, around 900; his Rīsāla to the Jews of Fes, in which he compares Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic, has been edited by J. I. L. Bargets and D. B. Goldberg, Paris 1857: AJL § 75; G. Vajda, La Chronologie de Juda Ibn Quraysh, in Sefarad, xiv (1954), 385-7. Sa'dyā (supra, A) produced an immense oeuvre, which has been published in part only and even more incompletely studied, in his translations of the Hebrew Bible (his versions influenced those of the New Christians and Samaritans) and commentaries on it, and as the founder of the systematic grammar and lexiology of Hebrew; for the bibliography prior to 1920 consult H. Malter, Saadia Gaon, His Life and Works, Philadelphia, 1921 (repr. 1969); an important step in research is marked by M. Zucker's work in Hebrew, with a summary in English, Rau Saadyy Gaon's Translation of the Torah, New York 1959. A complete if not critical edition of his annotated translation of the Psalms was produced by Yosef Kāfīb, Jerusalem 1966. As Sa'dyā's contributions to the grammar and lexicography of Hebrew were eclipsed by the work of the Judaeo-Arabic philologists in Spain, they were only fragmentarily preserved; this aspect of his work has been principally studied for about forty years by S. L. Skoss (d. 1953) and N. Allony; here we will cite only S. L. Skoss, Saadia Gaon, The Earliest Hebrew Grammarians, in Proceedings...., xxi (1952), 75-100 and xxii (1953), 65-90; N. Allony, Ha'Evron, Kitāb usūl al-dhīl al-ibra'īn, Jerusalem 1969. Samuel ben Hofni (d. 1304), head of the academy in Bagdad, wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch: AJL § 65.15.

The contribution of the 4th/10th century Karaites [q.v.] to Hebrew Lexicography and biblical exegesis occupies an important place in the scholarly output in Judaeo-Arabic. In lexicography, the Diʾāmāt al-alfāz, compiled by David ben Abraham al-Fāṣ (who seems to have lived mainly in Palestine), has been edited in exemplary fashion (unfortunately not in its most extensive reduction) by S. L. Skoss, 2 vols., New Haven 1936 and 1945. Strongly marked by polemics against all doctrinal adversaries of the Karaite sect, the exegetic work of Salmōn ben Yerūḥam and Yefet ben ʿElī (second and last third of the 4th/10th century respectively, but they had some precursors, both identifiable and anonymous, which lack of space makes it impossible to mention here) embraced a large part if not the whole of the Hebrew Bible; the edited texts and, with greater reason, the parts satisfactorily studied, cover only a small portion of the fairly plentiful material which has been preserved: AJL § 40, 44, which may be extended by the notes in G. Vajda, Deus Commentariorum Karaitarum Sur l'Ecclesiastique, Leiden 1970. Of the Arabic-speaking Karaite exegetes of later centuries, we will mention only ʿElī Ibn Sulaymān (10th/12th century), who does little more than abridge his precursor's commentary. His most extensive redaction was edited by S. L. Skoss, Philadelphia 1928.

The application to Hebrew grammar of the theory of trilitral roots, borrowed from Arabic grammarians, opened up a new period in the history of Hebrew philology; the Arabic-speaking authors who brought renown to the discipline between the end of the 4th/10th and the middle of the 6th/12th century were almost all Jews from Spain; most important are: Judah ben David (Abh Zakariyya Yaḥyā); AJL § 75; Jonah (Abu ʿI-Walīd Marwān) Ibn Danān [q.v.]: AJL § 81; Isaac Ibn Bārūn, AJL § 97; P. Wechter, Ibn Bārūn's Arabic Works on Hebrew Grammar and Lexicography, Philadelphia 1964; Saʾdīyā Ibn Danān (d. Granada 1485) one of the last
to write in Judaeo-Arabic in the West, also made a contribution to lexicography: *ALJ*, § 139.

What remains of the exegetic works of the brilliant Arab school in Spain is quantitatively of less importance. Here we will mention Isaac b. Judah Ibn Ghiyath (Ghayyath), whose commentary on Ecclesiastes, published under the name of Sa'adya by Y. Kafid (Nissof Megiloth, Jerusalem 1962, 161-196), is above all philosophical in character: *ALJ*, § 90.


Abraham Maimonides wrote a full commentary, for the most part preserved, on Genesis and Exodus, edited by E. Wiesenberg, Letchworth 1959. Finally let us mention the exegetic and lexicographic work of Tanbūm ben Yūsif ha-Yerushalmi (second half of the 7th/13th century): *ALJ*, § 174; the first part of his *al-Murghid al-Käfi*, a dictionary of the Mishnah and of Moses Maimonides’ Hebrew "code", was published by B. Toledano, Tel Aviv 1961, an edition continued by H. Shy (Shay), *Lëdonenu,* xxxiii (1968/9), 196-207, 280-6.

C. Laws and Ritual. — The need to give Arabic-speaking Jews access to the rules and instructions concerning the observances prescribed by religion and the conduct of everyday life, including the rules of law applicable by the courts of scholars within the limits of internal autonomy allowed to the ahl al-dhimma, frequently led spiritual leaders, Rabbanite and Karaitc alike, to employ Judaeo-Arabic in a field which is exclusively Jewish, liturgical directives, commentaries on the Talmud, more or less elementary manuals concerning the various aspects of Jewish law, contractual, matrimonial and successional rights, rituals for celebrating the feasts, food regulations, and finally the “consultations” (*She’ivot u-seghivot*, “Responsa”; cf. the *fatawa* in Islam). We shall mention only a small number of these texts (in addition to *ALJ* there are fuller notes, already no longer entirely up to date). In S. W. Baron’s *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, vi (1958), 355-61.

Sa‘adya found it expedient to accompany his recension of the Jewish liturgy with instructions in Arabic (Siddah, ed. I. Davidson S. Assaf and I. Joel, Jerusalem 1941); what remains of his treatise on the laws of inheritance, *K. al-Mawdih*, has been published by J. Müller, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. IX. Kétib ben Yassilah, a native of Kayrawân, it seems, compiled his *Kitab al-Sharh to the* *Kinh Sattah*, an account of the penitential precepts, towards the end of the 4th/9th century: *ALJ*, § 62, edition of the fragments preserved by B. Halper, *Book of Precepts*, Philadelphia 1915; an important complement in the paper of M. Zucker, *Proceedings...* xxix (1960/61), Hebrew section, 1-68.

Arabic fragments of works on casuistry and the Talmud by Nissim of Kayrawân (mid 5th/11th century: *ALJ*, § 59) are published and studied in the Hebrew work of Sh. Abramson, R. Nissim Gaon, *Libelli quinque*, Jerusalem 1965. The preserved fragment of a commentary, probably from the 6th/12th century, by a Morooccian rabbi on the talmudic “précis” by Isaac Ibn al-Fāṣi (d. 1203) is very little remaining in the original text of what al-Fāṣi himself wrote in Arabic: *ALJ*, § 95, has been published in facsimile by J. Leveen, *Zekaryah b. Judah al-Agmati, A Digest of Commentaries on the... Babylonian Talmud, London 1961*. The most comprehensive and probably the most important work in this field is that of Moses Maimonides, who also composed a "Book of Precepts" (ed. M. Bloch, Paris 1880), a commentary on the *Mishnah* (published in complete form by Yosēf Kafid, Jerusalem 1963-68), just as he drafted his letters and responses in Arabic when they were destined for Arabic-speaking correspondents; the most complete and recent edition of the responsa is that of Y. Blau, *R. Moses b. Maimon Responsa, Jerusalem 1957-61*; the response of his son Abraham, also for the most part drafted in Arabic (in the East, Abraham b. Moses ha-Nakna, perhaps, drafted the first part earlier by A. H. Freimann and S. D. Goitein, *Abraham Maimuni, Responsa, Jerusalem 1937*).

From the corresponding and highly developed Karaitc branch of this genre, most noteworthy is the great code of Abû Ya‘qûb Yûsuf al-Kirjissânî (mid-4th/10th century), which is also an outstanding theological treatise entitled *K. al-Anwar wa-l-marâkıb*, it has been largely preserved, and edited by L. Nemoy, *New York 1939-43: ALJ*, § 43: P. J. 7, 12-14 (add. G. Vajda, in *REJ, cxx* (1961), 211-57 and cxci (1963), 7-74). The ritual code of Yûsuf al-Baṣrî (K. al-Istibâr), as well as his *Masâ‘û, of which sizeable portions are extant, have remained unpublished and unstudied. A small part only of a much more recent treatise has been published: al-Murghid by Samuel ben Moses al-Maghribi, completed in Cairo in 1434: *ALJ*, § 199; F. Kaufmann, *Traktat über die Neulichtbeobachtung...*, Leipzig 1903.

D. Miscellaneous. — As was observed at the beginning of this outline, the Arabic-speaking Jews made little use of their “vernacular”, which to a greater or lesser degree was in line with the written language, for those genres which are covered by the term “literature” in the narrow sense, poetry, and philosophy; moreover, they hardly ever used it in compiling historical works, a genre with little popularity which was relatively neglected by the Jews of the Middle Ages. The exceptions are few and without much difficulty can be attributed to theological preoccupations, even if those are blurred or to some extent have been lost sight of. Thus it was with a view to reaffirming belief in divine justice as much as to divert the Jewish public from reading Muslim books that Nissim b. Jacob of Kayrawân (said to be Ibn Shāhtn, cf. supra C) composed a treatise on consolations, made up of edifying narratives, probably in imitation of Arabic works on the theme of al-faradî ba‘d al-shidda, but composed of material borrowed from the Jewish Aggada and from universal folklore. As well as a language which deviates appreciably from the norms of the literary idiom, this composition presents difficult problems: in the absence of more detailed research, Sh. Abramson’s discovery of versions that differ from a manuscript long considered to be unique has confused rather than clarified these. The Leningrad manuscript forms the subject matter of a valuable if not definitive edition by J. Obermann.

Moses Ibn Ezra, one of the most brilliant Hebrew poets of Spain (around 1070-1140), composed two works in Arabic: al-Muḥādara wa 'l-mudhakara, in type a book of adaab but with Hebrew poetry as its subject, and al-Ḥadda fi ma'na 'l-muqadda wa 'l-muḥādara, which is reminiscent of ʿilm al-bayān; it is likely that the author's aim in these works was to enable biblical exegesis and national poetry in Hebrew to benefit from the attainments of Arab rhetoric and poetics as much if not more than to amuse the reader while instructing him; neither of these works has yet been published in entirety, although they have been the subject of several scholarly studies: ALJ, § 101; A. Diez Macho, Mols Ibn 'Ezra como poeta y preceptista, Madrid-Barcelona 1953.

The exhortation to study written by Mūṣā Ibn Tūbī of Seville (first half of the 8th/14th century ?) in highly popular language, is a rhymed composition of 70 lines, hence the title al-Sab'īniyya; in spite of its acceptista, Madrid-Barcelona 1953. An outline of the whole, Judaeo-Arabic Literature, was written by A. S. Halkin for the collective work: The Jews, their History, Culture, and Religion, by Elisha S. Finkelstein, New York 1960, 112-47. The collection of pieces in the original language, H. Hirschfeld, Arabic Chrestomathy in Hebrew Characters, must be used with care because of its many inexactitudes. References may also be made to the encyclopedia articles (especially J.E and Encyclopaedia Judaica) concerning the authors mentioned above. Of the fairly numerous scholarly works touching more or less on the early Judaeo-Arabic literature, we shall cite here only S. Poznanski, The Karaite Literary Opponents of Saadia Gaon, London 1908 (extract from JQR 18-20, 1905-8, repr. Karaite Studies, New York 1971, 131-223); J. Mann, Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature, 1, Cincinnati 1931, ii, Philadelphia 1935, repr. 1972. For popular literature in the various Judaeo-Arabic forms of speech, we shall limit ourselves to some references only: W. Bacher, Die hebräischen und arabischen Poesie der Juden Jemens, Budapest 1910; idem, Zur neuesten arabischen Literatur der Juden, in Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie, years 1903, 1908, 1911; S. D. Goitein, Jewernica, Leipzig 1934; idem, Travels in Yemen (ed. of the account written in Judaeo-Arabic of the journey of Joseph Halevy to the Yemen, by his guide Hayyim Habgha[h], Jerusalem 1941; the bibliographic essay in Hebrew by Y. Ratzaby, "The literature of the Jews in Yemen", in Kirjat Sepher, xxviii (1952/3), 255-78, 394-409, and cf. ibid., xxxiii (1957/8), 111-7, xxxiv (1958/9), 109-16; Eus. Vassel, La littérature populaire des Israélites tunisiens, Paris 1904-7; R. Attal, Aperçu sur la littérature populaire à ce jour: ALJ, § 131; Tunisians, in Ben-Zvi Institute Studies and Reports, iii, Jerusalem 1960, 50-4; David Cohen, Le parler arabe des Juifs de Tunis, Paris 1964; L. Brunot—E. Malik, Textes judéo-arabes de Fès, Paris 1939; H. Zafrani, Pédagogie juive en terre d'Islam, Paris 1969; finally, there is a fair amount of bibliographic data in Abstracta Islamica (appendix to REJ) under the heading Judaeo-Arabica from 1936 onwards.

JUDAEO-BERBER. The Berber-speaking Jews of the Şheikh and Tamasghit regions had their own living dialects, and a folklore that was in no way inferior to that of their Muslim neighbours [see Berbers], as well as an oral traditional and religious literature of which unfortunately only a few vestiges remain. These have been collected recently by the author of the present article. Living in the valleys of the Atlas, in the Sous and on the borders of the Sahara (and in all likelihood in certain parts of Algeria and Tunisia), they formed small communities grouped in melahs and had been established there for centuries, or even one or two millennia. Today there is scarcely a trace of them. After Moroccan independence they emigrated to Israel en bloc. Setting aside the problem of the origin of these communities and the very controversial hypothesis concerning the "Judaizaten of the Berbers" (H. Z. Hirschberg, History of the Jews of North Africa, Jerusalem, 1965, two volumes in Hebrew, reviewed in the Journal of African History, viii/3 (1966)), it is important to note that until recent years Berber was one of the vernacular languages of the Jewish communities living in the mountains of Morocco and the south of the country. Most of these communities were bilingual (Berber and Arabic speaking); others seem to have been strictly Berber speaking, as at Tīfūn; of the latter category several isolated individuals, who had emigrated to Israel, have been discovered in Askhelon (on the geographic distribution of the Jewish communities in Morocco, notably in the Atlas and the Moroccan south, and on the internal migrations of their populations, see H. Zafrani, Vie intellectuelle juive au Maroc, Pensée juridique et Droit appliqué dans leurs rapports avec les structures socio-économiques et la vie religieuse, doctoral thesis, typed, 210-14; on the Jews of the Dadès and the other Berber speaking communities, see ibid., 177 ff., and by the same author, Pédagogie juive en Terre d'Islam, Paris 1969, 33-38). In the valley of the Todhâ (Tinghir), in the regions of Tiznit (Wijian, Asaka), of Warzaat (Imini), at Ufran in the Anti-Atlas, at Illīgh and elsewhere, Berber was used by the Jews not only as a means of communication in the family, social and economic milieus and in contacts with the other ethnic and religious communities, but it also constituted, alongside Hebrew, the language of culture and traditional instruction used in the elucidation and translation of sacred texts, as had been the case of Judaeo-Arabic or old Castilian in Arabic-speaking Jewish communities or those of Spanish origin. Certain prayers, benedictions of the Torah among others, were said solely in Berber; this usage, as we shall see below, is attested in the Passover liturgy. Written and oral documentation has been collected of the folklore and the intellectual life of these Berber-speaking communities: some biblical texts in their Hebrew and Berber versions, liturgical cantos, festive songs which mark the peaks of Jewish life (circumcision, bar-mitzvah, marriage, etc.) and especially the Passover Haggada, the most important and precious piece in the collection. The latter is the subject of the greatest interest, for the unique importance of the linguistic and cultural traditions of a world that was too little explored when there was still time, a world belonging to a diaspora which had long been ignored and has now disappeared. (A
list of these documents was published by H. Zafrani,
Compte-rendu d'enquête, in JA, ccilijit (1964); others
were collected later in Israel itself. This Haggadah
is the integral Berber version of the liturgical com-
position which the Jews recite on the eve of Passover,
the basic theme of which is the story of the exodus
from Egypt, accompanied by the hallel (a group of
Psalms from CXIII to CXVIII) which are a part
of the liturgy for the high holy days and some other fest-
vaks). Like those in Judaeo-Arabic or old Castilian,
it is a traditional translation of the Hebrew text,
but it presents nevertheless some variants and nuances
of interpretation. The text was transcribed
recently (around 1959) in vocalized square Hebrew
characters at Tinghir in the valley of the Todgha
(where there is no other known manuscript of a Berber
script in Hebrew characters). Some morpho-syntactic
ambiguities and oddities which sometimes make understanding difficult are conse-
quences of the usual procedure of literal translation, being Berber calques
of the Hebrew text; the Berber recitation coincides
with the Hebrew original and follows the same
rhythm and melody. The language of this Haggadah is akin to Tama
tazagh, a group of Berber vernaculars
(here we should note the connection which South
Moroccan Jews make between Berber and “the
language of the Philistines”: the Hebrew
syllabification of the biblical texts is always rendered as brabar
in Moroccan Judaeo-Arabic translations; see H.
Zafrani, Pédagogie juive en Terre d’Islam, 153, n. 31); it is nevertheless characterized by composite traits
which make it difficult to assign it a specified
location; it presupposes the existence of a literary
language which is not the speech of a given group
or a specific period (see P. Galand-Pernet and H.
Zafrani, Une version berbere de la Haggadah de
Pesah, Texte de Tinghir du Todgha (Maroc), Paris
1970, Supplément au tome XII des Comptes Rendus

Bibliographie: Apart from the references

JUDAEO-PERSIAN, New-Persian written in
Hebrew characters.

i. — Literature

If we define as Judaeo-Persian literature strictly
"literary" works composed by Jews in the Persian
language but in Hebrew characters, then the first
fruits of such literary endeavours could have emerged
only when the Persian language had penetrated deeply
enough into the life of Persian Jews to become a
vehicle for their literary expression. This condition
for the birth and growth of a genuine Judaeo-Persian
literature seemed to have been fulfilled only during
the rule of the Il-khan dynasty over Persia, from
the end of the 13th/13th century on.

1. Early Judaic-Persian Documents.

Long before this period, however, evidence of the
infiltration and penetration of the Persian language
—always in Hebrew characters—among Persi-
speaking Jews is available. There have come to light
in widely scattered regions of the Eastern lands of
the Caliphate inscriptive sources, business letters,
and tombstone inscriptions such as the three stones
from Tang-i Azao about 200 kilometers east of Herat
with Judaeo-Persian inscriptions, incised in the year
A.D. 752-3; (according to Henning, though Rapp
disagrees); a fragment of a Persian business letter
of the eighth century found by Sir Aurel Stein at
Dandân-Üyîlk, near Khotan, in Chinese Turkestan
(Sin-Kiang), containing thirty-seven lines in Persian,
written in Hebrew characters by a Jewish merchant;
and those four signatures in Persian with Hebrew
characters by Jewish witnesses on a copper plate
referring to a grant for a Christian church on the
coast of Malabar, in the early ninth century, known
as the Quilon Copper Plate. A further proof of the
use of Judaeo-Persian as a vehicle of correspondence
is supplied by a Judaic-Persian Law report found
near Hormshir, the modern Avâz in Khūzestân,
written in the year 1020-21 as well as a Judaeo-
Persian document dealing with the sale of some
land, found in the region of Khotan, ascribed to
the year 1107. There is also a fragment of apologetics
in the British Museum (Ms. Or. 8659) going back
to the same period.

To the category of early Judaeo-Persian inscrip-
tions belong also those fifty-four Judaeo-Persian
tombstone inscriptions, accidentally discovered in
the mountainous region of Ghūrāstân, east of Herást
near the former capital of Fīrūzkūh. Those Judaeo-
Persian inscriptions with texts ranging from one
to eight and covering the period from about
1189 A.D. to 1216 A.D. contain, along with Hebrew
and Aramaic, many Persian names and terms. Frag-
ments of Persian letters in Hebrew characters sent
by the heads (Geonim) of the Jewish academies in
Baghdād in the 12th century to scholars in Hamadān,
then the seat of a rabbinical college, testify to the
ever-increasing use of the Persian language in Jewish
circles.

All these inscriptions and other literary records
can, however, hardly be classified as literature. It
was only from the 13th century on that Jews began
to create Jewish literary values through the medium
of the Persian language—after the fall of the Il-khan
—of the Persian language in their own Hebrew script.

This Judaeo-Persian literature, which was devel-
oped in many Jewish communities in the Persian
diaspora, encompassed three major fields: the
translation of the Hebrew Bible into Judaic-
Persian and lexicographical treatises connected with
it; the composition of original Judaeo-Persian poetry;
and the transliteration of classical Persian poetry into
Hebrew characters.


There can be no doubt that Persian Jews were
steadily engaged in the study and interpretation of
the Hebrew Bible. Fragments of biblical books written
or copied as early as the ninth century in Hebrew
—not in Judaeo-Persian—among them a manuscript
of the later prophets in Hebrew with Massoretic notes
from Yezid, and a commentary on Ezekiel pres-
erved in Leningrad with a Middle-Persian form of a
passive and a Judaeo-Persian Daniel text attest
to this.

The first Judaeo-Persian translation of the Penta-
teach in Hebrew characters became known as late
as 1556 and is attributed to Jacob b. Joseph Tavus,
a Jewish scholar from Persia, who apparently func-
tioned as a teacher at the Jewish Academy in Istan-
bul, established by Moses Hamon ([q.v.], 1450-1556). It
was published in Istanbul as part of the Jewish Poly-
glot Bible by Solomon b. Moses Mazal Tov, together
with the Hebrew original, the Targum and the Arabic
Tafsīr of Saʿādīyā Gaon.

This Judaeo-Persian product, the first printed
book in modern Persian of any sort, remained rela-
tively unnoticed at the time and failed to attract
the attention of scholarly circles. Only when, over
a century later, in 1657, the Tavus Pentateuch version
was transliterated from its Hebrew characters into
Persian characters by Thomas Hyde and incorporated
into the famous London Polyglot Bible of Bishop
Bryan Walton was an interest aroused in this new branch of Jewish-Persian literature. It was long believed that until then this Judaeo-Persian Pentateuch translation was not only the oldest, but also the sole literary achievement produced by Persian Jews. It became evident, however, that this Tavus Pentateuch translation actually represents the culmination of Judaeo-Persian Bible studies which had been going on for many centuries long before Tavus completed his own translation.

This assumption has been corroborated by early Judaeo-Persian Bible manuscripts, the oldest of which is a Pentateuch version of 1319 A.D., now in the British Museum, and by the systematic collection of Jewish-Persian Bible manuscripts at the beginning of the 17th century by the Florentine scholar Giambattista Vecchietti. The manuscripts he had recovered in the Jewish communities of Hamadan, Isfahan, Shiraz, Lâr and Yazd represented Judaeo-Persian versions of the Pentateuch and the Psalms and of all other biblical books, as well as books of the Apocrypha, all belonging to the early 14th century.

Despite the different origins of these Judaeo-Persian translations, they show a certain uniformity in style which leads to the assumption that they were the work of the same school of translators who flourished in the 14th and 15th centuries.

The authors of Judaeo-Persian Bible translations and lexicographical treatises such as Sefer ha-Me'ila or Agon and dictionaries show an astounding degree of familiarity with leading biblical and rabbinical authorities of the West, and, following faithfully the traditional method of Bible interpretation, utilized not only Targum Onkelos, Talmud, Midrash, Sa'adyâ, Gaon and Hai Gaon, but also Western commentators such as Rashi, Redak, Abraham b. Ezra and others.


The literary abilities of the Persian Jews found their most characteristic manifestation in the field of original Judaeo-Persian poetry. This new branch was opened up by the 14th century Jewish poet Mawlānâ Shahîn Shirazi, who dedicated his talents to the writing of Bible-centred poetry and who can be regarded as the first Judaeo-Persian poet. Under the influence of classical Persian poetry, inspired by a keen desire to promote a deeper knowledge of the Jewish past and imbued with a profound Jewish consciousness and loyal adherence to his religious heritage, Shahîn began to make the biblical narrative the topic of his writings.

His life work represents a poetical paraphrase, a reinterpretation of the Pentateuch, using the traditional epic style of the classical Persian poets. It is known as Sefer Shâhîn al ha-Torah, written in Persian with Hebrew characters.

Four distinct works of Shâhîn can be discerned: a Moses-nâma, a commentary to Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy (completed about 1327); an Aarschâ-nâma (completed about 1332), consisting of the story of Esther and Mordecai and the story of Shero and Mahzad, a typical Iranian love story; an Ezra-nâma, dealing mainly with the ascension and rule of King Cyrus the Great and the building of the Temple of Jerusalem; and a Genesis-nâma (completed about 1358), which includes the story of Yûsuf and Zulaykha.

In his poetical writings, Shâhîn has taken over the typical features of the Persian poetic art and applied the patterns, forms, technique, metre and language of Persian classical poetry, particularly that of Firdawsi and Nîzâmî, to his presentation of Israel’s religious heroes and events as told in the biblical narrative.

By selecting Jewish themes as the subject of his poetry and by celebrating the heroes of the Bible in a way typical of Persian classical poetry, Shâhîn has indeed produced the most typical literary monument of the centuries-long association of Jews with Iran. In the memory of Persian-speaking Jews all over the Eastern diaspora, Shâhîn is admired as “the Master Shâhîn of Shîrâz” (Mawlânâ Shâhîn Shîrâzî), and hailed as the founder of Judaeo-Persian poetry.

By writing his poetry in the Hebrew script, however, Shâhîn prevented his work from becoming known in Muslim-Persian literary circles and thus never gained admittance to the annals of Persian literature.

Two centuries later another Judaeo-Persian poet appeared in Shiraz, the birthplace of Shâhîn, in the person of ‘Imrânî. Inspired by Shâhîn’s poetical epic of the Jewish past, ‘Imrânî made the post-Mosaic period, the historical books of the Bible including Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings up to the time of David and Solomon, the subject of his poetical presentation. His major work, Fath-nâma (The Book of the Conquest), was composed around 1523; followed by Gandj-nâma (The Book of the Treasures), a free poetical paraphrase and commentary of the first four chapters of the Mishna treatise Pirâk ‘Abûdî (Sayings of the Fathers).

That type of Judaeo-Persian poetry was continued by Yahuda Lârî, of the city of Lâr; only a small part of his verses has been preserved, including Makkîn al-Pand (The Treasure House of Exhortation).


Persian Jews, far from living in a cultural vacuum in isolation, took also a keen interest in the literary and poetical works of their Muslim neighbours and shared with them the admiration for the classical Persian poetry of a Firdawsi, a Nizâmî, Rûmî, Sa’dî, Hâfiz, Dîmâf and others. In order to introduce selections of these literary products into the Jewish community they transliterated the Persian texts into the Hebrew script while retaining the language, metre and rhyme of the original Persian poetry. Through this remarkable process a new branch of Judaeo-Persian literature came into being.

Among the various types of Persian classical poetry, the romantic, the lyrical and the didactic, there have been preserved: Rûsraw and Shâhîn and Hajî Paykar (The Seven Images) by Nîzâmî (d. 1211); some poems of the Mathnawî by Dîlall al-Dîn Rûmî (d. 1273); some parts of the Gulistan by Sa’dî (d. 1291); the Divân of Hâfiz (d. 1390); Yûsuf and Zulaykha of Dîmâf (d. 1474); portions of the Divân of Sa’dîb of Isfahân (d. 1670) [etc.] and some others, all of which were made accessible in Hebrew translation and are preserved in various libraries in Europe, America and in Jerusalem.

Persian Jews evinced a lively interest also in the pictorial art and miniatures of their neighbours. In some of the Shâhîn and ‘Imrânî manuscripts and in those of the classical poetry in Hebrew translation, large coloured miniatures and illuminations of exceptional beauty have been incorporated. They could well be regarded as typical Persian pictorial art were it not for the Hebrew lines on each miniature, which lends it a distinct Jewish character. Whether this pictorial art was cultivated by Jewish artists, or whether the Hebrew written explanations alone were the work of Jews, cannot be established. Nor can it
yet be ascertained whether and if so where there existed a school of such Jewish artists.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, under the impact of the persecution of the Jews and the policies of the Safavid rulers, the literary productivity of Persian Jews was of a different genre. The literary output of that period mirrors the tragedy of Jewish existence. The torch of literary activity was carried on by a certain Bâbâ’ h. Lutf of Kâhkhâm and Bâbâ’ h. Farhâd, who wrote Kitâb-i Anâsî: The Book of the Events of the Forced Conversions of Persian Jewry to Islam, a chronicle composed in Persian but written in Hebrew characters, which deals in poetic form with the martyrdom of the Jews in the time of Șâh ʿAbbâs I and Șâh ʿAbbâs II and his successors.

5. Literary Activities of the Jews of Bûkhurâ.

In Bûkhurâ, where the Jews were not subjected to the persecution their brethren endured in Sařavîd Persia, there appeared Jewish poets and translators who began to create Jewish literature and poetry in their own Tadjîkî dialect. The most outstanding was Yûsuf Yahîdî (d. 1755), an exponent of biblical narrative. He wrote Muhâmmâs, an ode in praise and glory of Moses; Haft Birâderîn (The Seven Brothers), based on the Midrash of the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother; and bilingual and trilingual hymns honouring biblical heroes. He wrote also a commentary (tafsîr) to Megillat Antîkochus and translated many of the Zemîrât of Israel Najârâ into the dialect of Bûkhurî Jews, incorporated into the Judaeo-Persian song-books used until today.

Inspired by him, a school of Jewish poets in Bûkhurâ emerged, among them Benîmîn b. Mishâl, known also as Aminâ, who published Megillat Esther in Judaeo-Persian translation, in metric form and translated some poems of Ibn Gabîrûl [q.v.], such as Ashtarôk and Yîgadal, into Judaeo-Persian.

One of the finest poetical products in the Bûkhurî Jewish dialect of the end of the 18th century we owe to the Jewish poet Mollâ Ibrâhîm b. Abu’l Khayr. In his Khodåddâ he narrated the tragic story of a Jewish merchant by the name of Nathanîel (Kho- dâyddâ) who, refusing to become a Muslim despite all the promises and temptations of the ruler and his neighbours, died a martyr. In making this event the subject of his poem, the author gives an interesting picture of the religious and political conditions in which the Jews of Bûkhurâ lived in the second part of the 18th century under the rule of Emîr Ma’sûm (1785). This poetical work furnished at the same time a most authentic documentation of the linguistic peculiarities of Bûkhurî Jews.


Judaeo-Persian literature experienced an unforeseen development in the second half of the 19th century, not in Persia but in Jerusalem. This was precipitated by a wave of immigration into Palestine of Persian speaking Jews from Bûkhurâ, Turkestan, Afghanistan and Persia, who initiated the establishment in Jerusalem of a publishing centre, a printing press for Judaeo-Persian literature, intended to meet the literary and liturgical needs of the Persian Jews in Jerusalem and in the Diaspora. Though Jerusalem was not the first place of Judaeo-Persian printing activities, and some Judaeo-Persian books had been previously published by European scholars as well as by Bûkhurî Jews (particularly in Vienna and Vilnâ by the latter)—not to mention the first Judaeo-Persian print of any time in Istanbul in 1843—Jerusalem became the exclusive centre of Judaeo-Persian printing activities. From then on, all the liturgical and literary needs of Persian-speaking Jews were satisfied from Jerusalem and its Judaeo-Persian press.

It can hardly be attempted, nor is it intended here, even to enumerate the results of these printing and publishing activities in Jerusalem; their extent and quantity would preclude such a survey. Almost everything that was thought fit to strengthen the religious and literary interests of Persian-speaking Jews was printed and published. Every field of Jewish literature—Bible commentaries, prayer books for every occasion, rabbinical writings, Mishna and Zohar, religious philosophy, medieval Jewish poetry, Pîyyûmîm, Sîlîlûthî, Pîsmûnîm, Mîdrasha, historical narratives, anthologies of songs and stories—all these were translated into Judaeo-Persian, printed and distributed. Even secular literature from other than Jewish sources, such as parts of the Arabian Nights, and a part of Shakespeare’s Comedy of Errors, which appealed greatly to the imagination of the Oriental Jew, found its way to the translators and printers. It is of great significance that these Judaeo-Persian publishing activities represented a collective effort, a co-operative endeavour of all the various groups of Persian-speaking Jewry; Jews of Bûkhurâ joined hands with the Jews of Persia and Afghanistan and participated in the greatest common cultural enterprise in the history of Oriental Jewry.

Amîr-îgî the many outstanding figures who participated in this collective enterprise, mention ought to be made of Solomon Baboğlu b. Pinchas of Samarqand, an editor, author, translator and publisher, and of Simon Hâkhâm of Bûkhurâ.

One of the most outstanding Bûkhurî Jewish scholars in the last centuries who can be credited with a major share in the promotion of Judaeo-Persian literature was Simon Hâkhâm, who, born in Bûkhurâ in 1843, moved in 1890 to Jerusalem, joining the rapidly-increasing colony of Bûkhurî Jews, and it was there that he began his activities as author, translator, editor, and publisher of Judaeo-Persian works. The crown and glory of his many impressive literary accomplishments was his translation of the Bible into the Judaeo-Persian dialect of the Bûkhurî Jews, into Tadjîkî.


The interest in Judaeo-Persian literature led in the early decades of this century to the establishment of a Hebrew printing press also in Tehran, which produced many Judaeo-Persian works aiming at a revival of the religious and cultural life of Persian Jews.

7. The European investigation of Judaeo-Persian literature.

The ever-increasing number of Judaeo-Persian manuscripts which in the last century had reached European libraries (Parma, the Vatican, Paris, London, Oxford, Copenhagen, Jerusalem, St. Petersburg, Moscow, Berlin and others) aroused the interest of Western scholars and led to important publications and investigations. An unexpected development in the field of Judaeo-Persian studies took place when Elkan N. Adler, brought back from his journeys to Bûkhurâ and Persia in 1896-7 hitherto unknown Judaeo-Persian manuscripts which
opened up entirely new vistas. The more than one-hundred Judaeo-Persian manuscripts which he recovered changed fundamentally the prevailing conceptions as to the genre, scope and quality of the literary productivity of Persian-speaking Jews. While most of the manuscripts in European libraries were translations of books of the Bible or of the Apocrypha, creating thus the impression that their works were mostly religious, Adler's collection revealed an all-embracing literature, not only translations, but also original works, not only religious literature, but literature of a secular character, poetry and prose, stories and philosophy. This collection showed that no sphere of literary endeavour had been neglected by Persian Jews in their own language. In 1923 Elkan Adler's manuscript collection was acquired by the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York.

The most decisive contribution to the investigation of Judaeo-Persian literature was made by the Hungarian scholar, Wilhelm Bacher (d. 1913) who, stimulated by the literary treasures long dormant in the European libraries and above all E. N. Adler's collection, turned his attention to this field; and through a continuous flow of studies and monographs he became the undisputed author.

In the early 20th century, Teheran emerged as a centre of Judaeo-Persian printing activities, supplementing the Judaeo-Persian publications issued in Jerusalem. It is a sign of the cultural assimilation of the Persian-speaking Jews to their surroundings that they began to express their literary compositions no longer through the Hebrew script but through Persian characters, thus terminating, probably forever, the once flourishing Judaeo-Persian creativity.

The importance of Judaeo-Persian literature has most recently been summed up by J. Rypka (History of Iranian literature, 1968, p. 740), in these words: "Judaeo-Persian literature may be regarded as lying near the periphery yet within the circumference of Persian literature. Nevertheless it is of extreme importance in its national and religious aspects for the Jewish communities in the regions concerned, and linguistically for Iranian studies as a whole. The larger the collections of Judaeo-Persian manuscripts become, and the more minutely they are subjected to expert investigation, the greater will be their value for Iranian scholars. A great deal has already been achieved in both these aspects, but it is still far too little. It is quite possible that the ancient Judaeo-Persian translations will prove valuable in the preparation of critical editions of many a Persian text."


2. Judaeo-Persian Manuscript Collections: E. N. Adler, Ginze Paras u-Maday... The Persian Jews, their books and ritual, London 1899. See the catalogues of manuscripts in the libraries of Paris (Zotenbog, Blochot); Parma (G. B. de Rossi); St. Petersburg (Harkavy and Strack, C. Salemann, A. Freimann, W. Ivanov); British Museum (J. Darmesteter, H. Derenbourg, G. Margoliouth, M. Seligsohn, and S. Rosenwater 1966); Oxford (Neubauer and Cowley); Copen- hagen; Jerusalem (Ben Zvi Institute, Hebrew University Library); the Vatican (E. Rossi, Levi Della Vida) and D. S. Sassoon Catalogue Ohel Davíd. For collections in the U.S.A., see Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, (Adler Collection) and E. Spiechander, A descriptive list of Judaeo-Persian Manuscripts at the Klau Library of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, in Studies in Jewish Bibliography and Booklore, Cincinnati 1968, 114-36.


Judaico-Persian


6. On J. P. Bible translations:

- Salomon Munk, "Die Psalmen in hebrdischem Text mit persischer Uebersetzung," in The Indian Antiquary, viii, 1897, 89-95.


A number of Judaeo-Persian writings display linguistic characteristics which are not found in Persian texts in Arabic script. Amongst these one must distinguish between on the one hand stylistic peculiarities common to the translation of Scripture (word for word rendering of the Semitic text, use of certain rare or archaic forms), and on the other dialectal traits which reflect local varieties of spoken Persian. In all probability, these local dialects of New Persian were not peculiar to the Jews, but they have left scarcely any trace in literature written in Arabic script, where the classical language predominates to the virtual exclusion of other forms; however a considerable proportion of the Judaeo-Persian writings, notably all the earliest ones, are written in a language close to that of everyday speech. They are therefore of great interest for the light they throw on the historical dialectology of Persian.

Judaeo-Persian literature is not linguistically homogeneous. Several dialectical variations may be perceived, and with systematic exploration still others will probably be discovered.

1) The Dandān-Uyllk letter is noteworthy for certain archaisms (use of the īdāfā particle to denote the relative (as in Middle-Persian), paucity of Arabic words) and by the presence of some Sogdian words.

2) In spite of differences of detail, the fragment in the British Museum, the commentary on Ezekiel, and the Story of Daniel, mentioned above, a translation of the Pentateuch preserved in the Vatican, and a few other texts, are a reflection of a single dialectal group, which can probably be situated in the south of Iran (Fars and Khuzistan). In these texts various morphological characteristics (optative particle -kā, preposition -1, the form tūs “thing” = classical dīs) are found, along with a fairly large number of words which are otherwise unknown in Persian but appear in Middle-Persian. Rather than being archaisms peculiar to this form of Judaeo-Persian, these traits must have been characteristic of spoken Persian around the 5th/14th-8th/12th centuries in the south of Iran, which had remained much closer to Middle-Persian than the classical language.

3) Writings which can be classified as literature, especially poetry from the 8th/14th-12th/18th centuries, are generally free from dialectical characteristics. Imitations of the great classical works, they appear in a written language during the Soviet period. All these dialects could be designated “Judaeo-Iranian”.

A curious language reported in 1924 among the Jews at Herat appears to be merely a jargon based on Persian.


JUDGE (see ḲĀṬĪ).

JUDGMENT (see ṬUKM).

JURISPRUDENCE (see PAḴM).

JUSTICE (see ‘Aḏnl).

For other words generally written in English with J, see Ẓāl.
savannah. The land on the river banks often produces two harvests. The main crops are millet, maize, rice, peanuts, cotton and indigo. In the villages gardens are cultivated around the wells. Stock-farming is relatively well developed. The districts of Kaarta are Dafunu (Tambaraka) and Diomboko (Konjakari), Guidioum (Niognem) to the north of Dafunu; Tomora (Dida), Baghe and Kaarta Biné to the north of Faladugu; Dianghar to the east, and Baye des Nioro (Nioro). The main crops are the Bambara and the Soninke, but the population also includes Khasasonke, Fulani and Maures. The Bambara Massassi have a secret religious association known as the Bouri. Missionary activity for Islam is considerable.

Kaarta was visited by the British explorers Houghton and Mungo Park in 1795 and described by Duranton in 1828, Raffanel in 1864, Mage and Quintin in 1883 and Lenz in 1890.

Previously part of the empire of Ghana [4.6], and then that of Mali, Kaarta was divided between a number of principalities after the Mali uprising. At the end of the 17th century, a Bambara chief, Niangolo, settled in Sunsana, near Murdia, and created the ported Namiankoro, but the latter was defeated by the Banu Kaarta (in 18th century European sources Chaur). Arab authors and genealogists do not speak of them in detail but usually list them under Kaarta. They are said to belong to Kays (Aylān), a major central and eastern Arabian tribe. They do not seem to have emigrated from there to southern 'Irak and south western Iran before the 17th century. By the time of the Danish traveller Niebuhr (1765), they seem to have gained some notoriety among the inhabitants of the region. The Turks, the Persians and the British were among their victims, and each of these powers failed to subdue Shaykh Salmān, the Kaarta chief, during the second half of the 18th century. Kubbān, Dawrā and Fallābīyya are mentioned among their fortified towns. Their second prominent ruler after Salmān was his great grandson Thāmir (1837-40).

Like other Arab tribes in the British Empire, they mingled with the non-Arab population and are slowly losing their Arab identity. The main divisions of the tribe are: the Drīs, the Mūkaddām, the Kḥānāfīra and the Ḥazīb.

The Banū Ka'āb cannot be described as completely settled, nor on the other hand is any considerable portion of them truly Bedouin. The bulk of the tribe is now semi-nomadic. At the zenith of their power, shortly after 1750, the jurisdiction of their chief seems to have extended from the neighbourhood of Basra to the confines of Bihbānān; but their influence declined as that of the Mubayis of Muhammad rose, and the chiefs of the Banū Ka'āb, stripped of political power, sank into undistinguished vassals of the Shaykh of Muhammad, who early in the 20th century became, in turn, a vassal of the Iranian monarchs.

KA'B B. AL-ASHRAF, opponent of Muham-
mad at Medina, reckoned to belong to his mother's
clan al-Nadir, though his father was an Arab of the
Nabhan section of Tayyi'. He presumably followed
the Jewish custom of taking his religion from
his mother, but it is doubtful if he was a scholar,
as the words in a poem sayyd al-akhib (Ibn Higham,
659, 12) would imply, if the poets were genuine.
Aroused by the deaths of many leading Meccans at
Badr, and a poem attributed to al-Akhbaj (gen
632) which inspired him to write some poems, in partic-
ular a verse which Muhammad considered worthy of
attack the Ansar. On the basis of certain variants
which are to be found in the reply made by Ka'b
and al-Baladhuri (An-
Sàb, xi, 212) is correct, he lived long enough to
write a panegyric of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwan (65/685-
68/690), the lines which he quotes appear however in
a long 'asida of al-Kutami (ed. J. Barthe, Leiden
1908, 152-5; R. Leszynsky, Die Juden in Arabien
zu
it was then still a Christian,
but all the evidence leads to the assumption that
he had been converted to Islam.
He appears again attacking Ibn Sallam (ed. Beirut, v, 13),
at some uncertain date, on the Mirbad of Basra, in
the company of several poets, in particular the Nabigha
al-Djal'dl (on the relations between the two men, see
M. Nallino, in RSO, xiv (1934), 404-5 and Le poesie
di an-Nabigha, Rome 1933, 120). If al-Baladhuri (An-
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write a panegyric of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwan (65/685-
68/690), the lines which he quotes appear however in
a long 'asida of al-Kutami (ed. J. Barthe, Leiden
1908, 152-5; R. Leszynsky, Die Juden in Arabien
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the company of several poets, in particular the Nabigha
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M. Nallino, in RSO, xiv (1934), 404-5 and Le poesie
di an-Nabigha, Rome 1933, 120). If al-Baladhuri (An-
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that he had been killed. Some reports say that it was he who was charged with collecting the ṣadaka from the tribes of Aslam and Ḥijārā. For a reason which is not clear he remained in Medina during the expedition to Tabūk in autumn 9/630, and afterwards, with two others, was "sent to Coventry" until reprieved by the revelation of Sūra IX, 117/18 f. He seems to have had some links with Ḥassān, and this may have something to do with his avoidance of the expedition. With the Emigrants first came to Medina, Tabīha b. Ubayd Allāh was assigned to him as "brother", and some association continued between the two. He was later known as a partisan of ʿUṯmān ("Uṯmānīn), supporting him as caliph and composing an elegy after his death. In accordance with this attitude he refused to pay homage to ʿAli. He later became blind and died in 50/670 or 53/673.

Many members of his family were noted for poetical gifts. Muhammad realised the importance of poets in forming public opinion, and, following Sūra XXVI, 227 (see al-Tabari, Tafsīr), regarded Ka'ab as one of his poets along with Hassān b. Ṭḥābit [q.v.] and ʿAbd Allāh b. Rawāha [q.v.]. Much of Ka'ab's poetry is found in the Sīra of Ibn Ḥishām. Its authenticity has been disputed but most appears to be genuine. The sentiments are nobler than those of Ṣūḍr and there is greater enthusiasm for Islam. The poems deal with Badr, Ubūd, Bilād Ṭa'īma, Banū Ṭ-NA/dir, the Khandaq, Khaybayr, Mu'ta and other expeditions. Stories about Ka'ab seem to have been preserved in his family, and his sons ʿAbd Allāh and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and other descendants are mentioned as sources by Ibn Ḥishām and al-Wākidī.


KĀ'B b. ZUHAYR, an Arab poet and contemporary of the Prophet. A son of Zubayr b. Abī Sulmā [q.v.], he seems to have given proof of his poetic talent at an early age; although belonging to the Muzayna, he lived with the Dhubya and was involved in the wars of the tribe against the ʿAṣyā', the Kurayḥ and the Ḥazārṣ. His brother Buqayr was converted shortly before year 7 of the Hidjra, but he refused vehemently to follow suit and wrote some satirical verses attacking Muhammad. The latter officially sanctioned his murder. From that day, "the earth became too confined" for Ka'ab, who resolved to make his submission. He presented himself without warning, in the year 9, in a mosque in Medina where Muhammad was present and recited to him his famous piece known by the name of Bānaṯ Su'ūd (Su'ūd) which was published by T. Kowalski (Cracow 1971). The Bānaṯ Su'ūd has none of the characteristics of a religious poem; it takes its inspiration from the sentiments of pagan poetry, and it begins with a commonplace observation so frequently employed that Hammād al-Rawīya [q.v.] boasted of knowing 700 other poems with the same opening. Nevertheless it is the most authentic example in existence of the eulogistic poetry of the period: "the extended themes, the repeated cliches, the style and the vocabulary can serve for comparison with the traditional writings; in this work, the essential elements of the laudatory genre are defined for the first quarter of the 1st/7th century" (R. Blachere). It has frequently been reproduced, in the form of taqṣīr and ṭaḥwīs. Commentators on it are numerous: the most celebrated are Ṭabaṭaba, Ibn Durayd, al-Tibrizī (ed. F. Krenkow, in DZMG, ixx, 241-79), Ibn Ḥishām (ed. Guidi, Leipzig 1871), Ibn Ḥiddīja, al-Suṣūfī, and al-Bāḏjrī (v. Brockelmann, i, 38-9, S I, 68-9). It was published for the first time by Lette (Leiden 1748), and was later produced in several editions, in particular by G. Freytag (with Latin translation, 1823) and T. Noldeke (Delectus, Berlin 1890, 110-4).

R. Basset brought out (Algiers 1910) an edition accompanied by a French translation and two unpublished commentaries. Finally, it appears in the Duwām of Ka'ab published by T. Kowalski (Cracow 1950), containing 33 poems and fragments.

The date of Ka'ab's death is not known, but he appears to have lived to a ripe old age.

Bibliography: R. Basset, Le Bānaṯ Su'ūd, 14-82, and the authors mentioned 9-13; R. Blachere, HLA, ii, 270-1 and bibl. (R. Basset)

KĀ'B al-ʾAHBA'R, Abū ʾĪsā b. Māṭī b. Ḥaysu'ī/Hayyū, a Yemenite Jew who became a convert to Islam, probably in 17/638 (al-Tabarī, i, 2514), and is considered the oldest authority on Judeo-Islamic traditions. Ḥibbāḥar, from the Hebrew kibbār, the scholarly title immediately below rabīb current among Babylonian Jewish scribes. Subsequently, it is presumed to be equivalent to the Arabic ʿālim (al-Ḵawārizmī, Maḥfīṭ, 35); in Ka'ab al-'Abbār the plural is a determinative complement, while in the less frequent Ka'ab al-'Abhar the latter element is in apposition to Ka'ab.

Lidzbarski (De propheticis... legendis arabicis, Leipzig 1863, 34-5) assumes that Ka'ab was originally called 'Akbār or 'Awaṣ, but very little is known of this man who, according to tradition, came to Medina during the caliphate of 'Umar b. al-Ḵhaṭṭāb, accompanied the latter to Jerusalem in 15/636 (al-Tabarī, i, 2408) and after his conversion was on intimate terms with the caliph, whose death he predicted three days before it took place (al-Tabarī, i, 2722). He was a vigorous champion of ʿUṯmānīn, which led on one occasion to his corporal chastisement by the pious Abū Ḏahr (al-Tabarī, i, 2946-7). Subsequently, Muṣawīya tried to attract him to Damascus to become his counsellor, but it seems most likely that he withdrew to Himy, where he died in 23/652-3, in 34 (al-Tabarī, iii, 2474-5) or in 35 (Ibn al-ʿImād, Shadhārī, i, 40). According to al-Harawī (Yazdr̔āl, 9/20) his burial place and maqām are in this town, but Yākūt (ii, 595) and Ibn Baṭṭūta (i, 222) state that his grave is in Damascus (where a grave-stone bearing his name is still extant; Gibb, loc. cit.). Ibn Djubayr (55) and al-Makrīzī (ed. Wiet, iv, 6) consider that it is situated in al-Djiza in Egypt, while al-Harawī (14/35) reports that some people believe him to be buried in Medina and states (39/94) that the tomb of one of his sons is at Dīrāz.

Though his true figure is difficult to discern, so wrapped is he in legendary trappings, Ka'ab is considered to have possessed a profound knowledge of the Bible and southern Arabian tradition, as well as a personal wisdom attested by the numerous state-
ments attributed to him without argument because he inspired so much confidence (al-Nawawi, Tahdhib, 523); he is also the originator of traditions concerning 'Umar b. al-Kaṭāb which are considered authentic; al-Dhahabi (Hayawan, iv, 202-3) believes him to be trustworthy and would appear to be coming to his defence by implying that, in discussing the external data of the Pentateuch, Ka'b did not say, "It is written in the Torah" but "We find it in the books of the prophets". Sometimes he is accused of introducing Jewish elements into Islam, e.g. in a story, preserved by Ṭabarî (i, 2408-9), in which 'Umar charges Ka'b with Judaizing when he treats the temple mount in Jerusalem as a holy place. See further ISRA'ILYYAT.

Posterity sought to add lustre to his name by crediting him with a great variety of traditions, particularly those relating to the prophets, such as the Ḥadīth Dhī-'l-Kifl printed at Būkāb in 1283 (Brockelmann, S I, 101) or the legend of Joseph [see YŪSUF] in Aljamiado [see AJAVA], edited in a Latin translation by F. Guileen (Legendes de José hijo de Jacob y de Alejandro Magno, Saragossa 1888) and studied by M. Schmidt (Über das altspanische Poema de José, in Roman. Forschungen, xi (1901), 321), which is in fact a borrowing from al-Ṭablābī's Kiṣāʾ al-ṣanāfīs of his story Joseph, and he is also mentioned as an authority in Firdawsi's Yūsuf u-Zalikha (ed. H.ETHÉ in Anecdota Osmensia, Aryan Series, vi, Oxford 1908, 258, verse 2599).

Bibliography: Apart from references within the text: Ibn Sa'd, vii/2, 156; Ṭabarî, index; Ibn Khuyyayba, Maʿārif, index; Fikrist, 32; Ibn al-Aṣwār, iii, 121; Ibn Ḥadījā, Isbāb, no. 7496; idem, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, vii, 438-40; Al-Qāhira, ii, 50; Hamdānī, Ḥiḥl, viii, index; Well, Bibliische Legenden der Musulmānner, 10; M. Grünbaum in ZDMG, xlvi, 458, 477; Lidzbarski, 31-40; H. Hirschfeld in Jewish Encycl., i, Cairo 1925). Each year, when the curtains are replaced, the Banū Shayba divide the old ones into small pieces which are distributed and sold as relics.

The four walls of the Ka'ba are covered with a curtain (kiswa), which in Egypt is called al-burku (the veil). In front of the door is a special curtain, embroidered in gold and silver, with numerous inscriptions. Since Mamluk times (mid 7th/i3th century) this kiswa has been traditionally provided by Egypt except during periods of political tension (e.g., 1926-36 and after 1962). At one period the black kiswa was replaced by a white one between the 25th (or 28th) Dhū 'l-Ḥadīd and the end of the pilgrimage (cf. al-Batanūnī). Witnesses affirm that this practice has been discontinued. The curtains are occasionally fixed to the ground by rings and cords, or the base is raised by cords placed out of reach of human hands. The kiswa is usually of black brocade, with the shahada outlined in the weave of the fabric. About two-thirds of the way up runs a gold embroidered border (hisam) covered with kur'ānic texts. (Numerous photographs can be found in Ibrāhīm Rifʿat, Mirʿāt al-Ḥaram, i, Cairo 1925). Each year, when the curtains are replaced, the Banū Shayba divide the old ones into small pieces which are distributed and sold as relics.

The north-east wall, about 7 feet from the ground, is the door, parts of which have mountings of silver-gilt. When the Ka'ba is opened, a wooden staircase (darāj, madāraj) running on wheels is pushed up to the door; when not in use, it is kept between the Zamzam and the Gate of the Banū Shayba (see Snouck Hurgronje, Bilderatlas zu Mekka, no. ii; for a picture of the staircase, see Ali Bey, Travels, ii, 80).

In the interior of the Ka'ba are three wooden pillars, which support the roof, to which a ladder leads up. The only furnishings are the numerous hanging golden and silver lamps. On the inner walls there are many building inscriptions. The floor is covered with slabs of marble.

On the outside of the Ka'ba, in the eastern corner, about 5 feet above ground, not far from the door, the Black Stone is built into the wall; formerly broken into three pieces and several small fragments, it is now held together by a ring of stones mounted in a silver band. The stone is sometimes described as lava and sometimes as basalt; its real nature is difficult to determine, because its visible surface is worn smooth by hand touching and kissing. The surface is hollowed out irregularly, as can be seen in sketches and photographs. Its diameter is around 12 inches. The colour is reddish black with red and yellow particles.
The part of the wall between the Black Stone and the door is called al-multazam, because the visitors press their breasts against it while praying fervently.

In the east corner too, about five feet above the ground, another stone (al-ṣadqar al-ṣadq, the "lucky"), is built into wall. It is only touched and not kissed during the perambulation.

Outside the building there is still to be mentioned the gill water-spout (mizāb), which juts out below the top of the north-west wall, and has an appendage which is called the "beard of the mizāb". The spout is called mizāb al-rāmah, "spout of mercy" (on it cf. Ben Chérif, *Au Making Saintes de l'Islam*, p. 75); the part between it and the west corner is the exact kibla [q.v.]. The rain-water falls through the spout on to the pavement below, which here is inlaid with designs in mosaic. The ground all round the Ka'ba is covered with marble slabs.

Opposite the north-west wall, but not connected with it, is a semi-circular wall (al-khim) of white marble. It is three feet high and about five feet thick; its ends are almost six feet from the north and west corners of the Ka'ba. The semi-circular space between the kha'm and the Ka'ba enjoys an especial consideration, because for a time it belonged to the Ka'ba; in the perambulation therefore it is not entered; the faṭafaff goes along the outer side of the kha'm. The space bears the name al-ḥijr or ḥijr Ismā'ilī. Here are said to be the graves of the patriarch and his mother Hagar. The pavement on which the faṭafaff is performed is called maṭafī; a depression in it just opposite the door has still to be mentioned; it is called al-mi'ḍān "the trough"; according to legend, Ibrahim and Isma'il [q.v.], were mixed the mortar used in building the Ka'ba.

The maṭafī and the buildings around it have not always remained the same throughout the ages. Only the arch-shaped gate, the Banū Shayba (once also called al-bū al-Salām), still marks the traditional entrance to the maṭafī. Between this archway and the façade (N.E.) is a little building with a small dome, the maṣām Ibrāhīm. In it is kept a stone bearing the prints of two human feet. The patriarch Ibrāhīm, father of Ismā'il, is said to have stood on this stone when building the Ka'ba and the marks of his feet were miraculously preserved. Beside the maṣām Ibrāhīm, slightly to the north, is the pulpit (minbar); at the beginning of this century it was made of white marble in the classical minbar shape. The dimensions of the maṣām Ibrāhīm were considerably reduced during the recent reconstruction. The relic is now closely surrounded by glass and bars set into a polygonal base, the whole structure, capped by a much narrower kind of "helmet", being about three yards above ground level.

The pavement which is used for the faṭafaff was relaid during the important work on the mosque which began in 1956. On old photographs the slender columns which surrounded the maṭafī, clearly demarcating it, can be seen. They were used to hold the lamps which lighted pilgrims at night. Today a new electric lighting system has been installed. On Ali Bey's plan of the mosque there were two further buildings, at the edge of the outer pavement and to the north east of the Zamzam building; these were called al-kubbaṣatayn; by Snouck Hurgronje's day they had disappeared. For many years the Zamzam well was covered by a building or kubba. A description of this well can be found in the *Rapport quatorzentraine* of 1905 by Dr. Soliman Bey (p. 13; published in Egypt; a résumé of the text is given by J. Jomier in *Le Mahmal et la caravane égyptienne des pèlerins de la Mekke*, Cairo 1953, 154-6), but the situation nowadays is completely different. There are no buildings on the surface and pilgrims can take advantage of this extra space. A staircase leads to a sort of underground hall divided into two sections, one for men and one for women, with water distributed by means of a system of taps.

The three little buildings previously situated on the exterior of the maṭafī also vanished during the course of the recent works, not only to provide some open space but also because, to an increasing extent, the diversification of rules has become of secondary importance to many Muslims. Such buildings housed the imāms of the four main schools during the prayers. The largest building (maṣām or maṣumāl ḫanafī) was north west of the Ka'ba in front of the ḥijr; the Hanbalīs was to the south east and the Mālikī to the south west. The Shī'īs used the Zamzam well building.

Finally we must mention the work begun in 1956 which has transformed the promenade from Safā to Marwa into a spacious covered passage with a lofty ceiling. A group of huge galleries, with a floor overlooking the courtyard of the mosque, has been built on the outside of the old arcades of the izwān, which have been allowed to stand as a relic of the past.

II. The history of the Ka'ba.

Aside from Muslim traditions, practically nothing is known of the history of the Ka'ba. The sole reason for presuming that the Ka'ba was already in existence in the 2nd century A.D. is the mention of Mecca, under the name of Macoraba, by the geographer Ptolemy (*Geography*, vi, 7). Glaser (*Skizze der Gesch. u. Geogr. Arabiens*, Berlin 1890, ii, 235) believes that this name may have signified the same as the south Arabian or Ethiopian miṣrāb, i.e., a temple. The accounts of the campaign of Abraha [q.v.], which have been elaborated with legendary features, also suggest the existence and worship of the Ka'ba in the sixth century but tell us nothing of its appearance or equipment. The Tūbba' Aṣ'ād Aḥū Karīb al-Hunayri, who came to Mecca, is said to have for the first time provided the building with a kīwān and with a door with a lock. The information available regarding the distribution of the offices [see below ii.] among the sons of Kuṣayy shows that the worship of the sanctuary had developed into a carefully regulated cult several generations before Muhammad.

In matters pertaining to the history of the building of the Ka'ba, modern Muslims tend to hold fast to the letter of the Kur'ān and discount, to an increasing extent, other accounts. It is in fact in the Kur'ān, and in the Medinan sūras, that Ibrāhīm and Ismā'il are said to have laid the foundations of the Ka'ba (Kur'ān, II, 121/127). The maṣām Ibrāhīm is indicated as a suitable place for the salād (II, 119/125).

At God's command, Ibrāhīm ordained the pilgrimage (XXII, 28/29). The Ka'ba was the first sanctuary to be established on earth, and was now named the sacred house (V, 98/99), the ancient house (XXII, 30, 34, 32/33). We can only speculate about the milieu in which these tales circulated in pre-Islamic times. Were these stories similar to the Coptic traditions concerning the Holy Family's flight to Egypt which the Judaized milieu of Arabia transposed to Abraham's journeys to Mecca? We will never know.

For Muslims, these accounts are grounded on the authority of the Kur'ān and the Kur'ān alone. Whether or not in pre-Islamic days Kuṣayy demolished and rebuilt the edifice, as historians say, is impossible to determine.
The historical references only begin with Muhammad. When Muhammad had reached man's estate, the fire of a woman ceased. The Ka'ba is said to have burned from the 6th-7th to the 20th century and was included in the building and two doors were made on the level of the ground. In the jahid the four corners were kissed.

These alterations lasted only a short period. In 74/693 al-Hadidjādi b. Yusuf conquered Mecca and killed 'Abd Allāh al-Zubayr. In agreement with the caliph 'Abd al-Malik he again separated the ḥāḏir from the Ka'ba and walled up the west door. The building, in keeping with the wish of the Umayyads, thus practically received its pre-Islamic form again and this form has survived to the present day. The piety of the populace has always resisted any considerable innovations. Only to an unimportant degree have the authorities now and then made improvements. As was the case in the pagan period, floods have continued to be a danger to the building. When in 1611 it threatened to collapse, a girdle of copper was used to avert the disaster. But a new sayl made this support also insufficient, so that in 1650 renovations were decided upon. But the old stones were used as much as possible for the rebuilding.

The Ka'ba successfully withstood the Karmatian invasion of 317/929; only the Black Stone was carried off. After an absence of some twenty years it was sent back to Mecca (cf. de Goeje, Mém. sur les Carathes, 104-111, 145-8).

The custom of covering the Ka'ba is said to have been introduced by the Tuba'. The annual re-covering of the Ka'ba only became an established custom in modern times; for the oldest Muslim period, the 'Ashūrā day is mentioned as the day of covering, but in Rādiq also and in other months the building has changed its covering. The kiswa consisted sometimes of Yemeni and sometimes of Egyptian or other cloth; during Umar's caliphate the building threatened to collapse on account of the many coverings hung on it. All sorts of colours are mentioned also. The Wahhabis even covered the Ka'ba with a red kiswa.

The makams around the Ka'ba are mentioned as early as the 'Abbāsid period, sometimes under the name sula ('a shade'). The present buildings are said to date from 1074/1663. A dome over the Zam zam well is mentioned at an equally early period; the present one was built in 1072.

The Ka'ba had offerings dedicated to it in the pagan as well as the Muslim period. Al-Azraki devotes a detailed chapter to this subject (155-6).

Many a worldly ruler has used these treasures for political purposes. Tradition reports that 'Umar said: "I will leave neither gold nor silver in the Ka'ba but distribute its treasures". To this, however, 'Ali is said to have raised vigorous objections so that 'Umar desisted from his plan.

III. The Ka'ba and Islam.

Every man living in Mecca in the 6th-7th century A.D. must of necessity have had some relationship with the Ka'ba. On Muhammad in his Meccan period the Kur'an is silent in this respect. All that is known is that the early community in Medina turned to Jerusalem in prayer. This was in the early days when it was still reasonable to hope that the Medina Jews would be won over. Subsequently, about a year and a half after the Hijra, the community turned to Mecca in prayer and in Mecca itself faced the Ka'ba.

"Turn thee that face towards the sacred mosque and wherever ye be turn your faces towards that part" (Kur'an, II, 139/144).

At this same period the Kur'an began to lay
stress on the religion of Ibrâhîm, presenting Islam as a return to the purity of the primitive religion of Ibrâhîm which, obscured by Judaism and Christianity, shone forth in its original brightness in the Kûrâ. Guarded support for this interpretation is advanced by Sprenger and followed by Snouck Hurgronje in his *Het Meknaansche Feest* (cf. E1, appendix to article IBRAHIM; for a contrary opinion see Théodore Moubarac, *Abraham dans le Coran*, Paris 1958).

It is incontrovertible that an entire pre-Islamic ritual, previously steeped in paganism, was adopted by Islam after it had been purified and given a strictly monotheistic orientation. The pilgrimages to the Ka'ba and ritual progressions around the building were continued, but now for the glorification of the One God. The abrahamic vision of the Ka'ba created a means of discerning an orthodox origin buried in the midst of pagan malpractices to which the first Muslims pointed the way.

In 6/627 a prospect of taking part in the Meccan cult was held out to the Muslims by the pact of al-Hûdâbiyya [q.v.]; in connection with it, the "Umar al-Kadâ" took place in the year 7. Muhammad's political endeavours culminated in the conquest of Mecca in 8/629.

All the pagan trappings which had adhered to the Ka'ba were now thrust aside. 360 idols are said to have stood around the building. When touched with the Prophet's rod they all fell to the ground. The statue of Hubal which 'Amr b. Luhây is said to have erected over the pit inside the Ka'ba is said to have been shattered by Muhammad when he washed the building. The opening takes place on definite beginning and the end of the holy rites.

Two special ceremonies concerning the Ka'ba may here be mentioned, the opening and the washing of the building. The opening takes place on definite days and men are first admitted, then the women. On this occasion the above-mentioned staircase is pushed up to the building. The days in question change at the will of the Meccan authorities—but some usually fall in the month of the pilgrimage and one on the roth Mubarram ('Ašhûrâ day). It is considered particularly meritorious to perform the salât in the Ka'ba.

The procedure for the washing of the inside of the Ka'ba was as follows at the beginning of the 20th century. After the *Haddâ* is completed, at the end of the month Dhu 'l-Hijdâja, the Ka'ba is washed, a ceremony in which the Grand Sharif, the governor and other authorities, as well as a number of pilgrims, take part. The first to enter is the Sharif, who after a salât of two rakās washes the ground with Zamzam water which flows away through a hole in the threshold. The walls are washed as well as the floor of the Ka'ba *sidâna* and *biâdâ*. His descendants:

- Abd Manâf
- Abd al-Dâr
- Hashim
- Uthmân
- Abd al-Mutta'âlib
- Abd al-Uzza
- Abbâs
- Abû Tâlib
- Abû Talib
- Abû Allâh

administered the offices after his death, 'Abd Manâf and his descendants getting the *rifda* and *sîbâa* etc., while 'Abd al-Dâr and his descendants saw to the *sidâna* and *biâdâ* etc.

When Muhammad conquered Mecca his uncle 'Abâs or, according to another tradition, 'All asked for the administration of these offices. But Muhammad said he had abolished all of them except the *sîbâa* and the guardianship of the Ka'ba. The former remained in the hands of 'Abbâs; the latter he gave to 'Uthmân b. Talib who allowed his cousin Shayba b. Abî Talib to act as his deputy. The Banû Shayba are the doorkeepers at the Ka'ba to this day. The *rifda*, which was in the hands of Abû Tâlib, was taken over by Abû Bakr in 9/630; after his death the caliphs looked after the feeding of the pilgrims.

Muhammad's control over Mecca and the Meccan cult was first clearly marked at the *Haddâ* of the year 9. As plenipotentiary of the Prophet, who did not participate in the pilgrimage, Abû Bakr announced to the assembled pilgrims the latest arrangements, which were put in the form of a revelation. They are contained in Sûra IX, which from them is often called the Sûra of Immunity (*barâ'a*) (v. 1-12, 28, 36-7).

According to it, idolaters are henceforth forbidden to participate in the Meccan festival as they are impure (*nâdja*). Moreover, they are declared outlaws. A period of four months is given them during which they can go freely about the country; but after that "kill them wherever ye find them'. Excepted are those with whom an alliance has been made in so far as they have punctiliously observed its terms and helped no one against the Muslims.

In 10/631 Muhammâd himself led the pilgrimage, at which therefore according to the tradition that a single idolator was present: the Ka'ba had become an exclusively Muslim sanctuary. At every salât Muslims throughout the world turn towards Mecca and at the ceremonies of the pilgrimage the Ka'ba forms the beginning and the end of the holy rites.
under the water-pipe is described as particularly efficacious: "Anyone who performs the salât under the mā'atāb becomes as pure as on the day when his mother bore him'" (al-Aţrâkî, 224). The Zamzam water, which the pilgrim has poured over him again and again, is useful for every purpose for which it is drunk (ma'? Zamzam li-md ǧibrīla lahu, Kūf al-Dīn, 34).

There is abundant testimony in Muslim as well as European literature to the intensification of devotional feeling which the sight of the Ka'ba produces in the pilgrims. We may here quote al-Batanuni's (md* Zamzam li-ma shuriba lahu, Kutb al-isdrū, i. 367):

"The whole assembly stood there in the greatest reverence before this highest majesty and most powerful inspirer of awe before which the greatest souls become so little as to be almost nothing. And if we had not been witness of the movements of the body during the salât and the raising of the hands during the prayers, and the murmuring of the expressions of humility and if we had not heard the beating of the hearts before this immeasurable grandeur we would have thought ourselves transferred to another life. And truly we were at that hour in another world: we were in the house of God and in God's immediate presence, and with us were only the lowered heads and the voices raised in prayer and weeping eyes and the fearful heart and pure thoughts of intercession" (cf. Macdonald, The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam, Chicago, 1909, 216-7; Ben Cherif, Aux villes sacrées de l'Islam, ii-i, 45-6, 68).

Even the Shī'is and the Wahhābīs have left the Ka'ba its place in Islam. Only the Karmathians form an obvious exception.

Many moderns lay stress on the fact that Mecca was chosen by God as the place of revelation; they emphasise that the Ka'ba is a symbol of the unity of the Muslim world, the place of God's grace, His worship, and the proclamation of His glory.

As to the mystics, their attitude to the Ka'ba depends on their position regarding the law. For the, so to speak, nomic mystics like al-Ša'zālī, the Ka'ba, it is true, is only a building which one has to go round in the āwāf. The āwāf and its object however only receive their value for men when they give them an inducement to rise to a higher spiritual level. Ibn al-ʿArabī goes a step further when he says that the true Ka'ba is nothing other than our own being (al-Futūḥa al-Makkhiyya, i. 733); the Ka'ba however also plays a part in his mystic experiences. Hūjūrī however quotes some sayings of mystics, who no longer require the Ka'ba as an inducement to rise, and even despise it. Muhammad b. al-Fadl says: "I wonder at those who seek His temple in this world: why do they not seek contemplation of Him in their hearts? The temple they sometimes attain and sometimes miss, but contemplation they might enjoy always. If they are bound to visit a stone, which is looked at only once a year, surely they are more bound to visit the temple of the heart, where He may be seen three hundred and sixty times in a day and night. But the mystic's every step is a symbol of the journey to Mecca, and when he reaches the sanctuary he wins a robe of honour for every step". Abū Yazīd al-Bīṣāmī also says: "On my first pilgrimage I saw only the temple; the second time, I saw both the temple and the bāb of the temple; and the third time I saw the Lord alone. In short, where mortification is, there is no sanctuary: the sanctuary is where contemplation is. Unless the whole universe is a man's trysting-place where he comes high unto God and a retired chamber where he enjoys intimacy with God, he is still a stranger to Divine love; but when he has vision the whole universe is his sanctuary. The darkest thing in the world is the Beloved's house without the Beloved. Accordingly, what is truly valuable is not the Ka'ba, but contemplation and annihilation in the abode of friendship, of which the sight of the Ka'ba is indirectly a cause" (al-Hūjurī, tr. Nicholson, 327).

IV. The Ka'ba in Legend and Superstition.

In the article ka'ba in EI1 there is an account of a whole series of legends concerning the origins of the Ka'ba; we will not go into these here. It is common knowledge that when protesting against his coreligionists' imaginative excesses Muḥammad 'Abduh even cited certain current legends about the Ka'ba (Taftūr al-Manār, i, 466-7). Well known too is the fact that after the Sa'udi conquest of Ḥijāţ (1924-6), a number of popular cultic places, such as the tomb of Eve in Ḏuqrda, were suppressed. Among the legends relating to the Ka'ba are those describing its creation at the beginning of the world, what happened to it during the flood, how Abraham was guided to make his way to Arabia, details of his conduct during the construction of the Ka'ba, how Gabriel brought the Black Stone which had been preserved since the flood in Abū Kubays [g.v.]. Originally white, the stone had taken on its present colour after contact with the sins of the pagan era. There are also legends about the Zamzam well, especially concerning the role of 'Abd al-Muţsāib and the two golden gazelles he discovered. These had been concealed by the Djurhum, along with swords and armour. All this was deposited at the Ka'ba or used to decorate the buildings.

From analogous theories developed earlier with relation to Jerusalem, Mecca was considered the navel of the world (cf. the account of these theories in the article ka'ba in EI1).

Mecca is also a burial ground. Not only Ismā'īl and his mother but a whole series of prophets, numbering hundreds, is said to have been buried round the Ka'ba.

V. Religious history before Islam.

From the fact that Ptolemy calls Mecca "Ma-crobα" (i.e. miūrāb, temple) we may conclude that in his day the Ka'ba was regarded as a sanctuary dedicated to one or more deities. According to a statement of Epiphanius (Haereses, v, following the text in Philologus, 1860, 355), Dhu 'I-Shāra had in Petra his ɣazzūd, a word which is probably the same as Ka'ba. It is not clear from Epiphanius, however, whether the temple in Petra was meant, or the quadrangular black stone which represented Dhu 'l-Shārah. Al-Bakrī (Mu'jam, ed. Wüstefeld, 46) relates that the tribe of Bakr b. Wā'il [g.v.], as well as the main body of the Iydk tribe, had their centre of worship in Sinjād in the region of Kūfā and that their holy tent (or temple, basil) there was called Dkhāt al-Ka'abāt (but cf. al-Hamdānī, Sīf al Dīnārat al-ʿArab, 172, l. 14, 17, 230, l. 12). What was the relationship between the sanctity of the Ka'ba and the Black Stone? We can do no more than offer hypotheses, like Wellhausen's.

No tradition suggests that the Black Stone was connected with any particular god. In the Ka'ba was the statue of the god Hubal, who might be called the god of Mecca and of the Ka'ba. Caetani gives prominence to the connection between the Ka'ba and Hubal. Besides him, however, al-Lāt, al-'Uzza, and
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al-Manāt were worshipped and are mentioned in the Kūrān; Hubal is never mentioned there. What position Allāh held beside these in pagan times is not exactly known.

Many other idols are mentioned in the Ka'ba and the vicinity, among them the 360 statues.

The Ka'ba possessed in a high degree the usual qualities of a Semitic sanctuary. First of all it mark ed the whole surrounding ground. Around the town lies the sacred zone (ka-ram) marked by stones, which imposes certain restrictions on each one who enters it [see haram]. Moreover, the sanctity of the area is seen in the following points. In the haram the truce of Allah reigns. When the Arab tribes made a pilgrimage to the Ka'ba, all feuds were dormant. It was forbidden to carry arms. Next, the haram—and the Ka'ba especially—is a place of refuge. Here the unintentional slayer was safe just as in the Jewish cities of refuge. On the Ka'ba there was a kind of arrangement which recalls the purport of the haram. Blood was not allowed to flow in the haram. It is therefore reported that those condemned to death were led outside the haram to execution.

The idea of peace extended even to the flora and fauna. Animals—except a few injurious or dangerous sorts—are not to be scared away; hence the many tame doves in the mosque. Trees and bushes were not cut down except the idhkhir shrub, which was used for building houses and in goldsmiths' work. These regulations were confirmed by Islam and are in force to this day.

As to the rites, it is said that in the heathen period animals were sacrificed at the Ka'ba. Among the ancient Arabs the idol of stone replaced the al-ilāh; it was certainly syncretistic, conforming to the usual symbolism. Golden suns and moons are repeatedly mentioned among the votive gifts (al-Azraf, 155 ff.).

It is a question whether and how far the Ka'ba was connected with the hajjī in the pre-Islamic period. On the one hand, the hajjī was an integral part of the ceremonies carried out outside Mecca, not at 'Arafat: the hajjī is the peak of the pilgrimage. On the other hand, the Kūrān (III, 91-97) uses the formula hajjī al-bayt to refer to the Ka'ba. It is therefore most probable that in pre-Islamic times there was a fusion of two groups of ceremonies which, in a fashion still followed by the Arabs, united two adjacent holy places in the same celebration. It cannot be denied that the cult of the Ka'ba in the pagan era reveals traces of an astral symbolism. Golden suns and moons are repeatedly mentioned among the votive gifts (al-Azraf, 155 ff.). According to al-Mas'ūdī (Muruḍā, i, 47, ed. and tr. Pellat, § 1373), certain people have regarded the Ka'ba as a temple devoted to the sun, the moon and the five planets. The 360 idols placed round the Ka'ba also point in this direction.

There has been such a view cannot be safely propounded as foremost. In the pagan era the cult of the Ka'ba was certainly syncretistic, conforming to the usual features of Arab paganism. It is impossible to discern to what extent North Semitic cults were represented in Mecca.


On III: C. Snouck Hurgronje, Het Mekkaansche Fesel, Leiden 1880; the Eastern and Western biographies of Muḥammad; commentaries on the Kūrān on the passages mentioned.


A. J. Wensinck-[J. Jomier]
1. North-eastern façade. In the foreground, to the left, are the Makâm Ibrahim, the Bâb Bani Shayba, the Minbar and the Zamzam well; the building (habba) of the latter is obscured from view.

2. North-western wall with the mizâb; to the left are the Zamzam building and the Makâm Hanâfî.
3. South-western corner before the recent works. Opposite the north-western wall is part of al-ḥaḍir with al-ḥijr: to the right lie the Maḥām Ḫanafī, the Bāb Bānī Shāyba and the ẓubba. a. Maḥām Ḫanafī; b. Maḥām Mālikī.

4. South-western corner; to the left is the Maḥām Ḫanafī, to the right the Maḥām Ibrāhīm.
the reform movement which was followed under Selim III.


(E. Kuran)

**Kâbâla** (Ar.), "guarantee," a juridical term used mainly in connection with fiscal practice, in a manner which is still very difficult to define precisely.

The particular field with which this discussion is concerned is a double one—that of the levying of the land-tax, kharâdî (q.v.), and that of special taxes, mukâs. As was already the case before the Arab conquest both in the Byzantine Empire and under the Sasanids, local communities were held jointly responsible by the Treasury for the payment at the required time of the full amount of land-tax demanded. Nevertheless, it frequently occurred that many individuals had difficulty in finding the necessary ready money immediately. In these conditions, as a result of an agreement between the inhabitants and the administration, application was made to a notable, often but not necessarily a man of the locality, to advance the sum required, for which he had to ensure that he would be reimbursed later. The matter having generally been agreed in advance, this notable in effect acted as a guarantor for the debt of the locality in question. This procedure constitutes the contract of kâbâla, the offer being called kâbbî and the person named muâkkabî. In this form, 'Abû Yusuf does not disapprove of kâbâla. But in practice it appears that matters often happened otherwise, that is to say that not only the principle of the guarantee but also of the amount were known in advance; here, jurists and traditionists, such as 'Abû Yusuf and 'Abû 'Ubâyî, disapproved—traditionists, more particularly when, as the harvest could not be estimated in advance, the tax to be levied on it was likewise not calculable if it consisted of a percentage; and jurists, because the total sum envisaged, being necessarily less or greater than the eventual proceeds of the tax, was bound to be injurious either to the tax-payers or to the Treasury. But it is precisely on account of the anticipated profit that the military leaders began to seek out kâbâlî. At the start, they had been allotted emphyteutic concessions (kâbâlî; pl. of kâfî [see 197]) on the State lands (sawafî). But as these were practically hereditary, it was not possible to find new ones, and they therefore turned their attention to the private kharâdî lands, so that they might succeed either in retaining the kharâdî for themselves while only paying the tenth (see Arabic, i, 1954, 358), or, a less serious offence, contract an advantageous kâbâla. However, the kâbâla disappeared quite rapidly in face of the development of the new type of ikhâ, although definitions of it are still to be found occasionally in the later lexicographers, such as al-Zamakhshari. Clearly it possessed some of the characteristics of tax-farming, and the texts sometimes confuse kâbâla and ikhâ; nevertheless, kâbâla usually denotes merely the operation at the basic level of the whole local community, whereas ikhâ also applied throughout the whole course of Muslim history, to the far wider concession of the right to organize and levy taxes, for some years, from a vast district, in return for the payment—more or less in advance—of a sum which is guaranteed, but markedly smaller than the scheduled revenue. Sometimes the texts also compare the kâbâla with the mukâsîa which, in the case of a small estate, in effect probably differs only in the matter of duration, but which also applies to vast semi-autonomous districts or provinces in whose entire internal administration the State definitively renounces all interest, in return for the settlement of a guarantee.

What has just been said appears to be applicable in some measure to Muslim Asia in general. In the Maghrib and in Spain, where the kâbâla is to be found in regard to mukâs, it is not certain if the term occurs in connection with kharâdî; occasionally it denotes the fixed dues owed by the administrator of a waqf. But it is above all with reference to Egypt, always distinctive in agricultural and fiscal matters, that some particularly delicate questions arise.

In Egypt, indeed, it seems that no kâbâla was distributed, although State lands and private lands possessing some degree of autonomy existed there before the conquest. And here the term was retained afterwards. But no doubt both because the Arab population of Egypt was originally limited to the garrison towns, and because control of the Nile and the resultant agricultural organization created, throughout all the irrigated territories, a unified administration which deprived each of them of part of its own effective autonomy, the very term kâbâla in this sense seems unknown (although in the plural kâbâ'ît it denotes the Tulûmîd quarter of Fustâṭ created on the model of Samarrâ). Kâbâlî, however, do exist, often in the hands of persons whom the papyri call mâzû, 'alâ or 'alâ'ir. Then in the 2nd/8th century, Arab tribal groups settled in Egypt and, as it was not possible to give them kâbâla', they were granted lands for which they assumed the kâbâla, under conditions which guaranteed an income for the State but which also left them with a substantial profit for themselves. It appears that this was brought about by distribution by auction, held in Fustâṭ for four years, with a revision of the basic tax survey every thirty years. Despite reforms in the methods employed (particularly under al-Afdal and al-Ma'mûn al-Batâbî, in the second century of Fâtîmid rule), it seems that the system was maintained in certain respects until the Ayyûbid conquest introduced into Egypt a new system more or less inspired by the eastern ikhâ. In short, the old system differed from similar systems in the Near East only in its systematic and durable character, and by its adaptation to the specific agricultural organization of Egypt.

However, this does not solve all of the problems. Papyri, and later the fiscal treatises from the Fâtîmid and subsequent periods, reveal that there was a distinction between lands lying outside the kâbâla, which were subjected to permanent survey (sawafî), and the kâbâla, deciding each year the areas to be flooded and the different types of cultivation to be employed on them.
and lands of kabdlāt, which were themselves bišā misāba, and for which therefore it was sufficient to have a contract drawn up independently of the annual verification of the surface area and type of cultivation. In the fiscal treatises of al-Makhzūmī, Ibn Mammūt al-Nabulusī, the first system is called the mujfādana, imposition by faddān, or simply sirāʿ, and the second kabāla, but also, at least in certain cases, munādīsaya, settlement after dispute, sometimes mukūs, an equal division ( Ibn Hawkalī, i, 133; distinguishes between maḍud and mukūs). On the other hand custom tended increasingly to give kabāla the sense of arq al-kabāla, land subjected to the system of kabāla, and if one or two papyri give the impression that a kabāla can include several small properties of another sort, as in the Asiatic system, others on the contrary suggest relatively small pieces of land, and the later fiscal treatises reveal a situation where the tax agents controlled the entire body of lands consisting both of divisions of land in mujfādana and of others in kabāla, and had the right to transfer certain of these from one category to the other, according to the types of cultivation dependent upon the condition of the land after inundation: this suggests that now that the distinction between the Arabs and the converted native inhabitants is blurred, the difference between the two categories of lands is connected with a difference of agricultural utilization, the kabāla being applicable only to those lands used for the cultivation of cereals and leguminous plants, to the exclusion of orchards and economic crops (flax, sugar, etc.). We do not know if this was already the situation at the time of the earliest adjudications.

Finally, if we come down to the Mamlūk period, we see that this evolution continues. There remain some lands for which the "rent" (idgārā) is fixed at a sum determined in advance by lanādījūs = munādīsaya, but what is now called kabāla is no more than the agricultural unit of land generally subjected to misāba, and within it a distinction is made between the different types of land imposed on the faddān according to the type of cultivation: in other words, integration with the complete system is completed without adjudication or tax-farming or any other "guarantee" save that of paying what is due. This is a normal conclusion since frequently these dues now go not to the Treasury but to the mkūsī, the true heir to the profits of the former mukakabī. In the Ottoman period, if there are mukakāsī and iṣlaṣṣātī (the meaning of which is etymologically related to damān, but in fact corresponding rather to ṭahāṭ) the word kabāla disappears from the vocabulary of land taxation; and, with Bonaparte's scholars, munādīsaya was explained as signifying merely poor lands.

Alongside its use with regard to taxation on land, as described above, the word kabāla, as well as damān in this context, occurs in a more permanent sense to signify the farming of special revenues, generally of mukūs, especially in towns, such as the sale of salt, or the management of baths or even of a local customs office. It is most often in this sense that we must interpret those passages which show rulers abolishing or condoning kabālā, like mukūs elsewhere; and it is in reference to such kabālā, which are perhaps more often designated in this way in the West than in the East, that Europeans have understood the word and adopted it (Spanish alcabalas attested in 1201, Italian gabelle current in ports and among the Normans in Sicily in the 12th century, from which the French gabelle, which however has so far not been found before the beginning of the 14th century; Provençal gabel). (It should be noted however that, in the account of Ramon Muntaner of the Catalan expedition to the East, at the beginning of the 14th century, gabella denotes the Turkish tribes, and therefore derives from kabāla and not from kabāla.) For these taxes, see provisionally barīb above, but no study has been devoted to the methods employed for levying them.
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Modern works: no complete study. Some information in Quatremère, Journal des Savants, 1848, 49 (with etymology of gabelle); De Goeje, Glossaries of Balkhūrī and Tabārī (but the passage from Balkhūrī called upon to show that akh al-īkībīla = ahl al-dhimma in this case is too uncertain to justify anything); Dozy, s.v. kabāla (the same correction should be made to the passage from De Goeje) and munādīsaya; Lokkegaard, Islamic taxation, ch. iv (but cf. Arabica, i (1954), 350); Cl. Cahen, Fiscalité, Propriété, etc., in Arabica, ii (1955); idem, Impôts Fāyūm, ibid., i (1957); idem, Contributions, in JESHO, v (1962); idem, L'administration de l'armée fatimide, in JESHO, xiv (in press); Diyyāʾ al-Dīn al-Raʾūsī, al-Kharājkī fiʾl-daula al-Islāmīyya, Cairo 1957, last chapter; Makoto Shimizu, Les finances publiques de l'Etat abbasside, in Der Islam, xlii (1965), particularly p. 12; E. Lévi-Provençal, Esp. Mus., iii, 29, 370, 301, 430; M. Talbī, Kaḥf, iii, 367; H. R. Irīs, Ţirdā, ii, 615; Vincenzo Crescini, Gabella, in Romantica Fragmenta, Turin 1932; Giovanni-Battista Pellegrini, L'elemento arabo nelle lingue neolatine, in L'occidente et l'Islam nell'alto medioevo, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medio-Evo, XII-2, Spoleto 1995, 706, 769-70; F. Nasset, Les emprunts lexico-logiques du français à l'arabe, Beirut 1966, 273-4 and index. See also 1935.

(C. CAHEN)

KABARDS, a Muslim people of the Caucasus. In Russian they are called Kabardints, in Turkish Kabartaylar; other designation, Kasag. The name of the Kabards was first mentioned as Chechernei by Barbaro, who visited the Caucasus in 1436. Its etymology remains uncertain.

The Kabard language belongs to the eastern branch of the Adighe (Cerkes) linguistic group, which is also referred to as "high Adighe". According to the 1926 Soviet census, there were 139,925 Kabards ethnically and 138,925 linguistically. The census of 1939 records 164,000 Kabards.

The Kabards live in the basin of Upper Terek and some of its tributaries and are divided into two groups: one, forming the tribes of the Great Kabard, lives between the rivers Malka and Terek to the west of the Terek; the other, forming the tribes of the Little Kabarda, lives between the Sunja and the Terek, to the east of the Terek.
The Kabards arrived in their habitat in the 13th century from their original homeland further to the west, after the Alans had been weakened by Mongol invasions, and after the collapse of the Golden Horde they began to play a leading role in the history of the Caucasus. In the 16th century Kabard princes maintained friendly relations with the rulers of Moscow. The second wife of Ivan IV was a Kabard princess, Marie, daughter of Tatkak. In the 17th century the Kabards led the coalition of Caucasian peoples against the Kalmyks. Because of the dominating role they played in the Central Caucasus and their location near the Daryal pass, they were the first to come under Russian control in the 19th century, accepting it without any strong resistance. At the time of the Russian conquest a number of Kabards settled between the upper Kuban and the Zelenchuk and were called Fugitive Kabards. After 1864, some Kabards, mostly of the fugitive group, emigrated into the Ottoman Empire.

Sunni Islam of the Hanafi madhab was introduced in the second half of the 16th century by the Crimean Tatars, in competition with Christianity. They were completely islamanized by the end of the 17th century. The traditional Kabard economy consisted of horse-breeding, agriculture, and home industry. Traditional Kabard society had a complex structure which consisted of eleven classes grouped in two main divisions: the noblemen, or the free group, and the pshrtfa, or the non-free group. At the head of society were the princes (pshrt), among whom the wali was the chief of the Kabard people. They were followed by the nobles (work, or workkü). These in turn were subdivided into four classes according to the rights and obligations which bound them to the princes. The nobles were followed by the free peasants (fokhkol). The non-free group consisted of the asat (freed peasants who were bound by some servitude to their former masters); og (serfs); loganapci (between og and slaves); sanati (slaves).

In the 16th century attempts were made by K. Atažukin to create a literary language, and in 1685 he published a Kabard alphabet based on the Cyrillic script. However, Kabard did not attain the status of a literary language until 1924. The speech of the Great Kabarda was used as the basis of the literary language, and this language is used officially in the Kabardo-Balkar A.S.S.R. and the Karaçay-Cherkes A.R. The first newspaper in the Kabard language was published in 1924 under the title Kara Kakılı. According to the Letopis periodicheskikh svedenii S.S.S.R., there were in 1960 two Kabard newspapers and two magazines.

The Kabards were first organized into the Kabard Autonomous Region on 1 September 1921. On 16 January 1922 they were joined with the national district of Balkar, which on 5 December 1936 became the Kabardo-Balkar Autonomous Region. In 1944 the Kabard Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was announced, which further changed into the Kabardo-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic on 9 February 1957. The territory of the Republic occupies 12,400 sq. km. In 1959 there were 420,115 people in the A.S.S.R. Of these 45 % were Kabards, 8.1 % were Balkars, 38.7 % Russians, and the rest other groups of Caucasians.


AL-KABBĀB, ABDU MUNIM MUBÂH AL-ĀLĪ. HUSAYN AL-TAMGRŪT! AL-DAR, derived from Abû 'l-Kasîm, in Ramadan 983/Dec.-Jan. 1575-76, and settled there until his death on Friday 12 Dümâdâ II 1045/23 Nov. 1635. He was buried in the place since called râysat al-ašâyûth, on the Sidijumâsa road. His fame had attracted many disciples, whom he initiated into the dhâr al-ḥâlîd and who acquired some fame, such as the aforementioned Abû 'l-Kasîm, the two brothers Mûsâmâ and Husayn Ibn Nâsîr al-Dârî. The teaching of the pshrt, which he had received from Abû 'l-Abbâs Abâmâd b. 'Ali al-Ḥadîdîjâl al-Dârî, derived from Abû 'l-Abbâs Abâmâd Zarrûk, whose teaching was transmitted by Abû 'l-Kâsim al-Ḥâzîl, 'Abî b. Abû Allāh al-Sîdîlmâd and 'Abbâs b. Yûsuf al-Râghîdi. Bibliography: E. Levi-Provençal, Chorfa, 315 and n. 4; Irânî, Ṣafrica, 70; Kâdîrî, Naĝîrî, i, 169; idem, tâbâdî, fol. 14v; idem, al-Nâṣir al-kâbir, i, fol. 56v; Naṣîrî, Tašâvat al-μunâwarat, i, 128-36 and passim; Makkîtî Naṣîrî, Dûrur (after al-Ḥâṣhtûkî, Inârat al-baṣārîr ve Tašâvat al-daṣâ); Husayn Ibn Nâṣir al-Dârî, Fahrasa; Vâstit, Mûhâdarât, in fine. (M. LAKHDAR)

KABBÂN [see Misân]

KABD (A.), verbal noun meaning "seizure", "grasping", "contraction", "abstention", etc., and used in the special vocabulary of various disciplines, i.e. In fikk the word signifies taking possession of, handing over. In Mâlikî law ḥiyâsa is more frequently used. Tasallum is also employed to mean the act of handing over. Taking possession is accomplished by the material transfer of the thing when movable goods are involved; by occupation when it is a question of real estate, but also symbolically by the handing over of the keys or title deeds of the property. Kaḥd only has a subsidiary role to play in the sale, since fikk, from the very beginning and in all its versions, recognized that the ownership of the thing which has been sold, when a definite object is involved, is transferred immediately by the agreement of the parties, before any formal transfer. The part played by the kaḥd in the matter of gifts (kibta), Joan (kaḥd), commodate (warâṣya) and security (raha), is a subject of dispute amongst the legal schools. The Mālikîs excepted, most authors teach that the agreement of the parties on which these contracts are founded does not carry with it any legal obligation on the part of the one who gave the undertaking, nor any absolute right on the part of the beneficiary. The former cannot be forced to hand over the thing he has promised, nor can the latter demand its transfer, kaḥd. These contracts are "efficacious", therefore only on the basis of the kaḥd, freely agreed. The formal authors, according to which kaḥd is useful for the completion (tamâm, lusûm) of these contracts, is
not sufficiently significant. Properly speaking, these contracts only become juridically valid through the operation of the *kabd*. Only the Mālikī school holds that immediately after the agreement of the parties relative to a gift, loan, commodity or security the beneficiary may constrain the man who made the contract to hand over the object (Darādī, al-Shārī al-Saghir, ii, 344 for the gift; ii, 226-9 for the commodity; ii, 121 for the security).

However the *kabd* becomes a condition of the validity of the agreement itself (ṣarīf al-sīka) as regards two contracts which become invalid if the material transfer does not take place at the time of the agreement: these are the *salām*, or forward sale (the price to be paid at the time of the contract) and the *ṣarf*, contract of exchange (exchanged currencies must be transferred there and then).

*Kabd amāna* and *kabd damān*. In regard to contracts which involve the temporary transfer of something from one contracting party to the other, in particular hiring, commodity, safe custody and mandate, there arises the question as to whether this taking possession is a *kabd amāna*, in which case the trustee is only held responsible if he has been at fault or in transgression (*la'addī*) of the rules of the contract or of the customary dealings in such matters. If it is a case of a *kabd damān*, which holds the trustee responsible for any loss arising in respect of the object, even through chance or circumstances over which he has no control. The Hanafīs are of the opinion that in all these contracts, without exception, *kabd amāna* is the only possibility. The Shāfi‘īs and the Hanbals make a distinction according to whether the contract is concluded in the interests of the trustee (commodate, hiring), in which case the *kabd* is *damān*, or whether the contract is profitable chiefly to the owner of the thing (safe custody, mandate), and in this case it is *kabd amāna*. As for the Mālikīs, they adopt another criterion. According to whether the thing held in trust in accordance with one of the contracts outlined above can be concealed easily (*mū yuqddābu al-ṣalayhi*) or with difficulty, in the first case they enforce the consequences of *kabd damān*, and in the second case of *kabd amāna*.

**Bibliography:** Muhammad Yusuf Mūṣa, al-Awdal wa-nasāriyyat al-ṣabāb, Cairo 1953, 449; Muṣṭafā Ahmad al-Zarkā, Mīkhab al-ṣifārī al-sāmīm, Damascus 1964, no. 153. For Mālikī law: Darādī, al-Shārī al-Saghir (with the commentary of Shābi, Bulāk 1289, ii, 226-7 (commodity), ii, 344 (gift), ii, 121 (security); D. Santillana, Istuzones di diritto musulmano malichita, Rome 1938, i, 316, ii, 379, 477 and passim; Chafik Chehata, Les concept de qabd damān et de qabd amāna en droit musulman hanafite, in St. Isl., xxiii (1970), 8f. (Y. Linton de Bellaffenon).

ii.—In Sufism, a technical term used to denote a spiritual state of "contraction" as opposed to "expansion", *baṣd* [q.v.]. According to al-Kūshārī [q.v.]: "just as *kabd* is above the degree of *khamaf* (lean) and *baṣd* above that of *rajdā* (hope), so *khāyba* (reverential awe) is above *kabd* and *uns* (intimate ease) is above *baṣd* [q.v.]. The explanation of this hierarchy is clearly that *kabd* and *baṣd* denote the pure objectivity of the *ṣarīf* (*gnostic*) untainted with any individual subjective reaction such as fear and hope, while on the other hand *khāyba* and *uns* denote a greater degree of unveiling on the part of the Divinity. The end of the path is when Divine Subjectivity obliterates the objective experience of *kabd* and *baṣd* in a transcendent synthesis of the two. The terms themselves, as used by the Sūfis, spring from the Divine Names [see al-ʾasmāʾ al-ḥusnāʾ] as *al-ʾkabd* (He who causes contraction) which is an *ism djamālī* (Name of Majesty) and *al-ʾbaṣd* (He who causes expansion), which is an *ism djamālī* (Name of Beauty); and the Sūfis frequently use *djamālī* and *djamāl* as synonyms of *kabd* and *baṣd* when referring to the divinely subjective experiences of the *ṣarīf* (*gnostic*). Ahmad al-ʿAllawi [see Ibn ʿAllawi] quotes his Shaykh as saying, in moments of *kabd*: "My Majesty is One with My Beauty"; and he comments: "Since the gnostic is with Him who contracts, not with the contraction itself, and with Him who expands, not with the expansion itself, he is active rather than passive and has thus become as if nothing had happened to him... Let your attribute be kamāl (perfection) which is beatitude in both *djamālī* and *djamāl*.

**Bibliography:** Kughayr, Risāla; Ibn al-ʿArabī, Risālat al-Kuds (for examples of *kabd*); Ibn ʿAllawi, al-Minaḥ al-Kūddasiyya, 283-5. (M. Lings)

iii.—In prosody *kabd* means "contraction". To the exposition in the article *ṣarīf*, 671-2 and in G. Well, Grundriss und System der altarabischen Metern, Wiesbaden 1958, 27, 30, the following may be added (on some of the rules governing the *kabd* there is no agreement and a complete survey cannot be given):

The *kabd* is a suppression of the fifth quiescent letter in the feet *faʾālun* and *māfālun* which occur in the metres *jawīl* [q.v.], *ḥadad*, *muḍrīs* [q.v.], and *muṭāhārīb* [q.v.], so that these feet are reduced to *faʾālun* and *māfālun* respectively. A foot suffering this alteration is called māḥābūd (this last term occurs already in a discussion of poetry in the Šera of Ibn Isḥāk [q.v.], but its meaning is uncertain, see R. Blachère, Deuxième contribution, in Arabica, vi (1959), 133, 141).

The shortening of *māfālun* to *māfālun* is obligatory in the last foot of the first hemistich (ʾarād) of all varieties of the *jawīl*, so that this foot can never appear in its "primitive" form, except in case the first hemistich rhymes with the second (ṣaprī, see ṣāvra). The same shortening of the last foot of the second hemistich (darb) of the second variety (which would imply that the *kabd* belongs not only to the zihīfāl, but also to the ṣīlāl, see Mūhammad b. ʿAll al-Ṣabbān, al-Kāfiyya al-shāfiyya ft ʿilmay ar-ʾarūd wa-l-kāfiyya, Cairo 1321, 10). The *kabd* is also recommended (according to some it is obligatory) in the penultimate foot of the third variety of the *jawīl*. In this variety the last foot of the second hemistich is reduced to *faʾālun*, and the penultimate foot, which is also *faʾālun*, should become *faʾalun*. This rule also applies to the first hemistich in case of ṣaprī. On the other hand the *kabd* may not occur in the metre muṭāhārib when the penultimate foot of either hemistich has been reduced to a single closed syllable (*faʾāl or faʾāl*, but cf. Darstellung, 283), and in all cases where the foot muṭāhārib has already been reduced to *māfālun* (*baṣd*). Finally it should be noted that in the metre muḍrīs the foot *māfālun* appears never in its primitive form, but is always changed into *māfālun* or *māfālun* (cf., however, ʿSabbān, al-Kāfiyya, 32, l. 7-8).

KABD — KABID 327


(Moh. Ben Chirb[S. A. Bonebarker])

KABID (according to lexicographers the only correct form) or KABD, "the liver".

1. Names for the liver and their semantic field. The Muslims peoples, like all others, recognised the internal organs of the human body and identified them with the analogous organs of animals. They also attributed to them one or another physiological and psychosomatic function based on observations which they interpreted according to mental structures that are only partially clear to us.

Language itself testifies to these early identifications. As E. Bargheer says, "these are significant characteristics which very often endow an organ with a pre-eminent place in the conceptual world of the people; in the case of the heart it is its beating or rhythmic movement, of the lungs breath, and of the liver its central position, its exceptional size in relation to the other organs, its variable shape and edible nature" (Handwörterbuch des deutschen Älterglaubens, hrsg. von E. Hoffman-Krayer, Berlin 1937-42, v, col. 975, s.v. Leber).

In Arabic the classical name of the liver is kabid, but the frequent dialectal forms, habd and kibd, are also encountered at a very early date (cf. Wörterbuch der klassischen Arabischen Sprache, i, Wiesbaden 1970, 18). As in other Semitic languages, it is the great weight in the liver that attracted attention. The noun for liver, common to all Semitic tongues, comes from the root k-b-d or k-b-l where the Western Semitic d seems to derive from an assimilation (k-b) of the Accadian t (habatu later kabatu, poetically kabatu), which is thought to be the original form (Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik d. semit., Sprachen, Berlin 1908-13, i, 152). But we also find in Accadian gabidu, kabidu, probably borrowed from Western Semitic. It seems clear that this is a metaphorical derivation from the adjective "heavy" (Acc. habd, fem. habatu, habi; kibd, kibd; Ugar. dhd; Gaaz kbd etc.) and the corresponding verb (cf. Arab. habada, "to endure, to support"; cf. H. Holma, Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen, Leipzig 1911, 78; P. Fronzaroli, Studi sul lessico comune semitico, Rend. Linc., series 8, vol. 19, fasc. 5-6, 1964, 32 f., 47, 54). The use of this metaphor to denote the liver ("the heaviest and thickest of vessels", Galen, De usu partium, vi, 17 = iii, 495, ed. C. G. Kühn; i, 360, l. 19 f. ed. G. Helmreich) is a Semitic innovation in comparison with Hamito-Semitic, which has a number of very different words for it. It is questionable whether, as A. Cuny avers, it is to be found in Indo-European (Recherches sur le vocalisme ... en "nostralique", Paris 1943, 68 f.). The word most frequently found in Indo-European (from an etymology "*yekh-" (p) is perhaps linked to the idea of lump, swelling tumour (J. Pokorny, Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, i, Berne-Munich 1948-9, 504). In our field it is represented chiefly by the Persian dagar (Lat. sicur, Gr. καθαρός, etc.), which was borrowed by Ottoman Turkish (and Serbo-Croat for the liver of animals).

The Turkish word, in its most current form bag trách (attested as early as the runiform inscriptions of the Yenisei, cf. V. G. Egorov, EtymologischesIslav*, Twułskiego, Cheboksary 1964, 155, who also gives all the forms of the word in Turkish languages), is perhaps associated with the idea of a tie, a bundle, a sack or a pocket (cf. the Ottoman Turkish noun bag and the verb baglamak, but L. Bazin notes that the relationship presents some phonetic difficulties).

It should be said that the words cited above were stabilized at a very early date as corresponding to a "normal" or "central" meaning (L. Bloomfield, Language, London 1935, 149) which is the organ "liver". But they also correspond, from no doubt as early a period, to a semantic field comprising "marginal" or "metaphoric" values, the result of "transfers".

Through contiguity of meaning, some of these "transfers" (cf. S. Ullmann, The principles of semantics, Glasgow 1951, 231 ff.) led the words in question to be used to designate the parts of the body in the vicinity of the liver. Thus in classical Arabic kabid can denote the surfaces of the body more or less close to the liver as well as the chest and even the belly: a woman is described as having kabidun maladu, "a sleek stomach" (Aşghā, Divān, ed. R. Geyer, London 1928, 77: 158 = Tašrara, Divān in W. Ahlwardt, The divans of the six ancient Arabic poets, London 1870, 11: 64) and so on (references in Wörterbuch der klassischen Arabischen Sprache, i, Wiesbaden 1970, 18-20). Similarly Uyygur has baghär hasmag, "clasp to the breast or heart", hasmag pakhan, "a hero (or athlete) with a mighty chest" (E. N. Nadzip, Uyурсbo-russkii slovar, Moscow 1968, 226) and likewise in Azeri baghina hasmag means "to embrace, seize in one's arms, clasp to one's bosom" (H. A. Azizbekov, Azerbaydžanskoy-russkii slovar, Baku 1965, 47).

In Persian, the composite daggar-band, "the liver complex" (attested for example in Sa'di and Shams-i Tabrizi) denotes the place of the liver as well as the chest as a whole: lungs, heart, liver. The Turkish languages had already borrowed the word dagar in the sense of "liver" in the Turkish translation of the Gülüssân prepared in Egypt by Sayf of Saray (1391; cf. E. Fazylow, Starouzbekskiy yazyk, Tashkent 1966, 71, i, 370). But the existence of another word (bag deterministic (for the word if have, etc.) for the same concept in the same languages, and probably the use of daggar-band in the sense indicated above as well, led to the extension of daggar itself to another organ of the thoracic cavity, the lung, despite the existence of a properly Turkish word to designate this (okt), "spleen, etc., with the anciently recorded metaphorical sense of "anger, grief, dissatisfaction, affliction" (cf. Egorov, Etim. slovar, 280 f.), which remains the only meaning in current Ottoman for the word if have, etc., alongside the dialectic term ogyan, "lung"). Consequently it was necessary to use an adjective to distinguish between the "black liver" (Azeri gara diyyar, Ottoman hara diyyar, Lat. orthog. if have, that is the liver itself—and the "white liver" (Azeri ağa diyyar, Ottoman āk diyyar, Lat. orthog. ak ciğer), that is the lungs. Other languages within the sphere of the Ottoman Empire borrowed this same distinction, for example Bulgarian where (the distinction was applied to the Slav word drob rather than to the loanword diyyar, "lungs and liver", cf. 8izgariški etimologologen rečnik, v, Sofia 1966, 362) and Serbo-Croat (forms orna dierysara, "liver", 8ijela dierysara, "lung", cf. Abdullah Škaljic, Turcismi u serpskoherstom jeziku, Sarajevo 1965, 240 f. While the Indo-European word if have is strictly specialized in an anatomical sense). The expression "white liver" (hkbid bbd) was also used in Arabic, at least occasionally, probably for the lungs (Ibn Džizla, Minhādī al-baydân, s.v. habid, Ms. Paris, Bib. Nat., Ar. 1949, fol. 159 v., etc.).
The process of transfer of meaning by contiguity extended the semantic field covered by the word “liver” not only to the organs of the thoracic cavity but also to all the internal organs of the trunk. Moreover these organs as a whole are described, in a more or less vaguely limited fashion, by the plural of the word “liver”. Thus in the Persian translation of al-Ṭabarî (4th/10th cent.), ḍāğrān denotes the entrails (G. Lazard, La langue des anciens monumens de la prose persane, Paris 1963, 195). But in Turkish baghır as such (or with a suffix baghırnak and variants) means “belly, paunch” and also “entrails” (cf. refs. in Drevnetverskii slovar’, Leningrad 1969, 77, 78). From this is derived the Uyghur baghırismâk, for example, which means “to grovel, to drag oneself along on the belly”. In the modern languages of Ethiopia too the Proto-Ethiopic word corresponding to the Go’a’k habād, “liver”, has acquired the meaning of “belly, heart, interior, intestines, paunch” (Tigré ḥabd, Tigriña ḥabdā), and this has become the only meaning of ḥod in Amharic (from habād, cf. Brockelmann, Grundrisse, i, 204), which therefore has had to use another word to designorate liver (gubāda).

Such shifts in meaning explain the use of these terms generally to cover the middle, centre, interior (vom oder gesagt heart) and say heart) and finally, alongside the heart, of desire (cf. E. Dhomme, L’emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en araméen, Paris 1923, 128 ff.; Merx, Le rôle du foie, 436 ff., 439 ff.). For the Arabs the liver is wounded by the sorrows which we attribute to the heart, the pangs of love. The liver of the bashful lover or one who suffers in like fashion is “rent” (radicals ẓ-‘, f-l-k, f-l-ḥ), broken (habād marūdā, Hartir, Mahāmāt, ed. Silvestre de Sacy, 2nd ed. Paris 1847-53, 52f.), wasting away, thirsty, weighed down, burnt up. It is said of someone that “the pangs of love are consuming his liver”. A slender, delicate liver is the mark of a tender spirit, a sensitive heart. A saintly man has a black body but a white liver (Ibn Dībabay, 240f.), that is a pure soul (a very widespread metaphor found as far as the Ndembu of Zambia; cf. V. W. Turner, The Drums of Affliction, Chicago 1967, 283; cf. Bargheer, Leber, 979; id., Eingeweide, 95 ff.). To eat or strike the liver is to inflict great sorrow. As a result, the liver is regarded as a particularly precious part of the body and beloved persons are located in or assimilated to pieces of liver. A child is “the deep-seated blood” (muḥḍa) of the liver; a dear friend or a venerated man is placed “between the liver and its membrane” (khādīb). More generally, people dear to one are “pieces (bi‘ā) of liver”. (Ref. in Wörterbuch ... 19 f. and A. Merx, Le rôle du foie ... 429-33). This last expression is still current in, for example, the Tunisian village of Takrûnâ (W. Marçais, Textes arabes de Tabrouna, i, Paris 1925, 80-1, 272, 292, n. 42, with information from old texts, including a 6th/12th-century Mozarab deed between Christians) where the word “liver” simply means a cherished person, especially a child: ya khābīd, “my precious” (W. Marçais, ibid., ii, bk. vii, Paris 1960, 3354-6). In the region of Constantine children are described as khādā, “livers” of their parents (M. S. Belguedji, La médecine traditionnelle dans le Constantinois, Strasbourg 1966, 121).

Exactly similar expressions are found in Persian literature, where Merx believes to be direct transpositions from Arabic. (See, for example, the expressions in Merx, Le rôle du foie ..., 434-5 and in Farhangi saboni tijāki, Moscow 1969, 779f., as
well as those in the various dictionaries). To take only two examples: to a father his son is like the blood of his liver, *καριν-διεγαρ* already in Firdawsi (*Shahnama*, i, 256, ed. Mohl) and *διεγαρ-παρη*, “a piece of liver” (or *διεγαρ-γυθέ*, “lobe of the liver”) is a current expression for a dearly loved child.

Similar expressions are also found in Turkish languages; in these cases it is not easy to distinguish between those influenced by Persian and Arabic and those which could be original. A ruthless man is said to have a liver of stone or to be “liver-less” (*bağhkrsta* in Kutadgu Bilig (5th/11th cent.; ref. in *Drews*), *diegar-gushe*, “piece of liver” (or *diegar-gushe*, “lobe of the liver”) already in Firdawsi, *Shahnama*, i, 256, ed. Mohl) and *diegar-gushe*.

Between those influenced by Persian and Arabic and languages; in these cases it is not easy to distinguish 

Nouns of metaphysical and moral speculation on the soul were pushed to greater or lesser lengths among the various bodily organs and locate, for example, passion (*shahwda*), among other things, in the liver (ed. Cairo, *Bedeutung der Leber in der Antike*, iv, col. 1431 f.; in most cases it is the lung, cf. above).

In the pneumatic doctrine, both in antiquity and in its literature in Turkestan during the 8th/14th century there are numerous texts which speak of love in terms of the liver being broken in two, torn apart, burnt up, used as a target, eaten on skewers (these are often translations from Persian); a good choice of these has been collected by E. Faizylov in *Siarousbekshi yastik*, i, Tashkent 1966, 201-2. Elsewhere the liver is occasionally described as the seat of anger (some unconvincing references in Radioti, *Versuch*, iv, col. 1431 f.; in most cases it is the lung, cf. above).

Muslim psycho-physiological ideas, as noted above, is apparent in ex-

As far as the anatomy of the liver was concerned, Muslim writers fall into the categories of anatomical descriptions of the organ, its psycho-physiological role—of interest to philosophers as well as anatomists and physicians—its pathology and therapeutic.

The association of the liver with love for children, as noted above, is apparent in ex-

3. Scientific knowledge and scholarly theories. Rational study of the liver conducted by Muslim writers falls into the categories of anatomical descriptions of the organ, its psycho-physiological role—of interest to philosophers as well as anatomists and physicians—its pathology, its use in animal liver in pharmacology.

All the great treatises on medicine include extensive statements on the liver, in view of its central role in the Galenic physiology adopted by Muslim science. Monographs on the liver and its pathology, along the lines of Greek monographs like those by Rufus of Ephesus and Philagrius, were compiled by Kustâ b. Lûkâ and Muhammad b. Zakariyyâ al-Râzî (F. Seznin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, iii, Leiden 1970, 68, 156, 273, 292), although these may be chapters only of general works.

As far as the anatomy of the liver was concerned, Muslim writers, who, like the Greeks for the most part, were forbidden to make dissections, made do with copying Galen’s descriptions of the organ; Galen himself had followed Herophilos of Chalcodon (3rd cent. B.C.), who had dissected corpses in Alexandria and made studies of the liver, but had apparently allied observations of unhealthy human livers and the livers of animals to his study of the normal liver.

Galen’s faith in Herophilos on this point was con-
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Muslim science. Monographs on the liver and its pathology, along the lines of Greek monographs like those by Rufus of Ephesus and Philagrius, were compiled by Kustâ b. Lûkâ and Muhammad b. Zakariyyâ al-Râzî (F. Seznin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, iii, Leiden 1970, 68, 156, 273, 292), although these may be chapters only of general works.

As far as the anatomy of the liver was concerned, Muslim writers, who, like the Greeks for the most part, were forbidden to make dissections, made do with copying Galen’s descriptions of the organ; Galen himself had followed Herophilos of Chalcodon (3rd cent. B.C.), who had dissected corpses in Alexandria and made studies of the liver, but had apparently allied observations of unhealthy human livers and the livers of animals to his study of the normal liver.

Galen’s faith in Herophilos on this point was confirmed by dissections of monkeys (cf. Ch. Daremberg, *Oeuvres anatomiques, physiologiques et médicales de Galien*, Paris 1854-56, i, 293, n. 1; Max Simon, *Sieben Bücher Anatomie des Galen*, Leipzig 1906, ii, xxxiv, xxxvii f.). Muslim physicians followed him in teaching that the human liver had sometimes two or three lobes (*afrâf*) or extensions (*sawâ'id*), but
most commonly four or five, surrounding the stomach. Descriptions of the liver of this type are to be found in the Ms'ar of Muhammad b. Zakariyya al-Razi and the Malakhi of Ali b. Abbâs in an edition with French translation opposite by P. de Koning (Trois Traités d'anatomie arabes . . ., Leiden 1903, 68-71, 374-9), as well as a French translation of the relevant chapter of Book iii of Ibn Sînâ's Kânân, fann 14, chap. 2 (ibid., 706-15; ed. Rome 1593, 455-6; Lat. tr. Venice 1564, 740-2) with the parallel texts of Greek authors.

The ideas of Arab physicians on the psycho-physiological role of the liver derive first from the physiological system of humours that Galen had codified from earlier teachings, a system that was generally accepted in the countries conquered by the Arabs and in the Christian West (cf. the excellent recent account of the matter by Luis Garcia Ballester, "Galeno" in P. Lain Entralgo, Historia Universal de la Medicina, ii, Barcelona, 1972, 209-268; idem, Galeno en la sociedad y en la ciencia de su tiempo, Madrid 1972; simplified summary by G. Sarton, Galen of Pergamon, Lawrence, Kansas, 1954; diagram of blood formation and distribution in Historia Universal, 244 and in A. C. Crombie, Augustine to Galileo, A.D. 400-1650, London 1952, i, 254). In this system the liver plays a role of prime importance linking the four "faculties" (cf. Mani, ii, 21). The nutritive faculty spread out from the heart towards the liver (Ibn Sînâ, Shifd*, 1349/1930, 107). Another preliminary digestive process ("coction") could have taken place in the mesenteric veins (membranous, märsaraykh or mâsaraykh, Lat. mesaricae) which, participating in the nature of the liver, partially transform the chyle into blood (Ibn Sînâ, Kânân, iii, fann 14, mäshâla 1; beginning; for Galen's doubts on this point see Mani, i, 68, which gave rise to disputes in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance). The gastric "coction" had already taken place under the prime influence of the liver, the source of heat, whose lobes were thought to surround the stomach like fingers. The chyle, already transformed to some extent, reaches the liver by the vena portae (mâshâla, mäshâla, tr. as al-târîkh al-istifrâdî, Simon, Stéfen Bücker . . ., i, 346, then as al-tâbî) into which pour the mesenteric veins. There it is transformed into blood proper, fitted for the nourishment of the body (the adage sanguificatio est chylis in sanguinem mutatio was dogma until the 19th century, Mani, i, 59). A part of this blood becomes the substance of the liver, which can be regarded as coagulated blood (Ibn Sînâ, Kânân, i, fann 1, ta'îlm 3, fasl 2; ibid., iii, fann 14, mabûla 1), that it acts independently" (Ibn Sînâ, Shifd*).

Theories establishing a connection between the elements of the cosmos on various planes place the yellow bile along with the igneous element which predominates there and the "temperament" (kathis, misâdâ) which makes manifest its dominance, in a special relationship with the liver. But one variant links this organ rather with the blood, in which air predominates and, naturally, the sanguine temperament (see the diagram in M. Ullmann, Die Medizin im Islam, Leiden-Cologne 1970, 99 and that of R. Herrlinger, with colours showing the development since the Hippocratic corpus, at the end of E. Schöner, Das Viererschema in der antiken Humoralpathologie, Wiesbaden 1964; the common modern form taken from popular manuals can be found in T. Canaan, Aberglaube und Volksmedizin im Lande der Bibel, Hamburg 1914, 33).

Muslim physicians naturally also followed Galen in his linking of the principles of pneumatic teaching to the theory of humours, the inspiration for which we saw above. Some "spirits" (nâsîfâta, arwaâd), subtle vapours, animate the body and are thought to explain the performance of the vital functions. One of them, the natural or physical spirit (nâsîfa, râh jâbî or jâbîîyâ), has its seat in the liver according to Muslim medicine, which follows not so much Galen, who had doubts and vacillated on this point, as the Alexandrians and the Syrians, who systematized his ideas in a simplified fashion. This "spirit" is put on the same plane as the vital or animal spirit and the psychic spirit, which have their seat in the heart and in the brain respectively (classic treatment by Hunayn b. Ishbâk, al-mudthâhir fi'l-tibb, cf. O. Temkin, "On Galen's Pharmacology", Gesnerus [Aarau], viii (1951), 180-189). It is distributed with the blood by the veins.

Every one of these spirits, still according to Galenism, corresponds with a chief "faculty" or a group of "faculties" (bu'dâs, kawd, Lat. virtus) and physiological and psychological phenomena are attributed to the actions of these. Thus the physicians claim that the "natural" faculty or faculties are subdivided into one type whose function (fâlî) is to conserve and make up the individual, which preserves over nourishment and is situated in the liver, and a second type which conserves the species and is situated in the sexual organs. Taking their cue from Aristotle, Ibn Sînâ and many others differ from this theory to some extent and place the heart as the first substratum and mainspring of the faculties (cf. Mani, ii, 21). The nutritive faculty spread out from the heart towards the liver (Ibn Sînâ, Shifd*).
4 Developments in magic, religion and fable. Alongside a popular psycho-physiology which, like its scientific counterpart, considers the role of the liver in the body, in conjunction with scientific pathology, dietetics and pharmacopoeia from which (as a rule) cures for infection are derived, as well as an estimate of the value of animal liver as food or remedy, there exist the rudiments of basically symbolic and magical doctrines which were also developed for practical use. These sometimes appear in scientific treatises and are occasionally supplemented there.

Following Galen, Ibn Sinā reports, though with some doubt, that the size of an animal’s liver is in proportion to its greed and timidity (cf. P. de Koning, op. cit., 708, 711). Employing the magical principle of like to like, it was thought that eating sheep’s liver strengthened the liver of man (Dâwūd al-Anṭākī, Taḏdīḥra, Cairo 1356/1357, i, 207).

The scholarly conception of the liver as being formed (ontogenically, it could be said) from coagulated blood is understood literally or linked to a popular conception to give rise to a ḥadīth excepting the liver and the spleen from the general prohibition of blood: “two bloods have been permitted us” (liver and spleen: Ibn Mādîja, xxix, 31; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii, 97).

Talisman is used in cases of hepatic disorders. Thus the Ḥaḍīḥra al-Iskandar, a Philosophic collection purporting to be of Greek origin, contains a descriptions of a talisman consisting of a liver-shaped red stone with an ibex and an enigmatic inscription painted on it. This is a useful remedy for liver pains (J. Ruska, Tabula Smaragdina, Heidelberg 1926, 98 f.). Books of practical medicine contain many prescriptions which contain a mixture of magical observation, magical deductions (the use of wolf liver pulverized in oil), pure charlatanism (camel urine), and the use of washed talismans etc. (cf. for example, Pseudo-Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (Muh. al-Šanawbari, d. 815/1412), Al-Raḥma fi ʾl-tibb wa ʾl-hikma, Cairo 1357, 106 f. ch. 102). In Morocco pieces of prickly pear cut into the shape of a liver are attached to the outside walls of a Marabout sanctuary; they are thought to cure the sick as they dry (E. Westermarck, Ritual and belief in Morocco, London 1926, i, 202). Another Mooroccan practice consists of drying on a terrace the liver and kidney of a sheep skinned to a piece of prickly pear cut into the shape of the sole of the sick man’s shoe and stabbed repeatedly with a knife (A.-R. de Lens, Pratiques des harems marocains, Paris 1925, 12).

The Bedouin of central Arabia eat for breakfast cinnamon, known moreover as d’ruf or-detbād (ḥara al-kubdāb), “skins of liver”, as a cure for liver complaints (J.-J. Hess, Von den Beduinen des Innern Arabiens, Zürich and Leipzig 1938, 148 f.).

Divination by means of the liver (hepatoscopy), which was so important in ancient Mesopotamia and Etruria but already renounced by the Arab queen Zenobia in the 3rd century (Zosimus, i, 59), was not practised by the Arabs (cf. T. Fahd, La divination arabe, Leiden 1966, 397, 527) although it is mentioned by Ibn Khaldūn in a general list of methods of divination (Mukaddima, i, 193, 194, ed. Quatremère; i, 369, 371 ed. Wäff) and referred to by a Rabbi Levi of uncertain date who compares the king of Babel's
practice of hepatoscopy in Ezekiel xxi, 26, with "some Arab who slaughters a sheep and studies its liver" (Midrash Rabba to Eccles. xii, 7, etc. in Monuments Talmudicae, v, Geschichte, Vienna and Leipzig 1914, 48, § 84).

The liver plays a minor role in folklore, mostly as a curative. In Turkish tales the liver of a prince is the sole cure for a mad princess (W. Eberhard and P. N. Boratav, Türkischen Volksmärchen, Wiesbaden 1953, 302), a young girl sells an ass's liver for a kiss (ibid., 224), and there is a cannibal who eats human liver (ibid., 172). One version of the universal theme of the cure of a hero of magic (A. Aarne and S. Thompson, The Types of the Folk-tale, Helsinki 1964, 208, type 567) has the liver in the place of the heart; this is sometimes replaced by the kidneys, the crop, or the heart once again (Eberhard and Boratav, Types, 196-6). A story from Adayale tells of a miser who eats liver as an economy, an indication that the tale is a recent one (ibid., 88; cf. below).

The theme of a magical cure effected by a bodily organ (cf. Bargheer, Eingeweide, 139 ff., 235 ff.) combined with that of the extraordinary powers of marvellous beings is at the root of the Ṣahādna's account of the cure of Kay-Kawus and the Iranians blinded through spells cast by the White diw and the invasion of Mazandaran (cf. s.v. D!W above, ii, 323). Blood drawn from the liver of the white diw, which Rustam wrenched from its breast when he defeated it, gave them back their sight (ed. J. Mohl, Paris 1838-76, Kay-Kawus, verse 652 ff.; ed. E. E. Bertels et al., ii, Moscow 1962, 109, Mazandaran, verse 613 ff.; tr. J. Mohl, i, Paris 1876, 428 ff.). The efficacy of the liver against blindness on this occasion came close to a principle of Taoist magical biology (J. C. Coyajee, Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, n.s., xxiv, 1928, 187 f.).

But, as we have seen above, the use of goat's liver for eye infections appears in Avicennian scientific medicine, and in the Book of Tobit the liver, heart and gall of a fish help cast out demons (Tobit, vi, 5; vii, 2) and the gall gives sight to a blind man (vii, 3 ff.). The use of the liver against blindness on this occasion has doubt the frequent use of the liver in European popular etymology (Bargheer, Eingeweide, 284 ff.).

The prime importance of the liver in the body no doubt explains, by magical deduction, a group of practices. To chew or to eat at least nibble the liver of an enemy seems to mean annihilation or the highest curse. This gesture, Hind's nibbling Hamza's liver (Wusla, 1928, 140), a gesture which denounces cooks who sell fried liver tabd*ikh, which is made from pounded giblets and spurious musk (Sakati, Un manuel hispanique de hisba, ed. G.-S. Colin and E. LeVi-Provencal, i, Paris 1931, 45; tr. P. Chalmeta-Gendron, El-'Išāb fi ḏadā ḫiba', Madrid 1968, 126 = al-Andalus, 33, 1968, 193) and Spanish and Moroccan baldia (a sort of pâté made from meat and offal) was also built upon the liver that had gone bad, a great deal of bread, spices, etc. (ibid., text p. 39, l. 13; cf. cited p. 130).

The type of rich cooking shown in mediaeval cookery books makes little use of liver. Of the many oriental treaties of this type only the Wusla has recipes for liver, one in which boiled liver is roasted on skewers in a cauld (in the fashion of the kurdîyya, which is made from pounded giblets and includes liver), and one for liver boiled and stuffed with whole or chopped spices (Wusla, Ms. A, fol. 59 r.-v.; cf. Rodinson, Recherches, 135). Apart from that, liver is mentioned, cooked with the fat tail of a sheep (alisa) in the "artificial brain" (Wusla; cf. Rodinson, ibid., 158) and fried black in sesame oil along with poultry giblets or pieces of lamb to make a sort of sauce utilized in various dishes (Bargheer, cf. Rodinson, ibid., 133, n. 4, 156). There is no real recipe for liver in the Baghdadī cookery book sacrefice chez les Arabes, Paris 1955, 113 f.; J. Jouin, Hesperiis, xlii (1957), 320; A.-M. Goichon, La vie féminine au Maʿlab, Paris 1927, 264).

Among some tribes in Morocco, the bridegroom makes the gift of a bull to his bachelor friends: the liver, which must be eaten first, conveys the baraka and must be distributed among all the men present, but not the women (E. Westermarck, Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco, London 1914, 126).

5. Animal liver as food. Liver, often classed with offal and tripe, was dispensed and left to the destitute. Thus in southern Libya a proverb says that impoverished men grab at something mül en-nawār 'al-kabd, "like gypsies after a piece of liver" (F. J. Abela, Proverbes populaires, adages et locutions proverbiales du Liban-Sud (in the press)). Yet in other regions liver and heart are regarded as choice morsels, as in Hadramawt (F. Stark, The Southern Gates of Arabia, Harmondsworth 1945, 78). In Aden today offal is imported from Somaliland, where it is not eaten (information given by Yusuf Ṭālib). Raw liver is sometimes looked upon as a delicacy, as in the Lebanon and Jordan (A. Jaussen, Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab, Paris 1908, 65). In the Sahara, an animal killed in the hunt is speedily disembowelled. Liver, heart and lungs are tossed onto live charcoal and covered with sand, then eaten immediately or on the following day (M. Gast, Alimentation des populations de l'Ahaggar, Paris 1968, 136).

In the Middle Ages, Arab markets always had their kubūdās, "liver vendors", who sold liver cooked with onions or roasted on skewers to people who ate on the streets or did no cooking. Manuals on hisba forbid the mixing of goat or cattle liver with that of sheep. They describe in minute detail the type and quantity of ingredients which must be added ("Ibn al-Ukhuwwa", The Mas'ūlim al-burba, ... ed. R. Levy, London 1938, 95 ff. of the Arabic text). Such food was often adulterated. A treatise entitled Kīmiyyāt al-'tablīk, which denounces cooks who sell fried liver that contains no liver, is already attributed to the philosopher Ya'qūb al-Kindī (9th century) (Shaykh, Nikhāyāt al-ruthva, apud Ibn al-Ukhuwwa, i, 107, n. 8 and Ibn Bassām, Nikhāyāt al-ruthva, in Maghrib, 10, 1907, 1081). On the other hand scrapings of dried or pounded and roasted liver were used as spurious musk (Ṣaḥṣaṭ, Un manuel hispanique de hisba, ed. G.-S. Colin and E. Lévi-Provençal, i, Paris 1931, 46; tr. P. Chalmeta-Gendron, El-'Išāb fi ḏadā ḫiba', Madrid 1968, 126 = al-Andalus, 33, 1968, 193) and Spanish and Moroccan baldia (a sort of pâté made from meat and offal) was also built upon the liver that had gone bad, a great deal of bread, spices, etc. (ibid., text p. 39, l. 13; cf. cited p. 130).

The type of rich cooking shown in mediaeval cookery books makes little use of liver. Of the many oriental treaties of this type only the Wusla has recipes for liver, one in which boiled liver is roasted on skewers in a cauld (in the fashion of the kurdîyya, which is made from pounded giblets and includes liver), and one for liver boiled and stuffed with whole or chopped spices (Wusla, Ms. A, fol. 59 r.-v.; cf. Rodinson, Recherches, 135).
of the 7th/13th century of Shams al-Din Mutamad ibn al-Hasan al-Baghdadi nor in the Hispano-Maghribi culinary treatise of the same era edited and translated by A. Huici Miranda.

In present-day Lebanon recipes are found for mutton or beef liver which is usually grilled on skewers. These are calledワラク, strictly speaking “pluck, the viscera of the thorax” (M. K. Khayat and M. C. Keating, Food from the Arab World, Beirut 1961, 32 f.; P. Bazantay, Enquete sur l’artisanat à Antiochie, Beirut 1936, 47; a Lebanese recipe for liver fried in vinegar in Claudia Roden, A Book of Middle Eastern Food, London 1968, 180). Small pieces of liver, lightly fried and served hot or cold, are used as مكسيه, hors d’oeuvres served with an aperitif (Roden, 33). In the Maghrib, brochettes of liver and heart, formerly the food of the poor, have recently become a smart dish. Since the pieces are wrapped in caul they are called مسالف (M. Beaussiez, Dictionnaire pratique arabe-français3, Algiers 1931, 904 b; M. Gast, Alimentation des populations de l’Asie, Paris 1968, 134, 135, n. 2), and in Morocco با لف (L. Brunot, Tesles arabes de Rabat, ii, Paris 1952, 744; Z. Guineudeau, Fés vu par sa cuisine, Rabat 1957, 39). When pieces of liver are alternated with chunks of mutton fat the dish is called كعبا (the name for tripe, pluck, etc.) in Morocco (Z. Guineudeau, Ibid., 41; cf. H. Mercier, Dictionnaire arabe-français, Rabat 1951, 101). The specialist chef of the grill is called كعبا (ibid.).

In Egypt, various kinds of poultry are often eaten stuffed with a mixture made from chopped liver and gizzards mixed with crushed raw wheat or minced meat (C. Wissa Wassef, Pratiques rituelles et alimentaires des Copts, Cairo 1971, 581).

In Iran offal of sheep or chicken is used in a number of dishes, but liver is only mentioned in a comprehensive cookery book, probably compiled by the shah’s cook and edited in 1301/1884, in kebabs grilled on skewers or in a kind of stew called لخافت al-mulūkh, “the sigh” or “desire of kings” (“All Akbar b. Mehdi Kāshāi, Sofre-ye افههه, Ms. collection P. Ikovski, ed. and tr. M. Ghavam-Sattari, unpublished thesis, Paris 1967, 26, 27; the first recipe is found at a slightly later date in the books by Josephine Richard, alias Neshāt al-dawlā, تابعه-ی نشیه, Tehran n.d., 22, and Badr al-mulūk-i Bāmdād, رگمن-ی افکه (ibid.), Tehran n.d., 36).

Until recently liver was not eaten in Turkey and the butchers threw it to cats or dogs. However, consumption of liver and lungs (called نسخ, “the whole”) and of pluck and tripe has recently gathered a little ground, being the speciality of itinerant Albanian merchants (called سبکه، “tripe-sellers”), information given by P. Boratav; cf. W. Eberhard and P. N. Boratav, Typen turkischer Volksmdrerchen, Wiesbaden 1953, 88). Recipes for pilau using liver are found in present-day cookery books (کویپی, I. Orga, Turkish Cooking, London 1958, 125; تپان, with goose or chicken liver, C. Roden, op. cit., 248), and found in Bursa by a Turkish ethnographical survey (H. Z. Kosay and A. Utkućan, Anadolu yemekleri ve турш мустафи, Ankara 1961, 101). Cf. also the brochettes of liver rolled in yoghurt in I. Orga, Cooking with yoghurt, London 1956, 40.

In Uzbekistan also liver is cooked en brochette (دیگر kabob) and sometimes, as in Soviet Ethiopia, with pieces of fat-tail of sheep alternating with morsels of liver (دیگر kabob); liver is also grilled then stuffed (کوریگی دیگر) (K. Mahmudov, Uzbekskie bijuda, Tashkent 1962, 98, 102; N. K. Alhazov et al., Azerbaidzhan skaya kulinarika, Baku 1963, 43).

Bibliography: in the article. See also: Nikolaus Mani, Die historischen Grundlagen der Leberfor schung, 2 vols., Basle 1959-67. (M. Rodinson)
KABILA [A.] denotes a large agnatic group, the members of which claim to be descended from one common ancestor; this word is generally understood in the sense of tribe. It derives from the Arabic root *k-b-l,* of which the form *kabala* signifies to meet, which is thereby reduced to a very limited size. In reality, such examples are valid only when a type of group, while the latter names the Bakr. In the Antsur, the Band divisions and sub-groups. Al-BayclawI would in that case include a considerable number of the ancient tribal organization. When seen from outside, the desert Arabs, who use the two words indiscriminately to denote the clan, while the tribe is sometimes called *kabila,* sometimes *saff.* In the face of such uncertainty, some ethnologists eventually gave up using a vocabulary which appears to be unsuitable for translating the social reality which nevertheless it claims to express (R. Montagne, La civilisation du désert, Paris 1947, 50).

We are scarcely better informed in regard to the ancient tribal organization. When seen from outside, no social group appears to be as homogeneous and unified as the *kabila.* The traditional conception regards it as a large patriarchal family whose members, all closely linked, bear the same name. According to this etymology: "the *kabila* was so named because its component parts are placed face to face and in equal numbers*. Its structure seems indeed to be connected with that of the skull, in which the four bones, also denoted by the word *kabila,* are placed opposite to one another (LA, root *k-b-l*).

This term is often found in pre-Islamic Arabic poetry. Curiously enough, it is there employed almost exclusively in the plural, standing in the sense of tribe. It derives from the Arabic root *k-b-l,* of which the form *kabala* signifies to meet, which is thereby reduced to a very limited size. In reality, such examples are valid only when a type of group, while the latter names the Bakr. In the Antsur, the Band divisions and sub-groups. Al-BayclawI would in that case include a considerable number of the ancient tribal organization. When seen from outside, the desert Arabs, who use the two words indiscriminately to denote the clan, while the tribe is sometimes called *kabila,* sometimes *saff.* In the face of such uncertainty, some ethnologists eventually gave up using a vocabulary which appears to be unsuitable for translating the social reality which nevertheless it claims to express (R. Montagne, *La civilisation du désert,* Paris 1947, 50).

We are scarcely better informed in regard to the ancient tribal organization. When seen from outside, no social group appears to be as homogeneous and unified as the *kabila.* The traditional conception regards it as a large patriarchal family whose members, all closely linked, bear the same name. According to this etymology: "the *kabila* was so named because its component parts are placed face to face and in equal numbers*. Its structure seems indeed to be connected with that of the skull, in which the four bones, also denoted by the word *kabila,* are placed opposite to one another (LA, root *k-b-l*).
to ethnological research in order to define each of these aspects. For this purpose, then, instead of citing examples from the ancient authors, let us consider the tribe as it exists today among the Bedouin. The *kabila* appears as an independent political group, varying in size from a thousand to two thousand persons, and even larger when the process of sedentarization has started. It is generally composed of two or three interlocking aggregates, related by ties of kinship and in principle interdependent upon each other. Its members claim to be descended from a common ancestor, whose name they generally bear, along with those of their own section and of the clan, they jointly own an area of grazing-land, and they are ruled by one single ruler, formerly the sayyid, today the sayyid, old man, elder, a title also borne by the head of the clan.

Despite its monolithic appearance, the *kabila* falls into as many small, practically autonomous groups as it contains different lines of descent. The genealogists who have dealt so insistently upon the unity of the Arab tribe have almost entirely lost sight of its heterogeneity. Now, the division of Bedouin society into interlocking groups has resulted from a fundamental dualism, which is the predominant feature of the social structure. In each tribe, divisions exist which seemingly are symmetrical and of evidently equal strength. Each one of them seems to have its twin, the other at all levels of the social structure: *'Adnän*/*Kabîlân*, *Râbî'â/Mudârar, Hîmâyâ/Kâhlân, Bakr/Taghîlib, Aws/Kházârâtî, 'Abs/Zûbyân, Hîshâm/Umâyya*, etc. Bedouin society has in fact been subjected to a progressive process of segmentation. At each stage, two blocks of apparently equal strength confront each other, and attract or repel one another in accordance with the interests of the moment. At the family level, the division should cease to operate and should be replaced by absolute solidarity, for any conflict between the members of this group would be tantamount to an act of suicide. In fact, the duality pursues its way inexorably. The division begins even within the patriarchal family, where each male is a contestant for power. To restrict ourselves to an examination of the tribe, we may state that it is often divided into two large subdivisions which strive against each other for supremacy and even make war. The Banû Sakhr, for example, are divided into the *Tuwaga* and the *Kâhlân*; for a long time the leadership belonged to the latter, and then it passed into the hands of their rivals. Indeed, the tribe may be composed of several divisions, but it seems that a pluralism tends to be reduced to a duality; an entire little world gravitates, like satellites, around the two principal leaders. When the *kabila* consists of three subdivisions, it often happens that the most recent of these, if not the least important, endeavours to preserve the balance between the other two. Thus the Huwayyât are divided into three large groups, two of whom show no liking for each other (Ibn *Dâlî* and Abd *Tâyîh*), while the third (Ibn *Ndâlî*) observes a positive neutrality, trying to make the best possible use of this ambiguous situation. Even within the subdivision, the relations of the clans with each other are not free from duality. Each one of them seems to have its twin, the other half of the cell, for whom it is both rival and supporter, and with whom it avoids contracting marriages.

In the light of these ethnographical data, the definition of *dualism* which sets them against each other is seen in a new aspect. Its component parts are indeed symmetrical and of evidently equal strength.

Al-Hamdânî confirms the existence of this type of organization. The author of the *Iklî*, who is not particularly careful in his use of the terms of relationship, does nevertheless give most useful information on the organization of the *Naṣîh*, a branch of the *Bâlî*; they were divided into two factions (*bâsîn*), the *Yumûqî* and the *Dhû *'Abîrâb, and lived in the lower part of the *Djâf* in Rawhîn. The two groups had their own areas—over against one another and separated by the width of the valley. Each tribe (*kabila*) had about one square kilometre of territory. Inter-clan war devastated the two *hayyâs* (*Iklî*, ed. *Khatîb*, Cairo 1359, *x*, 123 f.).

Is the structure of the *kabila* then of a dualist type? It would appear rather to be a matter of a particular kind of dualism, since the different sections in question, far from intermarrying, practise strict endogamy. This hypothesis seems all the more probable in that, when the tribe becomes settled, it projects the image of its divisions onto the soil itself. On the eve of the *hidîra*, Mecca was divided into two concentric, rival and complementary halves: in the centre were the *Kuraysh al-Bîthâb*, on the periphery the *Kuraysh al-Zawâhîr*. A similar situation was observed in Medina where the two sister tribes were rivals for power. The *Khažârdî* had taken possession of the principal port of the city, while the *Awâs* were relegated to the outskirts. This same type of structure is found today in many small Jordanian towns inhabited by former Bedouins, particularly in *Mašân* and *Karak*.

hills of Sidi-Boulbaba—the site of the sanctuary of the patron saint of the town, alleged to be a companion of the Prophet—and the Manâra, a superb view-point where, in the Middle Ages, a lighthouse stood, and where, since 1962, a working-class district has been constructed to house those made homeless by the recent floods.

According to A. Bechraoui, who has devoted a very recent study to the subject, the oasis of Kabis contains a stock of 1,400,000 trees, of which 650,000, that is 47 per cent of the total, are rather mediocre date palms. Next in order of importance come the pomegranate trees, 107,000 in number and of excellent quality, which are the second most important crop produced in Tunisia; then come peach trees, vines and apricot trees. Olive trees succeed only in the Kettana-Teboulbou-Outouf-Metouia region. Banana trees produce ripe fruits, but they are rather sparse. Cultivated land is devoted to the production of cereals in small quantities, fodder (especially lucerne), tobacco, henna and also market-gardening, asparagus being a recent introduction. Live-stock are few in number; animal rearing is mainly carried out on a domestic basis and is regarded as a means of making a little extra money. The coastal waters, which are shallow and contain an abundance of fish, have been left almost unexploited. Without the help of irrigation, the oasis has been extended as far as possible. Some 60 borings having been made between 1890 and the present day, the over-exploited underground water-supply is in fact on the verge of becoming exhausted. Kabis has recently been selected as a development centre for southern Tunisia: equipment has been provided for a port carrying vessels of 50,000 tons; Industries Chimiques Maghrébines (I.C.M.), a company specializing in the manufacture of nitrate fertilizers, has been set up; and a gas pipe-line connecting the town with the El-Borma fields, providing fuel for brick-kilns and the power station, has been installed. Craft-work and tourism provide additional employment and can be developed still further.

History.—Kabis is the Arabic form of the name of the city known in antiquity as Tacape, Tacapas, with the elision of the Libyan Berber prefix ta. The site of Kabis has certainly been inhabited since the neolithic period, as is shown by many remains. Later, the Phoenicians were probably the first to establish an emporium specializing in trade with Numidia and across the Sahara. The emporium became a Carthaginian port, before being transformed into a Roman colony; after this date, specific information regarding the town is to be found.

From the reign of Tiberius (14-37 A.D.) the systematic development of the region began, as attested by the comitia centuriae. Tacapas was connected with Carthage by the main coastal road. In the year 14 a strategic route was opened, connecting it with Capsa (Kafsa) with the help of an aqueduct (Hâdâra) where the 3rd Legion (Augusta) was stationed. As a result of the Carthaginians' efforts in an earlier period, and as a result also of this network of roads which stimulated the port's activity, as well as of the abundant waters of the Oued-Gabès and of the Pax Romana, the town, the centre of which was certainly located upon the eminence where the sanctuary of Sidi Boulbaba now stands, was extensively developed. With such an extent of this development, however, there is some disagreement—and during the Christian period it became the seat of a bishopric. However, it was fortified only at a comparatively late date. "Until the middle of the 6th century Gabès at least still possessed no ramparts", wrote Ch. Diehl (L'Afrique byzantine, i, 229). It was defended only by a castellium barring the invasion route, that is to say the isthmus between the coast and the Chott El-Fedjedj, linking Byzacena with Libya. It was there that, in 547, the Byzantine forces suffered a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Astit tribes. No doubt it was after this disaster that a wall was erected round Tacapas which survived at least until the 16th century. Today, no monuments from its ancient past remain in Kabis though, to be strictly accurate, there are traces of the "Roman dam" across the Oued-Gabès, several pillars and capitâls that have been incorporated in the mosque of Sidi Idris or in the sanctuary of Sidi Boulbaba, and also some other fragments of lesser value which have been used in buildings in the old quarters.

The circumstances under which Kabis came to Islam remain obscure. It is however certain, despite assertions made later by al-Wazîr al-Sarrâjî (Hulal, i, 344), that ʻAbd Allâh b. Sa'd[q.v.] did not besiege the town during his invasion of Byzacena in 278/694-7. It was only later that it was captured, probably during the campaigns directed by Mu'amir b. Hudaydî or his successor ʻUkba b. Nâfî', between the years 34/654 and 50/670. It was later evacuated, after the defeat and death of ʻUkba in Tahûda, in about 64/684. The victor, KusayylÎ, established himself in Kayrawân and from there, according to Ibn ʻAbd al-Ḥâkâm (Fudîk, 70-1), he extended his rule over the neighbouring regions, including the "Gate of Kabis". It was through this gate that, in about 74/693-4, in the middle of the Byzantine occupation, the nitrate fertilizer production of al-Kabîna [q.v.] expelled Hassân b. al-Nûmân[q.v.] from the country he had come to recover. Some years later, however, the same gate once more served as his route.

From this time, Kabis was finally acquired by Islam and became intimately involved in its existence. In particular, Kabis was not spared the violent Khârijî storm which racked the whole of Idrîkîya from 122/740 to 155/772. The Zanâtî Uqasha b. Zu'ayd al-Nafusî, deposed by the Kharîjîs al-Wâdî b. Ayyûb al-Fazâ'irî, of Suffite persuasion, captured it in 123/741 and threatened Kayrawân, before being defeated and killed (125/743). Some years later, under the rule of ʻAbd al-Rahmân b. Ḥabîb, it once again fell into the hands of the Khârijîs, this time those of Ibaḍî tendencies. Again, it was recovered and the rebel leader Ima'mî b. Ziyâd al-Nafusî was defeated and killed in about 131/748-9. The assassina-
tion of ʻAbd al-Rahmân b. Ḥabîb (132/755) was the signal for new disturbances and a new Khârijî outbreak, during which the town passed from one to another of the opposing factions. The Ibaḍî Abu ʻl-Khâtîb captured it at the beginning of 141/middle of 758. It was liberated by Ibn al-Ash'ath in 144/761, only to be lost once more. Finally Yazîd b. Ḥâtim al-Muhallabî, the founder of the Muhallabî dynasty, entered the town on 20 Djamâd I 155/25 April 772 and for a quarter of a century brought an end to the bloodshed that had tormented the region for several decades.

In the Aghlabî period, Kabis became the chief town of the district and the seat of a governor. From the testimony of al-Shamâmkhî (Siyar, 203), who mentions an ʻâmîl of the imâm ʻAbd al-Wahhâb (168/944-208/823), it might be thought that the town formed part of the Rustamid kingdom. In fact, this ʻâmîl was merely a tax-collector who in a somewhat clandestine manner was organizing the sadakât.
the history of Kabis was one of constant turmoil, at home through a whole series of intrigues and fruitless struggles in the attempt to seize power, and in external affairs through the expansionist policy of the Normans of Sicily, who were trying to establish control over the coast of Ifriqiya. Despite various sieges (in 474/1082-3, 479/1086-7, 486/1093-4 and in about 511/1117-8) which finally failed, the town was only recovered for brief periods (in 489/1099-6 and 542/1147) by the successors of al-Mu'izz. In order to oppose these successors, the town in its turn adopted a frankly aggressive policy, welcoming their enemies and sending its troops, either alone or with allies, to assault their capital (in 476/1083-4, 493/1099-1100, and in about 511/1117-8). Against them, it made alliances not only with the Hilâls but also with the Normans of Roger II, who sent the usurer, at his own request, a diploma of investiture in fair and correct form as well as certain Christian decorations, and then provided a successor, Muhammad b. Rushayd, after the occupation of Mahdiyya (543/1148) and the whole of the Sahel. Despite all these conflicts, the town does not appear to have suffered immoderately. It was even embellished with a fine palace, that of al-Árdasayn, begun probably by Ibn Walmiya and completed by Râfi, who took the credit for it. It should incidentally be noted that Rushayd struck coins in his own name, a gesture affirming his independence.

The coming of the Almohads put an end to the independence which Kabis had already practically lost since 541/1146-7 by passing under the domination (tolerant, admittedly, but effective) of the Normans. The town, which had risen against the Normans in 555/1160-1, was captured by Abû Muhammad 'Abd Allah, the son of 'Abd al-Mu'min b. 'Ali [q.v.], in 554/1160. The period of peace it then enjoyed lasted only for a few decades. Soon Kabis became in fact a subject of contention between the Almohads and two adversaries who at certain times were allies, at other times hostile to one another, Kârâkûsh [q.v.], already master of Tripoli, and the Banû Ghâniya [q.v.]. Al-Mansûr (596/1199-609/1213) had to intervene personally in Ifriqiya since he was in danger of losing it and, by his victory at al-Hâmma (583/1187-8), he succeeded in recovering the town, which Kârâkûsh, in alliance with 'Ali b. Ghâniya, had turned into a fortified base. Kârâkûsh soon established himself there once again, but then, having fallen out with his former ally, he lost the town again to the Almohads, who had taken advantage of the situation. Yahya b. Ghâniya had meanwhile succeeded 'Ali, and after crushing Kârâkûsh and taking Tripoli from him, he laid siege to Kabis in 591/1195; to force it to surrender, he laid waste the oasis where, on its end. Abu Zakariyya Yahya b. Zakariyya (625/1228-647/1249), the founder of the Hafsid dynasty, was the ruler of Kabis when he was nominated by the caliph al-Ma'mun (624/1227-629/1232) as governor of the whole of Ifriqiya. Supported by 'Abd al-Malik b. Makki, the most influential land-owner in the city,
he succeeded in capturing Tunis from his brother, who was dismissed from office. This date marks the rise to fortune of the Banū Makki, who, from 681/1282 to 796/1394, constituted what was truly a small, local and largely autonomous dynasty in Kābīs—and, in fact, independent. The two most powerful members of this dynasty were `Abd al-Malik b. Makki and his brother Aḥmād; the latter was ruler of Ḍjerba, in particular, and from there for a time he expanded in extended his authority as far as to Tripoli. The two brothers were of Lūwātā origin; they were cultured—they liked to affect the style of a faḥīk—and also clever, and they often succeeded in influencing Ḥafṣīd policy, in which they took an active part, to their own advantage.

In Ṣa‘īd 683/October 1282, `Abd al-Malik opened the gates of Kābīs to the usurper Ibn ʿAbī ʿUmarā (1282-4) and helped him to ascend the throne. In his gratitude, he is said to have presented `Abd al-Malik “with all the young slaves who were in the palace of the late sultan” (R. Brunschvig, Ḥafṣīdīs, ii, 106) and to have appointed him as his vizier, with particularly wide financial powers. But the reign of Ibn ʿAbī ʿUmarā did not last long, and `Abd al-Malik returned to his fief of Kābīs. In 1286, the town was besieged by the amīr Abū Zakariyyāʾ and its palm grove was laid waste. During the disturbances that followed, `Abd al-Malik did not remain inactive. In 1287-8 he gave his support (this time without success, however) to the pretender Ibn ʿAbī Dabbās against Abū Haṣf (683/1284-692/1293); then, in 693/1294, he rejected the suzerainty of Tunis in order to lay claim to the pretender Ibn Abl Dabbus against that of Bougie where a grandson of Abū Zakariyyāʾ, the man who had besieged Kābīs in 1286, was seeking to obtain his ancestor’s inheritance. In 733/1332 a new pretender, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Liyānī, also received his support against Abū Bakr (734/1332-747/1346). The years that followed saw the apogee of the Banū Makki. From 751/1350, while hostile to the powerful and crafty chamberlain Ibn Tafrāṣīn, they succeeded in enlarging their territory and in making their authority more firmly based. Their prestige was such that, in about 1355, Venice concluded an advantageous treaty with them separately. Consistently hostile to Tunis, they gave their support to the second Marolid invasion (725/1325-757/1357), led by Abū ʿInān (qv.).

But some decades later, the reign of Abu 'l-'Abbās (772/1371-795/1374) marked the end of independence for all the cities in the south. The conquest of Kābīs was not easy, however. In Ḏhu Ḳa‘d 783/February-March 1380, the town was taken and a Ḥafṣīd governor, Yūnūs b. al-Abbār, was installed there. But in the following year `Abd al-Waḥḥāb, a grandson of `Abd al-Malik b. Makki, made himself master of the town and put the governor to death. Abu 'l-'Abbās had to lay siege to it in person in 793/1392 and, to force it to surrender, he had its date-palms cut down, a step which gave it a somewhat healthier climate, according to Ibn Khaldūn. `Abd al-Waḥḥāb thereupon decided to extend his authority over one of his sons to the Ḥafṣīd sovereign as a hostage, and paid a substantial indemnity. But `Abd al-Waḥḥāb was assassinated in 792/1390 by his uncle Yaḥyā b. `Abd al-Malik b. Makki, who proclaimed his independence. In 796/1394 a successful plot delivered him into the hands of the Ḥafṣīd sovereign, Abū Haṣf, who had him put to death. This was the end of the Banū Makki and of the independence of Kābīs.

From then onwards, little was heard of the town. Like the rest of the south, it again broke away from the authority of the last Ḥafṣīds, who were under Spanish protection, before coming under Turkish domination along with the whole of Tunisia, which was organized as a ḍāghālīk (1574). Uğman Dāy (1590-1610), who made great efforts to restore peace in the country, established in Ḏi’ārī a colony of kūl-oghūs, that is to say those of mixed breed, the progeny of Turks and native women. With its population of citizens, and with its situation on the edge of the Sahara, Kābīs suffered more than many other towns from the depredations which preceded the French occupation. It was under two-fold pressure, both from the nomads, who used to vanish into the desert or take refuge beyond the Libyan frontiers on the approach of regular troops, and from the beylical authorities. Thus, without being at the centre of the storm, Kābīs was not spared in the insurrection of ‘Abī b. Ḥadīthāhum (1864). In 1870, it was actually plundered by the khānsādīr.

At the time the Protectorate was set up, a split developed between the two rival groups over the attitude to be adopted—Ḏi’ārī opted for acceptance, Manzil for resistance. The occupation of the latter place was thus relatively difficult: it began on 24 July 1881, but was not completed until the end of November, after the fortifications had been entirely destroyed.

During the Second World War a defence line was constructed to the south of Kābīs, at Marxth, as a result of which the town was bombarded violently and severely devastated, but it did not escape occupation by the German army (19 Nov. 1942). It was recaptured by British and French forces on 29 March 1943. Historical Geography—Kābīs has been well defined as “a maritime oasis”. At all periods, its prosperity has been bound up with the richness of its luxuriant vegetation and the activity of its ports, which falls into three categories—date-palms; then olives, figs, pomegranates and vines; and lastly cereals and market-gardening.

No further precise geographical particulars relating to Kābīs, which in the meanwhile had become Muslim, are recorded until the 3rd/9th century. Ibn Khuradadhbih (d. 272/885-6) refers to it, without further comment, as “the town of the foreign Afārīkā” (madīnat al-Afārīkā al-aḍḍiim), Masalik, 6-7; this expression suggests that in his time the Afārīkā, that is to say the descendants of the Graeco-Romans and the latinized Berbers, mostly Christian, still constituted the major part of the population. It is certainly these Afārīkā who are designated by the term Afārīm in al-Ya‘qūbī (d. about 282-9/895-905), who adds that the “very mixed” population was composed of Arabs and Berbers alike. Al-Ya‘qūbī also notes that Kābīs was “an important and prosperous town, where trees and fruit are abundant”. In the middle of the 4th/10th century, Ibn Hawkal tells us that it was inhabited predominantly by Berbers and that for the first time records a community of Jews, who were subject to a special tax. He remarks that its inhabitants “are not over-endowed by nature in matters of beauty and cleanliness and are somewhat simple” (Ṣawāt al-ʿArḍ, 72; trans. Kramer-Wiet, 66). He notes that it was surrounded by a wall and a ditch, and that outside the walls there
was a suburb—here recorded for the first time—where the markets were held. Of its varied and abundant produce he makes particular mention of oil, wool, great quantities of silk of excellent quality, and very good leather, soft to the touch and perfumed, which was exported to all parts of the Maghrib. Alas! the hinterland was inhabited by thieving Kharidjites who had sacked and burnt the suburbs, bearing a particular grudge against the possessions of merchants and Dhimmis.

At the end of the 4th/10th century, al-Mukaddasi depicts it as a town "smaller than Tripoli", "built of stone and brick, rich in date-palms, grapes and apples" (Ahsan al-tabāsim, 12-13). Its "hinterland was inhabited by Berbers" and its walls "pierced by three gates".

The description given by al-Bakri and often repeated by later geographers is the most detailed and goes back to the middle of the 5th/11th century, the time when the town was ruled by Ibn Walmiya under the protection of the Hīlālī chief Muḥnis b. Yahyā. The town was then still contained within its ancient wall, constructed of hewn stone, the wall being reinforced with a ditch which could be flooded in time of danger. Since the time of Ibn Hawkal, however, it had seen great developments. In particular it was surrounded, not by one but by several suburbs to the south and east, and by and large, this was a sign of intense commercial activity. It was embellished with a rich mosque and possessed numerous hammāms.

The only shadow in this picture was that the climate had become unhealthy—this had not been so earlier—as a result of the destruction of a talisman which had come to light during the search for some treasure. This legend of the talisman certainly refers to the demolition of the ancient buildings situated within the walls on the heights of Sidi Boubaha, where the air is always very healthy, to allow for the construction, from the middle of the 4th/10th century, of the suburbs in the unhealthy basin enclosed by the oued. At the end of the 5th/11th century the suburb furthest away from the ancient walls, on the site of the present quarter of Djiāra, was already fully urbanized, as is shown by the mosques of Sidi Idris, Sidi al-Hādī, Sidi Umar and Sidi Nikāl, the latter attributed to the Banū Dāmilī (Architecture, 77-7) and which are all concentrated in this quarter. It was noted earlier that some fragments from buildings of antiquity have been re-used in these and also in other old buildings. Thus, from the middle of the 5th/11th century, the ancient city had begun to be deserted and eventually disappeared entirely, being replaced by the suburbs, an operation that intensified the unhealthy situation condemned by all the geographers from al-Bakrī onwards, whereas there had been no question of this beforehand.

Among the inhabitants, according to al-Bakrī, a distinction was still made between Arabs and Afārībē, which indicates that the ethnic fusion was still incomplete. The populace was the subject of various distinctions, "a true earthly paradise, in short a Damascus on a smaller scale". However, an important transformation was in progress. It is true that the ancient walls were still standing, but the centre of activity had moved out to "the suburbs, which were extensive and included most of the markets" (Rihla, 86-7). In the heart of the old town, the minaret of the Great Mosque had lost its equilibrium and was leaning dangerously; the Kasaba and the palace of the Banū Dāmilī, "the Kaṣr al-Āmedūn, a marvel unparalleled in the world", were nothing more than ruins (Rihla, 94-5). The air was unhealthier than ever, the inhabitants' faces were pale and epidemics frequent, on account of the oleanders (al-difdīl), al-Tīdānī explains, for they polluted the water, apart from two springs, "Ayn al-Amūr and "Ayn Ṣalmān.

We then have to wait until the beginning of the 16th century—that is to say, for the account of Leo Africanus, who visited Tunis in 1557 (Description, II, 398)—for further details of the development of
Kabis. It was, it seems, still "a very large town", and the old city was still surrounded by its "high ancient walls". But the fact that "it has been sacked by the Arabs" has brought about its decline. Its inhabitants were scattered about in the oasis. "Their skins are black. They farm or they fish, in poverty, and under constant pressure from the Arabs and from the king of Tunis" (Description, ii, 398). In short, the town's ruin was complete; there was no longer any reference to its abundance of fruit, to its industries, its exports in all directions. Not one word of the activity of its port, or of its markets: insecurity killed its trade, including the trans-Saharan trade which had left such a strong mark, doubtless through interbreeding with black slaves, upon the complexion of the inhabitants, who finally became of one single type in their poverty.

In the middle of the 19th century, V. Guérin was unable to discover any traces of the ancient walls. Nothing survived except for old hoard in Manzil and Dijara which, according to F. Laffite and J. Servonnet, scarcely deserved to be called houses. Manzil then had 3,500 inhabitants and Dijara 4,000, out of a total of 13,000. The rainbows which, according to F. Laffite and J. Servonnet, had gilt, Dijara, are the result of interbreeding with black slaves, and the old city was still surrounded by its "high ancient walls". The first two are dedicated to Sayf al-Dawla. We also have a poem describing the rainbow which Ibn Khallikan (Wafiydt al-Abd al-Maghrib al-arabi, Cairo 1653, index; G. Orgels, "Les traditions orientales, Paris 1965, index; B. Orgels, L'ossis de Gabes, in Correspondance d'Orient, 1968.


(1) KABIS, 'ABD AL-'AZIZ B. 'UThMAN B. 'Ali, Abu 'l-Sahr, astrologer, came from one of two towns called Kabiṣa (Yakut, 'Uthman al-buldun, iv, 308 of the Beirut ed.), the other near Sāmarrā', is in the environs of Kabis.

Al-Kabiṣi's principal surviving work, al-Māḏhgal islā sinā'at aḥkām al-nuḏūm (Hadīdīji Khallifa, v, 473 and 476) in five fuṣūl, is dedicated to Sayf al-Dawla, the Hamāndī ruler of Aleppo from 333/944-5 to 356/966-7. In its 4th he uses, in the year 317 Yazdîjîrd (A.D. 948-9). This book, as its title indicates, is an introductory exposition of some of the fundamental principles of horoscopy; its present usefulness lies primarily in its quotations from al-Andaraghar, al-Kindī, al-Hind, Ptolemy, Dorotheus, Māḥṣa' al-lāh, Hermas, and Valens. But it was highly valued in the Middle Ages; there are many Arabic manuscripts (including some in Hebrew script), though no commentaries. A Latin version was made by Ioannes Hispalensis in 1144, a French translation (presumably from the Latin) by Pèrein de Pousse in 1362; Ioannes' Latin translation was commented on by Ioannes de Saxonie at Paris in 1331 and by V. Nabod in 1560, and probably was also the text commented on by Francesco degli Stabili (Cecco d'Ascoli) (1269-1327).

In the preface to al-Māḏhgal al-Kabiṣi mentions his (now lost) Kitâb fi ẓabāt sinā'at aḥkām al-nuḏūm, which answers the equally non-extant Risālā fi 'Isa ibn 'Ali fi ẓabāt aḥkām al-nuḍūm (see also al-Bayhaqi, Taṣimma, 85). 'Istābīn 'All may be the well-known Harranian astronomer who made observations at Baghdād and Damascus in 214/829-30 and 217/832-3. A manuscript in Istanbul (AS 438) contains three short treatises written by al-Kabiṣi: Risālā fi annā wa-l-ālādā wa-fārābīn min al-ālādā mimīdum dijama'ahā min muqaddiṣātāt akhīn bi-ḥāqah al-sinā'at, a Risālā fi 'l-ālādā wa-l-āḏrām, and a Mā sharāḥahā min Kitāb al-fuṣūl li-ż-Fārābīn. The first two are dedicated to Sayf al-Dawla. We also have a poem describing the rainbow which Ibn Khallīkān (Wafiydt
al-a'yân, iii, 79 of the Cairo ed.) says some (including al-Thâbaṭî in his Kitâb yatîmad al-daâr; not located therein) attribute to Sayf al-Dawla, others to al-Kâbîš. There also exists, in a Latin translation by Ioannes Hispalensis and with a commentary by Ioannes de Saxonia, a De planetarum coniunctionibus attributed to Alchabitius; it was translated into French by Oronce Finé (1551). It is not, as Steinschneider suggested, part of al-Maârif, and perhaps it is not by al-Kâbîš at all; it was not known either to al-Bayhaḵ or to Hâdîḏī Khâlîfâ.

**Bibliography:** There are short references to al-Kâbîš in the several Arabic sources cited above. In modern times he has been noticed by M. Steinschneider, *Die hebräischen Übersetzungen*, 561-2, and *Die europäischen Übersetzungen*, repr. Graz 1955, 45-6; Suter, 60-1; C. A. Nallino, *Al-Battâsî*, i, 246 and 309, and *Raccolta di scritti*, v, 338; and Brockelmann, i, 254 and S I, 195.

Manuscripts and editions of the Latin translations of his *Isagoge* and *De planetarum coniunctionibus* are listed in a most confused and unreliable fashion by F. J. Carmody, *Arabic Astronomical and Astrological Sciences in Latin Translation*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1956, 144-50. I list here the editions and manuscripts actually extant, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and at Harvard. 1) *Isagoge*: Ed. Matheus Moretus de Brixia, Bologna 1473. Publ. E. Retoldt, Venice 1482. Ed. Bartholomaeus de Alten de Nusia (with the comm. of Ioannes de Saxonia), E. Retoldt, Venice 1485; I. and G. de Forlîvîc, Venice 1491; I. and G. de Gregorii, Venice 1502 and 1503; and M. Sessa, Venice 1512. Ed. Guilielmus Huyon (with the comm. of Ioannes de Saxonia and the notes of Petrus Turrellus), B. Trot, Leiden [1520?]. Ed. Antonius de Fantis Tarusinsius (with the *De planetarum coniunctionibus* and the comm. of Ioannes de Saxonia), M. Sessa and P. de Ravanis, Venice 1521; and P. Liechtenstein, Venice 1521. And publ. (with the comm. of Ioannes de Saxonia), Paris 1521. V. Nabod's comm. was published as *Enarratio elementorum astronomicorum*, Paris 1600; Cocco d'Ascoli's *Commento all' Alcubus* was edited by P. G. Boffitto, Firenze 1905. 2) *De planetarum coniunctionibus*: Ed. Bartholomaeus de Altem (with the comm. of Ioannes de Saxonia), E. Retoldt, Venice 1485; and I. and G. de Forlîvîc, Venice 1491. See also the editions of the *Isagoge* by Antonius de Fantis. The French translation by Oronce Finé was published as an appendix to his *Les canons et documents très amples touchant l'usage et pratique des communs almanachs*, Paris 1551 and 1557.

**AL-KÂBİLİ** (or IBN AL-KÂBISI), ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALI b. MUHAMMAD b. KHALAF AL-MAÂ'RIFI (324/935-405/1012), one of the principal representatives of the Mâlikî school of Kâyrawân, of which he was the leader after the death of Ibn Abî Zayd (d. 386/996). His father, a native of al-Maârifîyyîn in the neighbourhood of Gabès, had married a woman from Kâyrawân. An oral tradition affirms that al-Kâbîš, Ibn Abî Zayd and Siddîq Mahtre (Mubrîz b. Khalaf) were first cousins, since their fathers had married three sisters. His principal teachers in Hîrkiyya were Abu l-'Abbâs al-Ibyanî, a Tunisian with Shi‘î inclinations, Ibn Masûr al-Dabûbâkh and Dârâs al-Fâsî who possessed many Exact sciences; he was influenced by two devoutly religious men of Kâyrawân, al-Sâbi‘ and al-Djabarîyânî. His riḥla in the East lasted from 352/963 until 357/968; he was accompanied by Dârâs al-Fâsî and the Sînârîd al-Âṣîl. Since he was blind, his companions acted as his secretaries. Before devoting himself to fîh, he taught kûrānic "reading". An Usûl of Ashâ’îr tendencies, he had a predilection for the work of Ibn al-Mawwâz, but above all he was a traditionist of high repute and spread in the Maghrib the Sabîk of al-Buthârî, a riwâya of which, attributed to al-Kâbîši, is known to us. Of his works, we may mention a collection of hadîth of the Musawwa, highly esteemed particularly in Spain and Andalusia; a collection of hadîth extant in manuscript; a treatise on the rules of conduct of schoolmasters, largely inspired by the work of Muhammad b. Sâbînî, which has been published; a voluminous but incomplete compilation of traditions, classified according to the headings of fîhî; various epistles on kûrânic exegesis, practices of worship, articles of faith, the rites of the hadîth, the enclosures of riḥla, sadâsa and objection to witnesses, fear of Allah, repentance, etc.; one on al-Ashâ’î and another in which he refutes the "Bakrîtes". Particularly after the death of Ibn Abî Zayd and Ibn Shîbînî, he became a jurisconsult of very high authority. His role as spokesman for and slayhî of the jurists of Kâyrawân was clearly revealed in the affair of the nephew of Bâdsî. He had countless disciples. At the end of his life he was still teaching some 80 Kâyrawâns, Andalusians and Maghribis. Abû Bakr Ibn Abû al-Rahmân and Abû 'Imrân al-Âl-Sîsi were his principal continuators, bringing to its completion a work which was crowned by the breach between the Zîrîds and the Fâtîmids, the consecration of the definitive triumph of Mâlikism in Hîrkiyya.

**Bibliography:** 1) *Al-Sabîk*, Tarîb al-Madârik, Beirut 1955, i, 676-80; Ibn Nâdîj, *Maârifîm al-imân*, Tunis 1320, iii, 166-80; Ahwânî, *Al-Tâlim fi ra‘î al-Kâbîsh*, Cairo 1945; H. R. Idris, *Deux juristes kairouanais de l'époque zirîde*, in AIEO Alger, 1954, 173-98; idem, *Fêtes chrétiennes célébrées en Hîrkiyya à l'époque zirîde*, in R. Afr., 1954, 261-76; idem, ed. of *Manâfîb*, Publ. de la Fac. des Lettres d'Aâder, 1955; Paris 1959; idem, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Zîrîds*, Paris 1962, index. (H. R. Idris). 2) *AL-KÂBKB*, DJABAL AL-KÂBK (the most common rendering), al-Kâbk (e.g. Masâfîd) or al-Kabîj (e.g. Tabarî, Yâkûtî), Turkish Kavkaz, the name given by the Muslims to the Caucasus Mountains. The form kabk may derive from Middle Persian kafk-kh (the "mountain of Kaf", Armenian hâpĥk); in Firdawsi we find the Caucasus called kâk-î khâ (Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, i, 45, cf. Marquart, *Erânilah*, 94). A village called Kâbk is also mentioned by Ibn Rusta, 173, tr. Wiêt, 201, as being the first stage on the road from Harât to Isifîzâr and Sîstân.

1. Topography and ethnology.

The Caucasus became known to the Muslims from the time of the Orthodox caliphs, when the first raids northwards were launched through Akhchâr Djân to Arrân and beyond. Early Muslim geographers, apparently following Iranian concepts which may go back to Babylonian cosmological ideas, regarded the Caucasus mountain chain as part of the Kaf mountain range which forms a girdle round the earth, to the south of which lie the lands of civilization, but to the north of which lies the Land of Darkness. Thus Ibn Hâwî, al-Masâdî b. Ishâk, connects the Caucasus with the Carpathians, Alps and Pyrenees as a mountain chain dividing Europe (ed. Kramer, i, 192: 193 (= map), 194, tr. Kramer and Wiêt, i, 189-9 and Map 8; see also B. Munkácsy, *Der Kaukasus und*
Ural as 'Gurtel der Erde', in Keleti Szemle, i (1900), 236 ff., and KAP. Because of this identification with the mountains of Kaf, Muslim exegetes and antiquarians located in the Caucasus and Caspian Sea region the rock, sea and town mentioned in the story of Moses and al-Khidr in Kur‘an, XVIII, 59 ff.; thus Ibn Khurraadadhbih, 124, and Ibn al-Fakih, 287, say that “the rock is the rock of Sharwan, the sea is the sea of Djilân (sc. the Caspian) and the town is the town of Badjarwa”. In his section on the conquest of Armenia (Futuh, 197), Baladhuri states that the emperor

probably drew to a considerable extent on the Abu[Saddayn, the Christian kingdom of Iberia (sc. Georgia, see Kurdf), and to the east of Iberia, the region of Albania, which was only called in the period immediately before Islam, the little information which we have relates mainly to events in Transcaucasia; Ciscaucasia was at this time exposed to barbarian onslaughts, and little is known about it. But to the south of the Caspian casus range, the Christian kingdom of Iberia (sc. Georgia, see Kurdf), and to the east of Iberia, the region of Albania, which was only called in the period immediately before Islam, the little information which we have relates mainly to events in Transcaucasia; Ciscaucasia was at this time exposed to barbarian onslaughts, and little is known about it. But to the south of the Caspian casus range, the Christian kingdom of Iberia (sc. Georgia, see Kurdf), and to the east of Iberia, the region of Albania, which was only called in the period immediately before Islam, the little information which we have relates mainly to events in Transcaucasia; Ciscaucasia was at this time exposed to barbarian onslaughts, and little is known about it. But to the south of the Caspian casus range, the Christian kingdom of Iberia (sc. Georgia, see Kurdf), and to the east of Iberia, the region of Albania, which was only called in the period immediately before Islam, the little information which we have relates mainly to events in Transcaucasia; Ciscaucasia was at this time exposed to barbarian onslaughts, and little is known about it. But to the south of the Caspian contents an octagonal building, the court of the sultan, with a central basin, surrounded by columns and arcades, and a series of smaller buildings, including a mosque, a caravanserai, and a hospital. The mosque is of particular interest, as it is one of the few examples of Islamic architecture in the region that survived the Turkish conquest. The court is surrounded by a wall with a series of arched entrances, and is accessible only by a narrow path. The whole complex is surrounded by a moat, and is approached by a single entrance, which is guarded by a tower. The complex is well preserved, and is a fine example of Islamic architecture in the region.
conferred princely power (ghāsibya) on (1) the Khākān al-Dībār or Sāhib al-Sarīf who is called *Wahrazān-Shāh; (2) the ruler of Fīlān, called Fīlān-Shāh; (3) the Tabarsarān-Shāh; (4) the ruler of Lakz, called *Khurshād-Shāh; (5) the ruler of Maskāt, "whose principality has now disappeared"; (6) the ruler of Lāyān, called Lāyān-Shāh; (7) the ruler of Shārwān, the Shārwān-Shāh; (8) the ruler of Bālkh, and (9) the ruler of Zīrīkan. Most of these names can be identified and their principacies are traceable into Islamic times. The Sāhib al-Sarīf or "Master of the Throne" eventually gave his name to the geographical district of Sarīf, the middle Köy-Su valley in southern Dāḡhīstān. His other title, *Wahrazān-Shāh, may possibly relate to the undoubted identity of the ruler of Zīrīkan. Most of these names can be identified and their principacies are traceable into Islamic times. The Sāhib al-Sarīf or "Master of the Throne" eventually gave his name to the geographical district of Sarīf, the middle Köy-Su valley in southern Dāḡhīstān. His other title, *Wahrazān-Shāh, may possibly relate to the undoubted identity of the ruler of Zīrīkan. Most of these names can be identified and their principacies are traceable into Islamic times.

As mentioned above, the Arabs were in Darbānd before the close of Umar's Caliphate. At this time, and during Uthmān's reign, Muslim warriors from Kūfā were raiding across the Araxes and into the Kur valley, i.e., into Arrān. Habīb b. Maslama penetrated to Tiflis, and from Bardi'a's, the administrative centre of Arrān, places on the southern slopes of the Caucasus like Baylāgān, Kabala and Shamārd were reduced by Salmān b. Rabī'ā's Bāihilī's forces, and the local ruler of Shārwān agreed to become tributary (Baladhuri, Futūh, 201-4). It was probably here that groups of Khazars were first encountered, for the disintegration of the Sasanid empire had drawn the Khazars into the eastern Caucasian power vacuum (cf. Baladhuri, 197). However, the first full-scale clash with the Khazars took place north of the Caucasus and is well-documented by Tabārī. In 39/652-3 Abd al-Raḥmān b. Rabī'ā's Bāihilī, emboldened by what had been only token resistance on previous probes, went against the expressed wishes of Uthmān and advanced to the important Khazar centre of Balandjar (q.v.); it was probably located in the Köy-Su basin in Dāḡhīstān, to the north of Darbānd. But there, 'Abd al-Raḥmān was heavily defeated, with the slaughter of 4,000 Kūfān (Tabārī, i, 289-94, 2896-7; Ibn al-Aḥṭār, Beirut, iii, 131-9).

The eruption of Šāmhān or internecine strife within the Caliphate for a time deflected Arab energies from conquests in hazardous and less-rewarding highland zones like the Caucasus and Central Asia. Yet Khazar counter-raids meant that, once the Umayyads were firmly established on the throne, the Caucasian frontiers could not be neglected. Moreover, the raids into the Caucasus and Khazaria must have had an economic importance as a source of slave captives. In 'Abbāsid times, the nišab of "al-Khazari" is quite common amongst military slaves and others; this may well have been a blanket designation for Caucasian peoples as well as for Khazar proper and Turks. The Arabic sources for this warfare in the Caucasus are much less detailed than those for the conquests in the Iranian east, and the picture which has to be constructed from such sources as Baladhuri, Ibn al-Aṯīm al-Kūfī, Tabārī and Ibn al-Aḥṭār is somewhat skeletal. Dunlop has observed (The history of the Jewish Khazars, 58) that the antipathy of historians in the 'Abbāsid period towards the Umayyads and all their works has prevented a just appraisal of the exploits of the Caliph 'Abd al-Malīk's son by a slave mother, Maslama [q.v.], and of Highām's cousin and eventually the last caliph of the Umayyad line, Marwān b. Muḥammad.

According to Armenian sources, cited in Marquart, Strefstein, 443, the Khazars raided into Georgia, Arrān and Armenia during Yazīd b. Mu'āwiyā's Caliphate and again in the opening years of 'Abd al-
Malik’s, on this second occasion killing the Mami-konian prince of Armenia. It seems that the Khazars recaptured and temporarily garrisoned Darband soon after this, and it is probable that control of this strategic point oscillated between the Khazars and Arabs for a time. At a critical juncture after a Khazar invasion of Armenia, al-Djarrâb b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Ḫakami al-Madhîjî was in 104/722-3 appointed governor of the northwestern provinces of the Caliphate, with its attendant responsibility for the defence of the Caucasus frontier. From Bardha hea, he appeared in southern Dâghîstân and attacked the people of Gûmûk, that Caucasian people known later as the Ghaįl- or Kâšt-Kûmûk or Lak [q.v.], who lived as the Ghazi- or Kazî-Kumuk or Lak, a stronghold allegedly built in the first place by the Persian hero Isfandiyar to hold back the Alans. But not even Maslama’s skill could contain the violence of the Khazars. In 112/730 they poured down through the Alan Gate, defeated and killed al-Djarrâb, overran Adharbaydžan and Armenia, and penetrated as far south as Dîyâr Bakr and al-Djazira before the invasion was stemmed and Maslama carried the war back into the Khazar lands. Maslama is said now to have received the submission of various “kings of the mountains”, including the rulers of Shharwân, Lâyzan, Tabarsarân, Fillân, Khursân and Maşkât. Whether acceptance of Islam was required as a condition of submission is unclear. At all events, the impact of Muslim religion must have been very superficial at this time. The general picture in Arran and the Caucasus region resembled that in Armenia: the Arabs made no attempt at imposing direct political control, but were content to leave local rulers in power as their tributaries.

Some years after the great Khazar invasion of 112/730, the new governor Marwân b. Muḥammad campaigned against rebels in Armenia and then against the Alans, occupying the Dâral Pass and three fortresses there before returning through Georgi-a (118/736). In the next year, he penetrated into Khażaria, reportedly reaching the Khazar capital and converting the Khazar king to Islam. (Minorsky suggested the possibility that Marwân’s expedition was aimed at the lower Volga region, since large numbers of Sâkâliba, i.e., Slavs, were taken captive, some of whom, according to Baladhûrî, 207-8, were settled in Kakhêti; see A new book on the Khazars, in Oriens, xi (1958), 127-8.) The shortlivedness of Maslama’s agreements with the various native princes of the Caucasus is shown by the fact that Marwân had to re-impose them, exacting tribute in the form of slave boys and slave girls and of grain for the upkeep of the Darband garrison. Amongst the rebels whom Marwân subjugated were the Dûdâniyya (read *Dûdâniyya, according to Minorsky, the modern Didos of central Daghistân [q.v.]); but it was very long before Islam made much impression there, and a part of the Didos was still pagan in the 12th/18th century. See Baladhûrî, 197-209; Yaŷkûbî, Ta’rîkh, ii, 381, 395; Tabâri, ii, 1506, 1526, 1530-1, 1560, 1573, 1635; Ibn al-Athîr, Beirut, v, 145, 159-62, 173-4, 177-9, 198, 215, 240; F. Gabrieli, Il califfato di Hishâm. Studi di storia omayyade, in Mem. de la Société d’Archéologie d’Alexandrie, viii (1935), 75-81; idem, L’eroe omayyade Maslama ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, in Rend. Lin., Ser. 8, Vol. v (1950), 30-1; Dunlop, The history of the Jewish Khazars, 67-87; Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian history, London 1953, 28-9; Czegtedy, Khazar raids in Transcaucasia in 762-764 A.D., 77-8.

The advent of the Ḩâbbâsid brought no improvement in the generally weak pattern of Arab control over the Caucasus region, a control that could case only have practical significance on those infrequent occasions when Muslim armies entered the mountains to enforce the terms of agreements. The military and political influence of the Arabs was, if anything, diminished by the disorders in the Caliphate consequent on the progress of the Ḩâbbâsid da’iya. The Turkish and Khazar menace remained, and there were no commanders now of the calibre of the great Umayyad generals.

Al-Manṣûr’s governor of Armenia, Yaŷd b. Usayd al-Sulami, took over Shârwân in eastern Transcaucasia (see Barthold in EI, sârwân), including its naphtha wells (malădîf), and the caliph attempted to neutralise his northern enemies c. 142/759 through a marriage alliance between Yaŷd b. Usayd and the daughter of the Turkish Khâkân or of the Khazar king; this plan, however, came to naught. Relations worsened, and in 145/762 there was a major Turkish and Khazar invasion via Darband as far as Armenia. This was followed by an even more devastating one two years later, affecting Arrân, Kakhêti, Georgia and Armenia, under a commander whom Czegledy identifies as a leader of the Dâghîstân Avars or Huns, one Râs (or Âs) Târkhân. See Baladhûrî, 309-10; Yaŷkûbî, ii, 446-7; Tabâri, iii, 316, 647, 648 (under years 182 and 183 A. H.); Ibn al-Athîr, Beirut, v, 572, 577; Dunlop, op. cit., 179-81; and Czegledy, op. cit., 76-88. In the closing years of the 8th century A.D., the Ḩâbbâsids were beset by rebellion in Armenia; in general, the Turks and Khazars did not take advantage of these embarrassments, although in 185/999 the Khazars did answer an appeal by the discontented local nobility of Darband and invade Arrân (Tabâri, iii, 648; Ibn al-Athîr, Beirut, vi, 163; Dunlop, op. cit., 183-5).

The revolt of the Khurramî heresiarch Bâbak [q.v.], the epicentre of which was at Badhdh, just south of the Araxes, had some repercussions in Transcaucasia. It was the Armenian prince of Shâkî, Shâh-i Sumbi-tan, who captured Bâbak and handed him over to the Ḩâbbâsids in 222/837, and this prince came to dominate Arrân and the adjacent parts of Armenia and Georgia till Bugha’s drive against the local rulers there, described below (see Minorsky, Caucasica IV, 1, Shâh ibn Sunbâd of Shâkî and Arrân, in BSOAS,
In al-Mutawakkil's Caliphate, the Turkish general Bugha the Elder [see BUOHA AL-], xlv (1953), 504-14). In al-Mutawakkil's Caliphate, the Turkish general Bugha the Elder [see BUOHA AL-]
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foolishness. The al-Mutawakkil of the 9th/15th century appointed governor of Ağdarbâyjan and Armenia in 237/851-2, and over the next few years he conducted operations in the course of which he sacked Tiflis and deposed and killed its Arab amir, Iṣbāk b. Iṣmāʿīl. This line of Arab amirs was either of Kūrghaš origin or was descended from a client of the last Umayyad Caliph Marwân b. Muḥammad; the andirate had long been a focus of Arab power in the Caucasus, and Masʿuddi, Murūḏ, ii, 66, dated the decline of Arab power and influence in the Caucasus from this senseless act of destruction. Bugha also reduced to obedience various Christian and non-

and the Mongol campaigns, BSOAS, xv (1951), 232-8). On the southern slopes of the Caucasus lay several Christian, or partly Christian, partly Muslim, partly pagan, principalities, like those of Georgia, ʿṢanār, Ṣhakht and the adjacent Kabala, etc. Finally, we have some information on the Cerk sat the northwestern Caucasus, named as the Kašqak or Kasak (= the Kašak of the old Russian chronicles, see below) and already praised by Masʿuddi for their handsome men and beautiful women, their features that were to make them so highly-prized as slaves by the Mamluks and Chiernei Tatars. Masʿuddi describes them as magāsī or fire-worshippers, but by this time Christianity must have had at least a foothold in the indigenous paganism [see further Cerkes].
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eastern Transcaucasia into his orbit. The greatest achievement here was the incorporation of Sharwan within the Daylam sphere of influence as a result of two Musafirid invasions, the first by Marzuban b. Muhammad at some time between 334/945 and 337/948, and the second by his son Ibrahim c. 357/968. On the first of these occasions, the Sharwan-Shah (apparently Abu Tahir Yazid b. Muhammad, see Minorsky, A history of Sharwan and Darband, § 9) was compelled to pay tribute of a million dirhams. Amongst other rulers who came to terms with the Daylamis at this time were the local Shahkht, who is given the Armenian-sounding name of *Ishkhani (text, Ishdhanki); the lord of *Di-r-z, which Minorsky tentatively restored as Khazar, referring to Kabala between Shahkht and Sharwan, where Khazars had long been settled (see above); and one Abu 'l-Kasim Dji-y.dhun. Minorsky thought that this last name might conceivably be read as *Khayzani, referring to the Khayzans on the Caspian coast north-west of Baku, rather than *Khayubkhi, referring to the Daghistan district of Khaydak or Khaydhak mentioned by Mas 'ud, see above. Miskawayh in Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate, ii, 161, tr. v, 172, refers to Marzuban as successfully quelling in 344/955 a people who had rebelled against him in the region of Darband, but it seems improbable that Musafirid suzerainty could have been effectively extended into the northwest corner of the Caucasus.

The Musafirid empire in eastern Transcaucasia was only a transient achievement, and under pressure from the Kuridicised Arab family of the Rawwadids ([...], the Musafirids had lost even Adharbaydjan by c. 564/971), duwal; it stems, according to the compiler, from the duwal; thus in 416/1025 the History of Sharwan, § 38, records the marriage of the amir of Darband Mansur b. Maymun to a daughter of the ruler of Sarir Bukht-Yishu, whose religion is clearly shown by his Syriac Christian name. It is in the 4th/10th century that the Rûs (probably now mixed bands of Scandinavians and Slavs; see §80) impinge on the history of the Caucasus and of the steppe region to the north of the mountain zone. A notable event in Islamic history, from the alarm and terror which it caused, was the Rûs descent on Barlah'sa in Arrân in 332/943-4, when these adventurers sailed the Volga, and occupied it for several months [see BAKH]. It was the Khazars who bore the brunt of the Rûs raids down the Volga basin, and these attacks seem to have destroyed the Khazar state as it had existed in its heyday, or at least, left it seriously enfeebled and thrown back on the southerly Khazar lands, the Kuban steppe region. According to the Russian Primary Chronicle, Sviatoslav of Kiev in 965 defeated the Khazar Khan and took the Khazar town of Biela Vjez or “White tent or tower”, usually identified with Sarkil on the lower Don, the Greek Aspron Hestios and the depression of these mountain peoples; thus in 360/971 there was a violent battle outside Darband with the people of Sarir, in which the Muslims lost 1,000 of the Darband garrison and ghûris from outside (ibid., § 35).

The Muslims in turn retaliated by punitive expeditons into the interior, which served as outlets for the bellicose piety of volunteer fighters for the faith (gharib, streifzuge), and found excellent economic return in the form of the prized Caucasian slaves. The Sharwan-Shah Ahmad’s son Muhammad marched into the interior of the Caucasus in 371/981-2 and captured the town of Kabala from its ruler ‘Abd al-Barr b. ‘Anasba, presumably the ‘Anasba al-A’war mentioned in Mas’ud, Muradî, ii, 68, and described as “the shelterer of thieves, brigands and malefactors”. A further clash took place in 389/999, when the Sharwan-Shah Yazid b. Ahmad defeated Ibn ‘Anasba again and captured the fortress of Gursul on the Gök-cay river, a stronghold which was still in the shah’s hands a quarter of a century later and which constituted a strategically-valuable salient into the southern slopes of the Caucasian massif (A history of Sharwan, §§ 23, 14).

However, there were throughout the whole Caucasian and Transcaucasian region frequent shifts of alliances and groupings, in which religious affiliations were seldom decisive. An amir of Darband could recruit a guard of pagan Rûs (see below). In Tiffis, Muslims and Christians lived side-by-side, and in the three-cornered struggle in the second quarter of the 5th/11th century for control of the city between Bagrat IV of Georgia, his powerful vassal Liparit and the Muslim incumbent ruler of Tiffis, Dja’far b. ‘All, Bagrat and Dja’far could at times be found ranged against Liparit; Dja’far had also joined a coalition of Georgian and Armenian magnates against the Shaddadid Faql or Faqlun b. Muhammad b. Shaddad in c. 417/1026-7 (see Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian history, 43-4, 56-7). As in similar frontier regions, such as Anatolia and the Iberian peninsula, interconfessional marriages were quite common. Thus in 416/1025 the History of Sharwan, § 38, records the marriage of the amir of Darband Mansur b. Maymun to a daughter of the ruler of Sarir Bukht-Yishu, whose religion is clearly shown by his Syriac Christian name.

It is in the 4th/10th century that the Rûs (probably now mixed bands of Scandinavians and Slavs; see §80) impinge on the history of the Caucasus and of the steppe region to the north of the mountain zone. A notable event in Islamic history, from the alarm and terror which it caused, was the Rûs descent on Barlah’sa in Arrân in 332/943-4, when these adventurers sailed the Volga, and occupied it for several months [see BAKH]. It was the Khazars who bore the brunt of the Rûs raids down the Volga basin, and these attacks seem to have destroyed the Khazar state as it had existed in its heyday, or at least, left it seriously enfeebled and thrown back on the southerly Khazar lands, the Kaban steppe region. According to the Russian Primary Chronicle, Sviatoslav of Kiev in 965 defeated the Khazar Khan and took the Khazar town of Biela Vjez or “White tent or tower”, usually identified with Sarkil on the lower Don, the Greek Aspron Hospitall (Chronicle, § 32, tr. S. H. Cross, in Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, xii (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), 172; Dunlop, The history of the Jewish Khazars, 240-1; cf. Marquart, Streifzuge, 2-3, 479). Ibn Hawkal, i, 15, tr. i, 14-15, states that in 358/969 the Rûs utterly destroyed Bulghar and “Kazhazan, Samandar [on the Caucasian coast, south of the Volga mouth?] and Atin” (Dunlop, op. cit., 241 ff.). The Russian Primary Chronicle further relates that after taking Biela Vjez, Sviatoslav subdued the Yas (sc. the As or Alans) and the Kasog (sc. the Kaghak or Cerkes), implying that their raids reached to the northwestern and central parts of the Caucasus. After the Rûs raids of 965, the Khazar chiefs seem to have sought and received help from the Sharwan-Shah Muhammad b. Ahmad (or possibly...
this may be Ibn Hawkal’s mistake for this shah’s father, Ahmad b. Muhammad, who reigned in Sharwan till 370/980-1 to enable him to return to Attil and Khazar (Ibn Hawkal, ii, 397-8, tr. ii, 388; Dunlop, op. cit., 246, and Attil).

There were certainly Rus’ ships operating along the western shores of the Caspian around this time. The amir of Darband, Maymün b. Ahmad, endeavoured in 930/1525 to employ some of the Rus who had arrived there in 28 mercenary ships as mercenary troops (ghilmān), even though they were still pagan. The understandable unpopularity of these Rus contributed to popular disturbances in Darband against Maymün in 379/989-90, leading to his temporary deposition (A history of Sharvdān, §§ 13, 36). The inability of the remnants of the Khazars to keep the lower Volga course closed to Rus’ raiders must have allowed the Rus frequent access to the Caspian. In 421/1030, 38 Rus’ ships appeared off the coast of Sharwan and defeated the Shāh Ma‘nūš b. Yazid at Bākū. They apparently repeated the pattern of events of 90 years previously by sailing up the Kur, and entered the service of one of the contending parties in a dynastic dispute of the Shaddādids of Gandjā (ibid., §§ 15, 36). They eventually passed on to the western Caucasus and the Black Sea, making a circuit of the mountain region. It is possible that they then turned northwards to the Taman peninsula, where the Kievan prince Mstislav had in 988 founded the Rus principality of Tmutorokan (Russian Primary Chronicle, § 43, tr. 207, cf. § 52, tr. 223). This Rus’ foothold south of the Azov Sea enabled them to exert pressure on the Curkes and other peoples of the western Caucasus. In 1022 the Chronicle records that Mstislav attacked the Kasog under their ruler Redyva, and in the next year he was using Kasog and Khazar troops (Khazars of the Taman peninsula region?) in a dynastic dispute with his brother Yaroslav (§ 52, tr. 223). Later in the century, in 1066, Mstislav’s son Rostislav received tribute in Tmutorokan from the Kasog and other peoples, and the Khazars of the region are mentioned as late as 1083 (tr. 234, 258).

It seems that the Rus’ raiders were no longer exclusively water-borne. Two years after the attack of 421/1030 on Sharwan, there is mentioned a punitive expedition of ghādis led by the amir of Darband Ma‘nūš b. Maymün which harassed plunder-laden Rus returning from Sharwan through the Caucasus. In reprisal, a coalition of Rus and Alans tried to crush the little principality of Karakhan, which was a frontier region to the west of Darband and whose ruler bore the title of Marzōbān, according to Ma‘ụdī, Murādī, ii, 40; but the Rus and Alans were decisively defeated by the warriors of Karakhan, themselves converted to Islam only a generation previously (A history of Sharvdān, §§ 15, 36, 38).

4. The Saldjūq period.

The appearance of the Oghuz Turcomans in northern Iran and Armenia, once the Ghaznavid defences in Kjurask have been overcome, seems to have injected a new factor into Caucasian affairs, for both the Christian principalities of western Transcaucasia and the Muslim ones of the east generally felt the effects of disturbances in Ardjarbījān, Armenia and the Byzantine frontier sooner or later. Already in 436/1044-5 or 437/1045-6 the Shāh Šāh Kühbūb b. Yarib, who had arrived in 306/918, saw A history of Sharvdān, § 9) with a strong stone wall and iron gates for fear of the Oghuz (ibid., § 17).

The Christian kingdoms of western Georgia or Abkhāz and eastern Georgia or Kakhetia, under the Bagratids and the family of Bagrīk respectively, had felt the Turcoman threat on their southern flanks before this. Certain sources, and especially the Syriac and Armenian Christian ones, mention a long-distance incursion of Turcomans under Ḥāφṣ b. Dāvūd, brother of the later Saljuq Sultan Ṭughrīl, into Ardjarbījān and Araran in 412/1021, although other sources place the raid several years later (cf. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran, Edinburgh 1963, 223-4). If the raid took place at one of the earlier dates, it may have been a contributory factor in the abandonment by the last Ardīrudun, Senek Şerim or Sanhārīb, of the exposed province of Vaspurakan to the Byzantines in exchange for lands in Anatolia (1021), although the sources mention other factors; see E. Honigmann, Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071, Brussels 1935, 168 ff. For the moment, the threat to Georgia and the surviving Armenian principalities came more from the vigorous policies of the Byzantine Emperor Basil II Bulgarocionus, but after his death in 1025, the Georgian ruler Bagrat IV, the ruler of Kakhetia Kiurike III and other Georgian and Armenian nobles pursued a confused but generally expansionist policy against the Shaddādids of Arran and the amir of Tiflis, Dī‘ārī b. ‘All, this latter city coming sporadically under Georgian control after Dī‘ārī’s death c. 438/1046-7 (see Minorsky in EP, tiflis, and idem, Caucasian in the history of Mayyīfīsūrīn, in BSOAS, xiii (1949-50), 29, 31; the line of Amir Dī‘ārī in Tiflis went back, according to Ibn al-Azrāk, to c. 315/927).

The Shaddādids suffered further from other marauders from Dāghistān and the mountain regions. After the death in 414/1024-9 of the amir Lāshkhārī ‘All b. Mūsā, the leading men of the state abandoned several outlying fortresses constructed against the men of Shakklī, the Dādīdīyā (Dīdīs?), the Abkhāz or Georgians, and the Rum or Byzantines, hoping thereby to discourage their incursions (Studies in Caucasian history, § 13, cf. pp. 27-9). Hence when the roving bands of Oghuz, and later, the Saldjūq and their amirs, appeared in Transcaucasia, they found plenty of troubled waters in which to fish.

The Oghuz had harassed Arrān during the reign of Lāshkhārī ‘All (425-41/1034 to 1049-50) (Studies in Caucasian history, § 121), but when Tughrīl came to Ardjarbījān and Arrān in 446/1054-5, the Shaddādīd Abu ’l-Aswār Shāwūr, his Rawwadīd rival Wahsūdān b. Muhammad, and other potentates of the region, all submitted to the Saldjūq and made the khūba for him (Ibn al-Aḥīr, Beirut, ix, 598-9, cf. Studies in Caucasian history, 54). The Shaddādīd continued to feel Georgian pressure, and it was doubtless Georgian incitement which stimulated a large-scale invasion of Arrān in 454/1062 by the Georgan’s Alan allies, compelling Abu ’l-Aswār Shāwūr to fortify Gandjā (ibid., § 15, cf. pp. 74-5).

Ṭughrīl’s successor Alp Arslān followed a similar policy of deflecting Turcoman and ghādis elements from Persia to the western frontier zones, and in 456/1064 himself campaigned in Armenia, capturing Ani from the Byzantines and Armenians (Ibn al-Aḥīr, Beirut, ii, 37-41). Eventually the town was granted to a branch of the Shaddādīds, see KI and Studies in Caucasian history, 79 ff.). Two campaigns were made into Georgia against Bagrat IV, and Alp Arslān consolidated his influence there by marrying one of the king’s nieces; see W. E. D. Allen, A history...
of the Georgian people, London 1932, 91-2. Alp Arslan's second Caucasian campaign of 460/1068 seems to have been connected with a second incursion through the Darial Pass into Arrān by the Alans, who were joined by infidels from Shākkt; the invaders shut the terror-striken Shaddādīd forces up within Gangja, penetrated to the Araxes and took back with them an immense booty (A history of Shirvān, § 40; Studies in Caucasian history, § 16). Nevertheless, Abū ʿl-Aswār was at other times himself able to pursue an aggressive policy against Shirwān, invading it on four separate occasions, and making the Shāh Farrāburz b. Sallār his tributary. In turn, Farrāburz intervened in a dynastic dispute at Darband during 457/1065, imposing his son Afrīdūn there as ruler in 458/1066 (A history of Shirvān, §§ 19, 41).

Darband was, indeed, racked by internal strife between members of the ruling family and between the Hāshimī amirs and the local notables, exposing it on various occasions to fresh attacks from the Avars of Sarir and the Gumbakī of Northern Daghistān, see ibid., § 40. Possibly the raids of the pagan Gumbakī were lessened by their reported conversion to Islam at some time in the last decades of the 5th/11th century and their adhesion to the Shirwānī Shāh Farrāburz's cause when he was attacking them. From the shah's chancery, a description how, through the intermediacy of the Muslim Laks of Kuvā or Fuwā (to be connected with modern Kubba, north of Bākū?), the Gumbakī agreed to accept Islam, and how the Shāh sent to them his son 'Adud plus an imām and a khālib to teach the rudiments of Islam (Minorsky and Cahen, Le recueil transcascaie de Masrād b. Nāmādār, 139-41, 138-47).

Farīburz began to suffer from Turkman marauders towards the end of Toghrll's reign. During the second attack of the Oghuz leader Kārātīgīn in 459/1066-7, Yazdīyān and Bākū were attacked; so that in the next year Farrāburz agreed to pay a tribute to keep them away. Later in the same year Sultān Alp Arslan appeared in person and received the submission of both the Shaddādīdīs of Gāndjā and the Shirwānī Shāh Farrāburz tried to pull Turkish dāvis who claimed to have been granted Shirwān as an ʿamīr of the Two 'Irākīs Sawtīgīn, who had been granted all the Caucasian marches as his ʿamīr. Shirwān was now definitely reduced to the status of a Saljūq vassal-state and tributary. Sawtīgīn's appearance also meant the deposition of Faḍlūn b. Faḍī b. Abī ʿl-Aswār Shāwūr and the end of the main branch of the Shaddādīdīs in Gāndjā, and in Darband there was a third Shaddādīd occupation (Studies in Caucasian history, §§ 18-19: A history of Shirwān, §§ 20-42, 42-46).

With the end of the narrative of the Taʿrīkh Bāb al-Abwādī in 468/1075-6, our detailed information on eastern Transcaucasia and the Caucasus tails off. It seems, however, that lines of the Shirwānī-Shāhs and the amirs of Darband re-emerged as the Great Saljūq empire passed its apogee under Malik-Shāh and the earlier Hashimī amirs and the local notables, exposing it on various occasions to fresh attacks from the Avars of Sarir and the Gumbakī of Northern Daghistān, see ibid., §§ 19, 41. Minorsky also notes here how the engagement of Ibn al-Azraḥ and the astronomer-poet Falaki Sharwānī (see J. Rypka et alii, History of Iranian literature, Dordrecht 1968, 202-4, 208-9).

The Shirwānī-Shāhs continued to assert their hegemony over Darband, but during this period was to a considerable extent under the protectorate of Georgia, whose kings themselves took the title Shirwānī-Shāh. The shahs proper further acknowledged themselves as nominal vassals, at least, of the Great Saljūqs of 'Irāk and western Persia, and this acknowledgment appears on coins minted in Shirwān down to the death of the last Saldjūk, Toghrll b. Arslān, in 590/1194. The shahs made alliances with the Georgians aimed at recovering Darband, and marriage links were frequent; the Shāh Aḥsāṭān b. Manūẓīr b. Afrīdūn was the son-in-law of a Georgian prince.

This century was, of course, of the Persian monarch's great period of expansion, under such rulers as Dmitri I (1125-36), Giorgi III (1156-84) and Queen Thamar (1184-1222), when the southern frontiers were held against the Ildjīzīdīs of Ādharbāyjān and Arrān [q.v.] and Georgian arms frequently penetrated to the Caspian shores. Already in 1124 David II 'the Restorer' had led an army to Darband in support of his son-in-law, the Shirwānī-Shāh's claims there. Dmitri I was operating in Osetia and as far as Darband and Lāyzān in Shirwān in 548/1153-4, just after the historian of Mayyafterikīn, Ibn al-Azraḥ, entered his service as the royal secretary (Minorsky, Cauçasia in the history of Mayyafterikīn, 31, 33, 35; Minorsky also notes here how the engagement of Ibn al-Azraḥ was a sign of the growing influence of Arabic culture in the capital Titfīlīs and other parts of Georgia, Arabic now becoming a diplomatic language).

Giorgi III repelled an invasion of Shirwān by the amir of Darband Beg-Bars b. Muzaffar in 560/1167-8 or 571/1175-6, and one of Khākmī's odes describes how the vanquished Darband forces included Alans, Avars of Sarir, Rūs and Khażarār (these last being, in the plausible surmise of Minorsky, Khilīcār or Polovtsi rather than remnants of the historic Khażarārs). This Darband expedition was apparently a combined land and sea one, probably with the Rūs supplying the naval forces; Khākmī, whose patron was at this time Aḥsāṣātān b. Manūẓīr of Shirwān, claims that 73 Rūs ships were destroyed and that operations took place near the mouth of the Kur and also well upstream of that river (see Minorsky, Khākmī and Andronicus Comnenus, in BSOS, xi (1943-4), 557 ff., also in Iranica, twenty articles, Tehran 1964, 127 ff.).

In general, the Saldjūq and Mongol periods saw the beginning and development of a gradual process of Turkicisation in many parts of the Caucasus and Transcaucasia, especially in the lower-lying areas. The Turcoman begs brought with them their followers, and many parts of Arrān and Ādharbāyjān proved suitable for their flocks. In these provinces, too, the establishment of the Ildjīzīzīs, with a powerful military machine of Turcomans and Khilīcārs, favoured an increase in the Turkish ethnic elements there. The indigenous princes of the Caucasus were quick to...
discern that the Turks could be used as mercenaries in their internal quarrels. In the 6th/12th century, Darband, under pressure from the Sharwan-Sháhs and their Georgian allies, tended to look towards the Saldjúqs for help, although geographical distance inhibited much direct assistance. Great Saldjúq influence in the Caucasus was, at least in the earlier part of the century, more successfully exercised in Georgia and the southern Georgian fringes, symbolised in King Dmitri's acknowledgement of the names of the 'Abbásid caliphs and the Saldjúq sultans of 'Irák on his coins.

The Georgian monarchs were often in military alliance with the Christian Alans, and there were frequent marriage alliances between the two princely families, as also between the Alans and the Byzantine emperors (see Studies in Caucasian history, 74-5). Alan troops were used in the Georgian armies, and David the Restorer specially constructed fortresses to keep open the route to the Alan Gates and Ossetia; in 1189 Queen Thamar took as her second husband the Alan prince David Soslan (Allen, A history of the Georgian people, 104). C. 1128, David formed a special guard of 5,000 Klîpčak military slaves, converted to Christianity, and raised the military element in the Georgian state to times influential; militarily, it was used with effect on such occasions as in 599/1203, when the Ildégizid Nusrat al-Din Abû Bakr was repulsed from Arrán by an army of Georgians and Klîpčak, allowing Shâmkhâr, Gandja and Dvin to fall to the Georgian hands (Allen, op. cit. A. Z. V. Togan, Umumi türk tarihine giris, Istanbul 1946, 190-1).

5. The Mongol and Timurid periods.

The period of the Khwârzâmsháns and Mongol invasions brought devastation and upheaval to the Caucasus, and, for one thing, broke up the unity of Georgia and destroyed the Bagratids' ambitions for a greater Georgia dominating Transcaucasia. After pursuing to his death the Khwârzâmsháh 'Allâ al-Din Muhammad, Çingiz Khân's generals Djebei and Sübyetey in 617/1220 passed through western Persia to Adharbayjâd, receiving the submission of the Ildégizids, and then entered Arrán. They passed via Baylakân into Sharwan, devastated Shâmkhâr and went on to Darband. By means of a stratagem, they got into the Shâmkhâr court, thus through the Caspian Gate. The Alans were humbled, and the Mongols then entered into the South Russian steppes, defeated an army of Russians and Klîpčak and rejoined Çingiz in Central Asia (cf. Djuwaynî-Boyle, i, 148-9).

The new Khwârzâmsháh Djalâl al-Din appeared in Adharbayjâd in 622/1225; he defeated the Georgians at Garni in the same year, and in the following year 623/1226 occupied Tiflis, massacring all the Georgians and Armenians there (see Minorsky, in EI 1, tiflis). In Sharwan, Djalâl al-Din claimed to exercise the suzerainty rights of the Great Saldjúqs, and imposed on the Sharwan-Sháh Fariburz b. Gârgâsp the same tribute as had been paid in Malik-Shâh's time, till the shah protested that his dominions had considerably shrunk in the intervening centuries, and eventually the tribute was assessed at 30,000 dinars only. Transcaucasia remained open to the pillagings of the undisciplined Khwârzâmsháns, and in 625/1228 the Khwârzâmsháh returned. At Mîndor near Lërê he encountered a confederacy of Caucasian peoples under the Georgian commander-in-chief Iwâne Mkhardzâli. The allies are described as comprising Georgians, Alans, Armenians, Avars of Sarîk, Lakî, Klîpčak, Suvamînî (i.e., the Svan, the mountain people of northern Georgia), Abkhâz, Canit (i.e., Çanetî, the Georgian name for the Laz, corresponding to the Greek Sannoi or Tsamo), Syrians and Rûmîs or Anatolians; but they failed to stand up to the Hârsu al-Dîn and were defeated (Djuwaynî-Boyle, ii, 438).

Although Djalâl al-Din left the region soon afterwards, Transcaucasia continued to be disturbed, till a further catastrophe took place in the shape of the Mongol invasion of 633/1236. In the previous year, the Mongol general Çermaghun had raided Sharwan and eastern Caucasus as far as Darband, and now he entered Georgia via Gandja. The political unity of Georgia was now shattered. Hostages were taken from the Georgian nobles, and the kings forced to attend the Mongol kurultays. Georgians were pressed into the Mongol armies, and there were Georgian contingents present at the fall of Baghdad in 656/1258 and at 'Ayn Djalût in 658/1260. Only the internal divisions which arose within the Mongol royal house, and, in particular, the disputes between the Il-Khánids of Persia and 'Irák and Klîpčak families, prevented the Mongols from penetrating through the Transcaucasian and the Il-Khánids took place in Arrân and eastern Transcaucasia. Hülegi's forces reached as far as the Terek river before being defeated in 661/1265 by Berke's troops. Three years later, Berke returned to the Caucasus, occupying Gandja and sacking Tiflis, where he died in 665/1267 (Spuler, Die Goldene Horde 1, 47-4, 49-51). Only after the reign of the Il-Khánid Öljœtî was the Georgian king Giorgi V (1316-46) able to drive out the Mongols and bring much of Transcaucasia, including Sharwan and Arrân, under Georgian rule.

Sharwan was thus frequently a battlefield for the Il-Khánids and Bâtu'ids, and the constriction of the indigenous dynasty's authority is shown by the fact that during the Il-Khánid period, the Sharwan-Sháhs do not seem to have minted any coins. Despite its inaccessibility, Ossetia suffered from the attentions of the Mongols, and the Alan capital, *Magas, was destroyed in 636/1239 after a long siege, see Minorsky, Caucasian III. The Alan capital Magas and the Mongol campaigns. The period of the Mongol invasions nevertheless allowed the Christian Alans to break out of their mountain fastnesses and play a rôle on the wider stage of European and Inner Asian history. Papal missions reached them, and in turn, Alan missions are mentioned at the court of the Christian Great Khan Gûyûk (Djuwaynî-Boyle, i, 259). Alan colonies were planted in centres of the Golden Horde such as Saray on the Volga and Kertch in the Crimea (Spuler, op. cit., 237, 239, 284, 314). According to Ibn Baţţûta, ii, 448, tr. Gibb, ii, 516, the Alans in Saray had a special quarter and had become Muslim. Moreover, Alan troops found their way as far east as the borders of China.

Further havoc was wrought in the southern parts of the Caucasus region by Timûr. Timûr first appeared in the winter of 678/1280-1, and undertook a campaign, described as a djihâd or holy war, against the Christian Georgians. In defence of Transcaucasia, the Georgians were joined by the Muslim governor of Şakîkî, Sidi 'Allî of the Alurat tribe of the Çağhatayîd ulus, but this alliance brought forth further
Timurid invasions, culminating in the campaign of 805-6/1403-4, when Tiflis was again devastated and all the lands from Arrān to Trebizond given to the Timurid prince Ḵhallī Mīrzā. The 9th/15th century was a confused one in Georgian history, with attacks from the Turkmen Kara Ḵoyunlu amirs and internal weaknesses, so that towards the end of the century, the kingdom became divided into three parts (see Al-Ḵānī, history of the Georgian people, 131 ff.).

The Ṣarvān-Ṣāḥih Shāykh Isḥāḥīm (784-820/1382-1417) had to submit to Timūr and accompany him during his campaign against the Khān of the Golden Horde. Toktandūsh in 797/1395, but he did manage to retain his throne. In the post-Timurid period, Šarvān enjoyed considerable prosperity, with a flourishing cultural life and with many fine buildings erected in Bāḵū and Šāmāḵhī. The shahs were latterly allied with the Ak Ḵoyunlu amirs, in particular with Uzūn Ḥasan, but Ṣāḥih Farrūḵ-Ṣāḥār b. Ḵhallī Allāh was eventually killed in 906/1500 near Šāmāḵhī by Ismāʿīl Ṣafawī, and Šarvān was in 945/1539-8 incorporated into Persia. As for the adjoining district of Shākki, Šī Ḵālī’s son Šīd Aḥmad was re-established there c. 801/1398-9. The mention of Ḵabab by Don Juan of Persia shows that it was still of importance in the later 14th century, when Shākki, after falling to the Ṣafawīds in 958/1551, eventually became an Ottoman sandjak (984/1576); see Allen, Notes on Don Juan of Persia’s account of Georgia, in BSOS, vi (1930-2), 187, Minorsky in EI1, s.v. SHAKKI.

The northern parts of the Caucasus fell within the lands of the Golden Horde. Dāḡistān was conquered by Timūr in 797-8/1395-6, but it is about this time that the three main powers in Dāḡistān, the Ḵaytāḵ, the Ghišt-Ḵūmūx and the Māšūm princes of Šābārāxān, emerge (see DĀḠISTĀN). The western part of the Caucasus, sc. Circassia, played an important rôle in Golden Horde affairs and also in Islamic military history. The Čerkes were still mainly Christian, and Ibn Ṭaḇṭūţa, ii, 448, tr. Gibb, ii, 516, mentions that the Christian Čerkes and Kipčak had their own quarters in Saray, just like the Alans (see above). From the inauguration of the Mamluk Sultanate in Egypt and Syria in the middle of the 7th/13th century, Čerkes military slaves, carried from Circassia by the Genoese of Kaffa and other merchants, were a notable element in the state, and after 784/1382 provided most of the Mamlūk Sultans themselves.

The general process of Turkification in the Caucasian region must ultimately have favoured the spread of Islam. The steppe lands to the north of the Caucasus must have been Islamised fairly early after the decline of the Khazars there. Ibn Ṭaḇṭūţa visited Māḏar on the Kuma river (to be identified with Burgomadzāry). He found it a fine Turkish city. It was a flourishing trade centre of the Golden Horde Tatars, with a kaysārīyya (chief bazaar), and a famous Šīd Shāykh of the Ribāṭīyya order, Muhammad al-Ṭaḇṭūţa, had his kā營ī there (Rīḵūn, ii, 375-9, tr. Gibb, ii, 479-81). But the spread of Islam was a slow process, and the mountainous heartland long resisted Islamisation. The Laz of Mingrelia on the Black Sea coast, a people of Georgian stock and Christian since the beginning of the 6th century, maintained their faith through their close political and cultural connections with the adjacent Byzantine principality of Trebizond. Only after the Ottomans, Sultan Mehmed II in 865/1461 were the Laz gradually converted to Islam and the Šāḥīf ‘madḫ̱hab (see Minorsky in EI1, s.v. LÄZ).

The rise of the Ottomans, together with pressure from the Muslim powers in Arrān and Adharbayjān, also brought about the end—in very obscure circumstances, but probably towards the end of the 9th/15th century—of Christianity in Dāḡistān. As part of the Roman Church’s attempts in the Mongol period to unite the Eastern Christian churches and then win over all the oriental peoples for Christianity, Dominicans had been installed in Tiflis in the 7th/13th century. A Roman Catholic archbishopric was set up at Mərtəğa or Azov in the succeeding century, and a vigorous missionary campaign undertaken into Dāḡistān (in Chaydakenski patria, sc. the land of the Kaytāḵ or Kháyādīk). Helped by Genoese trading enterprises aimed at opening up a route to the east via the Caspian, this Christian church flourished till the onset of the Genoese from the Black Sea and the establishment of Ottoman supremacy there (see J. Richard, Les missionnaires latins chez les Kaitakh du Daghestan (XIV-XV* siècles), in Trudy XXV Kongressa Vostokovedov 1960, iii (Moscow 1963), 606-11). However, by 872/1466, when the Russian merchant Afanasii Nikitin was travelling across the Caspian, the ruler of the Kaytāḵ was a Muslim, one Allī (Ḵhallī?) Beg, brother-in-law of the Šarvān-Ṣāḥih Farrūḵ-Ṣāḥār.

Bibliography: An extensive bibliography of the older geographical and travel literature was given by C. van Arendonck in his EI1 article. For the classical period, see the article Kaukasos in Pauly-Wissowa, Real Encyclopädie der classische Altertumswissenschaft, xi, 1, 59-63. An important addition to the Islamic geographical literature is the anonymous Ḫudūd al-ʿAlam, tr. Minorsky, GMS, London 1937. A geographical survey of the Caucasus is given in A. Sanders, Caucasian Nummularia, Munich 1944, and there is much useful information in the article Kaukas in BSE, xix, 248-63.

The historical literature proper has been mentioned in the course of the article. Amongst all this, the works of V. Minorsky are outstanding, especially his Studies in Caucasian history, London 1953, his A history of Shārwan and Darband, Cambridge 1958, and his five articles in BSOS, xii-xv (1948-53); see also his article Transcaucasia, in JA, ccxxvii (1930), 41-111 (deals mainly with topographical and historical-geographical problems). Some of the many obscurities of Caucasian history have been illuminated by numismatic researches, in which the Bāḵū orientalist E. A. Pakhomov was a pioneer. The results of Russian and Armenian research have recently been utilised in the Ph.D. thesis of Dickran Kouymjian, The numismatic history of Southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjan based on the Islamic coinage from the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th centuries, Columbia University, New York, 1969 (unpublished).

(C. E. Bosworth)

LANGUAGES.

The indigenous languages of the Caucasus form a family with three distinct branches. It is to the languages of this family still or formerly spoken in the area that the name Caucasian languages is applied. In the course of time, however, speakers of languages belonging to the Indo-European and Turkic families have also penetrated the region and these languages have in turn been influenced by those of the Caucasian family, according to the length and closeness of their contact. The most significant of these languages is Armenian, a separate branch of the Indo-European family, which has a literary tradition, both Christian and secular, going back to the
fifth century of our era. The modern Eastern dialect is spoken by over two million people in the Armenian S.S.R. and in urban communities throughout the Caucasus. There are a number of representatives of the Iranian branch of the Indo-European family, the oldest established being Ossetic. This Eastern Iranian language, spoken by the remnant of the Alans living in the Central Caucasus and south thereof in Georgia, has two main dialects: Iron, used as a literary vehicle, and the more archaic Digorun, the latter spoken by a partly Muslim population. Ossetic is unique among modern Iranian languages in being little affected either by Islam, i.e. by Arabic loans, or by Persian culture. Other Iranian languages, all of the Western branch, are Northern Kurdish, Tadjik, and Tadj. Kurds are scattered throughout Armenia and the Adharbajdzjan. S. S. R. Tadjik is spoken in a region along the Caspian coast astride the Irano-Soviet border and Tadj on both slopes of the eastern end of the Caucasus chain and on the Apsheron peninsula. Almost half of the Tadj speakers are Jews; the remainder, and all the Tadjashi, are Muslims. About a quarter of the Kurds are Yazidis, the rest Muslims. Other Indo-European languages represented are Greek, and the German, Russian, and Ukrainian introduced by comparatively recent settlers.

Among Turkic languages the most widely spoken, by well over two million people in Soviet territory, is Azeri, which has been a literary language since the 8th/14th century. To the north-east of the Caucasian languages of the Kh¤§ group are found, namely Kumuk, Karadhay, Balkar, and Noghay. All these Turkophone peoples are Muslims. Kalmuk, a Western Mongolian language, is spoken in North Caucasus. The only Semitic language found in the Caucasus is the Neo-Syriac spoken by the scattered communities of so-called "Assyrians".

The Caucasian languages proper are divided geographically into Southern, North-Western and North-Eastern branches. The Southern, or Kartvelian, branch comprises four languages: Georgian, Svanetian, Laz and Mingrelian, the last two together forming the Zan group. Georgian alone is a literary language, the oldest texts dating from the fifth century of our era. The Laz and two groups of Georgian speakers, the A§ari and some Ingilo, are Muslims. There are three languages of the North-Western branch, Abkhaz, Circassian, and Udi, but the last is no longer spoken in the Caucasus, being kept alive only by a diminishing number of refugees in Turkey. The Circassians (Cerkes, or Askhe) have two main dialects, Kabardian and Kiakhh, both having a modern literature. The Abkhaz living south of the Caucasus have three related dialects; those living north of the Caucasus among the Circassians, known as Abaza, speak two different dialects. The great majority of Circassians and Abkhaz are Muslims.

The North-Eastern branch of the Caucasian family comprises a large number of languages and dialects, spoken for the most part in Dagestan by an almost entirely Muslim population. They fall into six groups: I. the so-called Veinakh ("we people") group, consisting of Cechen, Ingush, and Bats (the latter a small Christian community); II. the Avaro-Andi group, comprising Avar, Andi and its fellows (numbering eight in all), Dido (four languages) and Ardi; III. the Lakh-Dargwa group, i.e. five dialects of Lakh and three of Dargwa; IV. the Samurian group, comprising Lazi, Rutul, Tsakhur, Tabasaran (Tabarsarãn), Aghul, Budug, and Diosk; V. Kinhulag and VI. Udi, the language of a Christian people thought to be the remnant of the Caucasian Albanians. Cechen, Ingush, Avar, Lak, Dargwa, Lezgian, and Tabasaran are written languages, a status Udi formerly enjoyed. Avar is especially widely used as a lingua franca.

Although the three branches of the Caucasian family are very distinct they have a number of features in common. One is the richness of their consonant structures. Georgian, for example, has 29 consonant phonemes, including aspirated and glottalized voiceless stops and affricates, t, t, k, p, q, t, c, h, g, f, b, q; a similar contrast is found in Armenian, Ossetic and Northern Kurdish. Some North Caucasian languages have well over 50 consonant phonemes, including labialized and nonlabialized pairs. In contrast to this, vowel phonemes are few; Georgian has five vowels and both Abkhaz and Circassian have systems reducible to two vowel phonemes. A syntactic feature widespread among Caucasian languages is the "passive construction" of transitive verbs, wherein the agent of such a verb is expressed in an oblique case and the patient is the subject of the verb. This type of construction does occur, but only with the past tenses of transitive verbs, in many Iranian languages, including Northern Kurdish, and it is so restricted in Kartvelian, but in other Caucasian languages it applies to all tenses of the verb; thus "I am doing the work" is expressed as "by-me the work is-being-done". The distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs is absolute; a transitive verb must involve an object, so that, in Georgian for example, the sixth commandment can only be expressed "thou shalt not kill men". In the North-Western, and to a lesser extent the Southern, languages there is a multiple attachment of pronominal particles to the verb, each taking an appropriate position; for example, "the bread which the mother gives her daughter" is expressed in Abkhaz as "mother her-daughter which-to-her-by-her-give bread", the pronominal particles representing subject, indirect object, and agent in turn. In modern Georgian many of these pronominal forms are elided, leaving the unambiguous minimum; e.g. g-b¢a "(I)-you-kill", m-b¢a "(you)-me-kill", k¢a "(You-him)-kill", k¢a "(he-him)-kills". The North-Eastern branch alone has a system of noun classes, whereby signs indicating the class of thing involved (e.g. male, female, inanimate, material) run through the sentence; cf. Avar be-ca-w 6 ro-¢0-w u-ugo: be-ca-y iu ru fo-¢0-y y-ugo: be-ca-b ru ro-¢0-b b-ugo "the blind man/woman/horse in-the-house is". In combinations with the passive construction this system produces such intricate concord as (Cechen) "I work it-being-done I-am" for "I work", "by-me work it-is-done" for "I am working", and "by-me it-being-done it-is work" for "I am (actually) working". Although these and other features more or less common to the Caucasian languages can be matched both in languages of the ancient Near East and, among other modern languages, in the Basque of the Pyrenees and the Burushaski of Hunza [g.], no valid connexion between these and the Caucasian family has yet been shown.


KABOU, a locality in Togo (9°25'N., 0°50'E.), 24 km. to the north of Bassari, an important market whose prosperity, in pre-colonial times, was based
partly on the barter of crude iron given to the Kabre iron-smiths of Lama-Kara in exchange for slaves, and partly on its function as a halting place on the kola-caravan routes. The presence in Kabou of Muslim outsiders (particularly Häwsa and Djërma) was therefore not unusual.

It was a certain Oukpane, a native of Kalanga (about ten km. to the west of Bassari), who founded the village of Kabou, probably during the first third of the 19th century. Shortly afterwards Biramia, a Tykossi of Sansanè Mango, arrived, becoming the first Muslim actually to settle there; to some extent, no doubt, he was the representative of the authority of the Tykossi sovereigns, which extended over Bapure (20 km. to the west of Kabou), of which Kabou was probably a dependency at that time. After Oukpane, the supreme chief was Outoune, who reigned for thirty-five years. At that period, Kabou had its third imâm, Baba Toma (in succession to Biramia and Saliya). In Outoune's reign, the surviving members of the communities of Kalanga settled round Kabou.

Karaka, a younger brother of Outoune, received the French explorers Baud and Vermeersch in April 1895, and Baud for the second time in January 1896, before the Treaty of Paris (23 July 1897), which left Kabou in the Schutzgebiet of Togo. At the time the Europeans arrived a Muslim quarter already existed, containing several dozen Djërma mercenaries.

The leaders of this pagan country, for many years a vassal of the Tykossi warlords of Sansanè Mango, had appealed for help to the Muslim warriors of the Dogon chief of Yendi. The prestige of Islam was so great that Mama Bonfoh, the first of the Bassari chiefs to be converted to Islam, was nominated as chief by the German administration at the beginning of the century. The pro-Muslim policy of the German administration brought about the conversion of large numbers of the inhabitants, following the chief's lead.

Although the town (whose various districts comprise 4000 to 5000 inhabitants) is predominantly Muslim, the surrounding country is inhabited by Kabre and also from the over-populated regions of Lama Kara. Very few of these "immigrant settlers" appear to have been converted to Islam. (R. Cornevin)

KABR (A.), tomb was first applied to the pit used as a burial place for a corpse, as was the term darâk, giving rise to its habitual use in the text of numerous epitaphs containing the expression kâhâ kabru... "this is the grave of...". Originally distinguished from the term sandâk, "cenotaph" (cf., J. Sauvaget, "Les perles choisies" d'Ibn ach-Chîkhâa, Beirut 1933, 212 and "Les trésors d'or" de Sibt al-'Ajamî, Beirut 1950, 184), it had the more general meaning of the tumulus or construction covering the grave to bring it to notice, a custom current in Islamic countries from early times. Contrary to the formal injunction in hadîth to practise taswîrât al-kabûr, that is making the tomb level with the surrounding earth (cf. G. Wiet, CIA Egypte, ii, 64 f.), which was the outcome of juridical discussions and was linked with doctrinal controversies concerning "saint-worship" and the various rites of veneration of tombs (including that of the "pious pilgrimage" or siyâra [q.v.]), funerary monuments of all kinds, ranging from a simple heap of pebbles or mound of earth, with perhaps also a raised stone, to a mausoleum occasionally reaching monumental scale and forming part of a veritable architectural complex, in fact always constituted a significant portion of Islamic art.

Without going into the legal prescriptions and customary practices associated with the notion of "burial place" and therefore "tomb" in the Muslim world, we find that the word kabr designates a definite archaeological reality, though one which is sometimes difficult to define. In part this is due to lack of documentation, as regards both eras and regions, of the available monuments. To a greater extent it stems from a reluctance to group under the same heading the greatly differing remains covered by a variety of terms not only to differences in language and dialectal usage but more especially to distinctions in appearance and architectural style (e.g., radjam, hâkîr [q.v.], hawâq, tábîl, hawaâl, mkâbrîyya, hûbba [q.v.], kâsr [q.v.], gunbâddî, gîr, turbâ or turbaq [q.v.]), or even qualitative differences applying to the dead man and therefore to the value of the sanctuary (e.g., raâdîs, masjîd, imâm-säde [q.v.], shâk-säde, wâli, marbûs, masûr, makhâm and even makhân). Nevertheless, it is permissible to make a preliminary distinction in the midst of such confusion, following the usage proposed by Max van Berchem and justified by Arabic texts (cf. M. van Berchem, CIA Egypte, i, 286, note, and 293; CIA Jérusalem, i, 6, 124), between the tomb itself, treated here under the word kabr, and the "mausoleum" (hûbba or turbâ), that is "the construction consecrated to the tomb, either free-standing or to another time which is sometimes confused with those indeterminate structures that can be grouped under the heading of "commemorative monuments".

This article therefore excludes the many funerary edifices which constitute one of the most representative categories of ancient Islamic art and include notably the open-air funerary enclosure, the domed cubic monument and the funerary tower—the most widespread interpretations of the functional theme of the mausoleum. Yet the tomb situated directly over a real or assumed burial place is far from conforming to a simple, uniform type varying according to the time and region discussed. The existence of an original primitive element that can easily be recognized in many cases—hummock of earth, tombstone or stone-work bench, rectangle defined by pebbles or low walls, raised block or mound at the head or feet of the corpse—does not alter the fact that in detail of forms and even in decoration and inscription, Muslim tombs reveal a great variety to be seen in the archaeological remains from various epochs; it is to be regretted only that there does not yet exist an exhaustive catalogue of these monuments.

Such a lack is made even more apparent by the fact that cemeteries preserved intact for centuries on the outskirts of town and containing truly venerable tombs in the midst of more recent ones—in cities as diverse as Salé, Kayrawân, Cairo, Damascus and Istanbul, for example—have often had to give way to urban development and the extension of dwelling-areas. At the same time some popular and traditional customs or regular visits to particular sites are disappearing (for such religious attitudes before "our secularization of urban cemeteries" see L. Massignon, La cité des morts au Caire, Darâfa—Darb al-'Akhmar, in BIFAO, lvii/viii, 25-79). However, many groups of tombs situated in places that are protected or difficult of access still provide a rich documentation which should be submitted to detailed study. In the light of a broadened perspective and on more solid chronological and statistical bases, we must look again at the sole systematic study of this kind, the fifty-year-old study of old, decorated stèles in the cemeteries of Salé and Rabat which lends itself to comparisons with examples as far
In the absence of any new studies, research on the tombs erected throughout the Islamic world is dependent on a paucity of information and on data gathered in the course of some other research, mainly epigraphic. The first necessity is to sift the basic compilations of Arabic inscriptions made by town or by region (such as the series of *Materias pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum* impressively begun by Max van Berchem, or the several volumes, ordered according to slightly varying norms, which have appeared under the title *Corpus des Inscriptions arables de Tunisie*) and the vast inventories of the epigraphic productions of a given region such as Sicily or Spain (see the section *Epigraphes sepulcrales* by M. Amari, *Le epigraphes arabiche di Sicilia*, in the new edition, corrected and published by F. Gabrieli, Palermo 1971; and see especially E. Lévi-Provençal, *Inscriptions arables d'Espagne*, Leiden-Paris 1951, in which pages xxiii-xxv the introduction are devoted to the form or embellishment of epitaph stones).

Interesting descriptive notes may also accompany the presentations of series of steles, or of isolated examples, preserved in museums (the documentation of the Arab steles of Egypt contained in *Catalogue du Musee arabe du Caire, Les stèles funéraires*, i and iii by H. Hawary and H. Rached, Cairo 1932 and 1938, ii, iv-x by G. Wiet, Cairo 1936-42 is of particular interest, as are also G. Wiet's comments on Iranian steles of the 6th/12th century in *L'exposition persane de 1932*, Cairo 1933). They are also found, with more accuracy, in the papers of a given region such as Sicily or Spain (such as the series of *Arab steles recently published by B. Karamagarali, *Akhlaq mesartaşları*, Ankara 1972). Finally a few rare studies attempt to trace the stylistic evolution of tomb decorations or inscriptions (see, e.g., J. Styrgowski, *Ornamenti allabisscher Grabsteine in Cairo*, in *Isl.,* ii (1921), 305-36, or J. Sordel-Thomine, *Epitaphes coutiques de Bâb Saâhih apud Le monument auxibles de Damas*, bk. iv, Paris 1950, or the series of articles relating to the tombs bearing figurative representations in Anatolia, the latest of which is B. Karamagarali, *Sivas ve Tokat'taki figürlü mezar taşlarının mahiyeti hakkında*, in *Selçuklu Arastirmalar Dergisi*, ii (1971), 75-109).

However, such notations as we have are so ill-assorted that in the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to draw up even an approximate chart showing the development of a funerary art and epigraphy which gave birth to true works of sculpture in stone and contributed to a large extent to the rise of the most elaborate kinds of ornamental Arab scripts. At this moment no more can be said than that in Islamic civilization—setting aside temporary periods of austerity—as in many others tombs present a true reflection of the wealth and degree of refinement of a society in any one era; they also register the cultural and religious climate in which the epigrams were composed, with their information about the personality, circle and opinions of the deceased.

Inscriptions of a greater or lesser length are a constant characteristic of the majority of tombs, apart from those rustic ones which stand in humble anonymity. While here we will deal only with those in Arabic, it must not be forgotten that a number of important epitaphs were composed in later times in other languages. Such inscriptions appear on steles, cippi or cenotaphs and are inscribed on surfaces of a variety of shapes (most frequently rectangular panels or bandeaux), but in both style and disposition they always occupy the foreground of the tomb's layout. The prime purpose of such inscriptions being to record the name of the person buried there and to bear witness to his faith (through a variable use of *kurban* quotations) by calling blessings down on him, they are above all epitaphs. They are classified in Arabic under the vague term *kiāb* and follow a classical schema apparent from the end of the 2nd/8th century (more exactly from 1274/990, the date of the oldest stele in the Cairo museum).

From this date the inscriptions generally include, after the obligatory *basmâla*, either commonplace introductory phrases, such as the *tausīya* or less frequently the *hamdāla*, or a series of stereotyped fashions and accompanied by a varying amount of detail on his genealogy or titles. Usually this is followed by eulogies in his honour, ranging from one to many and sometimes including "transferred eulogies": the verb which was employed earliest to introduce the name of the deceased was *shâhida*, "has testified", found on the first Arab epitaphs in Egypt. The parallel usage of *tuwâfiya*, "X is deceased", which was first used especially to introduce the date of death, was later sometimes used alone in brief funerary texts (e.g., in the 6th/12th and 7th/13th century in northern Syria). Likewise the verb *isâb* noted above, which appears on a third of the earliest Islamic steles in Egypt, became the sole formula used without exception in later epitaphs from Ifrîqiya, al-Andalus, Syria, Anatolia and even eastern Iran.

Another important element, at least in the early period, was the confession of faith, with or without the *risâlia*, sometimes supported by quotations from the Kur'ān such as verse IX, 33. Later, the absence of the *shahâda* can be noted in some regions (rural epitaphs cut in Syria in the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries or contemporary ones from Anatolia) and in some types (epitaphs of children, for example, as attested by examples from Ḫayrāwān). Likewise verse IX, 33 was used less frequently in Egypt from the Fatimid era; although still popular in the same period in Ḫirīkiya and al-Andalus, it no longer appeared in Syria or the eastern provinces, nor in Anatolia from the 6th/12th century. This evolution parallels that observed in the case of other verses from the Kur'ān which were put to different use according to place and period. In Egypt, for example, verse XXII, 7, stressing the necessary advent of the final hour, was in vogue until the 4th/10th century and was also found in Ḫirīkiya. In al-Andalus, XXXV, 5, on the vanity of earthly life, was widely used, as was the phrase "every soul testifies", taken from Kur'ān III, 182 or XXIX, 7, in the whole of the mediaeval east from the 6th/12th century. Depending on period or region, basic religious texts
enjoyed greater or lesser favour, although verses II, 256, III, 16-18, and Sūrā CXII were always popular.

Also to be taken into account is the presence or absence of religious maxims whose precise meaning is known to us through studies like those done on the saying, "reliving the mourning for the Prophet" (cf. L. Massignon, La Rave de Ma’dîne, cadre de la méditation mausoléenne sur la destinée du Prophète, among others in BIFAO, cv (1960), 267-79), and also those moral maxims, complementary invocations and poetic texts which constitute, along with information on the date of death, the "accidental" portions of the funerary inscription. As a general rule, the wealth of doctrinal allusion and religious sentiment revealed by the epiphaṭs of the first four centuries of the Hīdgra are contrasted with the later poverty of traditional formulas, compensated for by new tendencies such as the development of the titular description of the deceased according to new customs of society, the abundance of quotations from the Kurâ as a feature of ornamental design (as in some Iranian steles in mihrāb form from the beginning of the 6th/12th century), the progressive introduction of "literary" customs leading to an increasingly bomastic style and multiplying the occasional verses or snatches of rhythmical or assonant prose (see examples of epitaphs of Maltese or Sicilian origin).

The epigraphic decoration of the most sumptuous tombs—not always those most venerated, for popular devotion was often given to graves marked by a simple heap of stones—cannot be separated from their form, material used, nor from the other decorative elements of which it was an intrinsic and harmonious part. It is not fortuitous, for example, that a particular type of ornate inscription, associated in Syria from the 6th/12th century with artistic influences from Upper Mesopotamia, was developed on a class of tombs which were also highly specialized in origin and in the circumstances of their appearance (see J. Sauvaget, La tombe de l'Orthôide Balâk, in Ars Islamica, v (1938), 207-15; cf. J. Sauvaget, La naderâ du Jakhkārīya, spâl Les monuments aybîdes de Damas, 41-50); a number of comparable cases could be cited, especially with reference to the arched steles whose stylistic evolution was parallel to the flat mihrāb and contemporary door frames.

However, the various currents which joined forces to give rise to the curious parallelism of methods of constructing funerary monuments from one end of the Islamic world to the other cannot yet be determined with any precision and we must confine ourselves to the following observations. Firstly, it would appear that the tabular steles used "to create that which is known in Arabic as ākād, the witness" constitute the oldest type of Muslim funerary stones (cf. E. Lévi-Provençal, Inscriptîons arabes d'Espagne, xxiii), a type which is attested in Egypt from the 2nd/8th century and endured until the Ottoman era, many specimens of the latter being known. These variously carved slabs, sometimes bearing the name of jburdr or lahm, were most frequently set at one or sometimes at either end of the tombs, being classified as archaic since they are in the shape of "boxes without lids" found in backward regions and isolated rural districts.

These steles vary greatly in appearance. They may consist of double rectangular steles, rounded or disc-shaped, of moderate size and quite simple decoration, sometimes without inscriptions, as in Spain and northern Syria. They may also be single, monumental steles, frequently remarkably ornamented, sometimes with abundant and finished inscriptions; these latter may still be seen in situ at Sa'd or Aqbat, for example, and are exemplified in museums by the so-called Almerian steles of the early 6th/12th century and by a no less interesting series of Iranian slabs of the same period. At times they consist of a rectangular framework surrounding inscriptions which are incised or sculpted in relief on a hallowed ground; this is the most dominant pattern in the first centuries of the Hīdgra from Egypt to Spain. At others the central motif is the inscribed arch, single or double, around which are arranged beautifully patterned ornamental compositions; this type appears in both east and west. Yet sometimes the tabular steles give way to shafts of columns embalished with inscriptions (ṣāmiydr ẖabra and sâyyiyyat ḫabra), which predominated in cemeteries in Toledo and Kayrawân in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries and still indicate Ottoman graves, where the cylindrical stele is usually crowned by a "urban" carved in marble.

On the other hand, from the 5th/11th century scaled-down sarcophagi were also popular. These consisted of strips of stone laid in tiers or of "long, low steles of white marble forming a prism standing on a pedestal", which are often given the Maghrībi names mihrābīyya, dānumūkriyya or ẓanam, and are generally recognized as schematic imitations of the primitive pile of earth. These stones or low constructions may also be accompanied by raised slabs, a hybrid style which appears in a number of regions. Examples are the old Syrian tomb of al-Ma'ārī (cf. J. Sourdel-Thomine, Inscriptions du mausolée d'Abū l-Ālāʾ à Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, in Arabica, il (1955), 289-94) and especially the various combinations seen in the tombs of Aqbat. But in this case too there is a great diversity of shapes enabling the tombs to be allotted to different categories, limited by neither place nor period, from the earliest archaeological evidence furnished by the tomb of Subuktâk in Ghazna, most probably c. 367/977 (cf. S. Flury, Le décor épigraphique des monuments de Ghazna, in Syria, 1925, 61-90). Ayyūbid examples from Syria can be interpreted as imitations in stone of the sculptured wood cenotaphs well known elsewhere (Mesopotamian, Syrian and Egyptian examples cited by J. Sauvaget, Le cénotaphe de Saladin, in Revue des Asiatiques, vi (1929-30), 168-75, or by G. Wiet, Les inscriptions du mausolée de Shāfi'ī, in Bull. Inst. Eg., xv (1933), 167-85). Other prismatic steles are closer to the type of stepped platform identified by D. S. Rice in a papyrus preserved in Vienna and attributed to the 3rd/9th century by A. Grohmann, of which he found later representatives modelled in brick and stone-work in the miniatures accompanying many copies of al-Harîrî's Mâkâmat (cf. D. S. Rice, The oldest illustrated Arabic manuscript, in BSOAS, xxii (1959), 207-20 and fig. on p. 219). A whole new chapter could be written on the funerary stones bearing representations of animals in relief which forms part of an even more original chain of tradition. The popularity of this style in Turkey has been the subject of many studies (see the most recent, noted above).

Bibliography: in the article.

(J. Sourdel-Thomine)

In works of fiṣḥ (usually in the chapter dealing with obsequies) two problems connected with tombs are discussed. May they be decorated to a certain extent? Is it permitted to visit them? On the first point it is surprising to observe the complete unanimity of the fukāhā (no matter what school they belong to) in disapproving of all ornamentation on tombs, however...
simple it may be. To mark the site of the tomb the more lenient among them permit at the most the construction of a lowly erection of unfired brick (labbin); the use of fired brick (diggur) is firmly advised as it would be the first step towards ornamentation. This modest construction must not be rough cast (though this is permitted by the Hanafis only) and must bear no inscription relating to the deceased (paradoxically enough, Ibn Hazm allowed his name to be inscribed) nor even passages from the Korân.

It is blameworthy to build a dome or any monument whatsoever above a tomb. It is obvious that this teaching, which the jukharâb based on traditions that they traced back to the Prophet, was never respected, except in impoverished villages. In the presence of the considerable number of richly decorated tombs found in all Muslim countries, it must be admitted that there are few areas where the divorce between theory and practice was so marked. No doubt this was the result of the nature of the condemnation formulated by the legal scholars: the decoration of tombs is blameworthy, reprehensible (makrâh), but not haram, that is, categorically forbidden; this has given rise to the almost general belief that their decoration does not actually infringe religious law. The permissibility of visiting tombs (ziyarat al-kubur) was admitted very early on by the schools, including the Hanbals and Zahirîs, even went so far as to recommend the practice, while foreseeing the faithful to shun the behaviour characteristic of Christian pilgrimages (carrying candles, chanting, distributing alms).

**Bibliography:** (I)—Ibn Kudâma, Muqnû, Cairo 1368, ii, 507; Ibn Rusâd, Bidâtayn al-muqtaqâh, Cairo 1959, i, 233; Ibn Hazm, Muâllîs, Cairo 1947, v, 133; Khâlîb b. Ithâq, Muqâsasâr, tr. Bouquet, Algiers 1956, i, nos. 46 and 47; Zaylaïî, Tabyin, Cairo 1913, i, 245. (II)—Ibn Taymiyya, Fatawâ, Cairo 1936, iv, 302-6; H. Laoust, Essai sur les doctrines..., d'Abâd b. Tâmiyâ, Cairo 1939, 334-5. See also Qânânâ, Ziyâra.

(Y. LIMANT DE BELLEFONDS)

**KABRA,** in Spanish Cabra, a town in a mountainous region of Andalusia to the south-east of Cordoba, situated at an altitude of 448 m. on the slopes of the Sierra de Cabra; at present it is the centre of a partido judicial of the province of Cordoba and has a population of 20,000.

The Muslim town of Kabra, which succeeded the Roman Igburum — one of the principal cities of Baetica according to Pliny — ranked as one of the fortresses of Andalus. Colonised by the gândar of Wâsît in Irâk in the time of the governor Abu l-Khaṭṭâb al-Kalbi (125/743-127/745) under the Umayyads it was the centre of a relatively small district (kfore) which took in Ecija. A single kâdi had jurisdiction over both these towns. The bishopric of Kabra, which date from the 4th century A.D., continued to exist under the Umayyad caliphate. Some rare, and unfortunately too brief, descriptions by Arab geographers speak of the equable climate, the abundance of running water, the profusion of olive groves and the luxuriant vegetation of Muslim Kabra; they bear witness to the existence of a great mosque with three aisles and a busy street-market. Not far from the town some lead mines were worked.

Mu'âkaddâm b. Muâlut (d. 299/310/912 [q.v.]), the originator of the muwaštâhâh, was a native of Kabra. He was involved in the frontier disputes between the Castilians and the Andalusian Muslims. Habîb b. Mâksân, the Zidîr dynasty of Granada, captured it in 419-20/1029-30. Conquered by Ferdinand III (the Saint) in 641/1244, the town belonged successively to the Council of Cordoba and to the Order of Calatrava. In 1333 the Nasrid Muhammad IV seized Kabra, destroyed the ramparts and part of the castle, and sent the inhabitants to captivity in Granada. Re-populated shortly afterwards by the Master of the Order of Calatrava, Kabra subsequently reverted to the Crown of Castile. In 849/1445 Henry IV gave the town to Diego Fernandez of Cordoba in reward for his services and granted him the title of Count of Cabra.

Various remains dating from the time of the Muslim occupation, in particular a ruined castle, can still be seen in Kabra.


(R. ERIÉ)

**KABR** [see BARD (IIa), YÜKÜK, ZAKât, and SİLÂ].

**AL-KABTAWRî,** Abu l-Kâsim Kalâbî b. 'Abî al-'Azîz al-Ghâfîkî, poet and letter-writer, from the island in the Guadalquivir called Kabtawa or Kabtûra (formerly Caput Tauri, Ibn Khaldûn—Tunis in 696/1297. Subsequently he settled in Medina, d. 788/1388. His students included Ibn Sayyid al-Nasî, Ibn Djabir al-Wadiyâshî, ibn Khallî b. 'Isâfîk, ibn Taymîyya, Mukhtasar, Cairo 1326, iv, 302-6; today Isla Mayor, of the Sierra de Cabra; at present it is the centre of a partido judicial of the province of Cordoba and has a population of 20,000. The Muslim town of Kabra, which succeeded the Roman Igburum — one of the principal cities of Baetica according to Pliny — ranked as one of the fortresses of Andalus. Colonised by the gândar of Wâsît in Irâk in the time of the governor Abu l-Khaṭṭâb al-Kalbi (125/743-127/745) under the Umayyads it was the centre of a relatively small district (kfore) which took in Ecija. A single kâdi had jurisdiction over both these towns. The bishopric of Kabra, which date from the 4th century A.D., continued to exist under the Umayyad caliphate. Some rare, and unfortunately too brief, descriptions by Arab geographers speak of the equable climate, the abundance of running water, the profusion of olive groves and the luxuriant vegetation of Muslim Kabra; they bear witness to the existence of a great mosque with three aisles and a busy street-market. Not far from the town some lead mines were worked. Mu'âkaddâm b. Muâlut (d. 299/310/912 [q.v.]), the originator of the muwaštâhâh, was a native of Kabra. He was involved in the frontier disputes between the Castilians and the Andalusian Muslims. Habîb b. Mâksân, the Zidîr dynasty of Granada, captured it in 419-20/1029-30. Conquered by Ferdinand III (the Saint) in 641/1244, the town belonged successively to the Council of Cordoba and to the Order of Calatrava. In 733/1333 the Nasrid Muhammad IV seized Kabra, destroyed the ramparts and part of the castle, and sent the inhabitants to captivity in Granada. Re-populated shortly afterwards by the Master of the Order of Calatrava, Kabra subsequently reverted to the Crown of Castile. In 849/1445 Henry IV gave the town to Diego Fernandez of Cordoba in reward for his services and granted him the title of Count of Cabra.

Various remains dating from the time of the Muslim occupation, in particular a ruined castle, can still be seen in Kabra.
Marluid). From a literary point of view these letters, models of the type prevailing at the period, are characterized by affectation, sadifa, and a wealth of metaphors, antitheses and borrowings from the Kūrān and hidūk. At times the striving for literary effects transforms some sentences into punning riddles. There is one striking oddity in this correspondence: a letter addressed to the Prophet, which is a sort of panegyric expressing an ardent desire to visit him at Medina. This letter is probably the oldest of its kind still in existence, for it antedates the two known letters of Ibn al-Khaṭīb (Ṣubh al-ʿaḍīkā, vi, 459).


KĀBUL [see BAV].

KĀBUL. A river of Afghanistan and the North-West Frontier region of Pākistān, 700 km. long and rising near the Unai Pass in lat. 34° 21′ N. and long. 68° 20′ E. It receives the affluents of the Panjgūr, Aīngar, Kunār and Swat Rivers from the north, and the Lōgar from the south, and flows eastwards to the Indian plain, joining the Indus at Ataq (Attock). The Ḫudūd al-ʿSām (end of 4th/10th century) calls it the River of Lōgar, the name of the region of Lōgar and Dunpūr, passing by Nangrāhrā (sc. the Djalābād district) and running down to Multān and the ocean. Bīrūnī calls it “the River of Ghorwand”, because one of the arms of the Panjgūr River rises near the Ghorwand Pass. From these and other statements in the geographers, it is clear that the Kābul River was at this time considered as the main course of the Indus. It is probable that the Kābul River (in Sanskrit Kukhā, one of the seven rivers of the Rigvīd) gave its name to the town and eventually the town of Kābul, see below.

Bibliography: J. Humlum et al., La géographie de l’Afghanistān, étude d’un pays aride, Copenhagen 1959, 46; Pauly-Wissowa, Real Encyclopädie, Reihe 1, xi, 1961-2, s.s. Kophen, Kophes.

2. The name of a town, in eastern Afghanistan, the city of Kābul being now the capital of that kingdom. The city lies in lat. 34° 30′ N. and long. 69° 13′ E. At an altitude of 1,750-1,800 m. on the Kābul River in a fertile and well-watered plain surrounded by chains of mountains and hills. Its excellent position as a communications centre, where the route up the Kābul River valley meets the various routes across the Hindū Kush and the route from Ghaznā and the south, made it a place of importance at an early date.

In pre-Christian times, the Kābul region formed part of the Hellenized Bactrian states-system, but early in the Christian era it was overrun by invaders from the steppes to the north such as the Kushtans and Kidarites and then the Hephthalites [see ḤAYRATA]. Buddhism flourished there and in the whole of the Gandharan region, as the numerous stupas surviving in the Kābul valley attest, and as the travel narrative of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim, Hiuen-Tsang, who knew Kābul as Kao-fu, likewise shows. Yet the diffusion of cultural influences from the Hindū Gandharan kingdom, based on Udabhan-dapar or Waynīd, favoured the Indianisation of the Hephthalite rulers of Kābul and the replacement of Buddhism by Indian culture. At this period, Kābul remained the name of the whole district of the upper Kābul River valley rather than a specific town [see KĀBULISTĀN]. Hence a Muslim geographer like Yaʿqūbī, Buldān, 290-1, tr. Wiet, 106-7, gives as the chief town of the region the cryptic term Kābul-Shāh, possibly to be identified with the citadel of Kābul itself (Wiet reads these names as applying to a single place, Djarwln, following Marquart’s Djarwln in ErBdahsahr, 277-89).

The name Kābul was known to the Arabs even in pre-Islamic times. The Ẓanjān and Muḥṣarām poets (sc. those of the intermezzo between the pre-Islamic and Islamic periods) use the phrase Turk wa-Kābul as a synonym for remoteness, an Ultima Thule; see T. Kowalski, Die ältesten Erwähnungen der Türken in der arabischen Literatur, in KCSA, ii (1926-32), 38-41. However, first-hand knowledge of eastern Afghanistan came only with the expansion of the Arābs from their basins in Sīstān and at Bost eastwards into Zāmdāwar and Zābulistān [qq.v.], the territories of the Zunbils, epitome of the southern branch of the Hephthalites. These local rulers strongly resisted the Arabs for over two centuries, barring the way to the Kābul valley, and the fact that these Zunbils seem to have been related to the Kābul-Shāhs made for solidarity against the Muslim raiders.

During Muʿawīya’s caliphate, the governors of Sīstān, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Samūra and al-Raḥbā b. ‘Aṣwān, raided as far as Kābul b. Niyād, described as flowing from the mountains bordering on Langhān and Dūnūr, passing by Nangrāhrā (sc. the Djalābād district) and running down to Multān and the ocean.

The main product yielded by the raids through these inhospitable regions was, of course, slaves. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān brought back slaves captured at Kābul to his house at Baṣra, where they built for him an oratory in the Kābul architectural style (Balāḏūr, Fuṭḥ, 397). The famous Syrian masūd scholar Maḥkūm al-Din Maḥmūd, teacher of al-ʿAwaḍ (d. 1182, 736), had been captured at Kābul during the first Muslim raid there (Ibn Saʿd, vii/2, 161; Ibn Ḧabīl-ḵān, tr. iii, 437). Yet the political effects of these and subsequent raids were invariably transitory, and in ‘Abd al-Malik’s caliphate, a Muslim army under Uḥayy Allāh b. Abī Bakr suffered a grievous defeat in the Kābul region (98/697-8); it was to retrieve the Muslim position that the famous “Peacock Army” was sent out under the command of al-ʿAwaḍ [see ʿAbd al-Malik].

During the rule of the Turk-Shāh dynasty, and under al-Maʿmūn there was a further raid entailing the capture of the ruler of Kābul and his adoption of Islam. For some time under the governorship in Khurāsān of ʿAbd Allāh b. Tāhir (213/828-30/843), the Kābul-Shāh paid tribute to the Muslims in the form of 1½ million dirhams annually plus 2,000 Oḡuz Turkish slaves (Ibn ʿUṯūraḏāḏgihīb, 36).

Only under the ʿĀrifīs of Sīstān [qq.v.] was real headway made by the Muslims. Thus Yaʿqūb b. Layykh’s expedition of 256/870 via Baḏḵh to Bāmīyān, Kābul and the silver mines of Panjgūr brought about the presence of elephants and pagan idols from the Kābul valley forwarded by the ʿĀrifīs (Tabari, iii, 1841; cf. Masʿūdī, Murūdī, viii, 125-6). The Islamisation of the Kābul region progressed considerably under Alpīḏān and the Turkish settlers of Ghaznā in the later decades of the 4th/10th century; under the Ghaznawids [qq.v.], Kābul seems to have been a depot for the army’s force of elephants.
(Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids*, 116-17). It now begins to be considered as administratively within the orbit of Ghazna rather than in that of the Bāmīyān-Ghīrband area, cf. Makdisi, 297.

The geographers of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries give a somewhat vague and confused account of the Kābul region, especially since it was peripheral to the experience of most of them. Long before it became Islamised, Muslim merchants resorted to Kābul, primarily because it was an entrepôt for the products of India: in the enumeration of Ibn Khurradābīhī, 38, for inferior aloes wood, coconuts, saffron, and above all, myrobalan (āṭhīlāḏī, ḥallī-āḏī), the astringent medicament, of which a special Chebuli or Kābulī variety was distinguished (see Yule and Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson*, a *glossary of Anglo-Indian colloquial words and phrases*, 607-10, and Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, 378). Towards the beginning of the Ghaznawid period, Kābul begins to be distinguished as a town, with a mixed Muslim and Indian population (the Indians regarding Kābul as a pilgrimage centre), a strong citadel and a prosperous rabād or commercial quarter (Mūkaddasī, 304; *Huddād al-‘ilmām*, i11.

The dominance of the capitals Ghazna and then Fīrūz-kūh [q.v.], under the Ghaznavids and Ghūrids respectively, inevitably, and contemporary sources do not have a great deal to say about it at all. Such destructions of Ghazna as those of ‘Allā al-Dīn Ghūri and Timūr favoured the gradual rise once more of Kābul, although the traveller Ibn BatṬtāštīf still found there in 733/1333 a mere village, with nothing there of note save a sāʿīyā or hermitage of the Sūfī Shāykh Ismā‘īl al-‘Afgānī (*Rīhla*, iii, 89-90). After the death of Timūr (591-607, 1192), the eastern half of Afghanistan formed part of the Timurid empire, and after Timūr’s death it became an apnanage (sawrīḡdāl) for Timurid princes. Thus Abū Sa‘īd’s son Ulūgh Beg (not to be confused with the famous Timurid prince) reigned in Kābul and Ghazna from 865/1459 to 907/1507. After his death, Kābul temporarily came under the control of the Aḡhnūd Mūshagīdīs, who had married Sa‘īd’s daughter, and until in 910/1504 Bābur came from Transoxania and took over Kābul, compelling Muḥtamīn to retreat to Kandahār. Kābul now flourished under Bābur, who is eloquent in his memoirs about the climate and natural beauties of the region, its amenities and its products, and the fact that it was a mecca for trading caravans, bringing thither the products of India, China, Central Asia and Persia; and it was at Kābul that Bābur laid out numerous gardens. He made it his centre for campaigns against Kandahār and into northern India, and his successors the Mughal Emperors of India kept it firmly within the orbit of their dominions. For the first time, Kābul becomes a mint centre for gold and silver coinage, and Mughal coins were produced there down to the reign of ‘AẒīz al-Dīn Ālmagīr (652/1254-673/1765). It was to his favoured centre of Kābul that Bābur’s body was brought, in accordance with his express desire, some years after his death at Āgra in 937/1530; his tomb is now a pleasant spot on the slopes of the Shīr Dāwāzī mountain on the west side of modern Kābul (see *Bābur-nāma*, tr. Beveridge, 188 ff., 705-6).

Nādir Shāh captured the citadel of Kābul in 1557/1738, en route for his Indian campaign, but after his death in 1160/1747, the Kheīlbsāḫ garrison of Kābul yielded it up to Ahmad Shāh Durrānī of Kandahār [q.v.]. Under Ahmad’s son and successor Timūr Shāh, it became clear that the Durrānī empire in northwestern India could not be satisfactorily held from Kandahār, so Kābul became the capital. In this way began Kābul’s modern rôle as capital of Afgānīsṭān, even though at times in the 19th century the authority of the amirs of Kābul was geographically fairly circumscribed [for the history of the period, see *Afgānīsṭān*, v]. The town suffered during the first two Afgān-British Wars and the civil strife between rival members of the Sadozay and Muḥamnadzay or Bārakzay families. Thus when British forces returned to Kābul in autumn 1842, they burned the great bazaar of Kābul in retaliation for the murder of Macnaghten and the sufferings of the British forces during their retreat from Kābul at the beginning of that year. In recent decades, Kābul has expanded to a city of 435,000 people (1965 estimate), has acquired paved roads and has become a considerable industrial centre; in particular, it has expanded northwards in the Shahr-i Naw suburb towards the British Embassy and southwestwards towards the University of Kābul and King Amān Allāh’s former palace of the Dār al-‘Āmān.


(C. E. Bosworth)
KABYS B. WUSHMAGIR B. ZIYAR — KABYLIA

388-403/998 to 1012-13), fourth ruler of the Ziyarid dynasty which had been founded by Mardawlid B. Ziyar [g.v.] and which ruled in Tabaristan and Gurgan (Qjurdan). Like other families rising to prominence in the “DaylamI interlude” of Persian history, the Ziyarids endeavoured to attach themselves to the pre-Islamic Iranian past, and Kabus’s grandson KAY KABUS makes Kabus’s ancestors rulers of Gilan in the time of Kay Khusrav (Kabus-nama, Preface). As under his predecessors, suzerainty over the Caspian region and lands continued to be disputed by the Samanids in Khurasan and the Buyids of western Persia. It seems to have been support from the Buyid ‘Aqbud al-Dawla [g.v.] which enabled Kabus to succeed his brother Zahir al-Dawla Bistutan in 366/977, for the great Amur’s overlordship is acknowledged on Kabus’s first coins; it was also at this point that he received the honorific of ‘Shams al-Ma’alim’ from the Caliph at-Tahawi.

However, Kabus soon afterwards gave help to his son-in-law Fakhr al-Dawla [g.v.], the Buyid ruler of the Kurdish region of Djibal, against the latter’s brothers ‘Aqbud al-Dawla and Mu’ayyid al-Dawla. This course proved disastrous for Kabus. He lost control of much of Tabaristan by 369/979-80, and in 371/981-2 the remainder of his kingdom was in the hands of Fakhr al-Dawla returned from Nishapur and with the support of Asfarabadd, Kabus and Fakhr al-Dawla were compelled to seek refuge in Nishapur with the Samanid general Husam al-Dawla Tash. Despite Samanid aid, the two fugitives were unable to stage a revanche as long as ‘Aqbud al-Dawla lived. The Caspian region remained under Mu’ayyid al-Dawla’s control until his death in 373/984, when after a defeat at Astarabad, Kabus and his brothers Tash. Despite Samanid aid, the two fugitives were unable to stage a revanche as long as ‘Aqbud al-Dawla lived. The Caspian region remained under Mu’ayyid al-Dawla’s control until his death in 373/984, when after a defeat at Astarabad, Kabus and his brothers

Kabus agreed to abdicate in 1006-7, may still be seen outside the modern town of Gurgan [see Gunbad-i Kabos]. After Kabus’s death, the Ziyarid kingdom fell increasingly under the influence of the Ghaznavids, heirs to the Samanids in Khurasan.

Despite his reputation for cruelty, Kabus achieved a great contemporary renown as a scholar and poet in both Arabic and Persian. His long exile among the Samanids brought him into close contact with the luminaries of the brilliant Buja-shahr court culture. In the Yatimat al-dahr, Tha’alibi calls him “the seated rulers, the outstanding figure of the age, and the fountainhead of all equity and beneficence”, whilst Ibn Shuhayd, cited in Ibn Bassam’s Dhakhira, i, 202 (cf. Ch. Pellar, Ibn Shuhayd, Haydithu wa-atharhu, Amman 1966, 132), links him with Badi’ al-Zamam al-Hamadhani as the leading figures in the new wave of rhymed-prose writers. The extant Arabic works of Kabus comprise a collection of rasul and a work on adab and proverbs, but ‘Askari gives high praise to a Risala fil-istikbhar wa’il-Salib, now lost (see Brockelmann, S I, 154). Kabus was also an expert calligrapher and authority on astro-logy. As a patron of the arts, he received the dedication of verses by several of the great poets of the time, but the greatest lure in the dedication of verses by several of the great poets of the time, but the greatest lustre accruing to him came from his association with Ibn Sinaj (Avicenna), who fled from Khwarizm for refuge at Kabus’s court before going on to Rayy, and also from his association with Biruni, who came to Gurgan shortly after Kabus’s restoration in 388/998. He was named amir al-Alfar al-bahiya.


KABUS B. WUSHMAGIR B. ZIYAR — KABYLIA

KABYLIA, a mountainous region in the Algerian Tell. The word Kabyla, coined by the French, means “land of the Kabyles” (bild al-Kabili). This term is of fairly recent origin, however, for it is not found in the works of Arabic historians and geographers; it is probably of oral origin and intended for use by foreigners, i.e., Europeans; it seems to have been introduced into geographic nomenclature by European writers from the 16th century onwards. The word “Kabyle”, the etymology of which is sometimes questioned, seems to correspond to the Arabic word kabili, plural of kabila “tribe”, which certain Arabic writers used as a synonym for the Berbers. It was already employed with this meaning by the author of the Rawd al-Kirds with this meaning by the author of the Rawd al-Kirds, who, in various passages enumerating the contingents of the Marinid armies (notably pp. 217 and 238 of the Rawd al-Kirds), carefully distinguishes between the Kabylia and the Arabs.

Geography and Economy. To the plain of Mitidja a barrier of high land extends which in all probability constitutes the geological basis of North Africa, rises and forms a coastal rim, outcropping as plateaux, deeply dissected by erosion...
into long parallel projections: such are the massifs of the Arbaa, n-Ath-Iraten (formerly Fort National), Collo, and Edugh. The crystalline rocks have more recent strata, of which two are of great geographic importance: the secondary calcareous rocks were folded into long ranges spiked with peaks; the highest point of one of them, the Djurdjura, is the Lalla Kjadidja at 2,305 m.; the Djebel Babor rises to 2,004 m. The tertiary sandstones spread out in an increasingly continuous surface layer from the west to the east, and because of the nature of the soils deriving from them are forested. Near the sea, torrents plunge over the Kabylian rim, where they gouge out virtually inaccessible vertical gorges; the gorges of Palestro and Kerrata and the canyons of Rhumel have a certain grandeur.

The northern flanks of the Kabylia are exposed to the masses of humid air originating in the Atlantic, thus receiving heavy rainfalls. One of the highest annual average rainfalls in Algeria, 1,773 mm., was recorded at Bess职业在the in the Collo massif. By reason of the altitude the precipitation can take the form of snow in midwinter, even reaching the depth of one metre at the ‘Ayn al-Hammam station (formerly Michellet). Abundant humidity and the predominance of siliceous soils favour the spread of forests. Here they cover vast areas; in the main they are of oak, carpeting the middle slopes: the cork on the Numidian sandstones, the zaid (chênes liens, quercus Mirbeckii), the afares (quercus castaneafovia) and ballat or hazelnut oak. Above 1,500 m. the cedar takes over; it used to grow on the scree on the slopes of the Djurdjura. Trees are important in the everyday life of the people of Kabylia: ash trees close to their houses are used to support vines; their leaves are used as fodder for cattle in summer and the wood is used in the manufacture of agricultural tools and domestic utensils. Olives and figs, which flourish as high as 600 m. and 1,000 m. above sea level respectively, are important components of the diet of the mountain dweller.

All these geographical elements, relief, humidity, low temperatures, and forests, contribute to making the Kabylia an unproductive mountainous environment which became the refuge of a population determined to preserve its identity in the face of invaders. The Berber ethos has been maintained for centuries; it has kept its essential characteristics: its old social organization and its customs. Islam may have been accepted, but it was wholly vested with beliefs peculiar to Berber traditions. Arabic has not wholly supplanted Berber dialects, which are still in use throughout Great Kabylia.

The Kabylia mountains are closely kin to those of the western Mediterranean, their landscape bearing the imprint of the same ancient civilization. This is borne out first by the type of dwelling. In the Arbaa n-Ath-Iraten massif the village predominates: it runs along a single central street which follows the line of the ridge. Stone houses roofed with round tiles are inhabited by a group of families, the harrarba, who refer to each other as brothers; each conjugal family occupies one room divided in two by a bench: on one side the people, on the other the livestock. The rooms are arranged around a central courtyard shut off on the outside by a double wooden door. In contrast to the collective village or tyifik, which is made up of scattered hamlets. Such dwelling places, perched high up and reached by winding paths, seem to have been imposed by the concern common to the populations of the Mediterranean world for protection against the attacks of neighbours or strangers. Another possible explanation is that they meet the requirements for working a soil which is particularly difficult to utilize. Threshing floor and oil presses are installed at the entrance to the village. Under the walls of the houses the women cultivate small vegetable gardens. The slopes, rarely terraced, support groves of olive and fig trees, and fields of barley. The valley bottoms, where the wadis flow between steep banks covered with brushwood, are chilly, narrow, damp and gloomy, and it is easy to see why they remain uninhabited. The people are concentrated on the high land, moving from ridge to ridge. Where the valleys widen out into alluvial plains, the population abandons the high land, spreading out into tyifiks among the barley fields. As in Lesser Kabylia, people are occasionally so dispersed that family huts are isolated in the midst of grazing for the oxen.

The geographer will be surprised at the almost total absence of terrace agriculture and the pastoral movement of flocks which have enabled other Mediterranean mountain dwellers to turn their environment to the best account. Instead, the Kabylia works silver, copper and wood to make coarse jewellery, carved tables and engraved dishes, while his wife weaves woollen carpets and makes pottery decorated with geometrical patterns. Pedlars travel beyond the Mediterranean to sell these objects. Such ingenuity does not suffice to explain the great densities of population concentrated in such an unfavourable geographical environment: more than 140 inhabitants to the square kilometre in the major part of the Great Kabylia of Tizi Ouzou, with a maximum of 250 inhabitants in the district of Arbaa n-Ath-Iraten; between 95 and 140 in the Lesser Kabylia of Bidjâya (formerly Bougie); between 70 and 95 in the Lesser Kabylia of Collo and the districts of Skikda (formerly Philippeville) and ‘Annâba (formerly Bône). These extraordinary population densities characterize a strongly structured human environment, appearing to be an instinctive defence to ensure the survival of a population which believes itself constantly threatened.

Be that as it may, the Kabylians could not have survived in such numbers if they had been reduced to living off the produce of their mountains. To these scanty resources they added the far more abundant ones available through emigration. The massifs are reservoirs of manpower from which the plains, settled at an early date, and the developing towns tapped a supply of workers when they needed them. Algiers is in part a Kabylian city; the outskirts constitute a waiting zone where those who still dare not face the unknown of the city crowd together: Afn Taya has grown at the fastest rate, increasing from 2,910 inhabitants in 1954 to 21,906 in 1966. The urban centres of the mountains are also growing: in 12 years the population of Tizi Ouzou has risen from 6,056 to 25,852; that of Bidjâya from 29,748 to 59,991; that of Constantine from 111,315 to 240,672.

Since the beginning of the 20th century mountain dwellers from the east of Algeria have even crossed the sea to look for jobs in France and neighbouring countries. The 1966 census brings the number of emigrants living abroad who have remained in touch with their families by sending letters and money up to 268,000; according to the 1968 French census there were 612,000 natives of all regions of Algeria living in France. The two Kabylia départements of Tizi Ouzou (Great Kabylia) and Setif (Lesser Kabylia) account for 20.77% and 25.99%, i.e., over 46% of all Algerian emigrants, which represents 16.9% and
14.5% of their total populations: thus one in six of those born in Great Kabylia lives abroad. The sums (savings and allowances) remitted by workers to their families have risen annually to 900 million Algerian dinars, a currency contribution exceeding that derived from the export of wine or citrus fruit. Almost half of this income is sent to the Kabylia, whose basic resource is now their labour force of young men.

The results of emigration have not all been happy. This special environment permits emigration, further, an emigrant's settlement has been upset. Several regions in Great and Lesser Kabylia have temporarily lost 20-50% of their adult male population. Old people, women and children predominate: there are not enough workers to cultivate the fields and shrub plantations. Agriculture is reduced to gardening on the outskirts of the villages and is declining. The wasteland gains more ground each year. Goats or poultry are reared on a small scale at the expense of flocks, which are decreasing in size.

Traditional society has been disturbed, with a monetary economy supplanting the exchange of goods in kind. As food and clothes are bought from the local trader, the number of shops increases: the old pedlar has settled down. Often the standard of living has risen: foodstuffs such as sugar, tea, coffee and bread baked from wheat are becoming part of the regular diet. The return of the emigrant often brings back luxury goods like cameras and transistor radios as presents. On his lavishly celebrated arrival, he introduces new ideas, tastes and desires which transform the outlook of his people. It is difficult for a young worker from a Renault factory to accept the absolute authority of an old man whose experience owes nothing to the modern world; breaking with tradition, he leaves the paternal roof and settles with his wife and children in a more open house, equipped with chimneys. Thus conjugal families often leave the kharriba.

The Algerian government is aware of the dangers involved in emigration: if France should refuse to take in these workers, the economic and social consequences in Kabylia would be extremely grave. To put an end to this dependent state, the establishment of new jobs is envisaged in the region to help ensure their reintegration into the national economy by 1985. This goal can be reached only through large-scale industrialization of the mountain regions. For several years the number of newly-created jobs there has been increasing. The largest textile complex in Algeria, which will employ 2,200 workers, has been established in Great Kabylia at Drâ ben Khedda (formerly Mirabeau). In Lesser Kabylia, Bigjaya today is an oil port capable of handling 14 million tons a year. Further to the east Constantine has a textile factory. Skikda will soon have a huge factory producing methane. The region of Annaba, which houses the leading metallurgical complex of al-Hadjjar (formerly Duzerville), is tending to become a focal point of development, the centre to their own language and customs, resisting changes brought by Islam and French colonization.

Beyond the forested borderland of Yakouren, the Kabylia is populated by Arabic-speaking Berbers. The Lesser Kabylia of Bigjaya, comprising the lower valley of the Soummam and the Babor mountain range, is occupied by small communities who make a living by tilling the soil and raising oxen. The Kabylia Collo massif shelters wild peoples in the heart of its dense forests. Eastern Kabylia is a region of mixed agriculture and livestock. It is a region where richer agriculture and facilities for transport have allowed towns to develop; Skikda, Constantine, Annaba, Guelma and Souk Ahras are poles of attraction for the mountain dwellers.

(H. Isnard)

Ethnography. A significant proportion of the inhabitants of Kabylia, though the precise number is impossible to determine, is Berber-speaking, occupying Kabylia of the Djurdjura or Great Kabylia in particular. Although the inhabitants of Lesser Kabylia or Kabylia of the Babors are Berber-speaking to a slight degree only, Berber customs are firmly rooted among them. However, the Kabyles cannot be considered as constituting one true ethnic group, for all the evidence points to their being ethnically different, although their origins are obscure. They form part of the relative ancient, pre-Carthaginian peoples of North Africa who probably arrived from different directions, but at least some from the Maghrib. Living together for centuries in the Maghrib, they eventually built up a common civilization with a single language, which was not written down in the majority of cases and diversified into a great number of dialects with many features in common.

This essentially rural civilization has lasted until the present day in spite of historical vicissitudes and the other civilizations—Carthaginian, Roman, Arabic, Turkish and French—which confronted it. Perhaps the Kabyles became more closely attached to their ancestral way of life the humbler and more rustic they perceived it to be; at any rate, they had no wish to sacrifice it for the elaborate civilization of the Arabs, for example. That the latter has been accommodated to a greater extent than any other was the result of a long association, it is true, but also because of the numerous eastern elements in Berber civilization and the affinities established at an early date. Much has been written on the customs of the Kabyles which, generally speaking, vary from community to community. Their rule of law, which until practically the present day was hardly ever written down but was preserved in the memory of all, differs on several points, notably the disinheriting of women, from Muslim law. Under French occupation a number of customs were recorded in French for the benefit of the magistrates, and French law gradually came to modify local custom and Muslim law.

That the Kabyles have been Muslims for a very long time is certain. Perhaps they embraced Kharidjism during its greatest expansion (from the middle of the 2nd/8th century), but no information is available on this point. At the time of the French occupation it was apparent that Kabylarian society professed an Islam more pietist than dogmatic, and that numerous holy men and women were venerated in the country. Religious figures, members of religious brotherhoods, and marabouts or shaykhs enjoyed great esteem, often using their influence to settle differences arising between families or tribal groups, and had such privileges as exemption from tax. They
were almost the sole bearers of the written, that is Arabic, culture, which on the evidence of the work of Shaykh al-Warbahli (12th/13th century) was fairly rudimentary. They were however capable of teaching the basics of Arabic and a smattering of theology and Muslim law. Significant also were the religious brotherhoods, that founded by Sidi Muhammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān Abū Kābrayn (Ṣūl Kābrīn) (1126/1175-1206/1296) being by far the most important. Alongside God, the Prophet and the saints, the Kabyles believed firmly in the existence of maleficient and beneficent forces closely interwoven with man's existence.

Finally, we must consider the oral tradition in the Kabyle language, as distinct from the limited literature written in Arabic. Numerous specimens from this very rich field have been collected, transcribed and very often translated by orientalists or Kabyles. It was handed down within the framework of the family or village and subject to all the hazards inherent in a purely oral transmission. The tradition was also preserved by professionals who travelled from village to village singing the praises of God and the saints and recounting the struggles of tribes and the exploits of warriors. Others were practitioners of a more earthy, robust style. Verse was more important, for it was more easily remembered than prose, and pious, moral and humorous tales were popular. This largely unexplored treasure is in great danger of disappearing, for the young are no longer interested in such old ways.

History. It is more or less established that neither the Carthaginians nor the Romans penetrated deeply into the Kabylia block. There are significantly few Roman ruins in Djurdjura, except in some coastal settlements. Arab civilization reached Kabylia by the end of the 3rd/9th century, as evidenced by the welcome given by the Kutāma to the Fāṭimid missionary Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Shīrī, but seems to have reached Kabylia of the Djeurjura only in the shape of Islam, which was probably introduced at an early date though in superficial fashion. In fact, throughout the Middle Ages little is heard of Kabylia. It was subject to the Almohads, but we have no idea under what conditions it then came under the authority of the Hāfsids or of the Zayyānids of Tiemcen, and sometimes, for very short periods, even the Marinids of Fez. Kabylia seems rather to have survived these vicissitudes than to have played a prominent rôle, and it may be supposed that during this period of more than two centuries it was largely autonomous.

It is not until the 10th/16th century that the Kabyles, perhaps unwittingly, took an active part in the history of the Maghrib. The Barbarossa brothers, 'Arūḍi and then Khayr al-Dīn, made the Djeurjul region their first base of operations, with Algerians as their final objective. Since the Kabylarian masses constituted a screen between Djeurljul and Algiers, the Turks were forced to take account of the local inhabitants who could cut off their route, and the latter had to adopt attitudes which obviously influenced subsequent events. At that time the Kabyle peoples were divided between three powers, which Western writers called the kingdom of Kūkō, the kingdom of Lābbes (Banū 'Abbās) and the principality of the Banū Djeurljul. The last-named held sway over the tribes inhabiting the coastal zone to the east of Bigjāya. The kingdom of Lābbes was situated to the west of the Wādī 'l-Sāḥul or Sūmmān, and spread over at least part of Kabylia of the Babors; that of Kūkō stretched from Djeurljura to the sea and was served by the port of Azeffūn: in other words it included the major part of Kabylia of the Djeurljul. At the time of 'Arūḍi, the leader of Kūkō was named Ahmad b. al-Kāḍī; 'Arūḍi concluded an alliance with him, obtaining contingents of mountain fighters as reinforcements for his scantly Turkish army. During this time the Banū Djeurljul and the Banū 'Abbās usually sided with the Spaniards from Bigjāya. Under Khayr al-Dīn the scene changed: having quarrelled with him, Ibn al-Kāḍī went so far as to attack him, and played no small part in his short-lived surrender of Algiers (1520-25). The Turks then turned back towards the Banū 'Abbās and regained the upper hand. A similar state of affairs must have obtained during almost the whole of Turkish domination, with the different Kabyle groups sometimes allying themselves with the rulers of Algiers, then rebelling against them for a time, until, besieged in their mountains, they were obliged to negotiate in order to gain breathing space. Occasionally a matrimonial alliance strengthened the bonds between the Kabyles and Algiers, (the marriage of Hasan Pasha to a daughter of the king of Kūkō in 1560); often Kabyle contingents arrived to reinforce the Turkish troops (during the Turkish expedition against Morocco in 1574). This did not prevent the Kabyles from continuing their intermittent relationship with Spain nor from welcoming Christian prisoners who escaped from Algiers: it was in this way that in 1559 the chief of the Banū 'Abbās had at his disposal "a good troop of musketeers" (Halédo, Histoire des Rois d'Alger, 119) and that for about ten years, from 1598 to 1608, the leader of Kūkō maintained close relations with Phillip III of Spain, who at one point thought of taking Algiers with the help of the Kabyles (Carlos Rodríguez Joulis Saint Cyr, Felipe III y el Rey de Cuco, Madrid 1954). These vicissitudes sometimes brought in their wake internal political changes, such as the disappearance of the kingdom of Kūkō and its transformation into a federation of the Zwawā, or the birth of a new federation of the Geššālī (Iqas'dal) in the western part of the Djurdjura at the instigation of a shaykh named Gassem (Kāsim).

Right up to the end, Turkish authority remained very shaky. The theoretically subject tribes were split into two Kaidates, Boghi and Seboua plus the town of Bigjāya. To maintain law and order and to raise taxes the Kais had at their disposal several hundred janissaries, stationed at fortified posts, and troops of auxiliaries, some black ('ābūd). They intervened as little as possible in local affairs and held the country by the constant threat of a blockade which it could not withstand, for the resources brought from outside were indispensable. In addition the Turks fostered local discord and gave their support to religious personalities by helping them erect sacred buildings. On the whole Turkish rule left no bitter taste in Kabylia since it was not rigidly enforced: "In popular songs the Turk is represented as a brave, dignified character; when the poet wishes to praise one of his compatriots, he compares him to a Turk" (Hanoteau, Poesie populaire de la Kabylie du Djurdjura, 63 4, n. 3).

During the Turkish period the Kabyle populations preserved their political and administrative institutions intact. These constituted an aggregated of small republics grouped into a federation extending over a small area. The political and administrative unit was the village (shaddar), which was subdivided into groups, called adrum, tharifth, takherubt and kharruba according to locality. A collection of several
villages bound by reciprocal obligations constituted a tribe, 'arsh. At the time of the French conquest there were 1,400 villages divided among 120 tribes. A federation of several tribes was called thabhilth (Arabic kabilah). In certain cases several confederations united as a temporary measure for communal military action, but any alliance outside the tribe was very unstable.

The whole seems to have been a municipal republic subject to the authority of the citizens' assembly (thajlima'stih, Arabic dijama'stih), which had very far-reaching powers. It appointed a president (amokhrin, amghar, amin) charged with carrying out its decisions, and temmân (sing. jaman, Arabic jāmin) as his deputies, or perhaps his supervisors. The dijama'stih assessed the quota and allocation of taxes, decided on war and peace, regulated relief funds and modified local customs if the need arose. It was composed of all the male inhabitants old enough to observe the fast of Ramadan, but in reality decisions were made by an oligarchy of rich and influential men who laid down the law. The authority of the dijama'stih was limited by the respect it owed to the rights of individuals and families, and by customs in force. Tribes and confederations employed the same type of organization, but the grouping the looser the bonds of solidarity between its members. Moreover this solidarity was restricted by the existence within all the groups of sof, or parties, of whose origins and methods of functioning little is known. In short, Kabylia was made up of very small units whose relations with each other were perpetually unstable, and as the traveller al-Warthali bear witness, the country lived in a state of endemic anarchy.

Such was the situation in Kabylia when the French disembarked at Algiers in 1830. They immediately came into contact with the Kabyles, since the latter were numerous in the capital, but had no thought of occupying their country, because, for several years, they were not even sure if they would remain in Algiers. After the departure of the Turkish garrisons, Kabylia enjoyed a period of complete independence which was hardly conducive to the cohesion of the country. Nevertheless an immediate understanding was reached between the new Kabyles and the French observers, since from August 1830 onwards Bourmont contemplated establishing military units of Zwawa (Zouaves); the chequered career of these units opened on 1 October 1830.

Before the French took any real interest in the Kabyles the amir ʿAbd al-ʿKadir made approaches to them, since he considered them part of his sphere of influence as defined by the treaty of Taifa, and since he knew they were hostile to French domination. He appointed a khalifa of Sebaou, but was not recognized as sultan by the Kabyles. When Bugueaud was appointed governor-general and commander-in-chief, he was too absorbed in his struggle against ʿAbd al-ʿKadir to attend to Kabylia; this he did in 1844, when, as soon as he gained a slight reprieve, he occupied Delfy. In 1847, in spite of French government opinion, he embarked on a fresh campaign and had some successes on the periphery of the territory, but the problem of the Kabyle massif remained more or less untouched. It was only after the election in France of Prince-President Louis Napoleon Bonaparte that the Kabylies, but the most important action against the supposed qarfi Abū Bāghla opened in 1851. Following another in Kabylia of the Babor led by General de Saint Arnaud which resulted in the decisive occupation of Djidjelli.

Kabylia of the Djurdjura remained unconquered, however, and disturbances were frequent, especially at the instigation of the Rahmāniyya brotherhood. On each occasion the French reacted, finally deciding to occupy the Kabylian massif completely, under the leadership of Marshal Randon, the governor-general. After a campaign, made difficult by the nature of the terrain and the tenacity of the tribes, the latter submitted at the beginning of July 1857. In return for hostages and a war tax the Kabyl tribes secured the preservation of their municipal regime, but the great native commands which had continued to exist in the face of many vicissitudes progressively disappeared.

The two Kabylias played an active part in the 1871 insurrection, and were harshly punished by confiscation of land and heavy fines; the municipal assemblies were theoretically suppressed, but the amins of the communities were maintained; French magistrates were introduced into the Djurdjura, charged with preserving Kabyle custom. Later, from 1880 onwards, Kabylia of the Djurdjura was divided into four "communes mixtes" and four judicial districts, and for several years gallicization was pursued with a measure of success. With the agreement of his principal councilors, Jules Dumarçay then clamoured for Kabyle politics, which he considered illusory. At the time of the creation of the Financial Delegations (1898), the Kabylies provided six (four for Kabylia of the Djurdjura) out of 21 native delegates. This mark of favour was followed by a new tendency to gallicize Kabylia, especially through the schools, which were relatively well-developed in this part of Algeria. At about the same period Kabyle emigration to France began. At first it was slight, but it conformed to a very ancient Kabyle tradition and need, and increased in volume during World War I. It produced quite a considerable rush of capital into the country with the workers sending all their savings to their families.

Thus it is not surprising after that that the Kabyles took a large part in the development of the "North African Star", founded in Paris in 1926 at the instigation of the French Communist Party and largely composed of Kabyles. As this group, which from 1927 was led by Mustāhi Badjī, soon clamoured for the independence of Algeria, a number of Kabyls found themselves at the head of the Algerian independence movement, although in the country itself tradition remained strong. It was on the border of Kabylia or in Kabylia of the Babor that the 1945 Algerian insurrection broke out; like that of 1871, it was firmly punished. From 1947 onwards a small group of Kabyles under the leadership of Belkāsem Krim (Ibn al-Kāsim Karīm) decided, for political reasons, to live as outlaws: this group became the core of the 1954 revolt in Kabylia.

Individual Kabyles, like Krim, Aīt Ahmad, Bouâdiaf, Quamran, etc., played a decisive role in triggering the Algerian War, whether they were directing action on the spot or living outside Algeria and travelling the world over to promote the Algerian cause. There was even a period (1955-7) when the action undertaken in Algeria was directed by the Kabyle Ramdān Aban. The apogee of this period came in August 1956 with the Soummam Valley Congress, inspired and brought into being by Aban and Krim. Of the death of the former in 1959 little is known; the other second was one of the negotiators of the Evian Agreement, which, in March 1962, put an end to the Algerian War. Not content with providing several influential leaders, a very large part of the population of Kabylia partici-
pated in the war, and the entire population maintained silence about the movements of the members of the National Liberation Army. At the end of the war the sector of Kabylia of the Djurdjura (Wilâya III) was under the command of a Kabyle, Colonel Mofcand u l-Hâdji. After the war and the referendum instituting independence, a fierce struggle for power began in Algeria, especially between the members of the N.L.F. who arrived from abroad and certain resistance groups (Wilâya III and IV); among the latter were the Kabyles of Wilâya III, including Belkassem Krim. On several occasions (July and the end of August) they united in their mountain stronghold, and then matters were settled, at least on the surface. But the uneasiness continued, as witness the referendum and presidential election of September 1963 in which a great many abstentions were recorded in the electoral constituencies of the Djurdjura.

Not long afterwards, on 29 September 1963, Kabylia of the Djurdjura rose under the leadership of Ait Ahmed and Colonel Mofcand u l-Hâdji, seemingly on the pretext of the government's dissolution of the Socialist Forces Front, founded by Ait Ahmed. The actual hostilities were insignificant, and the Algerian Moroccans fought which broke out on October 11 was made the occasion of smoothing over the conflict; everything returned to normal after October 20, although Ait Ahmed remained underground. This general protest by the Kabyles had an important consequence: the meeting of the N.L.F. Congress of April 1964, where, for the first time since the end of the war, it was possible to speak freely in outlining a common programme for the new Algerian state. In spite of this, outrages still took place in several places in Kabylia from April to June 1964 and Kabyle participation in the legislative election of 20 September was small: 57.38% voters and an appreciable number of blank papers.

Subsequently Ait Ahmed was arrested (17 October 1964), condemned to death and reprieved (22 April 1965). Escaping on 30 April he went to swell the opposition group living outside Algeria. Belkassem Krim founded an opposition movement abroad on 15 October 1967. For the moment all this is of little consequence. On the spot, the local elections of February 1967 were still marked by a large percentage of abstentions in Kabylia. But the government of Colonel Boumedienne (Abû Madyan) has ensured that Kabylia is peaceful, and in October 1968 published an economic and social development programme for Great Kabylia, matched by a sizeable number of millions of Algerian dinars.
KABYLIA — KADA**

KADÅ (a.), originally meaning "decision", has in the Kur'ān different meanings, according to the different contexts: e.g., "doomsday" (XLV, 17; X, 93), "jurisdiction" (XXVII, 78; XXXIX, 69; XL, 20), "revelation of the truth" (XXVIII, 44) and "predestination, determination, decree" (XL, 68) (cf. E. Tyan, Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire en pays d'Islam, Leiden 1960, 65). In A Dictionary of Islam (London 1885, 479), T. F. Hughes gives the following concise definitions of the word: (1) the office of a kāfīf (q.v.), or judge; (2) the sentence of a kāfī; (3) repeating prayers to make up for having omitted them at the appointed time; (4) making up for an omission in religious duties, such as fasting, etc.; (5) the decree existing in the Divine Mind from all eternity, and the execution and declaration of a decree at the appointed time; (6) sudden death. In the EI¹, D. B. Macdonald gives as the first "technical" meaning: "the office and functioning of a judge (kāfī), although this may not be the original (first formed) conceptual sphere of the word. D. S. Margoliouth has pointed out, in refuting J. Hammer's incorrect interpretation, that had the kada? been a kur'ānic institution, the word would be found in this sense in the Kur'ān (Omar's Instructions to the Kadi, JFRS (1910), 312-3).

On the basis of the Kur'ān the word kada? can be understood as God's "eternal decision or decree" concerning all beings. It is given different interpretations, especially when contrasted with another term, kādar (see al-kada? wa-kada?), meaning "destiny, predestination". For the reason of the word's kādar, kada? is the eternal, universal and all-embracing decree of God, while kada denotes the details of His eternal, universal decree. Contrary
to the appointed time; (4) making up for an omission in religious duties, such as fasting, etc.; (5) the decree existing in the Divine Mind from all eternity, and the execution and declaration of a decree at the appointed time; (6) sudden death. In the EI¹, D. B. Macdonald gives as the first "technical" meaning: "the office and functioning of a judge (kāfī), although this may not be the original (first formed) conceptual sphere of the word. D. S. Margoliouth has pointed out, in refuting J. Hammer's incorrect interpretation, that had the kada? been a kur'ānic institution, the word would be found in this sense in the Kur'ān (Omar's Instructions to the Kadi, JFRS (1910), 312-3).

On the basis of the Kur'ān the word kada? can be understood as God's "eternal decision or decree" concerning all beings. It is given different interpretations, especially when contrasted with another term, kādar (see al-kada? wa-kada?), meaning "destiny, predestination". For the reason of the word's kādar, kada? is the eternal, universal and all-embracing decree of God, while kada denotes the details of His eternal, universal decree. Contrary
to this, al-Raghib [q.v.] interprets kadār as predes-
tination and kadā as the detailed, definite decree. 
Akhtarl (in the middle of the 10th/16th century)
may have been influenced by him when he concluded
that: "Kadār devolit-i 'aliyye deferter-i iştimal ve 
kadā anıık terdi ve takısimi mensilindendir" (Kâmas 
terjümesi, iv, Istanbul 1305/1888, 1356). He also
quotes a saying which is highly relevant to this dif-
ferration; when the caliph 'Umar on his way to
Damascus turned back for fear of plague, Abū
'Ubayya al-Dairrāb [q.v.] asked him: "Are you run-
ing away from the kadā?", to which the caliph
answered: "I am fleeing from Almighty God's 
kadā to His kadār". The meaning of this, according
to Akhtari, is that "insofar as the kadār does not 
appear in the form of kadā, there is a chance of 
averting it" (op. cit., 1356). The essential point in 
all interpretations, however, is that the kadā is the 
"decree or decision" of God that must be fulfilled in 
all circumstances. This sense of the word was related
to the neglected performance of religious duties 
(salāt, sawm [qq.v.]), which was therefore also called kadā (Th. W. Juyboll, Handbuch des islamische 
Gesetzes, Leiden 1910, 68, 122). This concept of the 
word later passed into legal terminology, so that 
kadār came to mean "purposely, by decree". (Schacht, 

As well as this, it also acquired a more important 
legal interpretation: the judgement of the kadār, 
which he could never withdraw once it had been 
uttered, was also called kadār (Schacht, op. cit., 196 
and Tyan, op. cit., 445). The kadār announced by the 
kadār was always binding while the fatwā [q.v.] given 
by the muftis was not. In forming his kadār the 
kadār could rely not only on the fatwās but also on the 
"urf, for when some local customs grew stronger, the 
"urf gained ground alongside the kadār (M. Fuad Köprüli, 
Fikhi, IA, iv, 614).

In the Ottoman empire kadār meant not only 
the judgement of the kadār but also the district which 
its administrative authority covered. The extent of the 
kadās, however, varied, for local circumstances (the 
importance of a place, density of its population, etc.) 
dictated whether a city was made a separate 
kadā or how many kadās a liwa contained. For instance, 
in 1396/1390 in Rumelia the liwa of Aladağ 
Ḥiş(ar) was divided into five kados and the liwa of 
Hersek into four; the liwa of Izzonik contained only 
one kada, while the liwa of Bosna consisted of six, 
and so on (T. Gökbelgin, XV-XVI asırlarda Edirne ve 
Papa Livası, Istanbul 1952, 8-12). The term kadār, 
denoting an administrative district, has remained in 
use in the Turkish republic.
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avar-kladar, Egne Mahtasal 1336-38/1978-20; 
O. N. Bitmen, Hukuk-i İslamiye ve Islahatlar-i 
Fikhiye Kamusu, Istanbul 1968-70; A. Gorvine, 
An outline of Turkish Provincial and Local 
Government, Ankara 1956; Kaz ve ulayet üzüründe 
bir araştırma, Ankara Univ. Sıyasal Bilgiler Fak., 
Ankara 1957. (GY. KALDY NAGY)

AL-KADAR1 WA'L-KADAR. When combined into 
one expression, these two words have the overall 
meaning, the Decree of God, both the eternal 
Decree (the most frequent meaning of kadā) and the 
Decree given existence in time (the most frequent 
sense of kadār). Other translations are possible: 
for example, kadār predetermination (usually eternal, 
but according to some schools operating within time); 
kadār, decree (usually operating within time but 
according to some schools eternal) or fate, destiny, in 
the sense of determined or fixed. It is also possible 
to use kadār alone for Decree in its broadest sense and 
define kadār more precisely as existential 
determination. The expression combining them is in 
general use and has become a kind of binary technical 
term of 'ilm al-kalām.

A.—Analysis of the terms.—1. al-kadā. The 
dictionary meaning of this is judgement, decision 
(from which comes the corresponding technical 
sense of this in the "science of law"). In 'ilm al-kalām 
(and secondly falsafa) it means a "universal" judge-
ment or divine decree operating from all eternity 
and for eternity on whatever has existence (cf. al-
Djurjâni, Ta'rifât, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 185).

The verb kadā recurs frequently in the text of the 
Kur'an, usually referring to an act of God. How-
ever in XXXIII, 36 Muhammad's name is joined to 
Him ("when God and His Prophet have resolved..."). 
On four occasions (II, 117, III, 47, XIX, 35, XL, 
68) kadā indicates the absolute power of God, free 
from any type of intermediary, allied to the single 
creative Word: "Whenever He has decreed (kadā) 
something, He says 'Be it (kun)' and it is so'. 

Understandably, in order to magnify the transcen-
dent Will of the Almighty, the Ash'arī school laid 
stress on this sovereign Decree. Two references 
will suffice: a) In the Luma (ed. and Eng. tr. by 
R. McCarthy, The Theology of Aš'ārī, Beirut 
1953, 45-6/65), al-Ash'ārī distinguishes two aspects 
of kadā. In so far as it is (realized within) creation 
(kadā), it relates as much to the true as to the false, 
to acts done in obedience to the Law as to impious 
acts. Nothing escapes it: the decree and its 
object coincide. But in so far as it is the Command 
amer of God, the Decree is simply rectitude and 
justice, for it is distinguished from that which 
is decreed.—b. Al-Bâkîlînî's Tamhîd (ed. McCarthy, 
Beirut 1957, 325-6) takes up these themes almost 
word for word, substantiating them with kūrān 
proofs. For the Aš'ārī as a whole, kadā was the 
very expression of the Divine Will. Like Will it is "an 
attribute of essence" and thus eternal. 

Those of Māturīdī tendencies, however, understood 
kadār as the bringing into being of things in time, 
and therefore as "an attribute of action". Because 
of this, the Aš'ārīs accused the Māturīdī of making 
kadār a "contingent" attribute, while the latter re-
torted that in their view "attributes of action" had 
an eternal nature and that kadār, allied not only to 
the Divine Will but also to the Prescience, was the 
eternal attribute which dictates the production of 
things, takwîn. (Cf., for example, al-Taftzânî, 
Ṣarîh al-'ashâr'id al-masâfîyya, ed. Cairo 1321, 95; 
also 'Abd al-Rahîm b. 'Ali, Nasîr al-jarî'î, ed. 
Cairo 4 n.d., 28-30).

2. al-kadar has the meaning of measure, eval-
uation, fixed limit (cf. Ibn Ḥasan, K. al-Fiqh fi-
miyl, ed. Cairo 1347, iii, 37). "God distributes widely 
and measures out (yaḥdîr) His gifts to whom He 
pleases" says the Kur'an in several places (XIII, 26, 
XVII, 30, XXVIII, 82, XXIX, 62, XXX, 37). In its 
1st and 2nd form the root k-d-r has the general sense 
of to determine, to establish, to decree. God is "He 
who established [the fate of men] (kadâr) and 
directed them on the straight road" (idem, LXXXVII, 
3). There is a great number of kadâs on the subject 
(cf. khab al-kadar in al-Bukhârî's Sahîh). The Decree 
of God "for good or evil, weal or woe", which is 
storessed by several kadîls, is presented as one of 
the articles of faith which must be explicitly professed.
In its technical sense kādār therefore designates the divine decree in so far as it sets the fixed limits for each thing, or the measure of its being. It is often practically synonymous with the maḍṣar of the 2nd form, takdīr, the act of determining or decreeing. Two of al-Djurjānî's definitions (Taʿrīfāt, 181) summarize the Aṣḥābī conception of kādār, singly and in its relationship with kadd*: "kādar: the relationship of the essential Will with things in their particular realization", and "kadd*: the passage of possible entities from non-being into being, one by one, in accordance with kādār. Kadd* pertains to pre-eternity, while kādar belongs to the present order of things".

Thus Aṣḥābī traditions stresses: a) both kādār and kadd* belong to the eternal Divine Will; and b) that the former, the determining principle of contingent entities, is no longer "an attribute of essence", like kadd*, but "an attribute of action", itself designated "contingent" by reason of its end. In al-Aṣḥābī's Luma† (ed. cit., 37-53), the chapter dealing with the Divine Decree and its relationship with men's actions is entitled al-kādar, with questions concerning kadd* forming only one rather short section. Here too the Māturīdī line relates kādar not to the Will but to the eternal Frensce and considers it (unlike kadd*) "an attribute of essence".

Right from the first century of the issue, the Decree was one of the most frequently debated. According to Nallino (Raccolta, Rome 1940, ii, 176-80), all the thinkers who centred their discussions around kādar, no matter to which tendency they belonged, were termed Kaddariyya from the outset. Yet al-Aṣḥābī, in the Iḥāba and the Luma†, intends this term to be reserved for those early trends of Tim al-Kadariyya which, affirming human free choice, were confronted with the absolute divine Decree. These are the Māturīdī, as we have seen, the precise meanings of these two terms differ, as does their relationship with one another and their relationship with the Divine Decree and man's responsibility, which latter has been seen, the precise meanings of these two terms differ, as does their relationship with one another and their relationship with the Divine Decree and attributes. Yet every time that Tim al-kalām deals with the acts of the Almighty, one of the most frequently asserted instances is the problem of kadd* and kādar. At the wish of a school or writer, it is constantly allied with conceptions of "contingent power" (kudra bātīla), the "capacity" for action (istiṣ̱ā'ā, the "acquisition" of his deeds by man (kābīr, istiṣ̱āb). In Tim al-kalām it is the very expression of the aporia of divine Omnipotence and the absolute freedom of God in comparison with freely chosen human action (istiṣ̱āyā).

It was occasionally kadd* but often kādar (or both together) which was compared with human freedom. The Aṣḥābī and Māturīdī mutakallimūn endeavoured to affirm both the existence of the Divine Decree and man's responsibility, which latter is dependent on the Decree itself, through the kābīr, the relationship, created by God, between acts and the subjects who performed them. (Cf. L. Gardet, Les grands problèmes de la théologie musulmane: Dieu et la destinée de l'homme, Paris 1967, 116-20, 128-32).

Agreeing with this, Ibn Taymiyya upheld the absolute nature of the Decree (kādar) and the human faculty of free choice, but considered it pointless and futile to resort to the conception of kābīr or istiṣ̱āb, the "acquisition" or "endorsement" of acts in R. Brunschwig's translation. (See Ibn Taymiyya, Miskāf al-Sunnā, ed. Cairo 1382/1962, i, 85-7, and R. Brunschwig, Dessein et Pouvoir, in St. Isl., xx, 40-1 and refs.). This "pragmatic" attitude is found once more among the modern salafīyya, such as

---
2. Must man give his consent (ridā) to the Decree of the Almighty? The question was clearly put by the Muḥaddiths. If every thing that exists comes under the divine kadaḍ, they said, then the acceptance of the impiety of the ungodly (an acceptance which is itself impious) is obligatory... (Cf. ʿAbd al-Diāḥār, ʿAṣār al-ʿusul al-khatima, ed. 'Uthmān, Cairo, 1342/1965, 777 ff.), which we may cite a short chapter of the Iḥšād al-ṣaṣṣa, a text of the Taḥrīr of al-Bāqillānī and the Mafāṭīḥ al-rāḥib of Fāṭḥ al-Dīn al-ṣaṣṣ al-Kurān XXXIII, 37-8 ("God's Command must be carried out", XXXIII, 37... "God's Command is an enacted Decree", ibid., 38).

This recourse to the action of the stars on human destiny—which is in no way independent of Divine Knowledge but emanates from it—and the affirmation that all that happens occurs for the good of the soul are points of view belonging to the Ismāʿīlī atmosphere of the Iḥšād al-ṣaṣṣ. Other points of reference can be found among Shiʿī scholars which, like the Fāṣalmā's conception of Providence, are always dominated by an emanistic view of the world. This is the sense in which we should understand, for example, Mulla ʿṢāda Shīrāzī's statement in his Kādāb al-Maṣṣāṣīr mentioning among the central themes of his thought "knowledge of the kadaḍ and the kadaḍr," "du Dērēt prééternel et de la Destinée" in H. Corbin's translation (Arab. and Pers. ed. and Fr. tr. by H. Corbin, Tehran 1342/1964, 5-50).

Here, in comparison, are two Sunni elaborations:

—b) "We give our consent to and acceptance of God's Decree taken as a whole and for each single thing" (Taḥrīr, 327). But what if it is a case of kufr and sin? Here al-Bāqillānī makes a distinction between kadaḍ in the aggregate and its particularization. Assent is not given to kufr, even though every thing in existence and every accomplished act come under the Divine Decree, just as child, companion, wife and partner are not ascribed to God, though all that exists belongs to Him.

c) As far as vocabulary is concerned, Fāṭḥ al-Dīn al-ṣaṣṣ al-Kurān distinguishes more clearly between kadaḍ and kadaḍr, which are both understood in the Ašḥāraī sense. Consent and acceptance are given, with no difficulty, to kadaḍ, the eternal Decree. The existentialization of existing things, one by one, belongs to kadaḍr, and here the question becomes delicate. Every Muslim must adhere to both kadaḍ and kadaḍr together, but it is difficult for the ordinary man to reconcile such an admission, which is ordained by the Law, with condemning evil and wicked deeds, as the Law also demands. The solution sought by al-ṣaṣṣ lay in extending the distinction which al-Ašḥāra had already made between kadaḍ understood as the sovereign Command of God and what is enacted in the order of creation; or, in more precise terminology, between kadaḍ, the attribute of action which determines every contingent thing, and makdār, the enacted object: it is not kadaḍ but makdār, once placed by God in being or contingent action, which can be the object of reward or punishment, of praise or blame.

After having commanded the aporta of divine Omniscience and human freedom, al-kadaḍ wa'l-kadaḍr is as it were in the centre of the problem of good and evil, and of the moral qualification of actions. Bibliography: in the text; to this may be added all the chapters on 'ilm al-kadaḍ which deal with the question, among which we can quote Fārābī and again, for example in the manuals of "set conservatism", such as those of Sanūsī of Tiemcen, Lākānī, Fūḍjārī, Bāḍūrī, etc. (L. Gardet)

KADAM SHARIF (KADAM RASUL ALLĀH). Among the miracles (muḥāṣṣātāt) popularly attributed to Muhammad was the fact that when he trod on a rock, his foot sank into the stone and left its impress there. This miracle is usually referred to along with others, e.g., that he cast no shadow, that if one of his hairs fell in the fire, it was not burnt, that flies did not settle on his clothes etc. (cf. al-Halabī, al-Sira al-Halabīyya, Būlāk, 1292, iii, 407), or that his sandals left no imprint on the sand (cf. Ibn Ḥaḍjar al-Ḥaytamī, commentary on al-Qaṣīda al-Hamāyya, 1, 176. (Ind. Off., Ms., Loth, no. 826, fol. 94). No early authority refers to such a miracle, nor any kadaḍ be quoted in connection with it, as Djalal al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī himself pointed out (see al-Halabī, loc. cit., i, 497). But sufficient evidence of this miracle is considered to be provided by the numerous impressions of one or both of the feet of the Prophet, which are venerated in different parts of the Muslim world. The most famous of these footprints is that in the Masjid al-Ṣaṣṣ, at Jerusalem, on the rock from which Muhammad mounted Burūk [q.v.] for his journey to heaven [al-Suyūṭī, Iḥāf al-Akṣīṣā fi Fādāʾ al-Maṣṣijid al-ahdā, in JRS, n.s. xix (1887), 258-9]; this footprint is on a stone separated from the Rock at the extremity of the southwest corner; Sultan Ḥaḍram ordered an iron grill inlaid with silver to be placed over it in 1918/1909 (Maḏnj al-Dīn al-Hanbalī, al-Uṣn al-gaḥūl, Būlāk 1285, 375, tr. H. Sauvaire, Histoire de Jérusalem, Paris 1876, 106).

In the ancient village of Kadam, which lies to the west of the present district of the same name in the south of Damascus, there still exists a masjīd al-kadaḍ which seems to have been connected originally with the memory of Moses then transferred to that of Muhammad; the latter's foot also left an imprint on a black stone that was carried from Hawrān and preserved in the Muḥāṣṣāt al-kadār in the desert of al-Harawī (Ziyārāt, 14/36) and today is in the library of the oratory of Sitt Rukayya (A. Talas, Mosques de Damas, Beirut 1943, 230; J. Sourdel-Thomine, in B. Él., xiv (1952-4), 76). According to popular belief, the first footprint was made by the Prophet, when he half-alofted from his camel, but was warned by the angel Gabriel that God had given him the choice between the Paradise of this world and that of the next; whereupon he relinquished his intention of entering Damascus (W. G. Paulgrave, Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia, London 1865, ii, 19).

In Cairo there are two footprints, one in a mosque called Ašḥāra al-nabī (Rev. des Trad. Pop., ix, 689), the other at the tomb of Rāḥūt Bāy [q.v.] (Badeker's Egypt, 1914, 113), who, according to Abī Ḥālān [q.v.], purchased it for the sum of 20,000 dinars; in Taṭī, there are impressions of both the feet of the Prophet, in the shrine of Sayyid Ḥaḍram al-Badawi (Rev. des Trad. Pop., xxii, 410), as also at Istanbul in the tomb of Sultan ʿAbd
al-Ḥamīd I, in the tomb of Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī [q.v.], and (six) in the Khirfca-i Șahed room of the Topkapı Palace [see șarâk] (Reşad Ekrem Koçu, Topkapı Saray, Istanbul n.d., p. 79; for a colour photograph of one of these see Kemal Çiğ, Al-ʾAnṣārī Al-Muḥaddassā, Istanbul (Tanzimat ve Tarih Materyalleri 1966, p.[9]).

Closely connected with the veneration of the footprints of Muhammad, is that paid to representations of his sandals. Copies of these are hung up in the houses of the pious, as a protection against the assaults of Satan, the evil eye, the depredations of robbers, etc.; they are also said to relieve the pang of childbirth (al-Kaššālān, al-Musâhīb al-ladunyya, Cairo 1281, i, 337). Such representations are common in Algeria, Egypt, India and Syria.


India and Pakistan: The footprints of the Prophet, whether accepted as genuine relics or fraudulently admitted as mere token representations, are accorded special veneration in India and Pakistan. One may suspect here an Islamization of an old Indian reverence for the footprints of gods and sages; the Buddha was represented symbolically by the soles of his two feet, often embellished with auspicious marks, before representations of his person appeared in Buddhist iconography; and similar representations of the footprints of the god Vīghou continue that tradition in Hindu ēfus. Literary references (bowing to or touching the feet in homage, the sanctity of the dust of the teacher’s feet, etc.) are commonplace. The accepted genuine relics may be placed in mosques, as at Gawf [see LAKHNAWTI], or be housed in special buildings, as in the Ḳadam Rasīl building at Lakhnāwī (Lucknow) whence the relics disappeared in 1857, or in the best known example, the Ḳadam Sharīf at Dihlī [q.v.], where the prints, imported from Arabia with great ceremony by Frūz Shāh b. Ṛadbī, were placed over the grave of his son Faṭḥ Khān who predeceased him in 1776/1774; here the relics are kept constantly covered by water and garlanded with marigolds, and the relic shrine, with its accompanying graveyard, is contained within a fortified enclosure.

Both relics and token representations are accorded special ceremonies at the Bābās Wafāt, i.e. 12 Rahḷ Ḳaʿ, the ʿurs of the Prophet’s death; for a description of these in India see DiyarSharīf, Khānān-ī Islām, tr. G. A. Herklots as Islam in India and ed. W. Crooke, Oxford 1921, s.v. Bābās Wafāt. (J. Burton-Page *)

**KADAR** [see al-ʾkadar ʿawʾl-kadar].

**KADARIYYA,** a name commonly used by Islamists to denote a group of theologians, not in itself homonymous, who represented in one form or another the principle of *liberum arbitrium* (free will) in the early period of Islam, from about 70/690 to the definitive consolidation of the Muʿṭazila [q.v.] at the beginning of the tenth century. In Islamic sources the notion is ambivalent; only authors of a determinist standpoint use it in the above sense (in later works the term can also refer to the Muʿṭazila). Authors of a non-determinist standpoint, on the other hand, apply it (apparently synonymously with *muḍjibna*) to defenders of divine omnipotence (the earliest examples at present are the title *Ḳiṣâb al-rādī sāḥe al-Kadariyya* of *Anbūr* b. ʿUbayy [q.v.] d. 197, 134/716, p. 597] and a passage in Ibn al-Mukaffaʾs [q.v.] d. (after?) 135/756 translation of the Middle Persian Letter of Tansar, cf. the New Persian version in Ibn Isfandiyār, Tārīḵ-i Tabbārīn, ed. Iqbal, Tehran 1954, i, 40, 4). The word was always derogatory, never applied to oneself. Even sources fundamentally of the same tendency may therefore differ as to the scope of the notion, according to the rigour of their polemical intention. Conversely it may happen that one and the same phenomenon may be described with differing terminologies in different sources (for example Kadarites are often called "Murdjiʾites" in Muʿṭazila texts, and also elsewhere). Regional differences of meaning also seem to have played a part. The term apparently arose in Ḳarḵ; previously such locutions are found in *Ḳiṣâs al-mukaddasīn* (bi-makadār) or allâghīn yahalūna Ṭādūsh were used. Cf. C. Nallino, Il nome di ʿQasasīs*, in RSO, vii (1916-18), 461 ff. (= Scritti, ii, 176 ff.). W. M. Watt, *Free Will and Predestination in early Islam,* London 1948, 48 ff.; J. van Ess in *Oriens,* xvi-xix (1965-6), 127 ff.

**Sources:** 1) Hasan al-Baʿrī’s *Kadarītī* Risāla to the caliph Abū al-Malik (ed. H. Ritter, in I, xxi (1933), 67 ff.; for the content cf. J. Oermber in JAOS, lv (1935), 138 ff., and M. Schwarz in *Oriens,* xx (1967), 15 ff.). 2) Several references in the anti-Kadarite composition (genuine?) of al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Hanāfiyya (d. c. 100/18), which we know through its refutation by the Zaydī *mādūm* al-Ḥādhī Yawbī b. al-Husayn (d. 298/1010; cf. GAS, i, 595). 3) The Risāla of the caliph ʿUmār II against a more extreme faction of Ṭādūsh (bi-makadār) or allâghīn yahalūna Ṭādūsh were used. Cf. Abū Nuʿaym, Ṣulā, v, 346 ff. (cf. GAS, i, 594; for its genuineness, A. Ṣabrīn, xii (1921), 19 ff.). 4) The heresiographical report of Ḳhushayḥ (d. 253/867), preserved in Malāṭ, Tābīnī, ed. Dederer, 126 ff. (cf. Watt, *Free Will,* 51 ff.). 5) Lists of Kadarites, mainly traditionists, in Ibn Kutayba (Maʿṣūrī, ed. ʿUkāḥa, Cairo 1960, 625, 8 ff.; repeated with several corrections and supplements, by Ibn Rusta, al-ʿAṣkāl al-mawṣūfa, BG, vii, 220, 7 ff.), in Ibn Ḥadījī (Ḥady al-sārī, Cairo 1347/1928, ii, 112 ff.), in Suyūṭī (Tadbīr al-rāwī, Cairo 1385/1966, i, 328 ff.), in Ibn al-Muṭaḍār (Ṭabarānī al-Muṭassīla, ed. Diwald-Wilzer, 133 ff.) etc.; in addition the corresponding biographical details in Ḳhāhī, Miṣḥ al-Ṭadhīl, Ibn Ḥadījī, Ṭadbīr al-taḥdīl, etc. 6) Scattered historical data, especially in Tabarī. 7) Counter-polemical in the standard collections of Ḳhādīh (e.g., the *Ḳiṣâb al-Kadar in the Ṣahīḥ of Muslim*), in the works dealing with *mawṣūla* (Ibn al-Djawi, ʿḲiṣâb al-mawṣūla, Suyūṭī, al-Ladīl al-maṣnūwa, etc.), in other books of traditionist outlook (cf., e.g., the *Ḳiṣâb al-Shārīʿa* by Abū Bakr al-Adhīrī, Cairo 1369/1950, 149 ff.; the material of the relevant chapter is obviously mainly taken from the *Ḳiṣâb al-Kadar* by Fīrābīf, cf. GAS, i, 160, and finally also in works of *adab* (e.g., Ibn ʿAbd Rabīh, Ṣṭd, ii, 376 ff.).

**Historical development:** The sources mentioned...
under 5) list 40 certain names for Basra, about fifteen for Syria, six for Mecca, five to seven for Medina, about five for Kūfa, three for Yemen, and not a single one for Egypt and the whole of the East. These figures, however, express only part of the reality; they mirror above all the variable state of our information. The interest in a biographical listing of the Kadariyya apparently arose in Basra, where the pupils of Ḥasan al-Ḵadr, and their pupils in turn, began to quarrel over the correct interpretation of his doctrine. Therefore, contemporaries were classified in accordance with a particular understanding of the idea, and for the past relevant material was most systematically collected. Elsewhere fuller information existed only for Syria, where, in the last twenty years of Umayyad rule, Kadarites played a part in history through their revolutionary activity. It is possible that in many other areas, for example in Egypt, the doctrine never became a problem. According to the nature of the information, the Kadariyya is seen in Syria primarily as a political movement; in Basra on the other hand it is viewed as a school of theology. The political argument developed from the principle that a ruler is answerable for his actions, and in the case of unrighteousness should therefore be deposed or should abdicate; the theological stance arises from the idea that one must choose between evil and good. In the consequences which were drawn from this latter interpretation, a moderate and an extreme wing can be discerned.

The earliest document of the movement is the Ṣīdāl of Ḥasan al-Ḵadr; it was certainly composed between 75/694 and 106/723, the arrival of ʿAdī al-Qādirī in 75/694, and 80/699, the beginning of the revolt of Ibn al-ʿAsīrī. From it one can see how the kadarite doctrine is again encountered in the work of a group called by Khushaysh (in Malātī, Tābābāl, Muṣṭawī, 15, 3 ff.).

 Probably two decades after Ḥasan’s Ṣīdāl, Kadariyya doctrine is again encountered in ʿIrāk in a group called by Khushaysh (in Malātī, Tābābāl, Muṣṭawī, 133, 5 ff.). Shabibiyya, the adherents of the Khāridjītes Shabīb al-Nasqānī who lived about 100/718 (cf. Asghārī, Makālāt, 300, 10 ff.; also Asghārī, Makālāt, 93, 7 ff. concerning the Maymūnīyya who seem to have borrowed from them).

This comes very close to—and is perhaps identical with—the Kadariyya “innovations” attacked by ʿUmar II (reigned 96/715—99/717), who, in his treatise preserved in Abū Nuʿaym, God knows that one will sin, but also that one could abstain from sin (ḥaḍīth; cf. Malātī, ib., and Shahrastānī, Milātī, ed. Cureton, 94, 5 ff.; also Asghārī, Makālāt, 93, 7 ff. concerning the Maymūnīyya who seem to have borrowed from them). This is confirmed by the fact that among Ḥasan’s contemporaries are found other Kadarites, all of whom could hardly have been his followers: in the Yemen Ṭabīb b. Munabbih (c. 34/655–114/732 [q.s.]), whose non-deterministic sayings (in his Ṣīr’a and in his Ṣīdāl al-Ḵadr) could not be disregarded, even in later times; in Syria the ascetic ʿAlī b. Maḥdī b. ʿAbd al-Kurayb al-Ḵalīfī, (d. between 103/722 and 108/727; a Kadarite according to Ibn Ḥarīma, Maʿṣūrī, 625, 134) and the famous jurist Makbūl b. ʿAbd al-Malik (d. perhaps 113/731; at any rate he first came to Damascus as a prisoner of war from the region of Ḳābul); in Basra itself, amongst others, the ascetic ʿAbū al-Ḥaithām ʿUṣayrā al-Ḥilālī (d. 103/722 or 104/723). In its moderate form the Kadariyya doctrine was a rule of practical piety.

The absence of earlier theoretical formulations prevents our going back beyond Ḥasan’s treatise. We are given to understand that the purport of divine predestination had been “first” discussed when, at the siege of Mecca by the troops of Yazīd I in 64/683, the Ḳaʿba caught fire (cf. Sirā Ḳalābīyā, Cairo 134/I942, 1, 185, 15), or, conversely, that Muṣṭawī was the first to justify his use of force by divine “compulsion” (dīwān al-Kaʿba al-Ḍībār, 4, 3 ff., cf. Dūḥābī, 4, 3 ff., added in addition of ʿAmr b. Saʿd, the rebel against ʿAbd al-Malik, in Tābābāl, ii, 224, 18 ff.). But these are only answers to the wrong question. There was never a point in time when ʿKadaʿ was spoken of “for the first time”; there are only particular moments at which theological solutions emerge for the first time, or become generally significant or controversial. The alleged Kadariyya beliefs of the last Sufyānīd, Muṣṭawī ʿII (reigned 64/684; cf. Makdisī, al-Budīsī, ʿIltifā, vi, 16, 13 ff. and Lammens, Etudes sur le siècle des Omeyyades, 181 ff.) probably derive from the belief that he abdicated of his own accord, not because of his early death, which was perceived to be in accordance with the political programme of the Kadariyya (cf. Lammens, Etudes, 183, 192 ff.; Wellhausen, Arabisches Reich, 106). The letter from Ḥasan b. ʿAlī (d. probably 49/669-70) to Ḥasan al-Ḵadr on the question is manifestly a forgery (cf. the determinist version in Ḥarrānī, Tabābāl al-ʿAbdī, Ṣīr’a, 135/695, 162, 8 ff., and, shorter, in ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Walīd, Tābābāl al-Ṣīdālī, ed. Tamīr, Beirut 1967, 180, 1 ff.; a Kadariyya version in Ibn al-Muʾtaṣīm, Tābābāl al-Muṣṭawīk, 13, 5 ff.).
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him: 'Umar b. Hāni' al-安卓, who in 273/74-5 was put to death on the orders of Marwān II on account of his participation in Yazid III’s revolt against Walid II, was governor of Batanaea and Ḥawrān under 'Umar (cf. Buḫdhār, Taʾrīḵ habīr, ii/2, 335), and Ghiyān al-Dimāqī [q.v.], whose critical opinions he knew throughout (cf. Ghiyān’s Risāla to him in Ibn al-Murtadā, Taḥdīr al-Wusāsia, 25, 9 ff.) was in this time actively in the financial administration (cf. i. ‘Abdāb in al-Abbādī, ix (1956), 329 after Baladhurī, and Ibn al-Murtadā, Taḥdīrī, 26, 9). It was known that the Kadārites were not conformists; several of them had taken part in the revolt of Ibn al-Asbāḥī, and Maʿbad al-Dhuhānī, a friend of Ḥasan al-exaoīrī, was executed for this reason under ‘Abd al-Malik.

But Ghiyānī was the first to develop a political programme, not indeed under ‘Umar II, but first under Hīšām, when ‘Umar’s measures to give the same to the Kādārīyya in the direction of freedom of action (cf. Taḥdīr Taʾrīḵ Dimāqī, iii, 177, 11 ff., and Dāhābī, Taḏkīrat al-Sūfīyā, Hyderabad 1955, i, 147, 3 f.).

Walid II kept up Hīšām’s anti-Kadārīyya policy (cf. Taḥbīrī, ii, 1777, 15 ff.). Yazid III, on the other hand, took over Ghiyān’s political programme in his declaration from Damascus when he proclaimed the revolt against Walid (cf. Taḥbīrī, ii, 1835, 6 ff., etc.). Therefore his supporters are called Ghiyānīyūs, and often also Kadārites. The latter is perhaps precipitate; it is not always easy to decide whether those who took up this position because of the political programme were also Kadārites in the theological sense. Many of them were Kābbītīs, particularly from Mīzā near Damascus; thanks to the political development by which the Kābīs saw themselves increasingly neglected in favour of the Kāddfīs, the former māsādī party now received support from the indigenous Arabs. After Yazid’s premature death, the hopes of the Kadārites were transferred to his brother Ibrāhīm; when the latter capitulated before Marwān II they were again persecuted (cf. Marwān’s letter in Taḥbīrī, ii, 1831, 7 ff.). The names of several traditionists who took up a position in favour of Yazid III are known to us; with the assumption of power by Marwān, they had to flee to Syria, one of them being killed at the instigation of the caliph (cf. in detail in Ess in Stud. Isi., xxxi, 1970, 277 f.). With that the political role of the Kadārīyya was played out; it remained confined to Syria.

In Baṣra, apparently, the movement remained confined to personal statements: ‘Amr b. ‘Ubaydī is mentioned (cf. Ibn al-Murtadā, Taḥbātī, 120, 12 ff., and Shahrastānī, Miṣlīn, 17, 15); his “orthodox” opponent ‘Ayyūb al-Saḥḥīfīyī censured it (cf. ‘Aḥānī vii, vii, 82, 10 f.). The political development in the town proceeded differently (cf. Caetani, Chronographia, 1591). The quietistic Kadārīyya in the style of Ḥasan al-exaoīrī was continued by his pupil Kāṭābī d. Dīnā (d. 1177/755) and henceforth predominant. Militant characters, especially refugees from Syria, were finally integrated with the arrival of the ‘Abbāṣīds. Instead, theological antagonisms intensified. For a long time there survived a moderate wing, which, following Ḥasan and Kāṭābī, exempted sin from predestination, and obviously derived its argumentation from kūrānic exegesis; it was represented among the muḥaddithūn and others by Saʿdī b. ‘Abī Ṭabīb al-ʿAlawī (d. 136/753) and his school, Hīšām b. ‘Abī Allāh al-Dastuwayī (d. 153/770 or 154/771) with his son Muḥammad b. ʿAbī al-ṣaḥābī b. ʿAbī al-Adawī (d. 156/773) and his school, Hīšām b. Aḥānī b. ‘Abī Allāh al-Dastuwayī (d. 153/770 or 154/771) and his son Muḥammad b. Sālim b. Miskīn al-Namari (d. 164/778), Abū Hālīl Muḥammad b. Sulaym al-Rasībī (d. 167/784), Abū ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. Ṭāḥfād (d. 204/820 or 205/821-2) and, furthermore, by numerous ascetics and ṭawhīdīs, whose names we learn particularly from Ibn al-Murtadā, Taḥdīrī, and certainly by many others in whose deeds the authors of lists of Kadārites have no interest (cf., e.g., for the grammarians of Baṣra, Ṭawḥīdī, Ṣawdāʾīrī, ed. Kaylanī, iii, 592, 8 f.; Kīfī, Inbāb al-ruwādī, ed. Abū ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn ʿAbd al-Muʿtāzī, al-Baṣrī, (d. 180/796), perhaps also the Kāddfīs. They took as their starting point divine justice in—
Instead of human "freedom to do evil": God must keep His word (cf. the anecdote in van Ess, *Traditionistische Polemik gegen ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd*, Beirut 1967, 31 ff.; wa’d here still covers the later Mu’tazill wa’d wa-wa’id); a takhīl bimāl lā yuṣfik is impossible (cf. Tawhīdī, *Baṣāʾir*, iii, 223, 1 ff.). Here, too, the consequences for kūr’ānic exegesis are for the moment in the forefront: verses of the Kūrūn in which someone is explicitly given over to damnation (cf. Sūra LXXIV, 10; for Abū ʿUbayd’s lectures (cf. on his circle Dhāhahbī, *Mīzān*, ii, 515, 10 f.); one of his adherents, Zakariyya b. ʿIshākh al-Makkī, was banned from lecturing on account of his doctrine (at the time of Ḥishām or Marwān II? cf. Ibn Ḥadjar, *Tahārī*, iii, 329, 7 f.). In Medina several Kadarīyya obviously supported the revolt of Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakriyya (145/652; cf. Madelung, *Qāsim ibn ʿIbrāhīm*, 72 f.); that there were still Kadarīyya in the town at the time of the Caliph al-Mahdī, to be precise during the governorship of Dāʾīṣār b. Sulaymān b. Ἂ (All 160/777-166/783), is testified by an account in Ṭabarī (iii, 534, 11 ff.). In the ši’īite circles of Medina and Kūfah opinions about the problem were divided: Ḥasān b. Muḥammand b. al-Hanafiyya (d. c. 100/718) had been a supporter of predestination, and so too were the immediate disciples of Zayd b. Ἂ (fell 122/710) as he himself was probably a supporter of predestination (cf. Madelung, *Qāsim ibn ʿIbrāhīm*, 55 ff.); otherwise they frequently steered a middle course, which while coming near to that of the moderate Kadarīyya did not give anyone occasion to call them Kadarīyya (the formula: lā ḍjab wa-lā taʾfalad). The term taʾwil was almost always rejected or at least avoided (cf. the otherwise rather contradictory sayings of the ḫalīms in Kūhlin, *Kifṭ, Tehran 1334/1955*, i, 150 ff.). Here there was no necessity for a political Kadarīyya, since the ḫalīms had their own political motivations to offer.

Occasionally in polemic the Kadarīyya doctrine was attributed to Christian influence (in fact much more rarely than one would expect; the Ḥadīthīs speak of the "Magians" instead of the "Christians" of this community). This was expressed in the anecdote that ʿAbd b. Ḫujāna al-Ḥasān b. Iṣḥāq, the "first" Kadarīyya, had taken over from an (earliest) Christian: Ṣanḥūya, the husband of Umm Mūsā (cf. Ibn Saʿād, *Ṭabāhāt*, vii/2, 27, 1 ff., perhaps a former concubine of Ἂ (cf. Dhāhahbī, *Mīzān*, no. 11036), or from Abū Yūnūs Ṣansūya al-Usfūrī, who perhaps was the same person (cf. Makrīzī, *Khiṭīṣ*, iv, 181-6 f.), or a certain Ṣūnān (cf. Dhāhahbī, *Ṭabāhāt*, iii, 305, 14 f. etc.). The theological relationship is in fact unmistakable: for John of Damascus sin arises ἀν τῆς ἡμετέρας ῥεμπρομας καὶ τῆς διαβολοῦ πανουργίας (Migne, *PG*, 94, 1589), and in that respect he takes his place in a tradition for which we already find models in Efrem and Theodore of Mopsuestia (cf. e.g., representatives in the *Vööbus, History of the School of Nīṣibīn*, 2nd ed.). Ḥayyān al-Dimāgḥī, as a mašūla of Coptic origin, built upon Christian ideas (cf. Madelung, *Qāsim ibn ʿIbrāhīm*, 239, and M. S. Seale, *Muslim Theology*, 18 ff.). The Ḫārijī judge of the Shābībiyya came from Nāṯrān, the Christian centre of the Arabian peninsula. But it must not be concluded from that that the Kadarīyya had been engendered by Christian polemic against Muslim predestination (as in the thesis of C. H. Becker, *Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung*, in ZA, xxvi (1921), 175 ff. = *Islamstudien*, i, 432 ff., especially p. 441; cf. against the argument of W. M. Watt, *Free Will*, 58, n. 27, and the counterargument of W. Thomson in *MW*, xl (1950), 209). Predestination is "earlier" only in the sense that it is strongly connected with certain dichotomies (cf. H. R. Ringgren, *Studier i arabiskt falsam*, Upsala 1951, passim, especially 116 ff.; in the Kūrūn determinist and non-determinist sayings stand side by side, on the basis of the idea of a personal God (cf. Watt, *Free Will*, 12 ff.). There was nothing to prevent Muslim neo-plutists, at least after the conquest of Syria (cf. Subkī, *Ṭabāhāt al-Ḥadīthīyya*, i, 50, 4 ff.), from naively solving the theological problem posed by the ambiguity of the Scriptures with categories familiar to themselves; we have no evidence to show that at the time this was thought strange or un-Islamic. How far
the interdependence of the two religions could go is best shown by the well-known argument based on the child born of adultery. Christian theologians have from the earliest times cited adultery as an example of the sins that man may not ascribe to God (cf. the Nestorian Bâbâi in Vööbus, School of Nîsibis, 260), and the Kadarites said the same thing later (cf. Laoust, La profession de foi d'Ibn Bâjja, 92, n. 1). Muslim determinists counter with the question, inspired by the Kur'an, who then created the focus engendered by adultery, in the mother’s womb? (cf. Sûrâ XCVI, 3; XXII, 5 etc.). To that question Hasan al-Bâṣîfi (cf. Schwarz in Orientis, xx (1967), 19) and, diverging somewhat, John of Damascus a generation later (cf. Becker in Islam- studien, i, 440, and G. C. Anawati in L’Oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà, Rome 1964, 542 f.) provide an answer; the latter’s argument agrees with the Kadarite position reported in Khûhâysh (in Malajj, Tamthil, 134, 8 f.). John of Damascus was active in Damascus at the time of Hîshâm; when he as a Christian assailed the predominant Islamic belief of his time, it was natural for him to use the same arguments as the Kadarites. Only later, when, as a result of the internal development of Islam, the Kadariyya was forced from a moderate to an extreme position, did this plausible but accidental “aliens” cause offence.


KADÂSA (الکادسی), a neologism of comparatively recent creation, generally understood in the sense of holiness. The word does not occur either in the Kur’ân or in hadîth, and the LA ignores it. On the other hand, the root k-d-s is well known to the Arab lexicographers; the Kur’ân (II, 30, 87, 253; V, 21, 110; XVI, 102; XX, 72; LIX, 23; LXXI, 1; LXIX, 161) and hadîth (Wensink, Concordance) use it sporadically. Basically, it is used to denote beings and objects that are pure, wholly unsullied or in touch with the divine.

This religious meaning seems to be alien to Arabic and borrowed from Aramaic (A. Jeffery, The foreign vocabulary of the Qur’ân, 1938, 232; however, cf. Lagrange, Études sur les religions sémitiques, 1905, 145 n. 7, where the religious meaning is regarded as original in Arabic). But the borrowing would have taken place before Islam, as might be concluded from a verse of Isra’il al-Rays who speaks of the garment of a pilgrim to Jerusalem (musktaddîs) torn to pieces by the children (LA, root k-ds).

As a manifestation of purity, kadâsâ is not merely the negation of impurity, magâsa, it is also its antonym. It does not indeed signify the absence of any impure element in persons and things, a condition denoted by fahrâ, in the current sense of the word; it implies also the presence in them of supernatural forces, of celestial origin, which might make them dangerous to the profane. Nevertheless, with the help of certain precautions it would be possible to approach them: “I am thy Lord”, said Allah to Moses, “take off thy sandals for thou art in the sacred (musktaddîs) valley of Tuwa” (Kur’ân, XX, 12).

In the ethnological meaning of the word, kadâsâ represents the positive pole of the sacred, harâm. This last word is applied in fact to everything that is forbidden to the profane and separated from the rest of the world. The cause of this prohibition could be either impurity (temporary or intrinsic) or holiness, which is a permanent state of sublime purity. kadâsâ, in short, is merely the manner of existence of what is pure and sacred, that is to say of the divine, of that which contains a divine breath, of that which is the immanence of divinity, in touch with it or rightfully belonging to it. In its ordinary manifestations, it takes the form of baraka.

Bibliography: The sacred has been the subject of a very large number of studies which cannot be listed here. Some bibliographical outlines on this question will be found in J. Chelhod, Les structures du sacré chez les Arabes, Paris 1964, ch. 1. (J. CHELHOD)

KADDûR AL-ÂLAMI, the name by which is known the famous Moroccan popular poet, ‘Aab al-Kadîr b. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘AbÎ-‘Kâsim al-Irûfî al-Âlami, al-Hamdânî al-‘Âlami, ‘Aab al-Sâlim b. ‘Abî-‘Ali al-Sâlimî, Abd al-Rahmân, al-Mawlay al-Wazzânî, Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Šîkilî, and other eminent masters of his time. He gained numerous disciples no less famous, amongst whom were the Sultan Mawlây ‘Abî al-Rahmân, Muhammad b. ‘Abî al-Hafiz al-Dabbâgh, the imâm Muhammad Şâhî al-Râdiî, al-Ârabî b. al-Sâwî al-Šarkî and Muhammad Gharrît. Sayyîd Kaddûr al-Âlami, although unable to read or write, composed poems in the neo-classical and popular language, with astonishing skill and eloquence. These poems, which were long believed to have largely disappeared, or to have been burnt according to his wishes, have fortunately survived. Whether they were composed in sajjîl or in mahâmîn, almost all deal with the glorification of God, the praise of the Prophet, and of the saints and important people of Islam. As for wine, beauty and love, of which they sing, these are to be interpreted allegorically, recalling thereby the mystical works of Ibn al-Fârîd and Ibn al-Ârabî. The poem which had the most success is the one devoted to the saints of Meknes, and which begins thus: dhî man išrâlhum a râjîl Mkhâsa? mskhâ dârî fî hmâhum yâ hî lhrâyûm’ About four years before his death, which took place at Meknes on 25 Ramadan 1266/4 August 1850, he went into a trance, and never again set foot in the Djimi al-Zaytuna, where he had been accustomed to perform the Friday prayer.
He is said to have lived 112 hijra years, i.e., 109 Gregorian years, which would give as the date of his birth 1154/1741.


**KADDÎR AL-DIZZÂ'IRI.** Of Tunisian ancestry, but settled in Algeria, Aûb 'Abd Allâh Muhammâb b. Sa'd was, like his father, Sa'd b. Ibrâhîm (d. Shîbâl 1066 [July-Aug. 1656]), the most learned man and greatest mujtâdî of Algeria of his time. Amongst his most brilliant disciples was Abu 'l-Kâsim Muhammâb Ibn Zakûr al-Fâsî, to whom he was the last to grant an idjâda (beginning of Radjab 1094/26 June 1683). He died at Algiers on 15 Dhû 'l-Hijjâda 1098/12 Oct. 1687.

**Bibliography:** E. Lîvi-Provençal, Chorfa, 288 and n. 5; Kâdirî, Naçzîghi, ii, 93; idem, Ilhâbâl, fol. 40r; idem, al-Naşrî al-hâfizî, ii, fol. 148r; Joachim de Gonzalez, Essai chron. sur les Mus. célèbres de la ville d'Alger, ii, 191; Nañâwî, Ta'īrîf al-kâflîs bi-rîqâjî al-salâf, ii, 382.

**KADHF (A.), slanderous accusation of fornication (sinâd [q.v.]), or of illegitimate descent;** in this latter case, it amounts to accusing the mother of fornication. The guilty party is punished by a fixed penalty (kâdhî) of 80 lashes, laid down by the Kur'ân (XXIV, 4). A slave guilty of the same crime therefore receives only 40 lashes, on account of the general principles of fiqh. According to the majority of fiqhîs, kâdhî only occurs if the expressions used by the slanderer expressly relate to the fornication or illegitimate descent of the person who is slandered. The Malikîs alone consider as kâdhî an accusation expressed by allusion (ta'îrid) or by preterition, which considerably extends the scope of the crime amongst them. It is necessary to make clear at once that if, on account of the very restrictive interpretation put upon kâdhî by the majority of schools, certain slanderous accusations are not of a kind to warrant punishment by the kur'ânîc penalty, the judge may in such a case, by virtue of his discretionary powers (ta'îsr [q.v.]), inflict on the guilty party another penalty less than the kur'ânîc kâdhî (but in Malikî law it may be greater).

Any person having attained puberty and being in possession of his reason, whether he be slave or free, Muslim or not, may be punished for committing kâdhî. The only ones to escape, apart from those who can produce four witnesses to prove the truthfulness of their statements, are the progenitors (except in the Malikî school which admits no exceptions) and the husband if, after formulating an accusation of adultery against his wife, he has recourse to the procedure of isâm [q.v.]. But, on the other hand, kâdhî in the technical sense only occurs if the slandered person is muhsân. This expression in the context of kâdhî (unlike that of sinâd) can only be applied to a person who has reached puberty (except in Malikî law, which protects even people below the age of puberty against the accusation of illegitimate descent, for example); this person, being in the possession of reason, must, moreover, be free, Muslim, and have no previous conviction for fornication. If the slandered person lacks one of the qualities set out above, the author of the crime may only be given a punishment by ta'îsr, and not by the kur'ânîc kâdhî. The slandered person need not be alive at the time of the action; all his heirs, according to the majority of the fiqhîs, or certain of them (according to the minority), may instigate a court action to punish for the kâdhî if the dc cujus had not done it in his lifetime.

**Bibliography:** All the works of fiqh include a chapter on kâdhî. See, for example, Kâsûnî, Badâ'î al-sanâ'î, Cairo 1327, xvii, 40-65; Khâlî b. Išâkî, Mûkalâsîr, tr. Bousquet, Algiers 1964, iv, 50-1. For comparisons between schools: Ahmad Fâlî Bahnâsî, al-Dârâmîs fi 'l-fîsh al-islâmî, Cairo 1959, 125 ff.; L. Bercher, Les Délits et les peines de droit commun prévus par le Coran, Tunis 1926, 119-28; J. Schacht, An Introduction to Islamic Law, Oxford 1964, 179.

(Y. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS) **KÂDI (A.), "judge", a representative of authority, invested with the power of jurisdiction (kâdashî).** In theory, the head of the community, the caliph, is the holder of all powers; like all other state officials, the kâdi is therefore a delegate (na'âbî) — direct, if appointed by the Caliph in person, and indirect and in varying degrees according to the situation if nominated by intermediate representatives (tezzîr, governor of a province, etc.). But in all cases the delegate retains the power to do justice in person (the principle of "retained justice.")

There is a kâdi in the capital and a kâdi in the leading town of each of the great territorial divisions. But each of these can appoint direct delegates. The kâdi's justice has always been exercised by a single kâdi. At the most he may be instructed to consult qualified jurists (ghariî). In the Muslim West, particularly in Spain, this practice was even elevated into a system; alongside each kâdi was a consilium of jurists, whose role was purely consultative. The collegiate system was applied only in the extraordinarily justiciable of the mazâlim [q.v.]. Moreover, there were no degrees of jurisdiction; every kâdi, although delegated by another, pronounced judgement without appeal, apart from recourse to the mazâlim.

The objective being the application of the sharî'ah, which is essentially religious law, the function of the kâdi is of this same character.

In theory, the competence of the kâdi is general, embracing both civil and penal cases. The religious nature of his office has led to the acquisition of administrative functions of the same nature, such as the administration of mosques and wafrfs [q.v.]. However, his competence in penal matters is extremely limited; being responsible for enforcing the sharî'ah, he is restricted solely to the very few crimes envisaged by that law, while their repression is currently undertaken by the shurja [q.v.], the organiser responsible for enforcing the public order. In fact, it is this organism which undertakes repressive jurisdiction in general, a function which it fulfills officially, and outside the constraints and limitations of the sharî'ah (the discretionary punishment of crimes).

In those Islamic states — such as the Ottomâni empire — which in the middle of the 19th century set out to modernize their structure, the office of kâdi had been maintained until that time. Thereafter, it has survived only within the limited sphere of personal status and certain other specialised questions (inheritance, wafrfs).

The institution of the kâdashî al-khâdî (the holders'
The kādi 'l-dījamā'a. In its origins, the institution of the kādi 'l-dījamā'a of Muslim Spain differs considerably from the kādi 'l-budāt of the East. At that time it was merely a matter of a new title which Ābd al-Rahmān gave, between 1358/755 and 1414/788, to the kādi of the Spanish territory already conquered, until then known as kādi 'l-dījund (kādi of the military district). No doubt it was to indicate that the territory over which he had just asserted his independent authority was no longer merely a province of the Caliphate, that Ābd al-Rahmān rejected the old name; and moreover that, in place of dījund, he substituted the term dījamā'a (community of Muslims), both to signify that henceforward he was the sole legitimate authority of the Muslim world, and also as a mark of distinction from the judges of the native populations, the vast majority of whom remained strangers to Islam. Thus, in the particular circumstances, it was not a question of borrowing some foreign institution; nor was it a matter of new duties coming to be added to the jurisdictional function, properly speaking. Moreover, the term dījamā'a had already been in use for a long time, in Arabo-Muslim circles, to denote the holder of an office concerned with these circles, when the Muslim were still in a minority. Thus, the judge of the group of Muslims at the battle of Yarmūk (15/636) had been called kādi 'l-dījamā'a. However, by reason of the general conditions under which he had to perform his duties, the new kādi 'l-dījamā'a, a confidant of the sovereign who for his part was absorbed by his other occupations, was naturally bound to play the part of counsellor to the sovereign, as far as judicial administration was concerned.

Having once started upon this path, the institution was not slow to coincide with the kādi 'l-budāt. Moreover, at some period after the 3rd/9th century which cannot however be defined more precisely, it is known that the kādi 'l-dījamā'a directly exercised powers of judicial administration and nominated provincial kādīs. From the beginning of the 5th/11th century, the name kādi 'l-budāt was applied indiscriminately to the kādi 'l-dījamā'a. Moreover, as was the case in the East, the small kingdoms which came into being as a result of the decline of the Umayyad Caliphate showed their independence by each creating on its own account the office of kādi 'l-dījamā'a, also called kādi 'l-budāt. It should be added that the institution did not remain peculiar to Muslim Spain, but became general throughout the Muslim West.

Ottoman Empire. According to the Turkish chronicles the appointment of the first kādi can be related to the events that made 'Othmān independent. Karadžić was occupied as early as about 1290 A.D., but 'Othmān did not appoint a kādi there until around 1300; it was then that the fāthib Dursun, who became jointly kādi and kādī̂b, first read the khutba (q.v.) in the name of 'Othmān as the sign of sovereignty (Ashkhabād, German tr., ed. R. Kreutel, 39-40; Neghr, ed. F. R. Unat, 108-10). With the expansion of the Ottoman empire the number of the bādis increased so quickly that a new office soon had to be set up to supervise them. Therefore when Murad I appointed the first kādi 'askar (q.v.) in Bursa around 764/1363, he put him in charge not only of the military jurisdiction but also of the supervision of the bādis.

The bādis were already paid under 'Othmān (Neghr, op. cit., 186) but the amount was so inconsiderable that Bayazid—although he was on the point of punishing them severely for corruption—on discovering this, ordered that they should be given two per cent of every inheritance and two akbes for each written document (Ashkhabād, op. cit., 104 and Neghr, op. cit., 338). Their salary was reviewed on later occasions, and according to Mehmed II's code they were authorized to receive seven akbes for a sidjidet (record), 12 for a copy of the sidjidet, 32 for a hādisidet (certificate), 12 for their signature, 30 akbes on the marriage of a maiden and 15 on that of a widow, and two per cent of every inheritance. Besides this, they also received a daily allowance, fixed at between 10 and 500 akbes in the time of Mehmed II.

The district of which a kādi had jurisdiction was called a kādī̂ (q.v.) or kādī̂b, consisting of one or more nākīyeh (q.v.). According to the event of the kādī̂, the bādis had a certain number of deputies, called nākīyeh (q.v.). Next in rank to the bādis of the kādī̂b was the kādī̂iŝ (of the inland lands), then the eydletis (q.v.). The bādis districts of the larger or more important places were called mevleviyets (q.v.). In the 9th/15th century the districts of the bādis in Istanbul, Edirne, Bursa, Salonik, Filibe and Sofia were mevleviyets; their number increased greatly as the empire expanded.

The bādis were appointed by the kādi 'askar if their daily allowance was less than 150 akbes; otherwise their appointment was proposed to the sultan by the grand vizier, on the basis of the kādi 'askar's opinion. From the end of the 10th/16th century, however, the increased influence of the ālīsh al-Islām (q.v.) was reflected in the appointment of the bādis. The latter were appointed to the bādis for 20 months and to the mevleviyets for one year, and after the expiry of their term they became unpaid ex-office-holders (ma'sūl bādis) until their term came round again. In the meantime, the number of the free schools, supported by the waṛf (q.v.) (religious foundations) increased so much that in the reign of Sulaymān I the number of applicants for the offices greatly exceeded the number of the posts available in the empire. Therefore from 965/1557 on, on the advice of the grand muftī Abu 'l-Su'ūd, all who graduated from higher schools and passed their final examination were officially listed in order that they would be granted posts in due course. At the beginning of the 11th/17th century there were ten applicants waiting for one kādi post to fall vacant (Koči Bey Rıseteli, ed. A. A. Aksu̇, 108). The ma'sūl system which resulted reduced not only the bādis but all the functionaries to idleness, thus affecting basically the whole administration of the Ottoman empire.

Only after the tausımāt (q.v.) was it decided that beside officials of higher ranks (e.g., the bādis of Istanbul) every ex-office-holder should receive according to his merits a half, a third or a quarter of his pay while he was unemployed. This system was called ma'sūliyet ma'sūlî.

The authority of the bādis covered such a large area of responsibility that the full meaning of the title cannot be accurately rendered by the word "judge". Besides the legal matters, they held confidential posts to which they were appointed by the government, which expected them to report from time to time on the activities of high ranking officials, the general situation and the mood of the people. They had to see that craftsmen were attached to the army before it set off to war, that roads were safe, and that goods needed for domestic consumption were not exported. As well as this they had to supervise the public affairs of the cities, the suitability of buildings, the quality of goods and their prices. They were also responsible for seeing that foodstuffs were sold at officially fixed prices and the devshirme (q.v.) conducted properly. They were important as public notaries; their function was to issue different kinds of certificates and documents concerning sales, contracts, loans and the occasional manumission of slaves, to attest private and public documents, and to supervise the accounts of the waṛf incomes and endorse them with an authentication clause.

This extended authority of the bādis was restricted in the 19th century by the endeavours of reformers, and after the proclamation of the Turkish republic the very title was abolished. Thus the institution became a thing of the past, but the vast written material pertaining to it is of great interest to historians. The bādis recorded in their sidjidets the directives of the central government and the judicial and notarial affairs brought before them and these records are one of the most valuable sources of Turkish history.


KĀDI 'ASKAR (A.), "judge of the army". The first data relating to the institution of the bādis 'askar date from the 2nd/8th century: Kindl mentions that after Şalih b. 'All had become the governor of Egypt (c. 132/750), he organized a military expedition and appointed a judge over each unit of his army (E. Tyan, Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire en pays d'Islam, ii, Leiden 1960, 529-30). In the Ayūbid state the office of the kādi 'askar (i.e., bādis 'askar) first came into being in Saladin's time (1178-93) (İ. H. Uzunçarşı, Osmanlı devleti teşkilâtı, 375).
In the Ottoman empire Murād I appointed the first kādi 'asker in Bursa in 765/1363, with authority for military jurisdiction and also supervisory powers over all kādīs. Later, in 886/1481, Mehmed II established a second office of kādi 'asker with the wide range of functions, thereby dividing the empire into two parts each containing a kādi 'asker, one for Anatolia and the other for Rumelia; the latter was the more important of the two. As a result of further conquests, in 922/1516 Selim I set up a third kādi 'asker office in Diyarbekir with the title Ṭārīkh ve ʿAjdīm ṭārīkhī, but soon after the occupation of Syria and Egypt he abolished it.

Up to the 16th/17th century the kādi 'asker was appointed on the advice of the grand vizier, and later that of the mufti of Istanbul, although it was considered desirable that both should be in agreement. The kādi 'asker, like the kādīs [q.v.] of higher rank, was appointed for an annual term, but this could be prolonged if it seemed necessary. Their daily payment (500 ʿā.Rendering) was not more than that of the kādīs; their income, however, was a great deal higher because they were awarded 15 per thousand of the soldiers' wages (recorded separately). The influence of the Anatolian and Rumelian kādī 'askers was greatly increased by the fact that both were members of the imperial council (diwan-i humāyûn [q.v.]). Besides this, they were authorized to appoint kādīs who received less than 150 ʿā Render as well as to fill vacancies in schools and mosques. However, they began to lose their influence and leading position after the middle of the 16th century when, as a result of the activity of Abu ʿl-Suʿûd, power passed into the hands of the spiritual leader of Islam, the mufti of Istanbul. The kādi 'askers, however, remained members of the diwan-i humāyûn until the middle of the 19th century. The offices of the Anatolian and Rumelian kādī 'askers existed until 1914, when the two were united. However, the reorganized office of the Anatolian kādi 'asker was short-lived, for it was abolished under the Turkish republic.


**AL-KÂDI 'ASKAR — AL-KÂDI AL-FÂDIL**

Al-ʿÂli al-ʿAbd al-ʿRahîm b. ʿAli b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlāʾ al-Lârîmî b. Baysânî al-ʿAskâlînî, Muḥîyî (Muqâirî) al-Dîn, the famous counsellor and secretary to Saladin, was born on 15 Dîjmâdâ II 549/3 April 1153 at ʿAskalânî [q.v.], where his father, a native of Baysân, known as al-Kâdi al-ʿArâfî, was the judge. He was put by his father into the Diwan al-ʿînqâdî at Cairo as a trainee, about 545/1152-3. Already before 548/1153 he entered the service of the kādi of Alexandria, Ibn Ḥadîdî, as a secretary. As the elegant reports he drafted there brought him to the attention of the Cairo authorities, he was recalled to Cairo by the last representative of the family of viziers, the BâSH Ruzikî, al-ʿÂli Ruzikî b. al-Ṣâliḥ Ṭalîfî, as head of the Diwan al-Dîyyâ [see Diwan]. A little later, when Ruzikî had been set aside by Shâwar, the prefect of Kûs, al-Kâdi al-Fâdîl entered the service of Shâwar's son Kâmil as secretary, and, after the murder of Shâwar, the service of Shîrkhî, his successor as vizier. In 563/1167-8 his brother, Ibn al-Kâhîlî, the director of the Diwan al-ʿînqâdî under whom he had begun his career, in his functions, and, after the death of the latter on 23 Dîjmâdâ II 566/4 March 1171, he became his successor, Saladin having meanwhile taken over the functions of vizier. The following year, after the death of the last Fâqîmîd, when Saladin himself became ruler of Egypt, al-Kâdi al-Fâdîl was his right-hand man in the execution of the necessary reforms in the fiscal and military administration. He then accompanied the sultan on his expeditions to Syria; from 585 to 586/1189-90 he remained in Egypt to control the administration of finance and reorganize the army and the fleet. Subsequently he returned to Syria and stayed with Saladin until his death on 27 Şâfar 589/5 March 1193.

When al-Malik al-ʿĀdîl, who had seized power in Damascus, rapidly compromised his position by imprudent actions, al-Kâdi al-Fâdîl went to Egypt to serve al-Malik al-ʿAzîz. Soon afterwards war broke out between the two brothers, but al-Kâdi al-Fâdîl, through his mediation, brought it to an end in 591/1195. After this he returned to private life. He died suddenly on 6 or 7 Rabîʿ II 596/26 or 27 January 1200.

Of the official writings of al-Kâdi al-Fâdîl while at the Diwan al-ʿînqâdî, many examples have survived, in manuscript form (Helbig, see below), in early collections such as that of his emulator a century later, Muḥîyî al-Dîn b. ʿAbd al-Ẓâhir, al-Durr al-naṣîm min tarâsul ʿAbd al-Rahîm, ed. Cairo 1959, in the works of chroniclers such as, in particular, his colleague and friend ʿImâd al-Dîn al-Īṣâbihânî [q.v.], or at a later date Abu ʿAbâma, in collections of ʿînqâdî such as that of al-Kâlahshandî [q.v.], in particular, and lastly in various works such as the Kharîda of the same ʿImâd al-Dîn (for a correspondence with Usâma b. Münqûd see H. Deroenbourg, *Vie d'Ousama*, 383 ff.). While he was in office, he also edited an official diary known by the name of Mutadîdîdîdî (according to Mâqûdî) or Muḥâzîdîdî (according to Kamâl al-Dîn b. al-ʿAdîm, according to the latter the compilation of the historian of the same period Abu ʿGhâlib al-Īṣâbihânî), of which considerable extracts have been preserved by these writers. Al-Kâdi al-Fâdîl was also the author of a considerable volume of poetry in part mingled with his correspondence. It has often been said that al-Kâdi al-Fâdîl was vizier as well as vizier of the Fâqîmîd, never took a vizier himself. Al-Fâdîl was, however, a counsellor whose advice was heeded, and the director of his chancellorcy. The personal prestige he enjoyed in his old age was considerable; but it was not so much to the loftiness of his moral purpose, as to the exceptional quality of his private and official epistolary style that he owed his extraordinary reputation among his contemporaries and his emulators in subsequent generations. This style, which can be compared to that of his collaborator and friend ʿImâd al-Dîn al-Īṣâbihânî, combines richness (perhaps a little less prolix) and suppleness of form with a realistic treatment of the facts, a lesson too often forgotten by later writers, which makes his correspondence a valuable historical source. It is all the more strange to note that the work, which was considered to be a model by thousands of secretaries, has not yet found an editor in modern times. The Diary is lost, the Diwan has been published recently.
(by Ahmad A. Badawi and Ibrahim al-Ibyarl, Cairo 1961, 2 vols.), but the correspondence is still only accessible in the form of extracts found in the works mentioned above. The ideal would be to establish a concordance of all these extracts and manuscript collections; a long, exacting, but indispensable task, which was begun but by no means finished by Helbig, and which will be taken up again.

Bibliography: Almost everything said by the numerous authors who devote a monograph to al-Kādī al-Fādil goes back to the chroniclers of Ṣālah al-Dīn and to the account given by his friend ʿImād al-Dīn, who died a few months later, and reproduced by Abū Shāma s.a. 596. In addition, see in particular Ibn Khallīkān, no. 384, and Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir, op. cit. In modern literature the fundamental work is still that of Ad. Helbig, Al-Qādī al-Fādil, Diss. Heidelberg, 1908. See also Walther Björkman, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskantes im islamischen Ägyptien, 1928, and Horst-Adolf Hein, Beiträge zur Ayyubidischen Diplomatik, Diss. Freiburg/Br. 1968, with bibliography; GAL, I, 315, S.I, 549; Hilmy M. Ahmad, in Historians of the Middle East, ed. Holt and Lewis, 95-6 and n. 16; A. E. Ehrenkreutz, Saladin, Albany N. Y. 1972, index. (C. Brockelmann [CL. CAHEN])

AL-KADĪ AL-HARRAWĪ [see AL-ʿABBĀDI].

KĀDĪ KĀHN, FAKHR AL-DĪN AL-HASAN B. MANŞŪR AL-FARGHĀNĪ, 6th/12th century Hanafi jurist (d. Ramadan 592/August 1196), a native of Transoxania, who wrote commentaries on those works of Muhammad al-Shaybānī, Abū Hanīfa’s disciple, recognized as ẓāhir al-ruʿidya (authentic version). A few manuscript copies of his commentaries are extant, notably a Sharh al-Dīdmiʿ al-saghir and a Ẓahr al-Ziyādīdī, which was another collection of practical decisions but was rather a theoretical work, analogous in form and in substance, to the Ẓahr al-riʿaḍyā of al-Māʾṣūrī. Nevertheless, Kādī Kāhn was less preoccupied than the other jurists with abstract explanations and methodological cāzās; this was perhaps the reason for the success of the Fatāwā in the eyes of practitioners, especially in India, where the first printed editions of the work appeared (Calcutta 1835). Nowadays the preferred text is the Būlāk one, where the text is printed on the margin of the first three volumes of Fatāwā hindīyya (1310).

Kādī Kāhn was one of those men whom the Hanafi school agreed should be classed as qualified to handle iḍīthād [q.v.] and to put forward new solutions in legal matters. He was the last jurist of the classical period of Hanafi law, a time when a measure of legislative creativity was still possible.


(Th. W. Juynholl — Y. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS)

KĀDĪ L-KUDĀT [see KĀDĪ].

KĀDĪ MUHAMMAD, a Sūfī of the Shāfiʿī madhhāb, b. c. 1395, was head of the leading aristocratic and religious family of Mahābāb [q.v.] (the principal town of the Kurdish part of the province of Ādharbaydān since separated as the Third Ostān), where there was a tradition of lively Kurdish cultural activity. After succeeding his father, ʿĀlī, as kādī he quickly established a reputation for outstanding competence and incisiveness alike as judge, orator and practical man of affairs.

In August 1941 the Anglo-Russian invasion of Persia was followed by a general rising of the Kurdish tribes and the total breakdown of the machinery of government. At Mahbāb a committee of townspeople, headed by the kādī and supported by the tribal chiefs, took over the local administration. A political party, the Society for the Revival of Kurdistan, formed by a group of young nationalist intellectuals, later co-opted the kādī as president. Kurdistan was introduced as the language of instruction in the schools, and nationalism became aroused by theatrical productions, the publication of anthologies of patriotic verse, and other journalistic activities in that tongue. Although the last vestiges of government authority had long disappeared, it was not until 22 January 1946 that the Autonomous Kurdish Republic was proclaimed with Kādī Muḥammad as president.

The withdrawal of the Soviet forces four months earlier had opened the way for the central government to reassert its authority. With the reoccupation of Tabriz on 13 December both the Mahbāb Republic and the larger Communist “Democratic Republic” of (Persian) Ādharbaydān, set up in the Turko-Kurdish-speaking parts of the province, collapsed. Kādī Muḥammad surrendered four days later and, after trial on a charge of treason, was hanged on 31 March 1947.

Although the Kurdish Republic, as such, lasted only eleven months, on the committee led by the kādī had administered the district with commendable efficiency and success for over five years.


AL-KĀDĪ NUḤMĀN [see NUḤMĀN].

AL-KĀDĪ AL-TAḤARĪ [see IBN AL-RAḤĪB].

KĀDĪZĀDĒ RŪM [see SUPPLEMENT].

KĀDĪB, rod, one of the insignia of sovereignty of the caliph. As early as the Umayyad era, the rod (kādīb) or staff (ʿāṣa) was already in use, along with the seal, one of the badges of rank which was conveyed to the next of the caliph's lineage and supported by the tribal chiefs, who had administered the district. There was a tradition of lively Kurdish cultural activity. After succeeding his father, ʿĀlī, as kādī he quickly established a reputation for outstanding competence and incisiveness alike as judge, orator and practical man of affairs.

A like appurtenance of sovereign dignity is also attested in Muslim Spain, where the Umayyad caliphs possessed, along with other badges of rank, a rod called ẓāhir al-riʿaḍyā. On the other hand, the ʿAbbāsid caliphs of Cairo in the Mamluk era had lost the rod, but even so it did not pass into the hands of the sultans.
and seems no longer to have figured in the Ottoman ceremonial. Nevertheless the rod or staff (ṣapā) of the sovereign became in later literature the symbol of power, as is demonstrated in a passage from Ibn Khaldūn (Muhadadīna, part iv, ch. 4).


KADIM [see KIDAM].

KADIN [see MAR'A, SARAY].

AL-KADIR [see AL-AMIS AL-HUSNA].

AL-KADIR BİLLAH, 25th caliph of the 'Abbāsid dynasty, who reigned from 381/991 to 392/1002. Born in 336/947-8, Abu'l-ʿAbbās Ahmad b. Ishāk was the grandson of the Caliph al-Muqtadir [q.v.] and cousin of the Caliph al-Tāḥī, who was deposed in 381/991 by the amir Bahā' al-Dawla. Called to assume the caliphate by the latter, Abu 'l-ʿAbbās received the regnal name of al-Kadir bi'llah. The amir, who had met with some vestiges of resistance in al-Tāḥī, hoped to find a more tractable ruler in the person of al-Kadir, who had had to flee from the capital to escape the violence of his cousin after a family quarrel. In fact, the new caliph at first appeared to make common cause with the amir and seemed disposed to support his policies. Moreover, the proclamation was not initially recognized by the amirs in the eastern provinces; it was not until around 390/1000 that the Sāmānids and Ghaznavids decided to recognize the new caliph installed by their Buwayhid amirs, and obtained the amir's intervention in the matter of Kirwash, who re-established the 'Abbāsid khilâfa soon afterwards. He played his part by having read publicly in the palace, in Rabi' II 402/August 1011, a manifesto condemning the Fatimid doctrine, criticizing the genealogy of the Fātimid caliphs, and numbering the Isma'īlīs among the enemies of Islam. The manifesto was signed by Imāmī as well as Sunnī scholars.

The death of Bahā' al-Dawla in 403/1012 and the succession of his son Sultan al-Dawla made no great change in the political situation. It should not be forgotten that for a number of years the agitation of the Arab and Kurdish elements in Irāq had progressively weakened Buwayhid power, while the long-standing rivalry between Daylamites and Turks was ignited again in the course of any local disturbances, and incidents between Sunnīs and Shī'īs in Bagh̄dād and other towns could break out at any moment. Al-Kadir's main preoccupation was the struggle against any doctrines deemed pernicious and especially those which constituted a danger to the caliphate. From 408/1017 he demanded that the Ḥanafī jurists who held that certain doctrines of Imāmī as well as Mu'tazilī beliefs made an act of penitence; at the same time he forbade the teaching of Mu'tazilī and Shī'ī doctrines. Then, in 409/1018, he had a reading given in the palace of the text called al-risāla al-kadiriyya, a profession of faith defining the official doctrine which also conformed to the ideas of the Men of Old (Ibn al-Djawwī, Muntazam, viii, 109; A. Mez, Renaissance, 198-201; G. Makdisi, Ibn 'Asqalī, 299 ff.). Inspired by Hanbalite ideas, this text condemned not only Shī'ism in all its forms but also Mu'tazilism and even ṣaṭārīsm, which was denounced for taking a stance that was a dangerous compromise with Mu'tazilism, and also put forward the veneration of the Companions as a genuine obligation. In the same period the chief amir Sultan al-Dawla appeared in Bagh̄dād for the first time: soon after, he retired to Iran and ceded his position to Musharrīf al-Dawla, who turned up in Bagh̄dād in Muharram 414/March 1023 and demanded that the caliph come to meet him. Al-Kadir complied, but he protested soon afterwards when, without seeking the caliph's authorization, the chief amir wanted to renew the Turkish chieftains' oath of allegiance and procure the amir's vow of submission and fidelity.

The rivalry which broke out between the Buwayhid princes after the death of Musharrīf al-Dawla in 416/ 1025 gave the caliph the opportunity to play a truly political role once more. Opposed were Djalāl al-
Dawla, the brother of Musharrif al-Dawla, who at once secured the proclamation in the name of his name, and Abû Kâldjîr [q.v.], his nephew, who had himself proclaimed chief amir by the troops, an announcement ratified by the caliph until those same troops were deserting Abû Kâldjîr and rallying to Djâlî al-Dawla. The latter arrived in Baghdad in 418/1026, installed himself in the amiral palace and assumed certain caliphal prerogatives, but less than a year later the troops clamoured for his dismissal. Al-Kâdîr despatched the chief notables, the two nakibs and the kâdîb, to inform him that he must withdraw; he did so and was prohibited from returning to the capital for some time afterwards.

The caliph devoted the last years of his reign to reinforcing 'Abbâsîd propaganda. During 420/1029 three letters were solemnly read aloud from the palace: the first denounced Mu'tazzism anew; the second attacked in particular the doctrine of the "created Qur'în"; while the third proclaimed the superiority of the early caliphs and affirmed the obligation to "command good and forbid evil". At the same time doctrines favourable to Mu'tazzism had to be duly amended and the preacher at the mosque of Barâkh was dismissed as a Shi'i extremist. Moreover the caliph received frequent reports of events in the eastern provinces, where Mahmûd of Ghazna harassed the Shi'is and further extended Islamic power by settling out on the conquest of India, while at the same time engaging in battle against the Buwayhids, seizing Rayy in 420/1029 then attacking Kirmân in 422/1031. In 421/1030 the ageing caliph secured the succession by declaring his own son Abû Shâfar his heir without any reference to the chief amir. On his death in 422/1031, though it had not regained its traditional power, the caliphate had won a considerable amount of prestige. Above all Al-Kâdîr had worked effectively for the restoration of threatened Sunnis and in this way achieved ends as much political as religious. Al-Kâdîr's activities were reflected by the redaction of two treatises on public law, the two works entitled Al-Ikhbâm al-sulâîniyya, the one by the Sharîf al-Mawâridi, and the other by the Hanbali Ibn al-Fârâbî [q.v.].

Bibliography: The basic sources are: Abû Shudjî, Dâyî tadârîj al-îmam, passim; Ibn al-Djâwâl, Munîtâzîm, viii-viii; Ibn al-Athîr. Other sources are mentioned in the following: M. Kabir, The Buwayhid Dynasty of Baghdad, Calcutta 1963, passim; H. Busse, Chalif und Grosskonig, Die Buwayiden im Iran, Beirut 1966, passim; see also H. Laoust, La pense et l'action politiques d'al-Mawarînidî, in REI, xxxvi (1968), ii-ii; C. E. Bosworth, The Ghassânids, Edinburgh 1963, passim. (D. Sourdell)

Al-Kâdîr, Abû 'Abbâs Allâh Mu'mmânî, Al-Tabyîn b. Al-Sâlim al-Masani al-Kâdîrî, Sharîf, Moroccan historian and biographer, born in Fâs on 7 Rabî' I 1256/14 April 1712, died in the same town on 25 Shâhîbân 1197/11 November 1773. He was a pupil of the leading scholars of his time or, unlike them, throughout his life revealed an almost complete detachment from the good things of this world. Quite early he turned to Sûfism and, to make his living, was content to act as an 'âddî (legal witness to a deed). Al-Kâdîr left a fairly considerable number of writings. In the list of works, compiled by himself, Al-durar, fol. 104 v.), some of the most noteworthy of these (apart from works relating to Muslim learning) are a monograph relating to the saint Kâsim al-Khâsîsî, a short work devoted to the aṣbâfî of Sicilian origin, an obituary in râsatî on the family of the Fâsiyyûn [q.v.], an appendix to the Kifâyât al-mu'âjadîj of Ahmad Bûbâ [q.v.], etc.: but the most important of Al-Kâdîr's works is his dictionaries of the celebrities of the 11th/12th and 12th/13th centuries, the Ilkhbât al-âdâr and the Nashîr al-mathânî. The first exists only in a few manuscripts. The second, thanks to the lithographed edition (2 vol., Fâs 1310/1892 with an error of pagination in vol. ii between pages 161 and 249) and the French translation (vol. i, tr. A. Graulle and Maillard, in Arch. Maroc., xxii (1913); vol. ii, tr. E. Michaux-Bellaire, ibid., xxiv (1917)) is well known. These two works, probably the last written by the author, fulfilled the same purpose. While the hagiographic record compiled by Ibn 'Askâr [q.v.] had been continued for the 11th/12th century by al-Ifrînî [q.v.], for this same century there existed no dictionary of Muslim celebrities of all types. It was this gap that Al-Kâdîr set out to fill, although he seems to have been unaware of the existence of the Sâfawî man inatâshar of al-Kattânî [q.v.], written at about the same time. The first results of his researches were recorded in the Ilkhbât al-âdâr wa-mustâfâd al-ma'âsidîj wa'l-âhmar min ahbâb a'îdân al-mîsî al-dhâniyya wa'l-hidâya 'ashâr (in which also contained autobiographical elements). In a revised, completed and often abridged form, this work was presented under a new title, Nashîr al-mathânî la-mi'-al-khâm al-khdîr wa'l-khâmî. The two works thus resemble each other closely. They possess an original feature in that, following the obituaries for each year, they almost always give a résumé of the outstanding political and military events of that year. It seems that Al-Kâdîr also produced another version of the Nashîr al-mathânî, aside from the one lithographed at Fâs; this is slated by al-Kattânî (Salwat al-anfîsî, iii, 361), who had in his possession a more complete Nashîr, covering the period until 1183/1769. This more extensive edition was said to be entitled Al-Asbâr al-nâdiyya fi ahbâb aîdân al-mîsî al-dhâniyya wa'l-thânîsî. Al-Kâdîr was familiar with the whole body of literature relating to the Sa'dids [q.v.]; but his sympathies lay primarily with Muslim scholars, whether they were like himself Moroccan or not.

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the text, see: Kattânî, Salwat al-anfîsî, lith. Fâs, 1310/1898, ii, 351 (Graille in the introduction of his translation), without regard to the original order has translated Kattânî's note on Al-Kâdîr; E. Levi-Provençal, Chorfa, 319-26 (indispensable); 'Abî al-Sâlim b. Sûdâ, Dâlî mu'ârîkh al-Maghrib al-âksî, Tetuan 1369/1950, no. 3; I. Allouche and A. Regragui, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de Rabat, 2nd series, Rabat 1958, nos. 2306-8 and 2161; M. Lakhdar, La vie litteraire au Maroc sous la dynastie 'alawite, Rabat 1971, 240-1 and index. (G. Derendorf)
'l-Abbas (it deals with Abnab b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah Ma'm al-Andalusi, in whose company he had visited the Holy Places). He is also the author of the following works: 
_Djuubād fi 'l-nasab al-Hasāni wa l-ḥusaynī;_ 
_Taḥīf fi nasab al-aṣrāfī_ fi 'l-Ala'wisīyyīn;_ 
three poems in _rajdā_ metre: one on the Companions of the Prophet who had emigrated to Abyssinia, the second on the mosques in which the Prophet had prayed, and the third in _yād_ rhyme on the masters of his time. He passed the rest of his days in the odour of sanctity, devoting himself to the perusal of works of mysticism, and associating only with saints, such as Kāsim al-Khaṣṣā, Muhammad al-ʿArabī Barqalla, and the aforementioned Abnab b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah Ma'm. Previously at Fez, he had followed the courses of al-ʿUsī and 'Abd al-Ḳādir al-Ṭāḥī. He died at Fez, Monday 19 Djuumada I 1133/18 March 1721, and was buried outside the Bab al-Futūh near the oratory of ʿAdwāt al-Andalus.

**Bibliography:** E. Lévi-Provençal, _Chorfa_, 294; ʿKādirī, _Nahrī_, ii, 201; idem, _Iltikāf_, 61v; idem, _al-Nahr al-kabīr_, ii, 71v-72v; idem, _al-Zahr al-bāsim_; Ifrīnī, _Ṣaḥīfa_, ii, 353; R. Basset, _Recherches_, 28, n. 75; Ibn Sūda, _Dallī_, i, 80-1, 91, ii, 368, 434; Kattānī, _Ṣaḥīfa_, ii, 353.

_ʿAbd al-Ḳādir al-Hasāni_, Abū ʿAbd al-Ḳādir Muhammad al-ʿArabī b. al-Ṭāḥī, Moroccan scholar very learned in history and genealogy. He is the author of a great number of works: 

- _Tafṣīl fi 'l-nasab al-Hasāni_ (which is a history of the Rasūl), ii, 353.

_ʿAbd al-Ḳādir al-Hasāni_, a genealogist of the Chorfa. Born at Fez, 10 Ramadan 353. He frequented well-known mystics, amongst others Kāsim al-Khaṣṣā, Ahmad b. Ahmad al-Ḍurra, and al-ṣuḥrā Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Ḍurra, who appropriated it, passing it off as his own. Muhammad al-ʿArabī, who wrote the draft of this, when he was about to travel to the Holy Places). He is also the author of the following works: 
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signified that he subordinated his will to that of the former (al-Suhrawardi, i, 192). A long list is given in the Bakdja of men who attained various degrees of distinction who had received the khirka from 'Abd al-Kâdir, two of them at the age of seven and one at the age of one. These persons were said to “ascribe themselves” (intasaba or intamad or even tasammd) to 'Abd al-Kâdir, and could bestow the khirka on others as from him; in doing so they would stipulate that the murid was to regard 'Abd al-Kâdir as his shaykh and director after the Prophet. In a tradition which is likely to be apocryphal (Bakdja, p. 101, dated 592/1196), 'Abd al-Kâdir declared that assumption of his khirka was not absolutely necessary for entry into his Order; personal attachment to himself was sufficient. It would appear that during his lifetime several persons carried on propaganda in favour of his system; one 'Ali b. al-Haddâd obtained proselytes in Yemen, and one Muhammad al-Bâti'î, resident in Baalbek, did likewise in Syria; one Ta'ki al-Din Mu'mammad al-Yûnînî, also of Baalbek, was another propagandist, and one Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Samad in Egypt “ascribed himself to 'Abd al-Kâdir and in treading the Path relied on him after God and His Apostle” (Bakdja, pp. 109, 110). Since all who ascribed themselves to him were promised Paradise, the Order is likely to have been popular; and even in recent times missionaries in Africa appear to have little difficulty in obtaining fresh adherents to it (cf. O. Lenz, Timbuktû, ii, 33).

That 'Abd al-Kâdir’s sons had some share in spreading it is likely, though Ibn Taymiyya (d.728/1328) mentions that he had associated with one of his descendants who was an ordinary Muslim and not a member of it, and so did not agree with those who held fanciful views about him (Bukhayt al-Murtad, i, 124). The Bakdja however does not bear out Le Chatelier’s assertion (Confréries Musulmanes du Hâdjas, p. 35) that in 'Abd al-Kâdir’s life-time some of his sons had been preaching his doctrine in Morocco, Egypt, Arabia, Turkestan and India. It says much of 'Abd al-Razzaq, but nothing of the “mosque now in ruins, whose seven gilded domes have often served as the subject of foundation inscriptions recorded by J. P. Brown, the candidate could recognize him among a thousand. The form of Kâdirism which means the worship of ‘Abd al-Kâdir seems to prevail in North Africa, where it is called Djalilism (or Djilanism), and whole communities are called Djalil. Their system has been described as the application of Sâ'î mysticism to beliefs that are certainly pre-Islamic, and the materialization of that mysticism under the form of a cult of hidden subterranean powers (Michaux-Bellaire, in Archives Marocaines, xx, 235). Here the word khâlûs is used for a heap of stones where women attach rags to reeds planted between the stones and where they burn benzoin and styrax in pots with which they treading the Path relied on him after God and His Apostle. Nor does it confirm the statement that this 'Abd al-Razzaq introduced the use of music in the ritual, and indeed the employment of this was earlier than 'Abd al-Kâdir’s time, and is discussed by al-Suhrawardî (ii, 116) without allusion to 'Abd al-Razzaq. E. Mercier (Histoire de l’Afrique Septentrionale, iii, 14) asserts that the Kadiriyya Order existed in Berbery in the 6th/12th century and was closely connected with the Fâtîmins (whose rule terminated 567/1171), but he gives no authority for these statements.

Al-Suhrawardî holds that the exercises of each murid should be determined by his shaykh in accordance with his individual needs, whence it is unlikely that 'Abd al-Kâdir instituted any rigid system of dhikr, wîrd and ḫisti, and indeed those in use among different Kadiri communities differ (Rinn, Marna- bous et Rkouan, p. 185 ff.). The initiation ceremonies given on Turkish authority by J. P. Brown (The Dervishes, p. 98) are quite different from those furnished by Rinn on Native African authority. In one of these latter there is a tendency to set 'All above Muhammad and to insist on the importance of Hasan and Husayn, which cannot well represent the views of the Hanbalite 'Abd al-Kâdir. The wîrd of 'Abd al-Kâdir in al-Fuyûdî al-Rabbânîyya is given on the authority of one 'Abd Allâh b. Muhammad al-Adjamî, who lived 185 years (536-731) and may be regarded as mythical.
KADIRIYYA

Hanball, membership is by no means confined to
that school, and the Order is theoretically both toler-
ant and charitable.

3.—Geographical Distribution. Since his-
torical and geographical works rarely distinguish
between the different jiruk in their accounts of re-
ligious buildings, little can be said with certainty of
the date at which the first Kadirī zawiyas or khandān was
established in any country save al-‘Irāk. The Order is
said to have been introduced into Fez by the
posterity of two of ‘Abd al-Kadir’s sons, Ibrāhīm (d.
592/1196 in Wāsiṭ) and ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (who died in
Qīyāl, a village of Sindiār); they had migrated to
Spain and shortly before the fall of Granada (897/
1492) their descendants fled to Morocco. The full
genealogy of the Shurāfā al-Jiliyya of Fez is given in
Arch. Maroc., iii, 106-114, on the authority of al-Durr
al-Sani of al-Kadiri al-Hasanī (1090/1679), who
claims to have used a series of authentic documents.
The khalīfa of ‘Abd al-Kadir in Fez is mentioned as
early as 1104/1692-3 (ibid., xi, 319). The order was
introduced into Asia Minor and Istanbul by
īsmā‘īl Rūmī, founder of the khandān known as the
Kadiri khanānah at the Topkhane. This personage
(d. 1041/1631), who is called Fīr sohīn, “Second
shaykh,” is said to have introduced certain tekhīs in
these regions (Kāmūs al-A‘lam). A Kadirī ribāḥ in
Mecca is mentioned by Sālib b. Mahdī in al-‘Ālam
al-Shāmīkh, p. 381, about 1180/1767, but the
assertion that a branch was established there during
the lifetime of ‘Abd al-Kadir (Le Chatelier, op. cit.,
p. 44) is not improbable, since Mecca has a natural
attraction for the Šūfīs. In the A’in-i-Abkhar (about
1600; tr. Jarratt, iii, 357) the Kadiariyya Order is
mentioned as one that is highly regarded but is not
included among those recognized in India; nor does
there appear to be any allusion to it in the list of
Indian Šūfīs in the Maṭādīr-i Kirmān (1752), though
some other Orders are mentioned, and ‘Abd al-Kadir
himself is mentioned. Yet see Khāfī Khān, Muntak-
bhat al-Lubāb, ii, 604 and art, hind, p. 432.

Some statistics (to be received with caution) of
the Kadirīs and their zawiyas are given by Deport
et Coppolani (Confréries Religieuses Musulmanes, pp.
301-18). Much of its development is admittedly re-
cent, and may be due to the fame won by the name-
sake of ‘Abd al-Kadir [p.v.] who for so many years
resisted the French occupation of North Africa. It is
doubtless represented in all Islamic countries, though
it would appear that certain derived jiruk enjoy
greater popularity in many places. Thus the Kadrism
of Touba in Guinea, which has become a distinct sign
whereby the Diakanke tribe can be recognized, is
derived through the Sidia from the Kadirism of the
Kounta of Timbuctu (P. Marty in Revue du Monde
Mussulman, xxxvi, 183). These Kouta however form
a filiale of the Kadiriyya, and some of them prefer
to call themselves Shāhījlīyya (ibid., xxxi, 414).

4.—Organization. The Kadirī community ac-
knowledges nominal allegiance to the keeper of ‘Abd
al-Kadir’s tomb in Baghdād, and the deeds of invest-
ture published by Rinn, p. 179, and in the Revue du
Monde Mussulman, ii, 513 and ix, 290, are from this
source. It would seem however that the actual
authority of this personage is chiefly recognized in
‘Irāk and Pakistan. The latter periodically send
gifts which form the main source of the revenues of
his establishment; the members of this family find
it worth while to learn Urdu. The Meccan zawiyas
were subjected to the Shaykh al-Turuk, who had the right
to nominate their muhammad. The Egyptian branch
was under the control of the Sayyid al-Bakrī, who was
also Shaykh al-Turuk; All Pasha Mubārak (iii, 129,
see also P. Kahle in Der Islam, vi, 154) reckons the
order as one of the four which go back to a kub, but
asserts that it has neither jiruk nor buyūl. In
Africa, according to Rinn, each muhammad names
its successor; in the event of one dying without hav-
ing nominated anyone, an election is made by the
sheikhs at a bafrā. The approval of the head of the
Order in Baghdād is then solicited, and has never been
refused. The organization of the Order in North
Africa is described somewhat fully by Rinn, Deport
and Coppolani, in the works cited. The system appears
to be in general congregational, i.e., the zawiyas are
independent, and the relation between them and the
central institution in Baghdād is very loose. The
principle whereby the headship of a zawiyas is hered-
tarily is generally recognized.

5.—Symbols and rites. The sign of the Turkish
Kadirīs was said to be a rose which is green, having
been adopted by Īsmā‘l Rūmī. The candidate for ad-
mission to the Order after a year brought an arasiyya
or small felt cap, to which if the candidate be accepted
the Shaykh attached a rose of 18 sections, with
Solomon’s Seal in the centre. This cap is called muqābīl.
The symbolism of this is explained by
J. P. Brown, The Dervishes of Touba in Guinea, and shrines of
the saint (Rinn, p. 177). The Maisūm of the Dijlāla at Salé is described at length by L. Mercier in
Arch. Maroc., viii, 137-9; it commences the seventh day of the Mūlūd (Mawsīm), i.e., the Feast of the Prophet’s
Birthday, and lasts four days 17-20 Rabi‘ II. Sheep
and oxen are presented to the descendants of ‘Abd
al-Kadir. Michaux-Bellaire distinguishes in Morocco be-
tween the ceremonies of the Kadiariyya, who recite the
hīb, and the Dijlāla, who recite the ḍikr to the accompaniment of instruments; and again between the
Dijlāla of the country, whose instruments are the
bendar (a sort of big tambourine without bells) and
‘awdā wa ‘awdā, and those of the town, whose instruments are the ḥub, ḥalab and ḡayāq (Arch. Maroc., vi,
330 and xvii, 60). A description of the bahārat
malālikh, a performance executed with these last in-
struments, which leads to ecstasy, is given by him in
the first passage cited. He further records some special ceremonies connected with the Awlād Khālīfah
in the Gharb (ibid., xx, 287). All the Hālīfah of the
Gharb are Dijlāla, and in all the bahārat (services)
of the Dijlāla the presence of at least one Khālīfah is
necessary for the direction of ceremonies, and when
no actual Khālīfah is present, someone there takes the
name in order to perform the priestly duty. The
origin of the name Awlād Khālīfah is obscure (p. 284);
it may be noticed that the Bahārī mentions one Khā-
līfah b. Mūsā al-Nahramliki as having played a leading
part in the propagation of ‘Abd al-Kadir’s system.
The bahārat of the Dijlāla of the country contains
neither the hīb nor the ḍikr instituted by the
Shaykh, but a plain ḍikr of improvised words in the
ceremonial rhythm of the banādīr (plur. of bender).
These improvisations always terminate with the

...
words 'Thus spoke Mawlay 'Abd al-Kadir' or 'O Mawlay 'Abd al-Kadir.'” (Michaux-Bellaire, p. 288).

Various collections of rituals supposed to have been recommended by 'Abd al-Kadir have been published in Egypt, Turkey and India. In al-Fuyûdî fi al-Rabbâniyya he who is about to enter upon khâlwa (retreat) is advised to fast in the day and keep vigil at night. The khâlwa lasts forty days. 'If a figure reveals itself to him saying 'I am God', he should say 'No, it is not thou art in God' and if it be for prostration, it will vanish; but if it remain, then it will be a genuine revelation (taqaddî).'” (Dîhî 1330, p. 60). Reduction of food during the 40 days should be gradual till for the last three fasting is complete. At the end he returns by degrees to his former diet.

Some practices peculiar to the Dilâla of Tangier are recorded by G. Salmon (Arch. Maroc., ii, 108). Those who make vows to 'Abd al-Kadir are in the habit of depositing in the zauïya white cocks, which are called muharrar (Sûra III, 31); they do not kill them, but leave them free to rove about the zauïya, where however they do not long survive; the sharîf who lives hard by takes them for his food. The four daughters of a deceased sharîf continued to live on the revenues of the zauïya and carry away the muharrar fowl. The muhaddam at this zauïya was the sharîf, who conducted the ceremonies at which the kûrân is repeated without the khêt of 'Abd al-Kâdir being pronounced, and where dances similar to those of the Īsâwî (q.v.) are performed. Circumcisions are performed at the zauïya on the first day of the mauisî. A nightly meeting called layla is held on the eve of this day, at which the khêt of 'Abd al-Kâdir is recited. At El-Qsar, where there are also some local practices, all the potters belong to the Dilâla, among whom the richer members of the community are to be found (ibid., ii, 165).

The first time that the Kâdirîs appear to have played a political part was during the French conquest of Algeria, when the chief of the Kâdirîyya, Muhîyî 'l-Dîn, having been offered the leadership in the war against the infidel, permitted his son 'Abd al-Kâdir to accept it. This person was able to utilize the religious organization of his Order in order to establish the sovereignty which the French had accorded him, and when his sovereignty was threatened could fall back on his rank as muhaddam of his Order to win fresh recruits (H. Garrot, Histoire générale de l'Algérie, Algiers 1910, p. 800, 863 ff.). After his fall and exile it seems that the Kâdirîs in Africa lent their support to the French government. "In 1879 when there was a local insurrection in Aurès the shaykh of the Kâdirîyya of Menâsî, Si Muhammad b. 'Abbâs, displayed unimpeachable loyalty [see AWRAS]; and the same Order helped the French government to extend their influence in the Sahara at Wargla and El-Wad. Their nânîh, Si Muhammad b. 'Tayyîb, fell on the French side at the battle of Charouin, March 2, 1901." (Israël Hamet, Les Musulmans Français du Nord de l'Afrique, Paris 1906, p. 276).

Bibliography: Oriental editions cited: 'All b. Yusuf al-Šârāna, Baḥǧat al-Aṣrâr, Cairo 1904; al-Fath al-Rabbâni, Cairo 1902; Šâlîh b. Mahdî, al-Šâmîkî b. Ibrâhîm b. Ṣâhîh al-Baḥǧat, Cairo 1916. Established of these being the sanam Hirkî or mandrát Hirkî. Thanks to the geographer of Almeria who is known by the name al-Zuhri, we have some idea of the appearance of the tower at Cadiz, since we possess the eye-witness account of a writer who saw it on several occasions before its demolition in 1540/1145 and who states that the building in question was not the temple of Hercules with which it has often been confused, notably by the author of the Rawd al-mu'âdîr. This square manâra, 100 cubits and three storeys high, was constructed of dressed granite (kadhîkhân); the second storey was about one-third the size of the first, and the third, triangular in shape, was surmounted by a statue of a man looking towards the East, from the ocean, with his left arm outstretched and his fingers curled, except for the index finger, which pointed the way to the straits of Gibraltar. His right hand held a baton which seemed to indicate the sea (the author states explicitly that it was not a key). The date of construction of the Cadiz tower is unknown, but we must assume that it goes back to a period before the official introduction of Christianity to Spain, since the account refers solely to a statue, a purely Roman sign.

A member of the celebrated family of the Banû Maymûn of Denia became amîr of Cadiz at the end of the Almoravid period. Having been led to believe that the manâra, erroneously called the Tower of Hercules, had been constructed on top of a vast treasure, 'All b. 'Isâ b. Maymûn summoned a force of stone-masons and labourers who set to work removing the outer stonework; each time a block of stone was removed, a wooden beam was inserted into the empty space, with the result that in the end the vast mass of the tower rested only on wood. Then, after the spaces had been filled with wood, this support caught fire and the tower collapsed with a stupendous crash; all that could be found in the rubble were the lead that had served to bind the blocks of stone together and the brass from which the statue had been made. Ibn Maymûn's vain pretensions were thus exposed, and shortly afterwards he was assassinated by 'Vâlkâ, the grandson of the founder of the Almoravid dynasty.

Bibliography: Zuhri's text on the tower at
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Cadiz has been published by Dozy in his Recherches, appendix xxxv; it will be found in §§ 239-40 of the K. al-Dja'afriyya, published by M. Hadji-Sadok in BEO, xxi (1968), 7-312; cf. al-Rawd al-mufràd, ed. Lévi-Provençal, 145 in the text, 173-8 in the tr.—The Arabic and mediaeval sources on legends relating to the temple of Cadiz and the pillars of Hercules have been collected by Dozy, Recherches, ii, 311-4; see also R. Basset, Hercule et Mahomet, in Journal des Savants, 1903; Mados, Diccionario, v, 191004.

(A. HUICI MIRANDA)

AL-KADISIYYA, the name of several places in ’Irāk and al-Djazira. The Mu'tamar of Yākūt (337) lists five places of that name of which the two most important were situated near Sāmarrā and al-Kūfa. The history of these places is most difficult to trace.

1. A town in ’Irāk, on the Eastern bank of the Tigris, 8 miles S.E. of Sāmarrā. It seems to have been closely connected with the latter in its period of prosperity. We do not know what special part al-Kadisiyya played at that time. Herzfeld, (Reise, i, 107) suggests it is really identical with the town of al-Kâtūl which Ḥārūn al-Rašīd or the Caliph al-Mu'taṣim began to build before the foundation of Sāmarrā. Yākūt and other Arab geographers mention the glass-works of al-Kadisiyya, and it is reported to have been a large village (karya kabira) but little is known of its history. It is probable that it ceases to be of any importance shortly after the abandonment of Sāmarrā towards the end of the ninth century, for the 10th century geographers al-İstakhrl and Ibn Hawkal make no mention of it. It is found in al-Mu'kaddasī, but the reference seems to indicate the existence of a single structure, presumably the octagonal building which still survives today. In the middle ages the important Djedjail Canal left the Tigris opposite the town. The ruins of al-Kadisiyya lie in Lat. 34°5' N., between the two canals still existing out of the former three Tigris canals, called al-Kâtūl. They are a short quarter of an hour distant from the bank of the Tigris. The old name has survived and is now popularly pronounced Djasīsiyya (occasionally corrupted to Djaṣṣīyya, Djaṣṣīla). We owe full accounts of these ruins particularly to Ross and Jones; E. Herzfeld also investigated the ruins. Jones gives a plan of the ruins of the town, which Herzfeld says is entirely correct.

The enclosing walls, which measure about 6000 paces, form a regular octagon. They are flanked by towers at the corners and defended by 16 bastions at intervals. They were built of bricks which in technical terms are reputed to be of the best kind. A. Musil, on his journey of exploration in 1912, was the first to discover the real site of al-Kadisiyya and identify it with the early Islamic ruins of al-Ukhaybīr, a station on the Baghdad-Mecca road. The exact location of al-Kadisiyya was unknown until quite recently. An attempt had been made to identify it with the early Islamic ruins of al-Ukhaydir (25 miles S.S.W. of Kūfa)—for example by Ritter, Erdkunde, ix, 956, Loftus, Travels in Chaldaea and Susiana, London 1857, 64 note, and Justi in the Gr. i. Ph., ii, 540. This identification, however, is definitely to be rejected as erroneous (cf. the article of W. Cosek, Ukhâdir, in Is., xxix (1964), 28-37, which calls for an ’Abbāsī date for these ruins).

Besides, Ritter, op. cit., x, 186 places al-Kadisiyya much too far north, while the locations of al-Kadisiyya and al-'Udhaybīyīn given by Wagn. (Nachr. d. Göt. Gesellsc. d. Wiss., 1902, 257-9) are fairly correct. A. Muṣil, on his journey of exploration in 1912, was the first to discover the real site of al-Kadisiyya, cf. his report, in Is., xxxix (1960), 248-7-37, which calls for an ’Abbāsī date for these ruins). Musil there remarks that the spring al-Śawdd rising above the cultivated land and to the south-south-west of the plain where al-Kadisiyya stands was known as the find-spot of a statue some consider to be a statue of an important deity. This victory was of no small importance to the Muslims for it gave them the power to cross the Zagros and undertake the conquest of the whole of Persia.

Tigrisgebiet, 1, 1911, 105-107 (where the references to Rich, Ross and Jones are given).

(M. STRACK, J. LASSNER)

2. A place lying to the south-west of al-Hira [q.v.] and to the south-south-west of the plain where al-Kūfa was later found. This al-Kadisiyya is famed as the site of the resounding victory of the Muslims over the army of the Sasanian king Yazda-gird III [q.v.] at a date between 14/635 and 16/637. This victory was of no small importance to the Muslims for it gave them the power to cross the Zagros and undertake the conquest of the Arabian desert. Al-Kadisiyya was situated in the western part of the Taff, that steppe region rising above the cultivated land (al-Sawdd) and characterized by springs (e.g. that of al-Ughâyībī) which is the transitional area to the high plateau of the Arabian desert. In the Sasanian period the Taff was protected by a series of watch-houses (maslahas) and a great fortified ditch (khandak) from the raids of Arab tribes. The last village of the Taff, just before the desert, was al-Ughtaybīyīn, later a station on the Baghdād-Mecca road.

The locality of Kāides, which in his excursion to the ruins of Babylon in 1790 Beauchamp visited and reported as the find-spot of a statue somewhat similar (the report of his account of his journey in the Revue d'Assyriologie, x, 190), is perhaps also identical with the remains of al-Kadisiyya discovered by Musil. Kāides probably = Kādis, the shorter form of the name, which is occasionally found alongside Kādisiyya, as for example in an old Arab poet (see al-Bakrl, ed. Wūstenfeld, 226), in al-Tabārī, etc. Firdawsl writes Kādisī and Kādiyya. In the neighbourhood of al-Kadisiyya there was a village called al-Kudays, "little Kadis". The poets give the whole district round al-Kadisiyya the collective name al-Kawadīs.

The Arab geographers of the 4th/10th century (al-İstakhrl, Ibn Hawkal, al-Muḳaddasī) describe al-Kadisiyya as a small town with two gates and a mud
fortress, in the midst of cultivated fields and groves of date-palms, watered by a canal led from the Euphrates, the last running river in Irāk. In ancient times the Persian Gulf seems to have stretched up to the region of al-Kādisiyah. The main arm of the Euphrates once flowed, as al-Mas'ūdī notes (Munājīd, ed. Paris, i, 215 = § 229), towards al-Ḥira, where its ancient bed was still visible and was called al-ʾAtīk “the old (river)”. It flowed between al-Kādisiyah and al-ʿUghayb; at al-Kādisiyah there was a bridge across it called Ḫisr al-ʾAtīk or Ḫisr al-Kādisiyah.

The battle. To this one single battle of al-Kādisiyah al-Tabarī has devoted around one hundred pages and nearly another hundred pages to the preceding and subsequent events which must be taken into account for an understanding of this vitally important occurrence. The greater part of his account, however, is based on traditions of Sayf b. ʿUmar, whom some Islamists have accused of falsification. This is not the place for a detailed discussion of such accusations: it is sufficient to observe that Sayf’s account also forms the basis of the story related by the majority of Arab and Persian historians to such an extent that we have no alternative but to make use of this traditionalist for any account of the battle, expecting him where possible with the help of other accounts.

After the disastrous defeat of the Muslims at the Bridge [see Dīsr] (Ṣabʾābān or Ramādān 13/October or November 634) the campaign in Irāk suffered a setback, despite the arrival of reinforcements from Medina, the victory of al-Buwayh (Ramādān 13/Nov. 634 or Ṣafar 14/April 635, or one year after the Battle of the Bridge) and several subsequent and razzias. Al-Muthanna [q.v.], fearing that the hostilities would take a dangerous turn since Yazdāqird III was preparing to react vigorously, believed it prudent to withdraw to the outskirts of the desert, to disperse his warriors to various spots where there were watering places and to limit his actions to razzias. So as to be able to seize the offensive once more, he appealed to Medina for help. Makrūz, the general levy in Medina (Mubarram = ʿUmar, however, is based on traditions of Sayf b. ʿUmar to leave for Irāk.

En route Saʿd was joined by other contingents sent by ʿUmar, then halted at the beginning of winter (Ṣabʾābān 14/Dec. 635 or 15/Dec. 636?) in the Nadīd at Zarūd (or al-Thaʾlabiyah, near Zarūd) to call to arms the tribes of the surrounding area. He then made his way to Sharaf, which was at the western end of the Arab plateau near al-ʿAbsaʾ and was well supplied with waterholes. While waiting in a well-organized camp for the arrival of several thousands of other Bedouins (who, at times, included some Christian bands), he divided his men into deccuries, established a hierarchy of command and sent al-Mughira b. Ṣuḥra [q.v.] to occupy various localities in order to secure his forces against a possible attack. It was at Sharaf that Saʿd was to meet up with al-Muthannā, but the latter died during the winter of the wounds he had sustained at the Bridge. At last Saʿd had advanced as far as ʿUghayb al-Hijānāt, leaving there the women who had followed the expedition and gone on to strike camp in the plain of al-Kādisiyah. While awaiting the enemy—for a month it is said—he carried out razzias to secure his supplies.

Meanwhile, Yazdāqird had assembled a large army and compelled his marshal, Rustam [q.v.], to advance, taking no heed of the latter’s reluctance to face the Arabs on ground he considered unfavourable. At last the Persians pitched camp, separated from the Muslims by the channel called al-ʾAtīk. Hostilities did not open immediately; on the contrary, they entered into negotiations, which proved fruitless. During the month of Muḥarram Rustam built a kind of dyke with reeds, earth, straw and pack-saddles in this way he enabled his army to cross the channel and the following day battle commenced; this occurred on a Monday in Mubarram 15/Dec. or 16/Dec.; the date given by Sayf, 14/Dec. (al-Tabarī, i, 2289 and 2298) is undoubtedly an error. The Persians had behind them the channel and the Muslims the moat of a fortress named al-Kūdās. Saʿd, who suffered from abscesses (ḥabān) on the thighs and hips and could neither mount a horse nor remain upright, remained lying down and relayed his orders from the top of the fortress to his lieutenant, Khālid b. ʿUrtufa, by means of notes. According to Sayf the battle lasted three days and one night; as the latter was drawing to a close the Persian retreat began and by the fourth day they were completely and irreparably routed. Rustam fell in the melee; killed by an uncle, Arab warrior. Each day of the combat and the night of the third to fourth day have been given special names: 1) Yaum ʿArmadh = Day of the Rafts (perhaps a reference to the dyke on the channel?); 2) Yaum Aḥwaḏ = Day of Help (an allusion to the arrival of reinforcements from Syria?); 3) Yaum ʿAmāṣ = Day of the Hard War and Laylād al-Harīr = Night of the Cries of Sorrow (maybe a reference to the relentless savagery of the fray); 4) the last part of this night: Laylād al-Kādisiyah = the Night of al-Kādisiyah and the fourth day: Yaum al-Kādisiyah = the Day of the Battle of al-Kādisiyah (perhaps so called because the decisive hours of this night and the next day truly merited the name?).

Caetani, in his Annali, gives a detailed summary of al-Tabarī’s traditions. Noteworthy among the interesting details are: the Muslims were very badly equipped; the Persians made use of a number of elephants but their adversaries discovered a method of extricating themselves from this difficulty; some Syrian reinforcements arrived on the second and third day; the poet Abū Mihdjan [q.v.], who had been put in irons, succeeded in playing a valiant part in the fray; Ṣulaymān b. Khawwaylid [q.v.], the “false prophet” who had been defeated by Khālid b. al-Walīd [q.v.] during the ridda and later joined the Muslim ranks, proved himself to be a brave defender of Islam; for the first two days fighting took place during the day only—the night was employed in burying the corpses, giving water to the dying and carrying away the wounded Muslims, enemy wounded being despatched with blows of a staff; 30,000 (?) Persians, who had chained themselves to one another so that they could resist to the bitter end, fled when defeat was inevitable but were drowned in the channel, which the pursuing Muslims were able to cross using their bodies as a bridge; the Muslims seized the great Persian royal banner known as Dirāsh-i Kāvīyān.

Subsequent events. Saʿd sent a section of his forces in pursuit of the fugitives and remained at al-Kādisiyah for a month longer. One of the Persian commanders, Dhīllūn, was killed while trying to protect his retreating forces; other attempts to reassemble the fleeing troops, in the district of
Bābil for example, and to resist the Muslim advance became no more than a few battles which in no way altered the situation. Finally Sa’d marched on al-Madā’in and, after having besieged and conquered Bahūsdr, one of the seven or ten towns which made up the al-Madā’in ("the towns") group, was even able to ford the Tigris; this remarkable occurrence was regarded as the result of divine favour. After reaching the east bank of the river the Muslims occupied the other towns of al-Madā’in, which had been abandoned without a struggle by Yazdagird (Dhu ’l-Hidjja 15 or 167). Another battle of some importance took place on Irāḵi soil, at Djalālā’ (on Safar 16 or 17; other dates are also mentioned in the sources), marking the definitive overthrow of Sasanid dominion in Irāḵ by the Muslims.

Problems associated with the battle. There are two such problems which, in all probability, must remain insoluble: 1) The total strength of the forces which met at al-Kādisiyya, for there is too great a difference between the figures given in the sources and every attempt to arrive at an evaluation comes up against the impossibility of finding any solid foundation to build on; 2) the chronology of the events preceding the battle and following it and thus of the battle itself—dates given in the sources for the battle vary between the years 14 and 16, but the earlier date must be rejected since there is too much circumstantial evidence against it. Islamists working on the chronological problem, such as Wellhausen, Caetani and S. M. Yusuf, have looked for an answer by reasoning from the facts, and since it has proved impossible to reconcile the data given in the sources have chosen those which support their own beliefs. They consider it impossible that the Muslims could have recovered their strength almost immediately after the defeat at the Bridge and have dated the battle of al-Buwayb in 14 (according to Caetani no earlier than Ramadān), which obliges them to date the battle of al-Kādisiyya at the beginning of 16 (Wellhausen adds further considerations of the superimposed events which occurred between this battle and the battle of Djalālā’). In addition, Caetani and S. M. Yusuf consider the relationship between the campaign in Syria and that in Irāḵ and decide that the caliph ʿUmar could not have concerned himself with the second until after the end of the first, that is after the battle of Yarmūk: as this celebrated victory of the Muslims over the Byzantines took place on 12 Rādjab 15/20 August 636, the battle of al-Kādisiyya could not have been fought before the early months of the year 16. S. M. Yusuf places it a little after Rādjab 15, i.e. a month after Yarmūk.

After a fresh examination of the facts as they developed and as they are set down in chronological accounts in the sources, the author of the present article has concluded that Mufcarram is/February-March 636 is the date to be preferred for the battle of al-Kādisiyya. The Muslim success at al-Buwayb soon after their defeat at the Bridge is not to be considered impossible for the following reasons: 1) the troubles which broke out at al-Madā’in stopped the Persians from capitalizing on their victory at the Bridge; 2) Muslim reinforcements from Medina arrived immediately. Nor is it necessary to suppose that ʿUmar could not have been the battle and following it with the Irāḵ campaign until after the battle of Yarmūk, for such a view makes it extremely difficult to determine the date when the caliph resolved to send a fighting army into Irāḵ; in fact, 1) if ʿUmar did not take his decision until after Yarmūk, there is not a sufficient interval of time between the great battles of Yarmūk and al-Kādisiyya for Sa’d’s march, with the halts he made and his waiting period for the enemy (which the sources describe with too great detail for them to be ignored); it was perhaps this difficulty which led Caetani to propose that the battle did not take place in Muharram 16 but some months later; 2) if, to allow the necessary time for Sa’d’s march and his waiting for the enemy, the caliph were presumed to have taken his decision in 15 during the month preceding the battle of Yarmūk, then ʿUmar would have directed his forces towards Irāḵ precisely at the moment when he must have been greatly preoccupied by the news of the Byzantine emperor’s preparations for the offensive. On the contrary, if we concede that Sayf has given an exact account of the assemblage of the army at Šīrāz during Muharram 14 and of Sa’d’s long march, then it follows that ʿUmar decided at the end of the year 13 to renew with vigour the campaign in Irāḵ, that is during the period when his victories in Syria were following one after the other. These considerations, which are also supported by other circumstances—which the author of this article intends to set down in another work—lead us to decide on the date of Muharram 15/February-March 636 for the battle of al-Kādisiyya.
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KADJAR, Turcoman tribe, from which sprang a ruling dynasty of Persia (see next article). There is no foundation for the statements of later historians that the Kadjar tribe entered Iran with Hülagü (q.v.). In the 9th/10th century they formed part of the Boz Türk tribe; in the 12th/13th century the Kadjar settled in the Karabagh fortress of Alindjak, where they had been held captive.

In the 12th century the Kadjars entered Iran, and settled in northern Adharbaydjan (Arrân) they were joined by an important clan called Igirmi (= Yirmi) Dört. The defeat of the Kara Koyunlu by the Ak-Koyunlu, who thenceforth ruled much of Iran, prompted important branches of the Kadjar dynasty to move to Persia. The Kadjars of Persia belonged; also a village between the 16th and 20th centuries.

Bibliography: F. Sümer, Öğuzlar, Ankara 1967, 152, 154, 155, 228, 234, 286, 287, 358, 366; idem, Savaş devletinin kurulus ve gelişmesi (in press). F. Sümer, KADJAR (kaçar), Lubb al-tawdrikh, cf. J. Wellhausen, Sasaniden und Araber, ed. Wüstenfeld, 337. Ibn al-Athîr also mentions in 1497. Although the Kadjars supported Rustam, the latter was defeated again and killed. Soon afterwards a member of the Kadjar rallied to Shah Isma'îl, and like so many other Anatolian Turkish tribes, contributed to the establishment of the Safavid dynasty. For the next two centuries, however, they were not held in such esteem by the shahs as were, e.g., the Ustadjlû (Ustadji), Tekelî, Şâmulu and Dîlûkdr (Dilkadr). At this period the Kadjars were again dwelling in north Adharbaydjan. At the end of the 10th/11th century İmmâm Kûll Kân, who was beglerbegi of Karâbâgh, was a member of the Yalta oba of the Kadjars. But during Safavid times the Kadjars were administered mostly by the Ziyâd Oghlu family from which sprang the future ruling Kadjar dynasty. At the time of Şâh 'Abbâs some of the Kadjars were transferred to the district of Astârâbâd, to be a barrier against the raids of the Yaqa Turcomans.

In the 12th/13th century, whereas some tribes— Şâmulu, Dîlûkdr, etc.—broke up and lost their power, the Afsâhr (Afsâh) and Kadjars remained numerous and strong. Thus under Nâdîr Şâh the Afsâh were able to put an end to the Safavid dynasty and seize power, and at the end of the century the Kadjars could succeed the Zand. In the 18th century the Astârâbâd Kadjars were divided into two branches: the Ashâğa Bâsh and the Yûkhârî Bâsh. The Ashâğa Bâsh were formed by the Kowânû (or Kowânî), 'Izz ad-dînî, Şâm Bayâyt, Karâ Mûsânû (Mûsâû?), Washlû (Ashlu?) and Ziyâdî subtribes. The Kadjar dynasty belonged to the Kowânû (or Kowânî) subtribe of the Ashâğa Bâsh. As for the Yûkhârî Bâsh, they were formed by the other six subtribes, i.e., Dâwûlû, Şâpûnî, Köhnûlû, Közhûnû, Yâkûkûlû, and Kerîlû(?). The chief subtribe of this branch was the Dâwûlû.

The Kadjar rulers never forgot that they were Turks. They were even proud of it. Thus, some members of the Kadjar dynasty bore the names of Iilmânî and even Ottoman rulers, Arghun, Ilîdîrîn Bayâzîd etc. We see also some Kadjars claus (oynak) in Anatolia in the Ottoman period, between the 16th and 20th centuries.
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the followers of the Safawid Shaykh Haydar, and Sultan Câli nominated Isma'il (later Shah Ismail I) his successor and sent him to Ardabil, where he was accompanied, among others, by Karâ Petr Beg Kâdjâr (W. Hinz, *Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1936, 79, 96). Later, when Isma'il defeated the Aq Koyunlu Ahmad at the battle of Sharur in 907/1501, the Kâdjârs were among his supporters and formed one of the Kizilbash tribes. Kâdjâr khans held important offices under Tahmâsp I and his two sons Abbas I (Iskandar Munshî, Ta'rikh-i 'alamârâ-yi 'Abbâsî, Tehran 1959-60, i, 140, ii, 1085). One, Shah Kull Kâdjâr, was sent by the former in 952/1547 to treat for peace with the Turks (Pecewî, i, 327, 334; v. Hammer, *Histoire de l'Empire ottoman*, French tr., vi, 69, 320; Rical Kull Khan, *Diahdngushd-yi nadir* ed., ed. Müller, Wiesbaden 1966, 33-7, 40-2). The offices of beglerbegi of Karâbâh was held by various Kâdjâr khans. Muhammad Khan b. Khalîl Khan b. Shahverdî Sultan Ziyâdoghli, who succeeded Imâm Kull Khan on his death in 996/1587-8, was later appointed governor of Gandja in 1015/1606 (ibid., i, 385, ii, 716). The offices of beglerbegi and amir al-umûr of Karâbâh appear to have remained in the hands of the Ziyâdoghli family (ibid., i, 165). Another Ziyâdoghli khan, Hasan, was made dârâgha [q.v.] of Shirz in 998/1590 (Ahmad Kummî, *Khuldsat al-tawârijî*, ed. H. Müller, Wiesbaden 1964, Persian text, 68). Amir Gûna Khan Kâdjâr became governor of Erivan in 1011/1603 (Farâbî, ii, 652), and his son Tahmâsp Kull Khân was governor of Erivan and Çuğur Şâ'd in the reign of Shah Šâtî (Iskandar Munshî and Muhammad Yusuf, *Dâ'iri-i tâ'rikh-i 'alamârâ-yi 'Abbâsî*, eds. Suhaylî Khanansârî, Tehran 1938-9, 293). Kâdjâr khans also held governorships in Astarabad and Marv. Husayn Khan Ziyâdoghli is mentioned as being governor of Astarabad in 1010/1601-2, and in 1011/1602-3 when he was recalled to Karâbâh to take part in operations against the Ottomans (Farâbî, ii, 604, 657). Mirhân Khan Kâdjâr became governor of Marv on behalf of Shah Šâtî in 1042/1632-3 (Dhokî-i tâ'rikh-i 'alamârâ-yi 'Abbâsî, 103), became sipahsâhî to Shah Abbas II in 1057/1647-8. (See further K. Röhrborn, *Provinzen und Zentralgewalt Persiens im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1966, 33-7, 40-2). Kâdjâr historians attribute the dispersal of the Kâdjârs in the frontier areas of the empire to the deliberate policy of Shah 'Abbâs, aiming on the one hand at reducing their power because they had by this time become very numerous in Karâbâh, and on the other at protecting the empire against inroads made by the Uzbeks and Tatars. By the end of the 11th/17th century the main concentration of Kâdjârs appears to have been in Astarabad, and they played a prominent part in the struggles of power in northern Persia on the fall of the Safavids. They were divided in Astarabad into two main groups, the Koyunlû, who were flock-keepers, and the Develû, who were camel-herders. According to Rîdâ Kull Khân the Koyunlû, 'Izz al-Dînî, Shâhâbâyâtî (name which suggests some those of the Kâdjârs who had sojourned for a period in Syria), Karâmîsâlî, Ishlû, and Ziyâdûlû had pastures below the Mubârâkâbâh fortress of Astarabad and so were called Ashâkâbâh, while the Develû, Sîpâlû, Kuhânû, Khaaznadâlû, Kîyûkîlû and Karlû had pastures above the fortress and were therefore called Yûkâhârâbâh. He adds that according to another tradition the source of these terms is to be sought in the period before the Kâdjârs settled in Astarabad (ix, 7-8, 49). In the 12th/18th century the Aghâkâbâh and the Yûkâhârâbâh were split by internecine strife.

During the reign of the Safawid Shâh Sultan Husayn, Muhammad Khân, a Turcoman from Kazvin, was appointed governor of Astarabad. He was subsequently induced by the Uzbegs and Tatars. By the end of the Path Khan the Koyunlu, who were flock-keepers, and the Develû, Sîpâlû, Kuhânû, Khaaznadâlû, Kîyûkîlû and Karlû had pastures above the fortress and were therefore called Yûkâhârâbâh. He adds that according to another tradition the source of these terms is to be sought in the period before the Kâdjârs settled in Astarabad (ix, 7-8, 49). In the 12th/18th century the Aghâkâbâh and the Yûkâhârâbâh were split by internecine strife.
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and the intrigues of Muhammad Husayn Khan Develu, who had been appointed beglerbegi of Astarabad, retired to the Turkoman steppe. Muhammad Husayn Khan was later responsible for the murder of Tahmâsp and his two sons in or about Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1152/Febuary 1740 during Nâdir's absence in India (Lockhart, Nadir Shah, 177-8). Muhammad Hasan Khan in due course gathered together a force of Yamût Turcomans, Kadjârs and others and in Dhu 'l-Hijjah 1156/January 1744 took Astarabad from Muhammad Husayn Khan (see I. Hanway, An historical account of the British trade over the Caspian Sea, London 1762, i, 129 ff., for an eyewitness account of this event). Nâdir Shâh ordered Bihbûd Kâhan, the sardâr of the Atâk, to punish Muhammad Hasan Kâhan. An engagement took place to the east of Astarabad. Initially the Kadjâr army had the advantage, but after defections to Bihbûd Kâhan, Muhammad Hasan Kâhan fled. Some months later he appeared in Khâwarism with Yamût allies. In a battle with Nâdir's forces under the latter's nephew, 'Ali Kull Khan, and Bihbûd Kâhan, during which Muhammad Hasan Khan engaged Bihbûd Kâhan in single combat and wounded him, the Kadjâr forces were defeated a second time and Muhammad Hasan forced to flee for his life (Ri'la Kuli Khan, ix, 48-9). After about a month, the Kadjâr force encamped round Shâhrûkh and many of their livestock were captured by the enemy (Ri'la Kull Khan, ix, 48-9).

The internecine strife between the Aghâkâbâb and the Yukhârâbâb, which had been temporarily checked after Muhammad Hasan Khan had established his authority and included khâns from both factions among his followers, broke out again, and when a group of Afghans defected in Shawwâl 1171/June-July 1758, disorders ensued and the army began to dis perse. Meanwhile Muhammad Husayn Khan Develû, who had remained in Isfâhan, seized the opportunity offered by the absence of Muhammad Hasan Khan in the south to return to Astarabad and take possession of it, but Nâdir Shâh prevented it when the latter returned. He retired to Dâmghân, where Muhammad Hasan Khan besieged him. Karim Kâhan, hoping to benefit from the renewal of internecine strife among the Kadjârs, sent an army under Shaykh 'Ali Kâhan Zand to Mâzûdarân, where several of the local tribes joined him. Muhammad Hasan Khan raised the siege of Dâmghân and proceeded to Mâzûdarân to meet this new threat. Disorders among the Turcomans and Kadjârs in the neighbourhood of Astarabad, however, forced him to return there, and he took with him the Safawid, Ismâ'îl III, who was then living in Sâfâr (ibid., ix, 58). Muhammad Husayn Khan Develû now joined Shaykh 'Ali, while Karim Kâhan himself advanced from Tehran towards Astarabad. Muhammad Hasan Khan, who had been joined by 'Ali Muhammad Kâhan, Ta'âkhârî and his brothers and relations to Shâhrûkh, of the Ashakâbars, though keeping with himself the Safawid puppet, had been with Karim Kâhan. In 1168/1754-5 Ahmad Shâh Durrânî, who had taken possession of Mashhad, made a bid to extend his power over northern Persia, but was defeated by Muhammad Hasan Kâhan near Sabzavâr in the summer of 1169/1755. The Kadjâr leader, after taking Kázvin and reasserting his power in Gilân, marched on Isfâhan and in 1169/1756 inflicted a second defeat on Karim Kâhan, who retired to Shirâz. At this point Muhammad Hasan Kâhan was forced to return to the north to deal with the incursion of 'Âzâd Kâhan, the Atâk, and to quell the Kadjârs of Ashak-bar in the Lâhârdâyân, and also by some Shâdûllû Kûrds from Khurâsân, Girayîlûs and Hadjidjîlûs, joined battle with Karim Kâhan near Ashraf. Victory went to the Zand army and Muhammad Hasan Kâhan was killed in flight in 1172/1759 (or according to some sources 1171). Muhammad Kâhan Kûyûnûlû, who had been made beglerbegi of Astarabad by Muhammad Hasan Kâhan, escaped with 'Âzâd Muhammad, his full brother Husayn Kull Kâhan and various other members of the family to the Gûrân steppe to the aebra of Murâd Kâhan Diâfarâbîya of the Yûmût (ibid., ix, 73). Shaykh 'Ali Kâhan Zand reappointed Muhammad Husayn Khan Develû governor of Astarabad. These events further exacerbated relations between the Aghâkabâb and the Yukhârâbâb, and in due course Muhammad Husayn Khan captured Muhammad Kâhan Kûyûnûlû and the sons of Muhammad Hasan Kâhan who were with him. Later he persuaded Karim Kâhan to take 'Âzâd Muhammad Kâhan and various of his brothers and relations to Shirâz to attempt any attempt by them to reassert the supremacy of the Aghâkabâb, though keeping with himself 'Âzâd Muhammad's half-brothers, Murta'da Kull and Muş'tafû Kull, whose khanates, in particular the Ziyûdûghlû khâns of Gandja, joined him. He left his eldest son 'Âzâd Muhammad (whose mother was a daughter of Sulâyman Kâhan Koyûnûlû and who, as a child, had fallen into the hands of 'Âdû Shâh, but was castrated by him), then aged about sixteen, as his deputy in Tabrîz and returned himself to Mâzûdarân (Ri'la Kull Khan, ix, 39-40). If, however, Sir John Malcolm's statement that 'Âzâd Muhammad Kâhan was aged sixty-three at his death is correct, he would have been about twenty-two at this time. (See History of Persia, London 1829, ii, 203). From there Muhammad Hasan Khan set out for Isfâhan and Shirâz, where he besieged Karim Kâhan in 1171/1758. After about a month, the Kadjâr force encamped round Shirâz experienced difficulty in provisioning itself and many of their livestock were captured by the enemy (Ri'la Kull Khan, ix, 48-9).
of Astarābād by his younger brother Muḥammad Ḥasan.

Āḵā Muḥammad Khan and his brothers, together with other local leaders, were held by Karim Khan in Šīrāz as hostages for the good behaviour of their respective tribes. Khādijah Begum, Āḵā Muḥammad-mad's paternal aunt, was married to Karim Khan. His brother, Husayn Kūl Khan, was made governor of Dāmghān in 1182/1769, and from then until his death in 1191/1777 he had a turbulent career in northern Persia (hence his title Dīvānāmān). Seeking revenge for the death of his father, he made war on the Develū and also on the Zand governors of Māzandarān, Bīstān and elsewhere, in spite of Āḵā Muḥammad's advice to him to adopt a peaceful policy. Astarābād changed hands several times but remained, for the most part, in Develū hands. In or about 1188/1774, Husayn Kūl sent his son Fatḥ ʿAll (b. 1173/1759-60 of an ʿīz al-dīnī ʿAbdul-Malik Khan mother and known as Bābā Khan) (p. 68) to Šīrāz to conciliate Karim Khan. He was well received and sent back to his father and given Dāmghān as a sāyūrgādī (Rīdū Kūl Khan, ix, 90 ff.).

Āḵā Muḥammad Khan appears to have been treated with favour and consulted by Karim Khan on affairs of state (ʿAbd al-Razzāk, Maʿārif-i sultānī-yā, entitled Dynasties of the Kajars, tr. by Sir Harford Jones, 2 ed. London 1853, 1 ff.; Riḍū Kūl Khan, ix, 78; Rustam al-Hukama, 338; Malcolm, ii, 176). He was not, however, reconciled to captivity, and the death of Karim Khan in 1193/1779 enabled him to escape. He proceeded to Māzandarān, where he was occupied for some years in contests with rival khāns of the Aḵāḵābābābāb and the Yuḵāhīrābāb, the latter of whom held Astarābād and the country extending from there to Khūrāsān and Vārāmīn. Various of the khāns, including Āḵā Muḥammad's half-brothers, Murtadā Kūl Khan and Riḍū Kūl Khan, co-operated with the Zand forces in the north (Rīdū Kūl Khan, ix, 127 ff.; Rustam al-Hukama, 444 ff.; Malcolm, ii, 93 ff.). In 1194/1780-1 Āḵā Muḥammad Khan came into conflict with the Russians, who had established a settlement in Ašrafāf, and expelled them (J. McN. Stuart, Progress and present position of Russia in the East, 2nd ed. London 1836, 33-4).

By 1199/1785 Āḵā Muḥammad Khan had made himself master of Gurgān, Māzandarān and Gīlān, and on the death of ʿAll Murād Khan in that year, he set out for Isfahān, which Diqāfār Khan had besieged. He defeated a Zand force near Kūm and entered Isfahān. Reappointing as governor Bākīr Khan Khūrāskānī (whom Diqāfār Khan had turned out), he retired again to the north. In 1200/1786 he made Tehran his capital (cf. Riḍū Kūl Khan, who wrongly states that he was crowned in Tehran in that year, ix, 200). From this time onwards Tehran continued to be the capital, and the importance of northern Persia relative to southern Persia for strategic and economic reasons and because of its more numerous population increased.

In 1201/1786-7 Diqāfār Khan recovered possession of Isfahān, but was again dispossessed by Āḵā Muḥammad, who on this occasion appointed his half-brother Diqāfār Kūl Khan governor before retiring to the north again (Riḍū Kūl Khan, ix, 188 ff.; Rustam al-Hukama, 448 ff.; Malcolm, ii, 102-3). Lutf ʿAll Khan succeeded Diqāfār Khan Zand in 1203/1789-90 and in the following year Āḵā Muḥammad made another expedition to the south. Lutf ʿAll fled to Šīrāz. Āḵā Muḥammad besieged the city, but raised the siege after about three months and returned to Tehran. In the following year Āḵā Muḥammad was occupied in asserting his authority in Aḏharbāyjān, where a number of local khāns had been virtually independent since the death of Karim Khan. In 1205/1792 Lutf ʿAll Khan made an abortive attempt to recover Isfahān, leaving Hādīdī ʿĪbrāhīm, the khāṭānār, together with one of the Zand khāns, in charge of Šīrāz. During the absence of Lutf ʿAll, Hādīdī ʿĪbrāhīm seized the city. Lutf ʿAll turned back but failed to regain possession and retired to the south. Hādīdī ʿĪbrāhīm meanwhile entered into negotiations with Āḵā Muḥammad Khan, whose elder a Kāḏār force had suffered a reverse at the hands of Lutf ʿAll, marched in person on Šīrāz. A surprise attack near Persepolis by Lutf ʿAll failed, and Šīrāz was handed over to Āḵā Muḥammad Khan. Renewed disorders by the Gūṭkān and Yāmūt, however, forced him once more to return to Tehran and Astarābād. Lutf ʿAll who had fled to the east, after various vicissitudes, took Kūrmān in 1208/1794. Āḵā Muḥammad set out once more for the south and laid siege to Kirmān. The city fell after some months and large numbers of the inhabitants were massacred.

Lutf ʿAll, who escaped before the city actually fell, was eventually captured near Narmāshārā and sent to Āḵā Muḥammad, who killed him (Malcolm, ii, 110 ff. HādīdīMirza Ḥasan Fasāʾī, Fārsānā-i nāṣīrī, l.c., Tehran 1846-6, i, 232 ff.). Having thus disposed of his Zand rivals and established his authority over the greater part of Persia except Khūrāsān, Āḵā Muḥammad Khan planned to restore to Persia Georgia, the ruler of which, Heraclius, had placed himself under Russian protection in 1783, renouncing all dependence on Persia. He reached Ardabil in the spring of 1209/1795 and on Heraclius' refusal to return to the status of a tributary of Persia (which had been Georgia's position under the Safawids), he invaded Georgia and sacked Tiflis. He spent the winter in Mūghān and then returned to Tehran, where he was crowned in the spring of 1796 (Riḍū Kūl Khan, ix, 273-4). His next step was directed to the reestablishment of Persian control over Khūrāsān, which was nominally ruled by Shāhrukh, the blind grandson of Nadīr Shāh, and to the prevention of raiding by the Uzbek khāns. In 1207/1792 he restored to Persia Georgia, the ruler of which, Shāhāb Khan, who held the post of kābul, proposed joint operations for the conquest of Bukhārā. A Russian force meanwhile marched against Persia in retaliation for the sack of Tiflis. Although this was withdrawn on the death of the Empress Catherine in the same year, Āḵā Muḥammad abandoned his Khūrāsān plans, returned to Tehran in the autumn, and in the spring of 1211/1797 set out again for Georgia. Crossing the R. Aras, he took Shūḡā. A few days later, on 21 Dhu ’l-Hijja 1211/19 June 1797 he was murdered in camp by two slaves, who, although under sentence of death for some misdemeanour, had been left free overnight. His nephew, Fatḥ ʿAll Khan (Bābā Khan), who at the time of his uncle's death was governor of Fārs, succeeded as Fatḥ ʿAll Shāh.

Āḵā Muḥammad Khan, realizing the weakness brought about by internecine strife, had been much concerned to heal the breach between the Kojūnūt and the Develū. Accordingly he married Fatḥ ʿAll to one of the daughters of Fatḥ ʿAll Khan Develū, and laid down that the crown should pass to ʿAbdāss Mirzā (b. 1203/1780), Fatḥ ʿAll's third son, and the eldest of his sons born to Fatḥ ʿAll Khan Develū's daughter (Nādīr Mirzā, Taʿrikh wa diwārāfīyā-yī
The Kadjar dynasty, Tehran lith., 1905, 190-1; Fath 'Ali Shah in 1240/1824 and the succession passed in 1250/1834 to his son Muhammad Mirzâ (b. 1222/1807), whose mother, Ásíyâ Khánum, was also a Develâ, being the daughter of Muhammad Kháñ Develâ and granddaughter of Fath 'Ali Kháñ Develâ. Malik Dâhân Khánum, the mother of Nâsir al-Dîn (b. 1247/1831-2), who succeeded his father Muhammad Shâh in 1264/1848, was a granddaughter of Sulaymân Kháñ Koyunlû, Aḵâ Muḥammad Kháñ Kháñ’s maternal uncle. Nâsir al-Dîn’s son and successor Muẓaffar al-Dîn (b. 1265/1853, reg. 1856-1907) was the son of Shukâh al-Saltâna, the daughter of Šu’dâ al-Saltâna b. Fath ‘All Shâh. Although not all of Nâṣir al-Dîn’s sons who were successively declared to be his wâlî ‘ādâd were the sons of Kâdâr mothers, the normal convention was for the mother of the wâlî ‘ādâd to be a Kâdâr. One of the arguments raised against the possible succession of Zîl al-Saltâna, the eldest son of Nâṣir al-Dîn, who became for a period the virtual ruler of southern Persia, was that his mother, Iḥfâl al-Saltâna, was not a Kâdâr. The mothers of Muḥammad ‘All Shâh (b. 1265/1848, reg. 1907-9) and his son Aḥmad Shâh (b. 1314/1898, reg. 1909-25) respectively were Kâdârs. Failure to establish a stable system of succession proved a weakness and led to repeated intrigues over the appointment of the wâlî ‘ādâd, and Fath ‘All, Muhammad Shâh and Nâṣir al-Dîn all faced some degree of armed opposition by various Kâdâr princes when they severally assumed the throne.

On the death of Aḵâ Muḥammad, Hâdîdî Ibrâhîm, his chief minister, put himself at the head of the troops and returned to Tehran, where Muḥammad Kháñ Kâdâr had closed the gates pending the arrival of Fath ‘All from Fârs. The new shah had to contend with a number of rebellions, including one led by his brother Huṣayn Kull Mirzâ, but none of them were of any magnitude. He continued the practice of appointing princes of the royal house to the provincial governments which the Šafâwîs had abandoned but the Zandás had largely resumed. In 1799 ‘Abbâs Mirzâ, then about four years of age, was governor of Ardâr-bâyduñ, and from 1815, when he was appointed wâlî ‘ādâd, the province was normally held by the wâlî ‘ādâd. Its good order and security was considered crucial to the safety of the Persian state because of the critical nature of Perso-Russian relations and the fear that disorders would invite Russian intervention. From 1810 onwards Fath ‘All’s Shah entrust foreign relations to ‘Abbâs Mirzâ and for that reason foreign envoys resided from then until his death at Tabrîz and not Tehran. Ardâr-bâyduñ was one of the largest and richest of the Persian provinces, and its capital Tabrîz rapidly became politically and commercially the second city of the empire. There were, however, certain disadvantages in making Tabrîz the seat of the wâlî ‘ādâd: on the one hand he became more vulnerable to Russian influence and on the other the faction between Turks and Persians heightened since his entourage in Tabrîz tended to be composed largely of Ardâr-bâyduñ Turks, many of whom accompanied him when he came to Tehran to assume the crown.

When ‘Abbâs Mirzâ was made governor of Ardâr-bâyduñ his eldest brother Muḥammad ‘All Mirzâ, whose mother was a Georgian, was confirmed as governor of Kirmânshâh. This province was also of considerable importance in view of the repeated disputes between the Persian and Ottoman empires.

Huṣayn ‘All Mirzâ Farmandârmandâr, whose mother was the daughter of an Arab chieftain of Khurâsân, was made governor of Fârs, Muḥammad Wâli Mirzâ governor of Khurâsân, and Muḥammad Kull Mirzâ governor of Mâzândarân. In due course several other princes, too young to administer their governments themselves, were sent to other provinces accompanied by viziers who carried on the administration for them, much as had the atabegs for their wards in Sâldîdî times. The Kâdârs never succeeded in establishing family solidarity, and this in view of the numerous progeny of each of the shahs is, perhaps, not surprising. Rivalry between the sons of Fath ‘All Shâh, especially Muḥammad ‘All Mirzâ and ‘Abbâs Mirzâ, several times threatened to break into open conflict. When ‘Abbâs Mirzâ died in 1833, Fath ‘All delayed until June in the following year before he declared Muḥammad Mirzâ wâlî ‘ādâd, for fear that a nomination would give rise to civil war.

Under the Treaty of Gulistân the way to the intervention of foreign powers in the matter of the succession to the throne was opened. By Art. 4 the Russian tsar undertook for himself and his heirs to recognize the prince who should be nominated as heir apparent and afford him assistance in case he should require it to suppress an opposing party.

When Fath ‘All nominated ‘Abbâs Mirzâ in 1818 he took steps to secure the appointment of the tsar to his nomination because he suspected that Yermolov, the Russian viceroy of the Caucasus, was preparing to intrigue with Muḥammad ‘All Mirzâ. Fath ‘All, to assure ‘Abbâs Mirzâ’s accession, also granted him the revenues of Gilân as well as Ardâr-bâyduñ for the support of his army, placed the governors of Khâmsa and Kâzvin, through which he would have to pass on his way to Tehran, under his orders, and sent a battalion of ‘Abbâs Mirzâ’s troops to Tehran to garrison the capital. In 1828, under Art. 7 of the Treaty of Turkomânčây, the Russian tsar recognized ‘Abbâs Mirzâ as successor to the throne and undertook to consider him the legitimate sovereign from the moment of his accession. This limited Fath ‘All’s freedom of action, raised the possibility of ‘Abbâs Mirzâ waging war on his own government with the support of Russian troops, and endangered his personal and political independence. The appointment of Muḥammad Mirzâ as wâlî ‘ādâd was recognized by the British and Russian governments in an exchange of notes expressing their mutual desire to act together over the matter of his succession and in the maintenance of the internal tranquility, independence and integrity of Persia.

So far as the provincial governments were not held by Kâdâr princes they were, for the most part, entrusted to tribal leaders, though Fath ‘All, in so much as he was able, decreased the power of the tribes apart from the Kâdârs [see ILAT]. There was, however, no clear dividing line between the provincial governor, the tribal leader, the landowner and the military commander. This facilitated rebellion and made the shah’s control almost always precarious. The provincial governors were required to remit to the central government annually a definite sum, based on the tax assessment prepared by the muṣtaṣaff’s office in the capital together with a new year present (piştâk) and to provide troops when called upon to do so. The cost of the provincial administration in addition to the regular assessment was collected locally. At each major provincial capital there was a replica of the court at Tehran. This, in the absence of financial control, imposed an added burden upon
the local people. Ambitious princes, moreover, were encouraged to use the provincial resources to rebel. The remission of provincial taxes was frequently in arrears, and their collection often necessitated a military expedition. Fath 'Ali Shah had, in fact, set out on such an expedition to collect arrears from Husayn 'Ali Mirza Farman-farmā, the governor of Fārs, when he died, en route for Shirāz, in Isfahān on 23 October 1834. Husayn 'Ali Mirza thereupon read the kāda in Shirāz in his own name and marched on Isfahān. Muhammad Mirzā was in no state to set out from Tabriz. His treasury was empty and his troops mutinous. The means to make the troops march were collected largely owing to the initiative and energy shown by the British envoy, Sir John Campbell. On 10 November a force set out, and Muhammad Mirzā followed shortly afterwards. Tehran, where 'Ali Mirzā Zīlī al-Saltānā had proclaimed himself shah, was taken in December, and an expedition despatched to the south. Farmān-farmā's forces, led by his brother Hasan 'Ali Mirzā and his three sons, Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, Taymūr Mirzā, and Wall Mirzā, were defeated near Kumīshā. Farmān-farmā surrendered and later died. Hasan 'Ali Mirzā was blinded and imprisoned at Ardabil. Farmān-farmā's sons escaped, finding their way via the Ottoman Empire to England, whence they returned in 1836 to the Ottoman Empire and spent the rest of their lives in exile (see Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, Safar-nāma-i Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, nasa'i Fath 'Ali Shah, ed. Asghar Farmān Farmān-i Kādjar, Tehran 1963-4; J. B. Fraser, Narrative of the residence of the Persian princes in London, in 1835 and 1836, 2 vols., London 1838).

Several other Kādjar princes were seized by Muḥammad Shah and kept in captivity in Ardabil, lest they became rebels. About the same time it broke out in Tehran. Farmān-farmā's forces, led by his brother Hasan 'Ali Mirzā and his three sons, Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, Taymūr Mirzā, and Wall Mirzā, were defeated near Kumīshā. Farmān-farmā surrendered and later died. Hasan 'Ali Mirzā was blinded and imprisoned at Ardabil. Farmān-farmā's sons escaped, finding their way via the Ottoman Empire to England, whence they returned in 1836 to the Ottoman Empire and spent the rest of their lives in exile (see Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, Safar-nāma-i Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, nasa'i Fath 'Ali Shah, ed. Asghar Farmān Farmān-i Kādjar, Tehran 1963-4; J. B. Fraser, Narrative of the residence of the Persian princes in London, in 1835 and 1836, 2 vols., London 1838).

Several other Kādjar princes were seized by Muḥammad Shah and kept in captivity in Ardabil, lest they became rebels. About the same time it broke out in Tehran. Farmān-farmā's forces, led by his brother Hasan 'Ali Mirzā and his three sons, Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, Taymūr Mirzā, and Wall Mirzā, were defeated near Kumīshā. Farmān-farmā surrendered and later died. Hasan 'Ali Mirzā was blinded and imprisoned at Ardabil. Farmān-farmā's sons escaped, finding their way via the Ottoman Empire to England, whence they returned in 1836 to the Ottoman Empire and spent the rest of their lives in exile (see Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, Safar-nāma-i Riḍā 'Kull Mirzā, nasa'i Fath 'Ali Shah, ed. Asghar Farmān Farmān-i Kādjar, Tehran 1963-4; J. B. Fraser, Narrative of the residence of the Persian princes in London, in 1835 and 1836, 2 vols., London 1838).

The Kādjarān, having established themselves as the rulers of Persia, ceased to be tribal leaders and, like earlier rulers, became absolute monarchs. To impress their subjects with their power, they sought to emphasize the high, almost sacred, character of their rule. The pomp and circumstance of the royal court after the reign of Āḵā Muḥammad Khān, and the exercise of power, were still, in theory at least, accessible to the lowest of his subjects. Similarly, after the death of Āḵā Muḥammad Khān, the administration, based on the pattern of the Ṣafavīd empire, became more elaborate. All officials were the shah's deputies, elevated and degraded at his pleasure. He was the sole executive. In circumstances in which intrigue and corruption were rife, and the exercise of power depended on the personal influence of the intrigues of rivals, bribery and nepotism were almost inevitable.

The chief minister was the sadr-i aʿṣam (sometimes known as the Muʿtamid al-Dawla). His functions were much the same as the wasir-i diwān-i ʿālī of Ṣafavīd times [see Dāwān]. His main duty was to provide money for the administration and defence of the state. The three chief officials under him were the musawwir al-mamlūk, the wasir-i lāğkhār and the munṣiq al-mamlūk. The minister for foreign affairs (wasir-i khāridji), because of the increasing import-
ance of Persia's foreign relations, also became an influential official. From the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn onwards various attempts were made to modernize the administration [see HUKŪMA]. Aḵā Muḥammad Ḵān was well served by Ḥādīḏī Ibrāhīm, who became sadr-i ʿażam in 1209/1794. He was also joint vizier with Mīrzā Ṣafī to Fath ʿAllī. His power and nepotism led to intrigues, which aroused Fath ʿAllī's suspicions against him, and he was blinded and killed in 1801. Many of his relatives were also executed and his political enemies confected. Various ministers subsequently attempted without success to assert control over Fath ʿAllī. ʿAbbās Mīrzā as wali ʿābd was served with distinction by Mīrzā ʿĪsā Mīrzā Buzurg (d. 1822), who was succeeded by his son, Abū-ʾl-Kāsim Kāhm Maḵām, also a talented man. He later became minister to Muhammad Mīrzā, over whom he established his ascendancy. When Muḥammad Mīrzā succeeded to the throne, Kāhm Maḵām became sadr-i ʿaẓam. His rule, reputedly corrupt, was extremely unpopular and he fell from power in 1835 and was executed on 26 June 1835. Ḥādīḏī Mīrzā ʿĀkīstān, a Georgian from Erivan, who had been Muḥammad Mīrzā's tutor in ʿĀḏarbāyjān, succeeded him. He, too, eventually concentrated power in his own hands, holding a number of offices in addition to that of sadr-i ʿaẓam. This also brought unpopularity upon him, and on the death of Muḥammad Shāh, in fear for his life, he took refuge in Russia. Nāṣir al-Dīn on his accession made Mīrzā Ṭakī Ḵān ʿĀmīr Nīẓām, who had been deputy-governor of ʿĀḏarbāyjān since 1843, sadr-i ʿaẓam. He, partly because of the youth and inexperience of the shah, also concentrated power in his own hands, and treated his royal master with a certain measure of contempt. An able man, he perhaps attempted too much at once. His severe rule and vigorous attempts to reform abuses met with opposition, and in 1851 he was overthrown and murdered. The queen mother, among others, played a prominent part in his overthrow (see FIRĀDĀYDN ʿĀDAMIYYAT, AMĪR KĀBĪR WA IRĀN, 3 vols., Tehran 1956-7). He was succeeded by Mīrzā ʿĀḵā Nārī, whose misfortunes were largely taken up in defending the machinations of numerous rivals and in a contest with the shah for the sole exercise of power. Corruption, which placed every office within reach of the highest bidder, was his weakness and rendered him accessible to the attacks of his enemies. He was deprived of the office of sadr-i ʿaẓam in 1853 when the government was reorganized [see HUKŪMA].

By the middle of the century, the resurgence of the bureaucracy, after its relative eclipse under the early Kāḏjār, was becoming evident. In the second half of the century its influence continued to grow. The position of officials, however, was still fundamentally insecure. This was why they so often sought support for their schemes from outside sources, in particular the British and Russian missions. It also explains in part the apparently equivocal behaviour of ministers such as ʿĀlī Aqẖār Ḵān Ṭāmān al-Sultān, who, until the fiasco of the Tobacco Regie, worked for the modernization of Persia in close co-operation with the British minister, Sir Drummond Wolff, but later fell under Russian domination. During the Kāḏjār period there was a contraction in the area over which Persia claimed sovereignty, but within the frontiers as they were eventually established the control of the central government gradually became more effective. Aḵā Muḥammad Ḵān's attempt to regain Georgia proved abortive. Hostilities with Russia in the Caucasus, which had been intermittent from about 1805, were resumed in 1811, and the Persian army was decisively defeated at Aslāndūz on 31 October/1 November 1812. In the following year a preliminary treaty was signed at Guliston on 13 September 1813 by which Persia ceded Georgia, Darband, Baku, Shīrvān, Shākli, Gandja, Karābāḡ, Mughān and part of Tālīṣ to Russia. Neither side regarded the peace as permanent and the war was eventually resumed in 1827. The Russian advance was rapid. Tabrīz fell and a treaty of peace was signed at Turkmānchāy on 27 February 1828. Erivan and Nakhchivan were ceded by Persia and the cessions made under the Treaty of Guliston confirmed (for texts, see C. U. Aitchison, A collection of treaties, engagements and sanads, Calcutta 1933, xv ff. and xxiii ff.).

The Perso-Turkish frontier, which was broadly as laid down in the Treaty of Zuhāb of 1049/1639 (which was in turn based upon the earlier settlement of 962/1555), also gave rise to many disputes. The Kurdish section, some 700 miles, in particular, was difficult country to settle and control. Like Karābāḡ, Mughān and Tālīṣ, it was inhabited by semi-nomadic tribes. These moved to and fro between the Paḵhalik of Baghdād and Persia, while the frontier authorities of both countries were in the habit of giving asylum to marauders and refugees from the other. Relations with Turkey were also strained by Shīfāʾ creation and strife and, in ʿArabistān, by Per-o-Arāb antipathies.

In 1804 and 1805, the Ottoman Sultan Selim III had allowed Russian forces to use the south-eastern coasts of the Black Sea in their operations against Persia. Muḥammad ʿĀlī Mīrzā, governor of Kirmān, subsequently engaged in intermittent hostilities with Turkey. War was declared in 1821 and continued until 1823 when hostilities were concluded by the Treaty of Erzerum (for text see Aitchison, xix ff.). A series of major incidents between 1833 and 1842, including the burning of Muḥammad by the paḵā of Baghdād in 1837 and the temporary occupation of Sulaymānī by Persia in 1840, again brought the two countries to the brink of war. In 1843 an Anglo-Russian offer of mediation was accepted. The proceedings were nearly wrecked at the outset by a massacre of Shīfāʾs at Karbalā. A second Treaty of Erzerum was finally signed on 31 May 1847, by which the lowlands of Zuhāb were ceded to the Ottoman Empire and the highlands to Persia. The latter gave an appeal to Sulaymānī while the Ottoman Empire recognized Persian sovereignty over Muḥammad. The two parties further agreed to appoint commissioners to delimit the frontier. The commission consisting of four commissioners, one each appointed by Persia, Turkey, England and Russia, met in 1849. Its proceedings were interrupted first by the Crimean war (1854-6) and then the Anglo-Persian war (1856-7). In 1869 a protocol was signed, laying down a band of territory twenty-five to forty miles wide within which the commissioners considered the frontier ought to be found. Repeated disputes between Persia and Turkey and acts of armed aggression bedevilled the work of the commission, and the frontier was not finally delimited until 1914 shortly before Turkey's entry into World War I (see further C. J. Edmonds, Kurds, Turks and Arabs, London 1957, 125 ff.).

When Aḵā Muḥammad Ḵān left Khurāsān in 1796 Persian control had not been fully restored. The re-conquest of Harāt, which had been formed part of the Saḵawī empire in its heyday, together with the reassertion of Persian power up to the Oxus remained
the aim of Fath 'Ali Shah, Muhammad Shah, and, in the first part of his reign, Nasir al-Din Shah. In the event, the reincorporation of Harāt into the Persian Empire was largely frustrated by British actions, and Persia and Britain were brought to the brink of war in 1838-9 (see Correspondence relating to the affairs of Persia and Afghanistan, London 1839; J. W. Kaye, History of the war in Afghanistan, 3 vols.; London, 1857; J. A. Norris, The first Afghan war 1838-1842, Cambridge 1967, 82 ff.), and to actual war in 1856 (G. H. Hunt, Outram and Havelock's Persian campaign, London 1858; J. B. Kelly, Britain and the Persian Gulf 1795-1880, Oxford 1968, 452 ff.). By the Treaty of Paris (4 March 1857) which brought the war to a close, Persia recognized the independence of Afghanistan (for text see Aitchison, 81 ff.). In 1870, the shah proposed that the boundaries between Persia and Kalât should be settled. Commissioners nominated by Persia, Kalât and Britain met and their proposals were accepted in the following year. The rival claims of Persia and Afghanistan to Sístân, which more than once threatened to rupture their friendly relations, were also settled by British arbitration in 1872.

The subjugation of the Guklân, Yamût, and Tekke Turkomans, who were in the habit of raiding deep into Persia and kept the Russian government on its toes for some years, was brought to an end by the Treaty of Finkenstein (4 May 1807). The treaty was an accommodation, only, in a state of permanent disorder, also proved beyond the power of the Persian government, and opened the way to a Russian advance to Marv and the Aţgal. Persia was forced to abandon her claim to sovereignty over the area and in 1869 Nâşir al-Din Shah signed an agreement with Russia for a new frontier along the Atrek River, which was later superseded by the Aţgal-Khurasan boundary convention of 1881 (for texts see Aitchison, liv ff. and lxxi ff.). Persia's geographical situation on the frontiers of Russia on the one hand and of India and the Persian Gulf on the other, if nothing else, would have involved her in the political rivalries of Napoleonic France and England (with both of whom treaties were signed; for texts see J. C. Hurewitz, Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, New York 1956, i, 77 ff., and Aitchison 45 ff.) and later (in the 1870s), if nothing else, and on his second European journey, he asked the emperor of Austria for the loan of a number of instructors. A mission arrived shortly before his death and were employed in various parts of the country raising and drilling troops. They withdrew in 1836 on the rupture of Anglo-Persian relations over Harāt. A number of French officers were subsequently engaged but achieved nothing. By the end of the reign of Muḥammad Shâh the army, including the artillery, which Hâdîdji Mirzâ Ākâsî, in spite of his complete ignorance of military arts, had taken under his personal supervision, was in a state of decay.

Mirzâ Tâkî Khân, after he became sâdîr-i ʿâlam to Nâşir al-Dîn, began to reorganize the army as part of his policy to extend the power of the central government. Recruitment was reorganized and based on a system of quotas to be furnished by each village, district and tribe. In practice, however, the system was somewhat irregularly applied. Officers for the new army were to be trained in a new school, the Dâr al-Funûn, which was opened in 1851, and had on its staff a number of Austrian and other foreign military and civil instructors. These various steps, however, had little immediate success, and the emptiness of the treasury after the Harât campaign of 1856-7 precluded more radical reform. Subsequent efforts at military reform made during the ministry of Mirzâ Husayn Khân Muḥsîr al-Dawla were also unsuccessful.

Nâşir al-Dîn was not unmindful of the advantages of an efficient military force to maintain his own position, if nothing else, and on his second European journey, he asked the emperor of Austria for the loan of a number of instructors. A mission arrived in January 1879, to be followed shortly afterwards by a Russian mission to reorganize the cavalry, for which the shah had similarly applied to the tsar. The Austrian mission failed to achieve any results and left in 1881. The Russian officers remained and organized the Cossack Brigade, which became the most efficient regiment in the Persian army. It was a ready instrument for the Russians in the furtherance of their aims in Persia, and was used by Muḥammad ʿAll Shâh in his struggles against the constitutionalists (see further G. N. Curzon, Persia and the Persian question, London 1892, i, 571 ff.; F. Kazem-
The disparity in power between Persia on the one hand and Russia and Britain on the other had been demonstrated by the Russian wars and the disputes over Harat. Efforts at military reform, even if successful, would have done little to redress the balance between them, but would have contributed to the stability of the government and the maintenance of order, and so limited the intervention of Russia and Britain in internal affairs. As it was, both increasingly intervened in internal affairs because of the prevailing insecurity and maladministration, though their motives in doing so were different. Neither could regard with equanimity the prospect of civil war. Britain was not prepared to see the wa'il 'ahd, or another Persian prince, riding down to Tehran supported by Russian troops and the establishment of a puppet government, since this would have meant the establishment of Russia on the frontiers of India, while Russia could not afford civil war for fear that it might lead to a British occupation of southern Persia which would have blocked a Russian advance to the Indian Ocean. Persia, for her part, had no wish for subservience to either, but her dependence upon them grew, and in these circumstances it was natural that society should become divided into those who looked to Russia and those who looked to Britain.

Nāṣir al-Dīn probably had a clearer appreciation of Persia's weakness than his predecessors. Realizing that foreign intervention could not be prevented, he adopted a policy of encouraging foreign powers to invest in Persia in the hope that they would contribute to its development and prosperity, but he too did not recognize the need for radical financial and administrative reform if this policy was to be successful. It failed largely because of the disunity of Persian society, the rivalry of the powers, and the greed of the various parties concerned in the scramble for commercial monopolies and concessions. Thus, while the intrusion of France, Russia and England acted first as a stimulus to modernization, from the middle of the 19th century onwards, if not earlier, it added to the prevailing insecurity and intrigue, and so discouraged, rather than stimulated, progress and, in effect, contributed to the maintenance of the status quo.

The key to Persian independence was financial reform, which in turn presupposed administrative reform. Successive šadr-i a'zams, particularly in the second half of the 19th century and in the early 20th century, were harassed by demands for more money. In the reign of ʿĀqā Muhammad Khan the revenue was small, but broadly speaking expenses were met. Even in the time of Fath 'Ali Shah, in spite of the depletion of reserves by the Russian wars, the revenue from ordinary taxes (land revenue, cattle taxes, taxes on real estate in towns, and duties on merchandise), and extraordinary taxes (revenue from fines, new year presents, ad hoc presents, and public requisitions) balanced expenditure, though the pay of officials and of the army was frequently in arrears. During his reign there was, however, a constant drain of specie. This trend continued under Muḥammad Shah and resulted in a heavy depreciation in the value of the tumán, a rise in prices, and a general shortage of money, though conditions varied greatly from place to place and year to year. In the last three or four years of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shah an excess of copper coinage caused much distress among the poorer sections of the population and almost paralyzed small trade. This was withdrawn after the accession of Muḥammad Shah at great loss to the government.

By the middle of the 19th century government offices were being sold in an attempt to secure ready money, and there were signs of a financial breakdown comparable to that which had prevailed in Būyid times, prior to the emergence of the land assignment (šāhāni) as the dominant political and economic institution of the state. Scarcely any provincial revenue was reaching Tehran and payments by the government were almost entirely in the form of bills, whose value was nominal. At the beginning of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shah, Mīrzā Ṭāki Khān made an abortive attempt to effect financial reform. Venality and corruption in the tax administration thereafter continued unrestrained.

Various expedients, notably the grant of monopolies and concessions to foreign concerns, were adopted by Nāṣir al-Dīn and Muḥammad al-Dīn to provide themselves with funds. Muḥammad al-Dīn also sought foreign loans for the growing extravagances of the court, the allowances and pensions of the Kāḏjār princes and others, and general expenses (see further R. L. Greaves, British policy in Persia, 1892-1903, in BSOS, xxviii (1965), I, 34-60, II, 284-307, on the question of Anglo-Russian loans). Both policies gave rise to great discontent on the grounds that Persian resources were being sold and placed under the control of foreigners.

The first major concession was the concession granted in 1872 to a British subject, Baron Reuter, providing inter alia for railway and road construction, irrigation works and the establishment of a national bank. There was much criticism of this concession both inside Persia and abroad, and it was cancelled as a result of heavy pressure from Russia in 1873. It was finally remodelled and signed in January 1889, Baron Reuter being accorded for a term of sixty years the grant of the Imperial Bank of Persia, which was established under a British Royal Charter in September of that year. This was the beginning of a modern banking system in Persia. In 1890 a Russian subject obtained a concession for a loan bank, which some years later became an agency of the Russian State Bank.

In March 1890 a monopoly for the sale and export of tobacco was acquired by a British subject. This was the occasion for the open expression of popular discontent. The protest against the monopoly led by the religious classes resulted in the cancellation of the monopoly (see further A. K. S. Lambton, The Tobacco Regie: prelude to revolution, in St. Isl., xxii, 119-157, xxiii, 71-90; N. Keddie, Religion and rebellion in Iran. The tobacco protest of 1891-2, London 1966). The compensation paid to the Imperial Tobacco Corporation was provided by a loan contracted with the Imperial Bank of Persia in 1892.

A third concession of outstanding importance was granted in 1901, namely the concession to Mr. William Knox d'Arcy for the exploitation of natural gas, petroleum, asphalt and ozokerite throughout the Persian empire, with the exception of the five northern provinces, for sixty years. In 1909 the Anglo-Persian Oil Company was formed to operate the concession. In due course the exploitation of Persian oil resources transformed the economy of the country and profoundly affected her relations with Britain, but these developments did not reach their climax until after the fall of the Kāḏjārs (see further Ait-chison, 23 ff.).

In the course of the 19th century there were
changes in the direction and sources of Persian trade (see further M. L. Entner, Russo-Persian commercial relations, 1857-187). Customs duties, which were farmed, by the end of the 19th century, formed an increasingly important proportion of the revenue. Because of the provisions of the commercial agreement concluded under Art. 10 of the Treaty of Turkomân Cóy, Persia's hands in the matter of fixing the rate of duty were tied. The connexion between the customs and Persia's foreign relations was reinforced when the various foreign loans which Persia contracted were secured on the customs revenue. In 1890 Belgian officials were appointed to reorganize the customs administration. Greater efficiency in the collection of customs dues under the Belgian administration, coupled with new tariff charges secured by the Russian and British governments by agreements concluded in 1901 and 1903 respectively, aroused discontent among the merchant classes. This was an important factor in the support of these classes for the constitutional movement.

An arrangement of a rather different character from the normal concessionary agreements, but one which also emphasized Persia's weakness, was the secret agreement made with Russia in 1887 by which the shah pledged himself not to give permission for the construction of railways or waterways to foreign governments before consulting the tsar, and in 1890 a railway agreement was signed with Russia placing a ten-year embargo on railway construction (for text see Aitchison, lxxxii). There were still no railways by the end of the Kâdjar period except for a few miles between Tehran and Shâh ʿAbd al-ʿAṣîm and a line from Djuflâ to Tabâriz made in 1910. Lack of communications were an obstacle to trade and to the assertion of the control of the government in the provinces. In 1889 Persia had only two carriagable roads of any extent, namely from Kâznîn to Tehran and Tehran to Kûmm (Curzon, i, 486 ff., 613 ff.). Various concessions for road construction were given in the last decade or so of the 19th century, but little progress was made in road-building. In 1888 the Kârnûn River was opened to international navigation (see further R. L. Greaves, Persia and the defence of India, 1884-1892, London 1935, 161 ff.).

Insecurity, misgovernment, poverty, and the usurpation of power were not new to Persia, and there is plenty of evidence of unrest in the Kâdjar period—of rebellions by tribal leaders and others, such as the revolt of Aka Khán Mâhallâtî in 1840 (which also disturbed Anglo-Persian relations), mob violence in the towns, and movements of protest led by the religious classes, one of the most serious of which was the Bâbî movement led by Sayyid ʿAll Muḥammad, who declared himself to be the long awaited māḥdî in 1260/1844 (see Sâb). This movement was primarily a messianic movement, the intellectual bases of which went back to mediaeval Islamic movements of revolt and heresy, and like these earlier movements was provoked largely by a sense of injustice and frustration at the shortcomings of the government.

In spite of outbreaks of unrest the control of the central government by the middle of the reign of Naṣîr al-Dîn Shâh was more firmly settled. It was weakest in the tribal and frontier areas. An important factor contributing to the extension of government control was the establishment of the telegraph under a series of conventions, the first of which was concluded in 1863 (see Aitchison, 25 ff., Casp. i, 609 ff.). Both Naṣîr al-Dîn and Muḥaffar al-Dîn felt sufficiently secure to undertake extensive European journeys, the former in 1873, 1878 and 1889 and the latter in 1900, 1902 and 1905.

Although the government had succeeded in making its influence more widely felt by the last quarter of the 19th century, the increasing dominance of non-Muslim nations over Persia, which was a marked feature of the century had, by the turn of the century, given a new dimension to internal unrest [see also ʿIYYA]. Opposition to the government began to be expressed in terms of a nationalist movement, which was at once pro-Islamic and anti-foreign. The fact that Russia could at almost any moment send troops into Persia made the Persian government increasingly reluctant to resist Russian pressure, while at the same time Persia's subservience to Russia gave rise to growing resentment. Similarly, Britain's failure to give Persia the support to which she had felt she was entitled under the various treaties which had been concluded in the reign of Fath ʿAll Shâh and her refusal during the reign of Naṣîr al-Dîn to give a clear commitment to come to Persia's aid in the event of a Russian attack had created annoyance, which was added to by the Harât question, measures to suppress slavery and piracy in the Persian Gulf, and the British presence there, which, from time to time, was felt to threaten Persian independence.

New intellectual currents coming through diplomacy, travel, trade, Islamic modernist movements outside Persia, and education (though apart from the Dâr al-funûn there were few modern schools until the end of the 19th century) also contributed to this development, and to the progressive dissolution of the old institutions of government and society. Little by little a new system of government was worked out and the people who were to work it came to the fore. In the last ten years or so of the 19th century these trends were accelerated and reached their climax with the grant of the constitution in 1906 and the Supplementary Fundamental Laws in 1907 [see DUSTÔR and DÎMÎYVA]. In the first instance it was members of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs who first began to seek the reasons for Persia's backwardness vis-à-vis Europe and remedies for her ills. Among those who played a leading part in this respect were Husâyn Khân Mushâr al-Dâwla, who had served in consular posts in India and the Ottoman Empire, Mâlkâm Khân, a Persian Armenian from Isfâhân, who had been educated in Paris and was Persian minister in London from 1872 to 1889, Mirzâ Yusûf Khân Mumtâzî al-Dâwla, Mirzâ Muḥammad Khân Maqâid al-Mulik Sinâkl (d. 1881), Amin al-Dâwla, and others. Persians living abroad, or who had travelled abroad, such as Mirzâ Aka Khân Kirmânî, who lived in Constantinople, and Aka Mirzâ Fûrsât Shîrâzî, who travelled in India, and merchants engaged in foreign trade also contributed to the spread of new ideas. An important part was also played in this by the Persian press published abroad (there were no newspapers apart from the official gazette in Persia until after the death of Naṣîr al-Dîn Shâh), such as A dik founded by Mirzâ Aka Kirmânî in Constantinople in 1875, Kânûn founded by Mâlkân Khân in London in 1890, and Hâlî al-Mutâân first published in Calcutta in 1893 (see also ʿAWMIYVA, Persia).

The ʿulâmâ? also played a prominent part in the events leading up to the constitutional revolution and largely provided its leadership. This was not due only, or even chiefly, to the influence of the pan-Islamic movement led by Dîmâm al-Dîn Afgânî [q.v.], though this had considerable effect, but rather to the position of the ʿulâmîs? in society. Under
the Kadjars, the religious institution once more stood over against the state and was not wholly incorporated into it. The ‘ulama’ fulfilled certain functions for the government and many of them received allowances and pensions from the government, which to some extent compromised them, but on the whole they were able to exercise restraint upon the government and to act as peacemakers, though they were also sometimes associated with movements leading to outbreaks of violence in the cities. In the last resort, they provided a refuge for the people against injustice, and the people looked to them for protection and the fulfilment of their aspirations.

Fath ‘Ali Shah took pains to win the favour of the ‘ulama’. Later rulers were more concerned to limit their power. Muhammad Shah, although he gave pensions and allowances to the religious classes, was more inclined to the Shii than to orthodox Islam and he attempted to bring the ‘ulama’ under closer control. At the outset of the reign of Nasir al-Din Shah, Mirza Taqi Khan continued this policy and alienated the religious classes by reducing their salaries and pensions. He also attacked the practice of asylum (see BAST), which Bahman Mirza, when governor of Agharbodjan on behalf of Muhammad Shah, had also sought to limit. Tentative efforts to control waqf revenue, the spread of secular education with the setting up of the Dar al-Funun, and attempts at judicial reform by Husayn Khan Mushtir al-Dawla when he was sadr-i a’lam also created disquiet among the ‘ulama’, who began to feel their position menaced by the actions of the government. They also felt Persia’s traditional way of life and national independence were threatened by the intrusion of foreigners. Partly for these reasons, when dissatisfaction at increasing internal misgovernment and hostility to foreign intervention came to a head in the early 20th century, it was expressed in a nationalist movement, articulated paradoxically largely in terms of Islam and led mainly by the ‘ulama’ (see further A. K. S. Lambton, The Persian ‘ulama and constitutional revolution, in Revolution in the Middle East, ed. P. J. Vatikiotis, London 1972). It was not, as such, a revolutionary movement, and the understanding and aims of the various groups supporting it varied. In essence it was a protest against tyranny. So far as there was a demand for the adoption of modern techniques of government, its purpose was to restrain the arbitrary exercise of power by the shah in order to limit tyranny and to secure the country from foreign influence and intervention. So far as there was a demand for freedom, the freedom envisaged was seen strictly within the limits set by Islam and did not involve a revolutionary concept. The underlying intention of the majority of people who supported the movement was to carry out the Islamic duty of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil in such a way that the ruler would be duly warned and restore just government. Their aim was the restoration of “good” government. Since it followed from the traditional dichotomy between Islamic, i.e., just, government and usurpation, i.e., zulm, that the reassertion of just government meant “good” government by a just ruler, they did not demand a reformulation of the theory of government such as would provide for checks and balances in the exercise of power.

The victory of the constitutionalists in 1906 was shortlived. There was little to hold the various groups together once they had overthrown the despotism. Their confidence, moreover, was shaken by the conclusion of the 1907 Anglo-Russian agreement, which roused great resentment (see further R. L. Greaves, Some aspects of the Anglo-Russian Convention and its working in Persia, 1904-14, in BSOAS, xxxi (1968), 1, 69-93, II, 290-308). Muhammad ‘Ali’s counter attack against the constitution was, nevertheless, defeated and he was forced to abdicate. His son, Ahmad Shah, succeeded him as a regency. By 1913, however, when the constitution was suspended under Russian pressure, the leadership of the constitutional movement had passed into the hands of the bureaucracy and the landowning classes.

During the First World War of 1914-18 Persia proclaimed her neutrality but this was violated variously by herself, the central Powers and the Entente. At the end of the war a chronic state of disorder prevailed and the country once more seemed on the point of dissolution. In an attempt to forestall this, the abortive Anglo-Persian agreement, which recognized the independence and integrity of Persia, provided for military advisers, a loan, and co-operation in the improvement of communications, was signed in 1919. In the following year the Bolsheviks invaded Enzeli and occupied Ra’i, and a revolutionary government was set up in Gilan under ‘Ali Kuli Khan.

The last phase of Kadjar rule began with the coup d’état organized by Sayyid Diya’ al-Din and Rida Khan in 1921. The first action of the new government was to conclude the Perso-Soviet treaty of 1921, by the terms of which the Soviet government declared all treaties and conventions concluded with Persia to be null and void, but made it a condition that these concessions should be supported by Persia to aut its power. The measures taken by Sayyid Diya’ to create an orderly administration quickly aroused opposition. He quarrelled with Rida Khan and was overthrown. The latter, as minister of war, then began to reassert the authority of the central government. The movement led by Kocii Khan collapsed owing to internal dissension and the withdrawal of Russian support. In 1923 Rida Khan, as prime minister, sought by pressing the people to agree to a new constitution, which was to be null and void, but made it a condition that these concessions should be supported by Persia to aut its power. The measures taken by Sayyid Diya’ to create an orderly administration quickly aroused opposition. He quarrelled with Rida Khan and was overthrown. The latter, as minister of war, then began to reassert the authority of the central government. The movement led by Kocii Khan collapsed owing to internal dissension and the withdrawal of Russian support. In 1923 Rida Khan, as prime minister, sought by pressing the people to agree to a new constitution, which was to be null and void, but made it a condition that these concessions should be supported by Persia to aut its power. The measures taken by Sayyid Diya’ to create an orderly administration quickly aroused opposition. He quarrelled with Rida Khan and was overthrown. The latter, as minister of war, then began to reassert the authority of the central government. The movement led by Kocii Khan collapsed owing to internal dissension and the withdrawal of Russian support. In 1923 Rida Khan, as prime minister, sought by pressing the people to agree to a new constitution, which was to be null and void, but made it a condition that these concessions should be supported by Persia to aut its power.
bilizing force, while the merchants had played an important part in the transmission and provision of funds for the state. By the end of the period Persia had become a modern territorial secular state, drawn into and affected by international politics. She had acquired a constitution and modern forms of government (though the spirit in which the new institutions were worked had not been transformed to the same extent as had been the outward forms). The functions of government had been greatly extended, and political power had become more widely based.

The account of his early years is given by TakI al-Asghar Shamim, in Dargndma-yi Kishm (and is not to be confused with his namesake Kadri Shafak, Tehran 1337/1958, 63; Rieu, Le Monde Oriental, 190, 1. 19-20; this is placing the mahkrdad of the kaf too far back.

Remark: H. Blanc (The "sonorous" vs. "muffled" distinction in old Arabic phonology, in To honor Roman Jakobson, The Hague-Paris 1967, 306) sees in the pronunciation of Arabic in the time of Sibawayhi, in 'Irak in the eighth century, two occlusives, aspirated, surd and probably strong: k and t; he adduces (ibid., 298) the researches and reconstructions of I. Garbell in Remarks on the historical phonology of an East Mediterranean Arabic (Word, xiv (1958), 303-37) and also his own documentation, with reference to his communication: The fronting of Semitic g and the Qal'g dialectal split in Aramaic, in the Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies (Jerusalem 1969). A correct interpretation of Sibawayhi's doctrine, in phonetics, does not, in our view, allow us to see in k and t aspirated occlusives; moreover, the reconstructions of I. Garbell depend on the basic principles that she has provided for herself (Word, 306-9, Stage 1) (see the presentation of H. Blanc, loc. cit., 298).

The articulation described is a phoneme; for the phonological oppositions that define the phoneme k see J. Cantineau, Esquisse d'une phonologie de l'Arabe classique (in Mémoire de J. C., Paris 1960, 173); for the incompatibilities see ibid., 201.

Kaf in classical Arabic is a continuation of k of common Semitic, preserved in ancient Semitic, but subject to spirantisation (k > kh) in Aramaic and Massoretic Hebrew, when it is immediately preceded by a vowel, however short.

Alterations: Sibawayhi (ii, 452, l. 13-4) mentions a faulty pronunciation of k: kaf between g1m (in fact g1m [see (1)]) and kaf; this, in our view, very probably a g pronunciation (cf. M. Bravmann, Materialien, 49). According to Ibn Durayd (Ibn Ya'qub, Sharh al-Mufassal, 1463, l. 11-2, ed. G. Jahn), it was a dialectal pronunciation of the Yemen, widespread among the people of Baghda, e.g.: *gamal (see ibid., § 120).

For the conditional and unconditional alterations of k in the modern Arabic dialects see J. Cantineau, Cours (in Mémoires de J. C., 66-7) and the references of D. Cohen (Le dialecte arabe hассaïïa de Mauritania, Paris 1963, 31, n. 1).

KAF, 22nd letter of the Arabic alphabet, transcribed k, numerical value 20, according to the eastern order (see BARD)
zu den phonetischen Lehren der Araber, Göttingen 1934, 47, for aspirated ʰ (H. Fleisch)

KAF, 21st letter of the Arabic alphabet, transcribed ʰ, numerical value 100, according to the eastern order [see ABDJAD].

Definition: occlusive, uvulovular, surd. According to the Arab grammatical tradition: ṣhadīda, madẖūra, in makhraj: the rear-most part of the tongue and the highest part of the upper palate (Sibawayhi, ii, 453, 1. 5-6, ed. Paris; al-Zamakhšarī, Mufassal, 185, 2nd ed. Bruch), i.e., that is to say: the root of the tongue is in contact with the very lowest part of the soft palate and the uvula and the latter disappears during the retention in the articulation: al-Khallī correctly says ḫahawīya “uvular” (al-Azhari, Le Monde Oriental, xiv (1920), 45, 1. 7-8; Mufassal, 190, 1. 19-20).

The Arab grammarians place ʰaf not among the muḥāba “velarized” (emphatic), but among the musāliya, which prevent āmāl [q.v.] (Sibawayhi, ii, 285, 1. 17-20; Mufassal, 190, l. 8). Ḫaf, in fact, is not an emphatic in Arabic: thus, in the form ṣafāla, a ʰ, as the 1st radical consonant, has no effect upon the ʰ with which it is in contact, unlike the emphatics. So we find, for example: ṣ̱afatāla; it is its velar articulation that may involve the velarization of ʰ (s > ʰ), a consonant of the same root (Sibawayhi, ii, 279, l. 18). H. Fleisch, Traité, § 46 h and the Traiti de Philologie arabe, in MUSJ, xxviii (1949-50), 242, n. 2).

Arab grammarians since Sibawayhi (ii, 453, l. 17) have placed ʰaf among the madẖūra (voiced); “but the traditional pronunciation of classical Arabic must assign it a surd” (J. Cantineau, Cours de Phonétique arabe, in Mémoi̇ral J. C., 67). A voiced pronunciation of ʰaf must certainly have existed, at least in an important part of the ancient Arabic language, otherwise it would be difficult to explain precisely how the manner of pronouncing this ancient ʰaf should have become at present a principle in discriminating between the vernaculars of nomads, in which it is voiced, and those of sedentary populations, in which it is a surd (see H. Fleisch, Traité, § 46 h and the references; J. Cantineau, Cours, ibid., 68 and the references). See (ibid., 66-9) the vernaculars that have a surd ʰaf or one reduced to hamza and (69-70) those that have a voiced ʰaf, a ʰaaf.

The ʰaf is a phoneme; for the phonological oppositions that define it, see J. Cantineau, Esquisse d’une phonologie de l’arabe classique, in Mémoi̇ral J. C., 174); for the incompatibilities (ibid., 201).

The ʰaf, which is not an emphatic in classical Arabic, is the continuation of a common-Semitic ʰaf that is emphatic (J. Cantineau, Le consonantisme du sémitique, in Mémoi̇ral J. C., 287; M. Cohen, Essais comparatifs sur le Vocabulaire et la Phonétique du Chamiisme-sémitique, Paris 1947, 123); but it is difficult to indicate precisely the nature of this emphasis (see J. Cantineau, ibid., 291), and, according to M. Cohen (ibid.) it cannot be determined whether the Hamito-Semitic phoneme had a surd or a voiced articulation, but it can be confidently stated that its quality of surd or voiced was of secondary importance in comparison to its emphasis.

Alterations: final ʰ of a word can be assimilated to initial kaf, the following word, thus: ʰ k > -kk- (see H. Fleisch, Traité, § 12 o). An Arabic compound of an unconditional change: ʰ k among some tribes; this fact is difficult to interpret (see ibid., § 9 h).

In modern dialects, we have seen above the transfer of ʰaf to hamza and the question of voiced ʰaf. J. Cantineau (Cours, ibid., 70) suggests a possible assimilation of ʰ into ʰ before a ʰ, in oriental as well as in North-African vernaculars. The explanation involving a dissimilation seems an inadequate solution to D. Cohen (Le dialecte arabe Ḥassāniya de Maurétanie, Paris 1953, 35). There are examples of the change of ʰaf into ɣayn: in Syria (G. Bergsträsser, Sprachatlas von Syrien und Palästina, in ZDPV, xxviii (1915), 216 (§ 95) and Karte 37; J. Cantineau, Cours, ibid., 70-1); in certain “North-Arabian nomad” vernaculars, in the majority of the vernaculars of the Algerian, and, apparently, Moroccan, Sahara (J. Cantineau, ibid., 72); in Ḥassāniya (D. Cohen, ibid., 35-7 and the references).

Bibliography: Apart from the references in the text: H. Fleisch, Traité de Philologie arabe, i, Beirut 1961, § 2 c, § 44 c, j, n, § 46 a, § 48 b, § 49 i; M. Bravmann, Materialien und Untersuchungen zu den phonetischen Lehren der Araber, Göttingen 1934, 21, 45-6 and the references; A. Schaeade, Sibawayhi’s Lautlehre, Leiden 1911, 14, 66 (n. 19); H. Blanc, Ibn Durayd on the Qaf of the Banū Tamim, in Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies, Jerusalem 1969, 33-4; see also, ibid., 15-16, 28-32. (H. Fleisch)

KAF, in Muslim cosmology, the name of the mountain range surrounding the terrestrial world. There is little doubt that this conception is borrowed from Iranian traditions. These make the Alborz (the Alburz, or the Alborz), the mythical mountain at the edge of the world, and the home of the gods. All the other mountains in the world have come from the Alburz by underground ramifications. This mountain (the high mountain: Hara-berezyati) surrounds all the world, but also a lake with the name of Wurukasha; however, according to the Bundahsh, this lake itself, although confined to the edge of the world, does not form a moat around it. The same work, talking of the geography of these mythical regions, gives the name of a mountain: Kaf (cf. Windischmann, Zoroastrische Studien, Berlin 1863, 7, 73, 75, n. 1).

This geography interlocks with another, again an Iranian one, but with horizons limited to those of the Iranian world itself, and not the universe taken as a whole. Here the Alburz is the mountain rampart which bounds the Iranian world to the north. This is doubtless what makes Yākūt say (iv, 18) that the Kaf was formerly called Alburz; cf. also Mustawfi, Ḵuzat al-kūlūb, GMS, xxiii, i, 191-2. Geiger (Ostiranische Kultur im Kulturall, Erlangen 1882, 42-3) thinks that Lake Wurukasha originally referred to a definite place (Aral or Caspian Sea), but that since then, from the time of the Avesta, it has been relegated to the realm of myth. On the Alburz - Hara-berezyati system and Lake Wurukasha (Vāruḳāsh), cf. Ritter, Die Erkdunde oder allgemeine vergleichende Geographie, Berlin 1822-9, viii, 42-3; F. Spiegel, in ZDMG, vi, 85, and Eranische Altertumskunde, i, Leipzig 1871, 191 ff.; W. Gieger, op. cit., 42-3; F. v. Adrian, Der Hohenkultur asiatischer und europäischer Völker, Vienna 1891, 287-8.

Iranian cosmology has fairly close links with that of the Hindus. In their writings, particularly in the Purāṇas, they deal with the question of the fabled
mountain chain of Lokaloka, which separates the visible from the invisible world, and which rises above the horizon as a boundary of the world, situated in the north, as it appears in the Indo-Iranian tradition, was very widespread among the peoples of the ancient Orient. Perhaps, in the last analysis, the origin of this could be sought in Babylonian cosmology; cf. F. Deltzsch, Wo lag das Paradies?, Leipzig 1881, 21, 117-8; F. Hommel, Aufsätze und Abhandlungen, ii, Munich 1900, 345-6; Zimmermann, Die Keilschrifttexte und das Alte Testament, Berlin 1903, 353, 355, 620. Traces of the same conceptions are also to be found among the ancient Hebrews: cf. W. Gesenius, Kommentar über den Jeremias, ii, Leipzig 1821, 316-7 (where analogous opinions found outside the Bible are also examined in detail); Dillmann-Kittel, Der Prophet Jesaja, Leipzig 1898, 134. Lastly, to return to the Hindus, the Meru which in ordinary Buddhist thought is considered to be the centre and navel of the earth (cf. W. Foy, in Festschrift E. Windisch-Leipzig, 1923-4); E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, Strasbourg 1915, 253, index; Roscher, Neues Olympiak-Studien, Leipzig 1915, 72), is at times thought to be the mountains of the Himalaya bounding the Hindu world to the north. In this connexion it may be remembered that in the cosmological traditions of Islam itself as they are presented in the Kur’ân and Hadîth, an account of these themes can be found (T. Fahd, La naissance du monde selon l’Islam, in Sources orientales. La naissance du monde, Paris 1959, 237 f.). The general tendency of the classical Muslim world, apart from learned theories, is to consider the world as a flat disc. This manner of looking at it, which seems to result from certain kur’ânic passages (cf. e.g., Kur’ân, XV, 19, LXXIX, 30: God spread out the earth), is found in the traditions and consciousness of the people. The mountain of Kâf is separated from the terrestrial disc by a region which men cannot cross, a dark area which would stretch for four months walking, according to a saying of the Prophet (cf. the Persian version of Tabârî-Bai’damî, tr. Zotenberg, i, Paris 1867, 33). But the mountain of Kâf does not only surround the earth: it also encloses the Ocean which forms a girdle around the earth.

According to the descriptions, in particular those of Mutahhar b. Tâhir al-Mâkidî, Yâkût, Kazwînî and Ibn al-Wardî, the mountain of Kâf is made of green emerald, of which the sky reflects the colour. But others say that only the rock on which Kâf rests is of emerald. This rock (al-sakhra) is also called a stake (maṣâd); God made it to support the earth, which without it would not be able to stand up by itself. That is why the Persians say that Kâf did not exist, the earth would shake constantly, and no creature would be able to live on it: this latter idea can be compared with the role assigned to mountains in the architecture of the world by the Kûrân, cf. (XIII, 3 and passim).

The existence of Kâf combines with other conceptions relating to the supports of the earth. A tradition contained in Kazwînî, i, 146, tells how in the first ages, since the earth was oscillating in all directions, God created an angel who took it on his shoulders and grasped it with his hands (compare with the myth of Atlas); the angel had as his support a rectangular rock of green hyacinth, itself borne upon a giant bull which rests upon a fish swimming in the water. Ibn al-Wardî, who repeats these details (p. 12, 15-6), specifies that the mountain Kâf has as its base the rock of hyacinth. Elsewhere the same author (13, 17-8) increases the number of the supports of the earth, with the exception of the angel, and varies the hierarchy of elements already quoted. Other variants are pointed out by A. J. Wensinck, The Ocean in the literature of the western Semites, in Verh. Ak. Amst., Phil. Sect., new series, xix/2 (1918), 16 and n. 2, and J. Meyer, Die Hilfe im Islam, Basel 1901, 46. The Muslim Iranians describe the animal supporting the earth now as a bull (cf. Dâmî, op. cit., 13; Rosenzweig, op. cit., 190b; Vullers, Lex. Pers.-Lat., ii, 946a), now as a hybrid of bull and fish (cf. Firdawsi, Shâh-nâmeh, ed. Vullers-Landauer, Leiden 1877-85, 37, 144; Vullers, Pers.-Lat., ii, 947a). Similarly, popular belief in Baghdad long talked of a bull and a fish as supports for the earth (cf. H. Petermann, Reisen im Orient, ii, Leipzig 1861, 301). Amongst the inhabitants of the countries round the Red Sea, there reigned the belief that the earth rests on the back of gigantic bulls (cf. E. Rüppel, Reisen in Abyssien, i, Frankfurt-am-Main 1838, 256). Kazwînî gives for the bull and the fish the names of the biblical monsters Leviathan and Behemoth, proving in that way that these conceptions, taken over by the tradition of the Muslim world, are connected with ancient biblical ideas, which themselves go back to the Babylonian tradition of the chaos. But, on the other hand, the theme of the bull carrying the earth is also found in India, and the rock from which the mountain Kâf springs can double be identified with the stone Sêtitya mentioned by Firdawsi, which carries the umbilical stone of the earth, which God cast down into the depths of chaos or of the Ocean as the support of the earth (cf. for this legend Feuchtwang in MGWJ, liv (1910), 724-5; W. H. Roscher, op. cit., 73-4). It must be noted, however, to end the theme of the supports, that one tradition (Kazwînî, i, 144) maintains that God placed the earth in the universe without anything surrounding it or supporting it. Kâf is thought to be the mother-mountain of all the mountains of the world. They are linked to it by subterranean ramifications; when God wants to punish a people, or to destroy a country, He sets one of these ramifications in motion, thereby causing an earthquake. Others believe that the earthquakes are due to the fact that the bull, wearied by his burden, kicks, thus shaking the earth. However it might be, Kâf plays an essential role in the cosmos: it is the primary mountain, the one which sees the sun pass on its course, and it is given a certain human appearance with a head and a face.

Inaccessible to men, it marks the edge of the world; therefore its name is used metonymically with this latter meaning (cf. e.g., Dâmî, op. cit., 1). No-one knows what lies beyond; but some, while maintaining that this beyond belongs to the realm of eternal life, undertake to describe it: the country would be white like silver, stretching over forty days'
walk, and inhabited by the angels; stretching beyond Kāf there would be a land of gold, seventy of silver, and seven of musk, each one stretching in each direction over ten thousand days travelling, and each one populated by angels. Kāf with all the countries beyond can also be given as the home of the djinns. But above all, Kāf is thought to be the haunt of the fabulous bird Simurgh, a sort of griffon with characteristics similar to those of the ‘Anāq, [q.v.] of the Arabs. Existing since the beginning of the world, this marvellous bird then withdrew to Kāf in complete solitude, and lives there contented as a wise counsellor consulted by the kings and heroes of old. Kāf, its home, on account of this has been given the name, especially in poetry, of “mountain of wisdom”, or “mountain of contentment”. In the Ḍanīḥ al-Ṭayr, the Persian poet Farīd al-Dīn Aṭtār [q.v.] describes the pilgrimage of the Ṣūfī by way of the seven stations through which the soul must pass before it loses itself completely in God, by means of the allegory of a very difficult journey filled with adventures, accomplished by a bird, traversing the seven valleys, until it reaches the mountain Kāf, where their very wise king Simurgh is enthroned. Kāf also plays a certain role in the literature of tales; this mountain is found in the Thousand and One Nights (466th, 624th, and 787th Nights). On their return home an excerpt of the Korān, the letter Kāf, which stands at the head of Sūra L, as referring to the mountain Kāf (references in R. Blanchère, Introduction au Coran, Paris 1959, 147).

In purely terrestrial geography, no longer cosmological, Kāf at times denotes the part of the high Asiatic chain of mountains which borders the Muslim world to the north, especially the Caucasus and the mountains of northern Persia; that is why the Damar-Wand [q.v.], a mountain situated in the region of Haut-Tell about 30 km. from the Algerian border; the altitude varies from 700 to 850 m. Since 1962, an effort has been made to replace the traditional cereal cultivation with a greater agricultural diversification, although the attempt at co-operative collectivization of the land was abandoned in September 1969. The town has also benefited from a degree of urbanization and cultural promotion. To this end, since September 1967 an annual festival has been held in honour of Jugurtha, promoted to the rank of a local hero.

The site of al-Kāf has been inhabited since the Paleolithic era, but when the town itself was founded is unknown; it was probably a Libyan or Punic foundation. The name first appears in texts dated 241 B. C. relating to mercenaries sent there by Carthage after the First Punic War to fend off the threat to the capital. The Romans called it Sicca Veneria after a Punic goddess who was identified with Venus. There seems to be no doubt that ritual prostitution was practised at her sanctuary. Under the Empire the town was called Colonia Julia Cirta Nova; it later came under Muslim control under the name of Shīkka Banārya (a corruption of Sicca Veneria) and continued to be referred to as such in Arab texts until the end of the Middle Ages. Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406) knew it under no other name. The name al-Kāf appears for the first time in the works of Ibn Abī Dīnār, who wrote around 1100/1698-9, and al-Wázir al-Sarrājī (d. 1149/1736-7). The latter, citing Ibn Shabbātī on Shīkka Banārya, found it necessary to add, “which is the town now called al-Kāf” (Hulal, i/2, 325), indicating that the old name had been completely forgotten. The change of name must have begun at the beginning of the period of Ottoman control (1574), which brought about a new stage in the history of the town. Around a score of sites in Tunisia bear names containing the vocable al-Kāf (R. Vaufrey, Préhistoire de l’Afrique, index to vol. i and ii; L. Balout, Préhistoire de l’Afrique du Nord; index; J. Ganiage, Les origines du protectorat... 35, 62; Guide Bleu de la Tunisie, index). An al-Kifān (pl. of al-Kāf) is noted in the vicinity of Fez (Leo Africanus, Description de l’Afrique, i, 229 n. 370), and Yāḥt (Buddan, iv, 431) mentions a fortress in Syria bearing the name al-Kāf, undoubtedly the same one which Ibn Khaldūn called al-Kahf (“Ibar, v, 842) and which Zāhir Baybars (658/1260-676/1277) captured from the Ismā’īlīs. It is apparent that the toponym al-Kāf is very widespread. No doubt a corruption of the Arabic word al-kahf (“cave”) through the dropping of the unvoiced spirant h, it was used to denote any agglomeration occupying a cavernous site, one that was raised up. In this respect, al-Kāf merits its name. “Standing on one of the main shoulders of a massif which can be considered as a natural citadel, the town dominates the great plains of Sers, Zanfour, Lorbus and Oued Mellégue, and at the same time commands the main routes from Tunis to Algeria” (Tissot, Géographie comparée... ii, 378).

This “natural citadel” was frequently mentioned during the Jugurthine war, and he made it one of his bastions. When it came under Roman control, it was
raised to the status of a colony and enjoyed real prosperity under the Empire, reaching some eminence when... 

The bey liammuda Pasha (1782-1813) restored the

Frères Barbu, which became the most important fortress in the region. In the middle of the 10th/16th century Leo Africanus could still sing the praises of Laribus, now no more than a few ruins 30 km. east of al-Kaf and totally eclipsed by the latter. No Arab geographer mentioned al-Kaf again until al-Bakri (d. c. 461/1068) and he only incidentally in the course of relating several Muslim encampments and battles fought on the site of the ancient city. Despite its eclipse, al-Kaf figures from time to time in medieval historiography. In 1717/78 the Ibadî Kharîdîs suffered a crushing defeat there during the rule of the Muhallabid Dâwûd b. Yazzîd. Its fall, without a single blow having been struck, into the hands of the Fâtimid dâ'î al-Bârî was a preliminary to the definitive defeat of the Aghlabid troops at Laribus. Under the Zirids, the town played an active part in the conflict between Bâdis (368/969-406/1016) and his uncle, Hammad, and during the Hûlîi invasion (443/1052) a certain ‘Ayyûd (or ‘Abbâd or ‘Imâd) b. Naşr al-Killâtî led a band of adventurers and founded a little kingdom there, successfully resisting all invaders. In 554/1159 the Almohads drove out his descendants and united the Maghrib. Al-Kaf is not mentioned under the Hafsids, except for a battle which raged in the vicinity in the summer of 724/1324. From then on, its decline began. V. Guérin, who

visited the town between the 8th and 10th of June 1860 observed: “Two quarters are almost in ruins and barely inhabited, which means that the town contains less than half the number of people one at first imagines. The total population consists of 4,500 Muslims, around 600 Jews, a few Maltese, and the employees of the French post-office” (Voyages, ii, 53-4). In 1864 it was taken in the inscription of ‘All Ibn Ghâdâmâm, and was hit by the famine and cholera of 1867. The railway linking Tunis and Suk el-Arba (now Djendâbî), built in 1878, accelerated its decline by depriving it of its traditional role as a commercial station between Algeria and Tunisia. The population of the town continued to decrease. In 1881 “its 45 hectares, which could have accommodated 8,000 people, contain no more than 3,500” (Monchicourt, La région du Haut-Tell, . . ., 408). When the French protectorate was established in Tunisia, General Lagorot took the town without a struggle on 26 April 1881. Three years later, in June 1884, the first French school in the interior was opened there; on July 8 in the same year it was raised to the status of a commune and from 1886 it was made the seat of a civil controller who governed alongside the caid. The municipal census of 1912 indicates its new composition, revealing also the resurgence it had begun to enjoy. Its 6,312 inhabitants in 1912 were made up of 4,462 Muslims, 650 Jews, and 1,200 Europeans, 800 of them Italians and 340 French. During the Second World War it became a vice-residency, administering that part of Tunisia which was not occupied by the Axis forces.

Al-Kaf, formerly one of the centres of Maraboutism, still possesses many saâiyas, but the political influence of the brotherhoods, in the past of some importance, is now practically nil.
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- Mukaddasî, 4hsan al-tabâsîm, ed. and partial tr. Ch. Pellat under the title Description de l'Occident, . . ., Algiers 1950, 18-19; Mâlikî, Riyâd, ed. H. Monès, Cairo 1951, i, 30; Bakrî, Masâlîk, ed. tr. De Slane, Paris 1965, 33-74; Yâkût, s.v.; Ibn al-Shabbat, Siât al-Simî, Ms. 3208, Nat. Lib. of Tunis, fol. 82 v.—83 r.; From then on and throughout the Middle Ages al-Kaf gave way to Laribus, which became the most important fortress in the region. In the middle of the 10th/16th century Leo Africanus could still sing the praises of Laribus, now no more than a few ruins 30 km. east of al-Kaf and totally eclipsed by the latter. No Arab geographer mentioned al-Kaf again until al-Bakri (d. c. 461/1068) and he only incidentally in the course of relating several Muslim encampments and battles fought on the site of the ancient city. Despite its eclipse, al-Kaf figures from time to time in medieval historiography. In 1717/78 the Ibadî Kharîdîs suffered a crushing defeat there during the rule of the Muhallabid Dâwûd b. Yazzîd. Its fall, without a single blow having been struck, into the hands of the Fâtimid dâ’î al-Bârî was a preliminary to the definitive defeat of the Aghlabid troops at Laribus. Under the Zirids, the town played an active part in the conflict between Bâdis (368/969-406/1016) and his uncle, Hammad, and during the Hûlîi invasion (443/1052) a certain ‘Ayyûd (or ‘Abbâd or ‘Imâd) b. Naşr al-Killâtî led a band of adventurers and founded a little kingdom there, successfully resisting all invaders. In 554/1159 the Almohads drove out his descendants and united the Maghrib. Al-Kaf is not mentioned under the Hafsids, except for a battle which raged in the vicinity in the summer of 724/1324.

The town did not regain its former importance until the Ottoman era. Facing Constantine, its task was to defend the Regency of Tunis against invasion from Algeria. It was involved in the successive conflicts between Algiers and Tunis (1628, 1685, 1694, 1705, 1746, 1756, 1807) and in the squabbles among the various pretenders to the throne of Tunis. A kasba was built in 1675, and remained fortified. In 1739-40 Ilî Pasha built a rampart around the town. The bey Hammûda Pasha (1782-1813) restored the kasba in 1806 and consolidated the enceinte. During his reign al-Kaf, alongside Tunis, Kayrawân and Bêjda, was one of the four main fortresses of the kingdom, permanently endowed with a strong garrison of at least 500 men under the command of an aqâ. Yet the town lost its strategic value: the installation of the French in Constantine in 1837 made its fortifications henceforth useless.

From then on, its decline began. V. Guérin, who

visited the town between the 8th and 10th of June 1860 observed: “Two quarters are almost in ruins and barely inhabited, which means that the town contains less than half the number of people one at first imagines. The total population consists of 4,500 Muslims, around 600 Jews, a few Maltese, and the employees of the French post-office” (Voyages, ii, 53-4). In 1864 it was taken in the inscription of ‘All Ibn Ghâdâmâm, and was hit by the famine and cholera of 1867. The railway linking Tunis and Suk el-Arba (now Djendâbî), built in 1878, accelerated its decline by depriving it of its traditional role as a commercial station between Algeria and Tunisia. The population of the town continued to decrease. In 1881 “its 45 hectares, which could have accommodated 8,000 people, contain no more than 3,500” (Monchicourt, La région du Haut-Tell, . . ., 408). When the French protectorate was established in Tunisia, General Lagorot took the town without a struggle on 26 April 1881. Three years later, in June 1884, the first French school in the interior was opened there; on July 8 in the same year it was raised to the status of a commune and from 1886 it was made the seat of a civil controller who governed alongside the caid. The municipal census of 1912 indicates its new composition, revealing also the resurgence it had begun to enjoy. Its 6,312 inhabitants in 1912 were made up of 4,462 Muslims, 650 Jews, and 1,200 Europeans, 800 of them Italians and 340 French. During the Second World War it became a vice-residency, administering that part of Tunisia which was not occupied by the Axis forces.

Al-Kaf, formerly one of the centres of Maraboutism, still possesses many saâiyas, but the political influence of the brotherhoods, in the past of some importance, is now practically nil.
**KAFA'**

A term which in common usage signifies at one and the same time equality, parity and aptitude, but in the terminology of *fikh* designates equivalence of social status, fortune and profession (those followed by the husband and by the father-in-law), as well as parity of birth, which should exist between husband and wife, in default of which the marriage is considered ill-matched and, in consequence, liable to break-up. In fact, in *fikh*, *kaфа*a works in a single direction and protects only the wife who must not marry beneath her station; it matters little, on the other hand, if the man marries a woman of socially inferior status except in two cases. The scope of the theory of *kaфа*a, which varies from school to school, and the sanctions provided for by them in regard to an ill-matched marriage are discussed in the article NIKAH. Here, as there, questions of social, family and economic parity have retained all their importance, even though as in the Maghrib, inequality of status is not the object of judicial sanction.

One must therefore resign oneself to explaining the importance attributed to *kaфа*a by the Hanafi system, not by sociological reasons, but by the fact that in this school the woman who had reached the age of puberty was permitted to conclude her marriage without the assistance of a *walid* (q.v.), even though such a proceeding was considered blame-worthy. In these countries therefore the risks of misalliance were much greater for the wife's family than in countries under Mālikī law where the indispensable assistance of the *walid* gave an important guarantee to the wife's family. This explains the tendency in certain Mālikī countries (Morocco for example) counterbalancing the relative freedom at present enjoyed by the woman to arrange her own marriage, to introduce in their recent code of personal status attenuated forms of *kaфа*a, unknown to classical Mālikī law.

surety-bond as a unilateral commitment on the part of the surety. This conception was adopted by the other schools in which the surety-bond is an action that is valid solely through the will of the surety. The surety-bond being seen as an act of generosity on the part of the surety, it was deduced that the latter must be able to dispose of it freely; that is he must be in full enjoyment of his capacities, and must not be a minor, madman, nor “prohibited”. On the other hand, the creditor being in the position of a donee profits, in Hanafi law (where his acceptance is insisted upon), from the same facilities as any other donee. Only debts and obligations which are capable of being fulfilled by the security in place of the principal debtor may be the object of a surety-bond.

Therefore penal obligations and talion (ğişâs) are excluded, except in the case of kafala bi'l-nafs, in which circumstances the surety-bond only guarantees the debtor's appearance in court.

a) Kafala bi'l-nafs. This original form of surety-bond underwent a lengthy evolution in all works of fiqh no matter to which school they belonged. The first Shâfi’is and the Imam al-Shâfi’i in his second teaching were opposed to it: later the Shâfi’i school, “influenced by public opinion and the pressure of necessity”, finally permitted it. This surety-bond assumed that judicial proceedings may be instituted against the debtor; it is therefore invalid when the debtor has disappeared after the conclusion of the agreement and it is not known where he may be reached (except in Shâfi’i law, in which trial by default is permissible). For the same reason the bond no longer holds good when the debtor dies, and of course the death of the surety has the same effect.

The schools deal differently with the defaulting surety; that is someone who fails in his obligation to make the debtor appear in court. In the view of the Hanafi school if, after a certain period of grace has been accorded him (for his failure may be due to the temporary absence of the debtor), he is still unable to fulfill his obligations then he is to be imprisoned, at the decision of the kâdi. In these circumstances the Mâlikis and Hanbalis give to the surety the benefit of the same waiting period as the Hanafis; if the debtor has still not appeared in court after this period the surety is sentenced to pay the debt of the debtor. Shâfi’i law is less precise on this point, but it does not, under any circumstances, provide for the imprisonment of the defaulting surety.

b) Kafala bi'l-mâl. All debts may be bonded, even though their exact total is not known, by the surety at the time when he enters into the contract or it is a question of an advance credit in the patrimony of the creditor (except in Shâfi’i law). It is sufficient if the obligation can be fulfilled by a third for the account of the debtor, excluding (as we have seen above) obligations pertaining to the person of the debtor (badd, gişâs, fee for contractual release, etc.).

The surety bond is subject to the same restrictive clauses schools in attending the principal obligation. From this it is deduced that if the creditor concedes a limit to the surety, the debtor, who has firmly pledged himself, benefits from it also. Nevertheless, in Hanafi law (in which the surety-bond assumes an agreement between creditor and debtor), the creditor is allowed to consent to a limit to the surety and to make the express stipulation that the debtor may not benefit from this. The creditor’s release of the surety from his bond does not free the debtor but, in the reverse case, the release of the debtor frees the surety. If, instead of guaranteeing the payment of the debt, the surety takes over the debt this is not kafala but hasefâ (q.v.), that is conveyance or assignment of the debt.

The moment that the debtor’s obligation falls due, the creditor has the right to proceed against the principal debtor or the surety as he pleases, or both at once. Therefore in Muslim law there is no benefit of discussion on behalf of the surety as there is in Western law, where the surety can constrain the creditor to begin his proceedings with the debtor, unless there is legal and conventional liability. Only the Mâlikî law allows the surety the opportunity of obliging the creditor to begin his proceedings with the debtor when the latter is solvent; the same is true when the debtor is absent, as long as the existence and stability of his goods can be established without difficulty. These conditions hold good in the absence of any contrary stipulations made by the parties concerned. The surety who has paid the reckoning of the debtor has no remedy at law unless the latter asked him to guarantee him and, being so be, he is able to dispose of his goods. In default of one of these conditions, the surety is bereft of any remedy, except in Mâlikî law where he always retains his right of legal remedy provided that the discharge of the debt is established.


Y. LINANT DE BELFONDS - AL-KAFF ('ilm), a divinatory process which belongs to the realm of physiognomy [see PIRASA], and designates more specifically chiromancy, or the art of deducing the character of a person according to the shape and appearance of the hands, whereas chiromancy proper is designated by 'ilm al-asâdir (lines of the hand) or Shâfi’i law. One can also say nasr fi 'l-yad, from al-kaff (cf. T. Fahd, Divination arabe, 393 ff.). But the use of the term 'ilm al-kaff has become general, and this has supplanted the others. It covers both chiromancy and chiromancy; it also includes dactylocracy (prognostications drawn from the observation of the finger joints) and onychomancy (divination from the finger nails).

Although this form of divination, considered by the Chinese to be the first step in the science of the occult, has been and continues to be very widespread, literature on the subject remained rare until the Middle Ages (cf., for example, the recent collective work entitled La divination, studies collected by A. Caquot and M. Leibovici, Paris 1968, where chiromancy, mentioned only twice, appears to play a very minor rôle in the divinatory tradition).

In the West, a pseudo-Ciromantia Aristotelis (cf. L. Thorndike and P. Kibre, A catalogue of incipits of Mediaeval scientific writings in Latin, revised and augmented edition, London 1963, the Mediaeval Academy of America, no. 29, pp. 225, 303, 830) seems to have been at the origin of several short treatises or pamphlets on chiromancy attributed to Albertus Magnus (op. cit., 282, 350), Michael Scott (ibid., 531) and other scholastic theologians. This Ciromantia, said to have been translated (from the Greek?) by John of Seville and Adelard (of Bath?), appears to
have been unknown to the Arab translators of the writings of Aristotle. This pseudo-Aristotelian tradition, rather late in the Christian East, through the medium of mediaeval Latin works, as can be seen from three Christian manuscripts known to us: a) Beirut, Fac. Or. 271 (no. 579), entitled *Firāsat al-kaff*, dealing, in a first section of twenty-four chapters, with the nature of the hand and its aspects (with rough drawings), and a second section, also of twenty-four chapters, concerned with the mysteries of life according to the hand; b) Aleppo, P. Sbath, 529, with the same title, done in the 19th century by a monk in Jerusalem (414p); c) Berlin, Cat. Ahlwardt, 4255, an anonymous work of 55 fol., citing Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, among others.


In the East, where for once Aristotle was not invoked as the initiator of this art, two traditions come together in Arab divination: the Indian tradition represented by an anonymous work now lost, which was quoted by Ibn al-Nadim (*Fihrist*, 314), K. Khudil al-kaff wa l-makddlr al-asdbi* (titles reminiscent of the two Bursa texts: the author lived in this town), attributed to the historian Mustafā b. Hasan al-Djannāī (d. 999/1590) by Hāḍidī Khālīfā, iii, 576. Meanwhile, in order to gain a clear idea of the object of this art according to the Arab authors, we have at our disposal two definitions: the first is found in the *K. al-firāsa* by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (ed. and tr. Y. Mourad, Paris 1939, 11) and the second in Hāḍidī Khālīfā, i, 236. From this it appears that chiromancy allows the prediction of the length or brevity of a man's life, his destiny, happy or unhappy, his wealth or poverty, etc., based on the lines of the hand or the sole of the feet by observing whether they are close or far apart, long or short, whether the spaces which separate them are wide or narrow, and by looking at the patterns which they form.

Finally, as in the case of the *Firāsa*, *Lim al-asār* was applied in medical prognostication. Hippocrates and Galen practised it, as they did armed physiognomy (cf. *Divination arabe*, 381 ff.; cf. R. Labat, *Traité akhadien de diagnostics et pronostics médicaux*, Leiden 1951, where an appendix is devoted to the "pronostics akkadiens et pronostics grecs", pp. xxxv-xlv). In this respect it would be useful to verify the contents of the *K. Asrār* (= according to al-Rāzī, loc. cit.: lines of the hand and of the sole of the foot) *al-māṣ* and the *K. Asrār al-riddāl*, attributed to Galen and translated by Ḥunayn b. Isḥāk (cf. AS 4838, resp. fol. 57v-74v, and 76v-105y; Baghdātī Vehbi, 1409, fol. 191v-26v and 26v-32v).


**Kaff**, term used in prosody (see *Arab*); term with politico-religious meaning (see *Kof*).

**Kaffāra**, an expiatory and propitiatory act which grants remission for faults of some gravity. This technical term, which is only employed four times in the Kurān, is said to have been borrowed from Hebrew kāppārā (A. Jeffery, *Foreign vocabulary of the Qur'an*, 250; D. S. Margoliouth, art. *Expiation and atonement (Muslim)*, in *Hastings Enc.*). For the reasons set out below, this thesis should be considered as unproven. On the other hand the root *kfr* is undoubtedly Arabic.

Speaking strictly etymologically, *haffāra"covers"* sins rather than wipes them out. The root, which is frequently used in the Kurān, in fact means "to cover," "to cover a thing or person so that it is hidden from view." The renegade is called *kāfir* [q.v.] because his heart is wrapped in blasphemy; the same word refers to the night, for then things are shrouded in shadow (LA, root *kfr*). Thus the *haffāra* is intended to cover wicked deeds with a veil so that they are concealed. From this point of view, fault and expiation are regarded in a material sense, the moral content developing rather later.

Comparison with other Semitic languages leads to a closer understanding of the original meaning of the root *kfr*. In Syriac, *hefar* means to wipe, and the fault would seem to be seen as a stain which must be removed. Similar conceptions lie behind *kāppārā* in Assyrian, for it has the meaning of to wipe, to remove, to clean. The form *happura* expresses the idea of a magico-medical operation by means of which an illness is driven away or a demon expelled. In Hebrew, kippēr appears to be close to the Arabic meaning. According to Ed. König, "cover" is the only appropriate translation. True, this scholar's opinion has been criticized and kippēr can also have the meanings of to rub, to blot out and to wipe. The dominant idea is of expiation. Thus the kōfr is simply a ransom, the expiatory sum of blood; the *kappōrēth* is the region of the Ark which acts as a lid and serves as the instrument of expiation; finally,
Kaffara—Kafir

Kappdrd is specifically the expiation of a fault and wiping away of a blemish by means of a victim whose blood is used to rub or sprinkle the person or thing that is to be purified.

It is tempting, therefore, to consider that the ancient Arabs held a material conception of the remission of sins. It should be noted here that other Arabic words currently used to signify pardon also have the sense of to cover, to efface, to smooth away; in the same way mahb, to erase, by rubbing or covering, has the meaning of to pardon. Furthermore, according to al-Umar the Arabs sought pardon for their misdeeds by confessing them before an assembly and requesting those whom they had wronged to bury their misdeemaurers. This act, known as dafn al-qamaw [see ḍunūb, dafn al-] was enacted physically.

Although etymologically kaffara may be understood as “that which covers” sin, it should be noted that this meaning figures least in the Kurān, where essentially the root has the sense of to repudiate, to redeem, to pardon. In addition, the verb kafara, to be a renegade or infidel, often appears alongside aman, apparently its antonym (III, 156, IV, 37, XXIX, 12); the form kafara is employed with the sense of to erase (III, 195, IV, 31, V, 12, 65); kifr expresses forgetfulness (XXI, 94) and annihilation (while demolishing the sanctuary of al-Uzzā, Khalīd b. Walīl says: “Your annihilation and no longer your glory”, kifrana khāli subhānākh). It is therefore hardly surprising that kaffara is employed essentially in the sense of atonement: the kaffara for perjury and violating the ban on hunting when in a state of šahr is the manumission of a slave, fasting or the distribution of food or clothing to the poor (V, 89 and 95). Yet this is also a propitiatory act from which the idea of expiation seems lacking: “If a man grants pardon [for talion, this] will be a kaffara for him” (V, 5).

Therefore it is evident that kaffara, in its Kurānic conception, is obtained without the help of a blood sacrifice, unlike the levitical system, where the means of expiation is usually blood. We have thus eliminated the notion that this is a borrowing from Hebrew in spite of the similarity of pure form.

Other instances where the sinner must do penitence are dealt with in the Kurān: an attack on the physical integrity of the person (IV, 92), pronouncing the shāh oath (LVIII, 4), breaking the rules of fasting during Ramadān (II, 183 f.), violating the prohibitions of the pilgrimage (II, 195; V, 94, 95). In fact there are no grounds for claiming that these were cases of kaffārā stricto sensu, and it is by analogy that šāh applies this term to acts (fasting, liberation of a slave, feeding the poor, sacrifice) on whose exact nature the Kurān is silent (is it a case of redemption, expiation or propitiation?). It is also advisable to stress that šāh tends to regard kaffārā as a punishment (“shāh, ġzar”; cf. Ibn Rushd, Bidāyat al-muḍātahd, Cairo 1335, i, 212; al-Bukhārī, Sahih, kitāb al-ḥudud), which is not exactly the position of the Kurān, where there is a distinction between ġzar and kaffara (V, 95) and the latter is even considered a propitiatory act (V, 45). Following the standpoint of the legal schools, as is obligatory, the acts by which kaffara can be obtained include blood sacrifice, to be exact the ḥadiyy for complete infringement of the rules of the pilgrimage, particularly those of šahrām.

The expiatory nature of Islamic sacrifice is brought out especially by the rôle of the blood redeemer (J. Chelhod, La sacrifice chez les Arabes, 59, 174 f.). The Bedouins too believe that the blood of a victim gives protection against epidemics, averts ill fate, banishes the wrongdoer and casts out chthonian spirits. Such beliefs were widespread among ancient Semitic peoples. In Babylonian ritual, purification and atonement are obtained through blood sacrifice. As we have seen, the same means were used to obtain expiation in the levitical system. The Mineo-Sabians confessed their sins publicly and atoned for them by offering a bleeding victim (G. Ryckmans, La confession publique des péchés en Arabie méridionale préislamique, in Le Muséon, lviii, 1–14).


Kāfīla [see Tipārā].

Kapil [see Kāfās].

Kāfir (a.), originally “obliterating, covering”, then, “concealing benefits received” = “ungrateful”; this meaning is found even in the old Arab poetry and in the Kurān, Sūra XXVI, 18. In the Kurān the word is used with reference to God: “concealing God’s blessings” = “ungrateful to God”, see Sūra XVI, 57 and XXX, 33. “That they are ungrateful for our gifts”[cf. also Sūra XVI, 85. The next development—probably under the influence of the Syriac and Aramaic where the corresponding development took place earlier—is the more general meaning of “infidel” which is first found in Sūra LXXIV, 10 and is henceforth very common; plural kāfīrin or kaffarin, once (Sūra LXXX 42) kaffara. The term is first applied to the unbelieving Meccans, who endeavour to refute and revile the Prophet: Sūra I, 12 and elsewhere. The subject of incredulity is sometimes more nearly defined with added bi-., e.g., Sūra XXXIV, 33: “We do not believe in your mission”; Sūra VI, 89. In the early Meccan period a waiting attitude towards the unbelievers is still recommended (Sūra LXXXXVI, 17; LXXXIII 10 f.; see also Sūra CIX entitled al-Kāfrūn), but later the Muslims are ordered to keep apart from them (Sūra III, 114, also 27), to defend themselves from their attacks and even to take the offensive against them (Sūra II, 186 and elsewhere). In most passages the reference is to unbelievers in general, who are threatened with God’s punishment and Hell [cf. the article Dāranan].

In the literature of Tradition also the hadīth—when multiplication is in details—deal partly with the fate of the kāfir on the day of judgement and his punishment in Hell, and partly with the believer’s attitude towards him. For the rest they reflect the great controversy in early Islam on the question whether a Muslim should be considered a kāfir for committing a “major sin” (cf. al-Bukhārī, Kit. al-Imān, Bāb 22). Thus we find hadīths such as: “If a Muslim charges a fellow Muslim with kufh, he is himself a kuffar, if the accusation should prove untrue”; or “The reproach of kufh is equivalent to murder” etc. Nevertheless, kāfir in theological polemics is a fairly frequent term for the Muslim protagonist of the opposite view (see further Ṭāfṣir).

Eternal damnation for the kāfir has remained an
established dogma in Islam. In the dogmatic controversies of the early centuries the reasons were discussed for which a Muslim should be identical with a kāfīr and have to suffer eternal punishment. The most tolerant is the view of the Muḥātīja that all the Aḥl al-Kīlā, even if they commit a mortal sin (ḥabīra) are to be considered believers and their ultimate fate is to be left to God. The most striking contrast to this is the strict view of Ḧārīdīs (and Ḧābdī) that every Muslim who dies with a mortal sin, that is, every sin which has not been repented of—on his conscience is to be considered just a kāfīr. For this special case the Muḥatīja assumed an intermediate position between believer and unbeliever, the so-called “rejected” fāšik [cf. the article IMĀN]. According to Nallino, in the Riv. degli Studi orientali, vii, 436 ff., the names Muḥatīja, Ḧābdīja, etc. [q.v.] are probably closely connected with their attitude on this point.

According to the Liṣān al-ʿArab, vi, 459 f., the following kinds of unbelief are distinguished: 1) kūfr al-ʿināḥ = neither recognizing nor acknowledging God; 2) kūfr al-ḏiḥād = recognizing God, but not acknowledging Him with words, that is remaining an unbeliever in spite of one's better knowledge; 3) kūfr al-muʿādama = recognizing God and acknowledging Him with words but remaining an unbeliever (obdurately) out of envy or hatred; 4) kūfr al-izāfah = outwardly acknowledging, but at heart not recognizing God and thus remaining an unbeliever, that is being an hypocrite [cf. MUNAFIK]. Cf. the modernist war-psychology, on the other hand, at the time of the wars between Persia and Turkey could even bring it about that the Persians were called kūfīr in Turkish fethes etc. [see Pečewi, i, 311, 319], a name which the Turks themselves had applied to them in the proclamations of the Muhāl of the Sūdān.

Since in the modern period the trend of affairs has apparently been quite in the opposite direction, and Muslims have been more and more impeded in carrying out measures against the kūfīr by the political decline of Islam and the rise of the unbelieving nations (pressure of the Powers, capitulations, etc.), the very feeling of impotence in face of these facts may have contributed not a little to the strengthening of hatred and to periodical manifestations of it (in massacres etc.). This also explains the grotesque caricature of the kūfīr, which has sometimes been found in the popular imagination at the present day (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecka, ii, 48 f.) and which is connected with the ideas of the Arch-Kāfīr, Dādīdī [q.v.] who bears kūfīr on his forehead (cf. I. Goldziher, in Der Islam, xi, 178).

It may also be due to the hatred of the Franks (and to dogmatic squabbles) that kūfīr had developed into a term of abuse, so frequent in the Turkish form gławar (the Persian geber [see gābir] is said to be the same), although in theory it is (ZDMG, liii, 562) affirmed that the Muslim commits a punishable offence if he says to the Christian or Jew: "Thou unbeliever". From the Turkish the word kūfīr has entered into most Slavonic languages. The Spanish cafre and the French cafard also go back to kūfīr or kūfīrī. (Cf. Erwin Rosen [i.e. Erwin Carle], Cafard, Ein Drama aus der Fremdenlegion in 4 Akten, Munich 1914). In two cases kūfīr has actually become a proper name, the name of a country, Kāfīristān [q.v.].

Kāfīr and kūfīr underwent a special development of meaning in the terminology of mysticism. Compare, for example, the well-known verse of Abū Saʿīd [q.v.]: “So long as belief and unbelief are not perfectly equal, no man can be a true Muslim”, with the various explanations given in Muhammad Aʾīlā, Dict. of Technical Terms (ed. Sprenger, etc.), s.v., according to one of which kūfīr is just the equivalent of imān-ī habīb.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources already quoted above, see for the Old Arab poetry Zischr. d. Disch. Morgenl. Gesellsch., xlv, 544.—On the development of kfr in Syriac s. Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, i, 1758 f., in Aramaic: Levy, Chaldaisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim, p. 381 and his Neubruchisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch, etc. In his Talmudisch und Midraschim, ii, 383 f.—For the literature on Tradition the whole material is available in the Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane

(W. Björkman)

KAFIRISTĀN ("land of the unbelievers"), the name of a mountainous region of the Hindu Kush massif in north-eastern Afghanistan, until 1856 very isolated and politically independent, but since the Afghan conquest of that date and the introduction of Islam known as Nuristan ("land of light").

Some older European writers mentioned what might be termed a "greater Kafiristan", comprising such regions as Kafiristan in the restricted sense (see below), Laghman, Citral, Swāt, Bajawr, Gilgit, etc. This corresponds roughly with the mediaeval Islamic region of Bolor (the Po-lo of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims, Bolor of Marco Polo), which seems to have extended as far as Baktistan on the borders of Kāshmīr and Tibet; the *Hudūd al-Islam* (end of the 4th/10th century), tr. Minorsky, 121, 369-70, describes Bolor as a vast country ruled by the Bullūrīn-Shāh who was a Child of the Sun. Modern usage restricts Kafiristan to the region lying roughly between latitude 33°-36° N. and longitude 70°-71°30' E., bounded on the west by the Panjshir River valley; on the east by the mountain range separating the Kunar-Bashgil valley from Citrāl (sc. the modern Afghan-Pakistani border); on the north by the mountains forming the watershed between the rivers of Kafiristan draining southwards and those of Mīndān and Bādakhšān draining northwards to the Oxus; and on the south by the Kābul River valley. This last southern fringe of Kafiristan, the regions of Laghman and Kūnār (called by the Afghāns *Kafiristān-i sulāfā*), is ethnically Afghan and Pashto-speaking and forms the hinterland of Dja-lālābād. It is the more northerly region (Kafiristān-i ʿulyā) which is Kafiristan proper, comprising from west to east the basins of the Alīshang and Alīngar, of the Pāč or Pārisun and the Waigal, and of the Bashgal; above these steep-sided river valleys the Hindu Kush mountains rise almost to 20,000 feet. The inaccessibility of the region had made it a refuge area for a very old group of Indo-European peoples, probably mixed with an older substratum, and for a distinctive group of Indo-Iranian languages, the Kafiri ones, which form part of the wider Dardic group (see Afghanistan, ii, Ethnography, and Dardic and Kafir Languages).

The enduring paganism of the local peoples and their imperviousness to the Islam which came largely to surround them, account for the name Kafiristan, although an influence from the district names within Kafiristān of Katwar or Kator and the ethnic designation Kati has been suggested. The distinction of "wearers of black" (Pers. *Siyāh-pūgī, Pto. Torkāfīr), comprising five sub-tribes speaking Kati, and "wearers of white" (Pers. *Safīd-pūgī, Pto. Spīkāfīr), comprising the Prasungeli, Wangi, Wamais and Ashkuns, is an old one, but does not seem to have any scientific or ethnological basis. Anthropologically, the Kafirs are dolichocephalic, with abundant, usually dark, hair, but with a noticeable strain of blue-eyed blonds. Whence popular tales that the Kafirs are descendants of Alexander the Great's troops; a depiction came to Sir William Macnaghten in 1839 at Djalalabad during the First Afghan-British War, claiming kinship with the British troops.

Parts of Kafiristān were in pre-Christian times probably part of the Greek satrapy of Paropamisia and inhabited by a people called the Kambodjas, mentioned in the Asokan inscriptions. Alexander the Great campaigned in the Kunar valley on route for India (see Sir Thomas Holdich, *The gates of India*, London 1910, 102-4). Then, in early Christian times, it came within the Kushan kingdom and the Buddhist province of Kapiśa, so that southern Kafiristān, the region known as Lamakān, later Lamghān, was strongly Buddhist, as the survival there of stupas attests (see L. Edelberg, *Fragment d'un stūpa dans la vallée du Kunar en Afghanistan*, in *Ars Asiatica*, iv/3 (1957), 199-206). It is probable that at this time the ethnic Kafirs occupied a wider geographical area than in more recent times, but were pushed northwards into the mountain fastnesses.

The Muslims only reached the borders of Kafiristan through the extension of Šafārīd rule to the Kābul and Panjshir River valleys (later 3rd/9th century), and then through the establishment of the Ghaznavīs, and the Ghaznavid sultanate in eastern Afghanistan. It is in the Ghaznavid historian Bayhaḏāl that the occurrence of the name Kator/Katwar seems first to arise, when Sūltān Mas'ūd b. Mahmūd is mentioned in connection with the *Kātur* (424/1033 or 425/1034) (Ta'ārikh-i Mas'ūdī, ed. Ghani and Fayyād, Tehran 1324/1945, 407, tr. Arends, *Istoria Mas'ūda*, Moscow 1969, 504).
Mas'ud's father, the great Mahmud of Ghazna, had previously led an expedition in 417/1020-1 against the lion-worshipping infidels of what Gardizi calls the Nur and Kirat valleys, the first name possibly to be connected with the modern place-name Nurgal in the lower Kunar valley, i.e., southeastern Kafiristan (*K. Zayn al-akhbar, ed. Nāṣīm, Berlin 1928, 78-9, tr. Bosworth, in *East and West, N.S. xvi* (1966), 341-2; cf. Nāṣīm, *The Life and Times of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna*, (Cambridge 1931, 74-5, and Beveridge's Appendix X to her tr. of the *Bābur-nāma*, xxiii-xxiv).

Marco Polo mentions the land of the Pasciai idolators, ten days' journey south of badakhshān, which may refer to the Kafirs as much as to the Pashaats proper of the south-western fringes of Kafiristan; a 10th/16th century source, the account of the Muslim expedition of 990/1582 (see below), shows that some of the so-called Kafirs of that time were in fact PashaaTs. It is clear, however, that Marco Polo never visited this area himself, but must have relied on reports of the Mongol general Neküder's march from badakhshān to Cîtral and Kāshfīr across the Kafiristan mountains in c. 658/1260 (see Yule, *The book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian*, London 1872, i, 155; Cordier, *Notes and Addenda to Sir Henry Yule's edition, London 1866-77*, iii, 400-8). The Timurid Mīrūd Mīrzā b. Abī Sa'īd (d. 900/1495) is said to have campaigned twice in Kafiristan, gaining thereby the title of Ghārī, and Muhammad Haydar Dughštā, the future conqueror of Kāshfīr, led a raid in 934/1527-8 into what he calls “Būrkhān” (*Bābur-nāma*, tr. A. C. Beveridge, London 1912-21, i, 46; Muhammad Haydar, *Ta'rīkh-i Rashīdī, a history of the Moghuls of Central Asia*, tr. E. Denison Ross and N. Elias, London 1895, 384-6). Bābur gives a valuable geographical description of southern Kafiristan, with emphasis on its rich fruits and on the wine produced by the Kafirs, who exported it to Badjawr. He also speaks of Muslim nimbas or half-breeds, who were probably converted Kafirs and who still mixed with the Kafirs, living at Caghānsaray at the confluence of the Kunar and Pēc Rivers (*Bābur-nāma*, tr. i, 210-14, 371-2). Bābur himself made various incursions via the Lamghān district into the southern fringes of Kafiristan. In the winter of 913/1507-8 he crossed the Bād-i Pish or Bād-i Pakht Pass linking the lower Ashang and Kābul River valleys, causing an inscription to be carved above the pass commemorating his transit (the existence in modern times of this inscription has been noted by several observers, but it has not so far been scientifically described); in 926/1519 he passed again, he received the submission of certain Kafīr chiefs, who brought gifts of wine (*Bābur-nāma*, tr. i, 209, 343-4, 421-3).

In the Mughal period, the *Tabābdāt-i A'kbari* laconically mentions that in 900/1515 the Emperor A'kbar, whilst at Džalilbābād, sent an expedition against the infidels of Kātwor (Elliott and Dowson, *op. cit.*, v, 425). This detail can now be amply supplemented by the account in 16 dāstāns or epic narratives of the Kādī Muhammad Šālim, who accompanied this expedition as a preacher and encourager of the Muslim troops; Kādī Muhammad's work has been edited by G. Scarcia as the *Sīfāt-nāma-yi Darūl Muḥammad Ḥān-i Gāstī, cronaca di una crociata musulmana contro i Kafiri di Lašmān nell'anno 1582* (Rome 1965). The leader of the expedition, Muḥammad Hākim (d. 993/1584 or 994/1586), was A'kbar's younger brother and governor of Kābul, and was also a strong adherent of the missionary-minded Naqghbandiya Şofi order. The area attacked was the south-western part of Kafiristan, including the lower basin of the Alishang and Alingar Rivers, where the Muslim forces established various strongpoints against the Kafirs.

After this period, there is substantially silence until the 19th century, when British travellers and officials began to take an interest in Kafiristan as a still-independent buffer-zone between British India and the amirate of Afghanistan. Thus Mountstuart Elphinstone described the topography of the land of the “Seaoposh Caufirs, a strange and interesting people”, and gave the pioneering account of the Kafirs' customs and social organization, based on the reports of a Muslim envoy to Kamdesh in the Bashgal valley (*An account of the kingdom of Caubul, and its tribes of the Hindoo Koosh* (Calcutta 1880), he devoted a chapter to the “Siah Posh”, in which he included the Kalash of southern Ćitrāl, still today pagan in part, with considerable ethnological comment, and gave specimens of the Bashgali (i.e., Kati) language (*op. cit.*, 126-33, cxlv-cxliv). The first European to penetrate deep into Kafiristan personally was Col. Lordout, who was sending a mission in 1855-6 to examine the Hindu Kush passes and who spent some days amongst the Katis of the upper Bashgal valley. Soon afterwards, Capt. (later Sir) George Robertson, later British Agent in Gilgit, spent almost a year (1850-1) amongst the Katis at Kamdesh in the upper Bashgal valley adjacent to Ćitrāl; his account of the Kafirs still in their pre-Muslim phase of existence, *The Kafirs of the Hindu-Kush* (London 1896), remains a classic of ethnology.

The paganism of the Kafirs was a mixture of polytheism and animism. The *Sīfāt-nāma* of Kādī Muhammad Šālim mentions three of the gods whom the Kafirs invoked against the Muslims, sc. Pāndāl, Sh. w. y. and Lāmānd, and Scarcia has suggested a possible connexion with the cult of Śiva, in view of the long exposure of the Kābul River valley to Indian cultural and religious influences (*op. cit.*, clix-clx). Robertson says that the Kafir pantheon was headed by Imra the creator god, from whom sprang other gods such as Gisg the war god, the goddess Džranė and many lesser ones; there was also much emphasis on demons and evil spirits who needed constant propitiation. The politico-social system was locally-based, tribal and oligarchical. Internal affairs were directed by a council of senior clan headmen (jasts), and 13 magistrates (ur, urir) were elected annually for the actual conduct of government. Status was measured by wealth, symbolized
KAFIRISTAN — KAFIYA
by the giving of feasts and potlatches, and by
prowess in warfare, especially when the killing of
Muslims was involved. As well as the full tribesmen,
there was a class of poor freemen, mainly herdsmen;
a class of artisans, the baris; and a small slave class,
who were captives from warfare and who were
considered to be ritually impure. The status of
Kafiri women was low, with polygamy as the norm;
marrage was exogamous outside the clan. Note-
worthy as part of the material culture of the Kafirs
was the carving of wood into images of the
characteristic stools and chairs. Specimens of these
may be seen in the Kabil Museum and in western
ones like the Linden-Museum of Stuttgart; and see
on the craft, R. Henkl, The wooden sculptures of
Kafiristan, in J.R.A.S Bengal, Letters, xvi/ 1 (1950),
65-72, and J. Auboyer, The art of Afghanistan,
London 1968, P1s. 134-40.

In the 1893 Kâbul agreement between Sir Mo-
timer Durand and the Afghan amir 'Abd al-Râbmân
Kânân [q.v.], Kafiristan was left outside the British
Indian territory, and the amir in 1895-6 led an
expedition into Kafiristan, bringing the territory
under Afghan sovereignty and implanting Islam
amongst the pagan Kâfs (see Mir Munshi Sultan
Mahomed Khan, The life of Abdur Rahman, London
1949, xiii/1, 199-202). Today, most of Kafiristan,
own Nuristan, falls administratively within the provinces
of Badakhshân and the territory
between 40,000 and 60,000.

Most of the detailed studies
have been cited within the article. Scarascia’s edition
of the Sfârâ, nâmâm of Kâf Mubâhâmad Salîm [vi,
CLVI], contains an extensive account of the early
history of Kafiristan. For geography and topo-
graphy, see W. Barthold, Istoriko-geografitcheski
obzor Irana, St. Petersburg 1903, 56-7; M. Voigt,
Kafiristan, Breslau 1933; and J. Humlum et alii,
La géographie de l’Afghanistan, étude d’un pays
aride, Copenhagen 1959, 91-107. For a
synthesis of the information of Robertson and the
writers arising in 66/685 during the revolt of al-Mukh-
dar, Abu tfânifa al-Dlnawari, etc. (see Bibl. below), but
also A. R. Palwal, Die Kafiren, Formen der Wirtschaft und geistigen
Kultur, diss. Copenhagen 1965, 101-48, repr. in Sonderdrucke der Mit-
glieder der Südasien-Institut der Universität Hei-
delberg, no. 8, deals with the material culture and artificats of these two regions and their econ-
omic relations. Amongst historical and general
works on Afghanistan and Kafiristan or refer to the region, see V. M. Masson
and V. A. Romodin, Istoriya Afganistana, Moscow
1964-5, index; D. N. Wilbur et alii, Afghanistan,
it people, its society, its culture, New Haven
1962, 50-2; M. Klimburg, Afghanistan, das Land
im historischen Spannungsfeld Mitteleuropas, Vienna
1966, 133-4; and W. K. Fraser-Tytler, Afghanistan,
a study of political developments in Central and
Southern Asia, London 1967, 5, 57-60.

(C. E. Bosworth)

KAFIRKÜB, which is recorded only in the plural
form kafirkâbâl, is formed from the Arabic word kâfr
[q.v.] (impious, unfaithful) and the present participle
of the Persian verb kûbidan (to strike, to crush). It
denotes a club, literally a “heathen-basher”. The term
is testified, in 'Irâq, from the end of the 2nd/8th cen-
tury, by Arab writers and chroniclers: al-Dîbâz, Abû Hanîfâ al-Dinawarî, etc. (see Bibl. below), but
al-Tabarî already cites it when describing the inci-
dents arising in 66/685 during the revolt of al-Muh-
târ [q.v.], and his Shi'ite followers, al-Khâshabiyya
[q.v.], who were given the name because they fought
with kâfrîbûl clubs; see De Goeje, Glossary to al-taba-
rit, CXCVI, CDLV; however, other interpretations
of the name of this sect have been proposed (see T.A.4). According to Abû Hanîfâ al-Dinawarî, al-Akhâr al-
aiwâdî, 343, the appellation kafirkâbâl originated on the
contrary in the uprising of Abû Muslim’s [q.v.] fol-
lowers in Khurasân: indgâf al-nâs ‘alâ Abî Muslim min Harât... fa-lawzaw djamân musawâdî
‘îthiyad wa-kad suraâd anṣâfâ al-kâfrûl allât
ma’âham wa-samamkhâ kafirkâbâl: “the men
who converged on Abû Muslim from Harât... they arrived
dressed entirely in black and had also blackened the
short clubs they called kafirkâbâl”.

It should be noted that this term does not appear in
such Arab dictionaries as the LA, Kâmûs, TA,
etc., nor in Desmaison’s French-Persian dictionary.
Nor does it seem to have been used outside the ‘Irâkî
sphere. It is not to be found in the works of Egyptian
writers such as al-MakrlzI or al-Kalfcashandi, who
use the term dâbbâs for a club; Ibn Kâldûn does
not employ it nor does Dozy mention it. It would thus
seem to be a term born of a particular period and in
a relatively circumscribed area which swiftly became
obsolete.

Bibliography: al-Dîbâz, Bayân, ed. Sandübî, i,
142 (in an anonymous verse); idem, Râzî, ed.
Hârîn, Cairo 1384, 40 (in a list of arms carried by the Turks); Abû Hanîfâ al-Dinawarî,
al-Akhâr al-aiwâdî, ed. Cairo 1330, 343, Cairo 1960
(in connection with the uprising of Abû Muslim’s
followers); Tabarî, ii, 694, i. 15 (the year 66/685,
in connection with al-Khâshabiyya), iii, 1686, i. 13,
1587, i. 4, 1689, i. 17 (the year 251/865, in connec-
tion with the war waged by the pro-al-‘Azm 4yârin
of Baghdad against al-Ma’mûn); Mas’sûdî, Murâdî, vi, 144 = ed. Pellat, iv, § 2326
where kafirkâbâl has been substituted in an anec-
dote concerning Umm Salama, the wife of Caliph
al-Saffâh; Aghânî, ed. Dâr al-kutub, iv, 346 (an-
other anecdote concerning the same caliph); De
Goeje, Glossary to Tabarî, CDLV: I. Friedlaender,
The heterodosses des Skites, in JAOS (axix),
1908, 93-5.

KÂFIYA (a.), plur. kâfâfâm, term in prosody,
meaning “rhyme”. Goldziher (Abb. zur Arabischen
Philoigie, Leiden 1896, i, 83-105; cf. R. Blachère,
Deuxième contribution, in Arabicà vi (1959), 141)
has shown that the word meant originally “lampoon”,
then “line of poetry”, “poem” and, that these earlier
senses survived in Islamic times after the word had
also come to be used in the technical sense of
“rhyme”. He derives kâfiya from kafân, “nape of the
neck” (and the corresponding verb kafâ, “to hit
the nape of the neck”) and draws attention to pas-
sages in which lampoons and curses are compared to
dangerous missiles wounding the head or other parts
of the body. The native lexicographers connect the
term in various ways with the verb kâfû in the sense
of “to follow” (e.g., “it follows upon everyone’s
sense of poetry”). They believe that “rhyme” is the
original meaning and that “line of poetry”, “poem” are
secondary (see Freytag, Darstellung, 296-7).

The theory of the kâfiya is usually considered a
special science distinct from the 4îm al-‘arûd or
"science of metre" [see 412]. It teaches how verses should end as regards consonants and vowels and which letters can be used as rhyme consonants and which not.

Many authorities attribute to Khall b. Abmad[q.v.] a definition according to which the kbdya comprises the group of consonants beginning with the vowelled consonant (one version says: the vowel of the vowelled consonant) immediately preceding the last two quiescent consonants of the verse, but various other definitions are attributed to him as well as to later authorities (Ibn Kaysn, K. tahlk al-kawdfi, 48, 54, that Khall b. Abmad used the term kbdya in the sense of "rhyme consonant"). According to the Arab view a verse always ends in a quiescent consonant, since they also consider as such the alif mdw, and yd of prolongation. A distinction is made, however, between a kbdya in which the rhyme consonant is not followed by a letter of prolongation, called kbdya mukayyada, "tettered kbdya (as in yktil), and a kbdya to which such a letter of prolongation is attached (as in yktilu, yktilu, yktilu). In the case of s and t the mdw and yd of prolongation are usually not written and their presence (in a vowelled text) is marked only by a 2amma or kasra added to the rhyme consonant. This type of kbdya as well as the various types where a vowelless rhyme consonant is followed by a short vowel and a vowelled or quiescent khd is called kbdya mulaka, "loose kbdya" (some speak of the rawi mukayyad and the rawi mulak, the "tettered rhyme consonant" and the "loose rhyme consonant").

The consonants of the kbdya are six in number: (1) the rawi or rhyme letter which, since it occurs in every type of kbdya, is considered its principal consonant after which famous poems are often named, e.g., the Lamyia of al-Shanfar, the 2thyiya of 'Umbar al-Farid; (2) as an annex to the rawi, the wasl or sisla, i.e., a letter of prolongation following the rawi (as noted above the alif is the only one that is always written in this capacity). The wasl can also consist of a vowelless khd preceded by a short vowel (as in yktiluh, yktiluh, yktiluh) or a khd followed by a letter of prolongation and preceded by a short vowel; (3) the khd, the letter of prolongation following the khd as wasl (as in yktiluhu, yktiluhu, tkai, etc.). Being a letter of prolongation it is considered quiescent, but indicated only in the case of alif; (4) the ridf, i.e., the mdw and yd immediately preceding the rawi as letters of prolongation or to mark the diphthongs aw and ay, and the alif as letter of prolongation in the same position; (5) the ta'sis, an alif of prolongation placed before the rawi and separated from it by a consonant, the dakhil, which may be changed at will. In case the ta'sis and the rawi belong to different words, the second word should be a separate pronoun or a preposition with a pronominal suffix (as in "annabh hiya, badh hiya, but cf. Lusm, 14-7; Tanukhi, K. al-Kawdfi, 84-5); (6) the dakhil just mentioned.

The vowels of the kbdya are likewise six in number: (1) the madr or mudr, the vowel of the rawi; (2) the na'dh, the vowel of the khd serving as wasl; (3) the tawdlik, the vowel before the quiescent rawi (according to others also before the vowelled rawi); (4) the bawd, the vowel immediately before the ridf; (5) the hadh, the vowel of the dakhil (there is some confusion over this term since sometimes it is limited to the vowel of the dakhil in a kbdya mulaka, and is also reported to have been applied to the short vowel preceding the rawi in a kbdya mulaka with out ta'sis); (6) the rass, the vowel immediately before the alif of the ta'sis (always a of course). The two quiescent consonants of the rawi may be separated by as many as four vowels. Thus five different types can be distinguished: (1) the mutadkaw in which the two quiescent consonants are separated by four vowelled consonants (as in fud(ka damim)); (2) the mutarlikib in which three vowelled consonants stand between the two quiescents (as in fud(fudali)); (3) the mutaddrsk in which two vowelled consonants separate the two quiescents (as in badd(asul)); (4) the mutaadlik in which there is one vowelled consonant between the two quiescents (as in bafi); (5) the mutardlik in which the two quiescent consonants come in immediate succession. This happens in principle only in kbdyas with a ridf (khl, lasl, etc.) and forms like al-nakr are rare and not considered permissible by some scholars.

Two different types of kbdya may not be used in one and the same poem, except in certain forms of the metres sarand (rarely) kaml where fa'sum may alternate with fslum. Nor are any changes allowed in five of the six consonants mentioned above (the dakhil being the exception), and generally speaking, in the vowels (see the exceptions noted below). Violations of these rules were designated at an early date by special terms on the meaning of which considerable uncertainty prevails (for the first see The Kitab nakh al-shr, Leiden 1956, Intro., 20-2, 25-6, 34-5; Blachere, op. cit., 137-40, 149-50): (1) the iwh, the change of the vowel madr. The older poets occasionally allow themselves to alternate u with i (see J. Fск, 4Arabiya, Paris 1955, 41; al-Akhfsh al-Awsf[q.v.]; K. al-Kawdfi, 42, suggests that this change was very common), and less frequently u or i with ay, though the interchange of i and u seems to be rare (Lusm, 32-3; but cf. 4Ik, v, 508); (2) the ikf, the substitution of a cognate letter for the rawi, e.g., nun for mim, the substitution of a letter that is unrelated being sometimes designated by the special term ikfz or ikfn (for other interpretations of these terms see 'Umda, 1, 132-3, 143-4; Tanukhi, K. al-Kawdfi, 134); (3) if, however, the rawi is followed by the letter ha as wasl, the iwh seems to be rare (Lusm, 32-3; but cf. 4Ik, v, 508); (4) the tawdlik, the changing of the vowel of the dakhil, the alternation of the u with the i being a less serious defect than that of the a with the other two (especially in the case of a kbdya mukayyada, see Lusm, 25-7, 31 and 'Umda, i, 138); (c) the sinad al-badhe, the changing of the vowel immediately preceding the quiescent rawi, though the interchange of u and i is generally allowed and even the alternation of the a with the two others occurs frequently; (b) the sinad al-tasl, the changing of the vowel of the dakhil, the alternation of the u with the i being a less serious defect than that of the a with the other two (as in the case of a kbdya mukayyada, see Lusm, 25-7, 31 and 'Umda, i, 138); (c) the sinad al-badhe, the changing of the vowel immediately preceding the ridf. The bawd and the ridf together form the long vowels 3i and 3i and the diphthongs aw and ay. One can alternate 3i with 3i and aw with ay (undesirable in the case of a kbdya mukayyada according to Lusm, 28-9; cf. also Akfsh, K. al-Kawdfi, 15; Tanukhi, K. al-Kawdfi, 90, 110-11), but other combinations, e.g., i with ay constitute a sinad; (d) the sinad al-badhe, the rhyming of a line that has a ridf with one that has not (though occasionally this happens with aw and ay, the mdw and the yd being considered consonants in such cases; see Lusm, 21-2 and Freytag, op. cit., 313-4); (e) the sinad al-tasl, the rhyming of a line that has ta'sis with one that has not (though again it may happen that such a line is introduced in a poem without ta'sis, especially in cases where the vowel of the dakhil is fah; see Lusm, 20-1; Tanukhi, K. al-Kawdfi, 130-1; and cf. Akfsh, K. al-Kawdfi, 15-6).
It should be noted, however, that no uniformity of opinion exists on the extent to which alternations of vowels are permissible (somewhat different rules apply to strophic poetry, see W. Hoenerbach, *Die vulgäranarabische Poetik... des Sa'diyyadin Hilili*, Wiesbaden 1956, Intro., 22-3), and that the short vowel immediately preceding the rawi in a loose kāfiya (for which some adopt the term ḥāḍī2) may alternate freely.

Two further defects of the rhyme should be mentioned here, the ṭāḍīm and the ṭadāmim or ṭatāmim. The ṭāḍīm occurs when the same word in the same meaning is repeated in the kāfiyās of lines belonging to the same poem, though this repetition is permissible in cases where more than seven lines intervene, there is a change of theme, or cases where one of the two words has the article and the other not (for further details, including a stricter interpretation of what constitutes an ṭāḍīm attributed to Khallī, see Akhaṣhāf, *K. al-Gawāfi*, 55-64; ‟Id, v, 508; Wāfī, 242-3). The ṭadāmim, "enjambement", occurs when one line runs into another in such a way that the end of the line only gives a complete sense when we add the beginning of the next (for further details see ṭadāmim). The above by no means covers all the defects of the rhyme, and the treatment of these defects listed by the critics. It also makes no mention of the various defects connected with the common practice of rhyming the first two hemistichs of a poem (see below). For further details see especially Akhaṣhāf, *K. al-Gawāfi*, 64-8; Tanūghī, *K. al-Gawāfi*, 65-8; 123-4; 135-6; ‟Umda, i, 149-54; Wāfī, 250-3.

In general the letters alif, ḥāʾ, waw, and yāʾ cannot be used as rawi, unless they belong to the root of a verb or noun, important exceptions being the pronominal suffixes -hu (‟aṣ) and -ḥā following a long vowel or a sukūn, the waw and the yāʾ in the diphthongs aw and ay, and the yāʾ that is preceded by a long vowel or is itself vowelised, and the yāʾ marking long i in a shortened niha ending (‟aḍi for ‟aḍiy). Thus, for instance, the kādā in ṭaḥādhā, the waw in raḥma, and the yāʾ in ṭefāy and in sa`dāy can be rawi even though these letters are not part of the root, but the alif in dakhāla (inflexion of the dual of a verb), the yāʾ in ʾuḥūlā and ʾiṭāb (inflexion of the feminine of a verb and pronominal suffix of a noun respectively), the waw in hatalā (inflexion of the plural of a verb), and the kādā in ṭaḥābuhā (preonominal suffix of a noun and in raḥma (where the kādā replaces the feminine ending of a noun) are wasī. The waw of the tanūm and the second energetic form of the verb cannot be used either as rawi or as wasī. But there is no agreement on these rules. Exceptions occur and letters belonging to the root, e.g., the kādā in ašḥāb from b-i-ha and the waw in yahūd from b-i-wu, can also be wasī. Some prefer adopting the pronominal suffixes -ha and -hi of the second person singular and the kādā of the third person fem. sing. of the perfect tense as wasī rather than as rawi, so that for instance ḥarābat rhymes with ḥalabat, but not with ṭawazan. Where the poet doubles the rhyme consonant, adopts a second rhyme consonant, or imposes upon himself some other rule that is not prescribed by the theorists we have the figure iṣṭām mī lā yahāsam [q.v.], also called isṭāsam, ṭādīm, or ṭasāḥādī.

In the kāfiya the final syllables of word are often subject to changes, the most important of which are the following: (1) final short vowels are dropped or lengthened, the tanūm disappearing at the same time (ṣawīd or ṣawīdā for ṣawīdun, al-nār or al-nārū for al-nāru) (2) the ḥāḍī2 of the feminine ending may be changed into ḥād and in that case the ending is dropped (raḥmah for raḥmatun); (3) in the kāfiya muḥāyyada the vowel of the final letter may be transferred to the penultimate letter if it is unwovelled (al-nāku for al-nakru), to avoid the unacceptable form al-nakru; (4) a quiescent ḥād may be added to verbal forms from which the last letter of the root has disappeared (khiḍādī for ḥiḍādī) and to the pronominal suffix of the first person singular; (5) the ṭamām at the end of a word may be replaced by a waw or yāʾ of prolongation which may serve as wasī (hasī for ḥasī). Ibn Kayṣān, Talkīb, 53-4, 60-1, draws attention to the musical qualities of the ṭasīs, the ṭifī, the ṭīs, and the ḥurūdī as vowels that can be lengthened in recitation and singing, thus marking clearly the end of a metrical unit. Others discuss in detail the practice of ṭarānum, i.e., the lengthening of the final vowel in the kāfiya mufāḥa in singing, and three alternate modes of solemn recitation: (a) the method followed by the Ḥiḍāzīs who pronounced these vowels as long even when there was no ṭarānum, (b) the practice of the tribe of Tāmīm (according to Akhaṣhāf, *K. al-Gawāfi*, 105, also of Kayṣ) who pronounced the final vowel with ṭanūm, and (c) the rejection of final vowels, apparently even in cases where one of these three modes would violate the metrical pattern of the verse (see also Akhaṣhāf, *K. al-Gawāfi*, 12-3, 34-7; Fīyātq, op. cit., 323-4, where specific terms for the long vowels are mentioned).

In all classical forms of poetry the same rhyme is maintained throughout the poem. Moreover, the rhyme also appears at the end of the first hemistich of the first line (except in the metre ṭaḫqāqīn) where there are no hemistichics, resulting often in a shortening or lengthening of its last foot to make it conform to the pattern of the last foot of the second hemistich. This practice is called ṭasīrī and the critics note that some of the older poets omit the ṭasīrī in the first line, but use it in some other line of the poem. They also quote early examples of the use of internal rhyme (see Ruḍāma, Ṣābād, 14-9; for the possible connections between these examples and the post-classical forms of poetry see García Gómez, Una "pre-Muḥaṣṣāla" in Al-Andalus, 22, 1956, 406-14; E. Wagner, Abū Nuwas, Wiesbaden 1965, 227 ff.). The common term for internal rhyme is ṭasīrī, but a number of other terms were introduced by later theorists to distinguish different and sometimes complicated patterns (see A. F. M. von Mehren, *Die Rhetorik der Araber*, Vienna 1853 [repr. Hildesheim 1970], 168-9, for definitions and examples of some of the most important terms). Other devices include the repetition at the beginning of the line of the rhyme word of the preceding line and the use of a double kāfiya throughout the poem, each kāfiya marking the end of a metrical pattern (see Mehren, op. cit., 165, 173).

In keeping with the critics' view that each line of poetry should, as far as possible, contain a complete statement, all treatises on rhetoric give attention to questions of style and figures of speech that affect the choice of the rhyme word. Besides formulating some obvious conclusions on how to avoid stopgaps, the critics recommend structuring the line in such a way that the listener can almost predict the kāfiya. This may be achieved, for instance, by leading the hearer to anticipate the repetition of a word that has occurred earlier in the line or one of its paronyms, or by making some rhetorical device depend on the last word of the line, e.g., ḥarām, "forbidden", in the kāfiya to create an antithesis with muḥā sala, "declared lawful", earlier in the line (laḥīm, laṭāhīh,
**Bibliography:** Discussions of the Kafiya appear in almost every work on literary theory and criticism and it is impossible to offer a comprehensive bibliography. The following list, moreover, does not mention treatises and special monographs that have already been summarized in Western handbooks or in the article *Kafṣa*. Some authorities recommend basing the line, if possible, on a Kafṣa one has selected in advance and if the synonym on which it depends comes only at the end (see Bonebakker, *Some early definitions of the tawriya*, The Hague 1966, 97). The Kafiya should not contain any expression from which an evil omen could be drawn. His nisba, Kafiyyaḏi or Kafiyyaḏi, was earned by Ibn al-Hādjib [q.v.]. A grammatical work, a commentary on the Kauwaḏ al-iḏlib of Ibn Hāshim (Brockelmann, II, 29, S II, 18), was praised by al-Kafiyyaḏi’s biographer as his most important publication. But his interests were unusually wide, comprising, in addition to points of law and religion, the full range of the linguistic disciplines, history, the mathematical sciences and astronomy, and, above all, logic. His basic work on logic is a commentary on the Tahdhib of al-Taftazani (Brockelmann, II, 278, also mss. Laleli 2592 and Bursa Haragci 1378). His numerous treatises (often carrying the date of their composition at the front of the manuscript) are preserved in large part but, with one exception, have been neither edited nor studied. Most of them are brief essays that focus on specific problems and try to organize the subject matter along general lines based on formal logic. As was noted by al-Saḥḥāwī, al-Kafiyyaḏi thereby founded, or gave the impression of founding, new disciplines as in the case of his treatise on historiography (cf. bibliography) or, preserved in a little essay entitled al-Raʿuḥ fi ʿilm al-ruḥ (ms. Atif Ef. 2828, i67a–i69b, also Berlin or. fol. 4249, cf. M. Weisweiler, *Der islamische Bucheinband*, Wiesbaden 1962, 83), which defines a mystically tinged knowledge of the spirit as a special discipline. His sense of brevity ran in a way contrary to the dominant Tunisian school of the time, so that his treatment of Qurʿān science, al-Tayṣīr fi kauwaḏ ʿilm al-taṣrif (written for Ābu Saʿīd Timurbughā in 856/1452) provoked words of dissatisfaction by the otherwise well-disposed Suyūṭī in the introduction of the İtkān. But in sum, it would seem that al-Kafiyyaḏi’s writings deserve recognition and study for their author’s effort to be interesting and original. — See also *Kafiyyaḏ*.

**Production in Journal of Arabic Literature, i (1970), 3<sup>13</sup> art. SAADF, *S. Bonebakker*.

**KAFSA (GAFSA),** a town in Tunisia’s 350 km. south-west of Tunis, 200 km from Kayrawān, and 100 km from Gabès [see KAFS], population 30,000; the chief town of an administrative region with a population of 300,000 whose principal mineral resour-
ces consist of the phosphate deposits of M'Dilla, Metlaoui, Redeyef, and Moulares, which were discovered in 1885. The oasis of Kafsa contains about 100,000 palm trees producing dates of second-rate quality, to which must be added orchards of orange trees, lemon trees, apricots and figs, vineyards and, very recently, olive groves and attempts to grow pistachio trees. Irrigation is supplied by copious springs which are in the heart of the town itself, and also by the sinking of artesian wells. As it is the first oasis on the road from Kayrawân towards the region of the Chotts, and is moreover likely to detain the visitor on account of its prehistoric and classical remains, the town has begun to take an interest in tourism and has therefore been able to take advantage of some recent improvements such as that of the road system and equipment of hotels; development of parks; the restoring of the "Roman baths", the Kasaba and the Great Mosque; the partial reconstruction of the Byzantine city wall etc. Handicrafts, consisting mainly of the fabrication of brightly coloured blankets and carpets decorated with simple motifs, are also making some progress.

History: Kafsa is the Arabic form of the classical name of the city called Capsa, the toponym from which J. Morgan, in 1909, created the term "Capssian" to designate the Upper Paleolithic or Mesolithic type of civilization of which this region was one of the most important centres, as can be seen from the numerous "snaileries" and other traces of prehistoric industries.

When we come to historical times, the past of Kafsa is less clear. In particular, it is not known precisely when, or by whom, the city was founded. It is reputed to have been founded by a god, the Lybian or Phoenecian Hercules, which together with other indications suggests a Punic origin. However no archaeological discoveries have been found to confirm this hypothesis. According to the Arabs, the founder of the city was Shantiyan, the slave (gulâm) of Nemrod (al-Bakrl, Masâlih, 47/100), the legendary king of Chaldea. In fact the foundation of the city, whose origin is unknown, can be explained by the topography of the site. As S. Gsell says (Histoire, v, 279): "there was there a junction of natural routes leading to the oases of the Chotts, to Gabbès, to the Byzacena, to Maktar and to Tébessa". It is by no means impossible that a Punic town should have been established at these crossroads, of benefit to every trade.

In later years the town was part of the Numidian kingdom of Jugurtha who treated it well, even going so far as to exempt it from taxes, in order to keep it in his power. It paid a high price for these privileges, and their corollary, fidelity to the Numidian king. In the course of a daring campaign, Caius Marcellus, whom Rome had given the task of subduing Jugurtha, took it by surprise and set fire to it (107 B.C.). But it was reborn from the ashes and at the beginning of the 3rd/4th century, the region was largely inhabited by Khârijis—Luwatta, Zuwagha and Miknasa. In 224/839 they took part in the revolt of the district of Kastilîya and were severely punished by the Aghlabid amir Abû l-Iklâ. According to al-Shâmâhî (Siyar, 203), the imâm 'Abd al-Wahhâb (168/784-208/823) had an 'âmil there; by this is to be understood a tax collector who raised the kur'anic taxes from the inhabitants and sent them more or less secretly to Tâhât, for the town had never been politically a part of the Rustamid kingdom.

After being under the authority of the Fâtimids and then the Zirids, for more than a century Kafsa became the capital of a real independent little state including the whole of the land of Kastilîya, present day Djèrîd, (445/1053-554/1159). The Hîllâi invasion had profoundly modified the political context and the ethno-ethnic equilibrium of the area. The authority of the central government collapsed, and anarchy reigned everywhere. The Zîrîd governor of the town, 'Abî al-Allâh b. Muhammad b. al-Rand, in common with others proclaimed himself independent (445/1053-465/1073) and, by paying tribute to the Arab nomads—above all the Riyâb—with whom he formed an alliance, he strengthened his authority and the security of his realm, attracting to his court poets and jurists.

The rule of the Almohads, who united the whole of the Maghrib, put an end to the independence of Kafsa. The town was taken in 554/1159 by 'Abî al-Mu'imin b. 'Ali after a quite difficult siege. From that time, like all the south of Ifriqiya, it had a troubled existence. There were attempts to take it from the Almohads by an adventurer of Armenian origin, Karâkûs, and above all by the Banû Châmiya [p. 96].

The Banû 'l-Rand on their part would not admit they were defeated. This dynasty was restored by Ibn al-Mu'izz at the request of the inhabitants, dissatisfied with their Almohad governor, whom they had put to death. The caliph Abû Ya'qûb Yûsuf came from Marrakesh to lay siege to the town in person.
KAFSA

Thanks to these advantages, Kafsa was able to maintain its importance and prosperity right up to the end of the Classical era, despite the decadence of Byzacena. After the Arab conquest its importance grew even greater. We have noted that it kept the appearance and style of a Classical city for many years. About the end of the 3rd/9th century, al-Ya’qubi, who is the first Arab geographer to leave some detailed personal observations about this town, described it thus: ‘A fortified town, surrounded by stone walls. There are springs in the interior of the town; the streets are paved. The suburbs are very prosperous, and the fruit there is famous’ (Les Pays, 212). In the middle of the 4th/10th century, Ibn Hawkal—who was at Kayrawân in 336/947 (Sârat al-Ârd, 94, tr. Kramers-Wiet, 92)—informs us that Kafsa was an ‘autonomous (mustabiyya) town’, and that ‘its prosperity was perfect (fi khayyat al-kamâl)’ before 336/947, at which date it was devastated by Abû Yâzîd [q.v.] (Sârat al-Ârd, 92, tr., 93). It must have recovered quickly from these devastations. In fact, towards the end of the 4th/10th century, al-Mukaddasî (d. 378/988) counts it among the great centres of Ifrikîya. In the middle of the 5th/11th century, al-Bakfî (d. about 461/1068), who had not visited the country and in general reproduces the Itineraries of al-Warrâk (d. 363/973-4), gives us a very favourable description of it. This description is one of the most detailed we possess of the medieaval stronghold, lays emphasis on the Classical monuments, still in an excellent state of repair, its gushing springs, providing an abundant supply of water for its orchards, which produced, among other things, large quantities of pistachios exported to all parts of Ifrikîya, and even to Egypt, to Sidîlmâsî and to Spain. There were also to be found, he adds, dates as big as pigeons’ eggs. In the surrounding area there were no less than two hundred villages, called Kusur Kafsa, all flourishing. Lastly, and the final uncontroversial indication of wealth, he informs us that the taxes raised there furnished no less than 50,000 dinârs to the Treasury. It is certain that this description related to the highest degree of prosperity attained by the town, were also to be timed, al-Wârâk, that is the end of the 4th/10th century. This prosperity was doubtless maintained during the following century, that of al-Bakfî, despite the invasion of the Hûlîîs with whom the Banu ‘l-Rand succeeded in finding a modus vivendi which, though costly, was at least acceptable. The town continued to flourish until the middle of the 6th/12th century, when al-Idrîsî was writing, and he described it as ‘a fine town (madîna basâna)’, with its walls still intact, its abundant water supply, its well stocked markets, its numerous traders, its industries in full expansion (zindâ’ kâtîma), its vast palm grove producing dates of magnificent quality (‘aadjî), its populous villages, its gardens, its orchards, and its varied plantations providing, amongst other things, henna, cotton and cumin, all of which were highly prized in the Middle Ages.

From the time of the Almohads, the scene changed. The town, jealous of its independence, rebelled frequently, and paid a high price for its excessive love of freedom. Several times over, as we have seen, its ramparts were razed and its palm grove laid waste. Its economic decline can be traced back to that time. In the 7th/13th century, Yakînî (574/1178-626/1229), though he recounts its former splendours, mentions it at the time only as ‘a small town (ba[lîdâ’ saghîra) on the borders of Ifrikîya… in the middle of a sterile saline region’ (Buildîn, iv, 382). Its sur-
rounding villages, which were the most exposed to devastation, disappeared. In the time of Ibn al-Shabab (618/1222-680/1282), reproduced by al-Wazir al-Sarradji (Hulal, i, 437), "only a few of them survived". In the middle of the 10th/16th century, Leo Africanus, after reporting the destructions ordered by al-Mansûr, wrote: "Today Caphsa is completely repopulated, but its buildings are only small, with the exception of a few mosques. Its streets are very wide and paved all over with black stone like those of Naples and Florence. The population is under control, but poor on account of the taxes by which they are burdened by the king of Tunis" (Description de l'Afrique, ii, 444). He continues, pointing out that its climate is unhealthy, and praising its cloths, its pottery, its dates, its orange trees and its olive trees, which gave "an oil as perfect in taste as in colour".

The diverging descriptions in the sources imply no contradiction, but only different procedures existing in chronological order: Ibn Khurradadhbih, Masudî, and Ibn al-Fâthî, Bu'ainân, partially ed. and tr. Hadj-Sadok under the title Description du Maghreb... Algiers 1949, 6-7 and n. 70; a. Al-Wâzir, Bu'ainân, tr. Cairo 1937, 212; Ibn Hawkal, Sûrat al-Ârîd, Beirut n.d., vi, 87, 92 (tr. Kramers-Wiet, 92, 93); Mukaddasi, Ahsân al-tabâsim, partially ed. and tr. Ch. Pellat under the title Description de l'Occident... Algiers 1950, 4-5, 64-5; Bakrî, Masûdî, ed. and tr. de Slane, Paris 1965, 14 and 35, 47 and 100-2, 75 125-6, 148 and 284; Idrîsî, Nuzha, partially ed. and tr. H. Pérez, Algiers 1957, 75, 80, 89; Yâqút, Bu'ainân, Beirut 1957, iv, 382-23; Tidjânî, Rîhâ, Tunis 1958, 114, 136-9, 147, 353, 356-7; Safl al-Dîn al-Âbaghîdâlî, Marâdân al-Îsfîlî, ed. 'All Muhammad al-Bijâwî, Cairo 1954, iii, 1113; Jean-Léon l'Africain (Leo Africanus), Description de l'Afrique, tr. A. Épaulard, Paris 1956, ii, 443-5; al-Wazir al-Sarradji, Hulal, ed. M. H. al-HIla, Tunis 1970, i, 368, 379-81, 382-5; and medicines, but the latter, according to the Muslim sources native to Fanûr (Kansûr, Faisur, and variants) in Sumatra, production of which must have been greater in the Middle Ages than today, was much more expensive and efficacious than the East Asian variety; according to Marco Polo it was worth its weight in gold.

Camphor seems to have been unknown to Greek and Roman antiquity, but the Near East by Sâsînî at the latest, it was used as spice and perfume; when the Arabs conquered Ctesiphon in 16/637, they found there rich stores of camphor, which they thought was salt (Balâghurt, Futûb, 264; Ibn al-Âthîr, Kamûl, ii, 401). It was also known in ancient Arabia, for according to Kurîân LXXVI, 5, devout Muslims are refreshed in paradise with a drink flavoured with camphor. Camphor was known to ancient Arabic poets, al-Adârî, an, "a name; it is often put metonymically with musk (misk [q.v.]) as a symbol of the opposition of white and black, e.g., ʿUmar b. Abî Rabî'a, ed. Schwartz, 10, 16; 16, 14; 31, 2; 115, 12; 171, 6; 183, 3; Imruʿl-Kays in Hamdânî, Diastara, ed. Müller, 198; anon. in Yâkût, Muqâjam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv, 747. Cf. further Aṭghâ, ed. Geyer, 80, 6; Akhtal, ed. Sâlâmî, 35; Ibn al-Rûmî, ed. Rûmî, in Ibn Abî A'wâ, Ta'rikh, Voyage arabe à l'occidental, Danîla, ed. and tr. Descleis, De Sousse à Gafsa, Paris n.d., 153-213; V. Mayet, Voyage dans le sud de la Tunisie, Paris 1887, 171-86. Studies: L. Balout, La Technologie des plantes médicinales et de vie des mineurs de la région de Gafsa, Tunis 1968, 126, 127-32; E. Dozy, Histoire ancienne et à la Capitale moderne, Paris 1907; A. Bouhdibam Les conditions de vie des mineurs de la région de Gafsa, Tunis 1968, Etudes de Sociologie tunisienne, i, 165-233; R. Brunschvig, La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides, Paris 1940-47, i, 3, 6-9, 21, 149, 150, 158, 174, 189-90, 207-8, 305, 328, ii, 105-6, 186, 199, 220, 286, 297, Despois, L'Afrique du Nord, Paris 1955, 87-48; Bodureau, La Capitale espagnole et la Capitale moderne, Paris 1907; A. Bouhdibam Les conditions de vie des mineurs de la région de Gafsa, Tunis 1968, Etudes de Sociologie tunisienne, i, 165-233; R. Brunschvig, La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides, Paris 1940-47, i, 3, 6-9, 21, 149, 150, 158, 174, 189-90, 207-8, 305, 328, ii, 105-6, 186, 199, 220, 286, 297, Despois, L'Afrique du Nord, Paris 1955, 87-48; Bodureau, La Capitale espagnole et la Capitale moderne, Paris 1907; A. Bouhdibam Les conditions de vie des mineurs de la région de Gafsa, Tunis 1968, Etudes de Sociologie tunisienne, i, 165-233; R. Brunschvig, La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides, Paris 1940-47, i, 3, 6-9, 21, 149, 150, 158, 174, 189-90, 207-8, 305, 328, ii, 105-6, 186, 199, 220, 286, 297, Despois, L'Afrique du Nord, Paris 1955, 87-48; Bodureau, La Capitale espag..."

The same word kāfor (variants kufarrā, kifīrā, giyfarārā, et al., Lane 626a2; Lisān (Beirut), v, 149 f.) also designates the integument of the palm leaf or the grapevine. The word came through the Aramaic gōparā probably from the Akkadian. Cf. Asma', al-Nakht wa 'l-ḥarm, ed. Haffner, Beirut 1908, 6; Ibn Sīdā, Muhkhasas, xi, 119; Maimonides, Sharh asma' al-ḥabhar, ed. Meyerhof, no. 206; Frenkel, Aram. Fremden, 147; Brockelmann, Lex. Syr. 1, 120a.


KĀFŪR, Abū'l-Misk, a black eunuch (the name al-Lābi, given to him by al-Mutanabbī, suggests his origin from Lāb in Nubia) became the dominant personality of the Ikhshīdīd [q.v.] dynasty in Egypt. Sold to its founder, Mūhammad ibn Tughjī al-Ikhshīdīdī [q.v.], Kāfūr so impressed his new master that the latter sponsored his rise to positions of political and military influence. As a field commander Kāfūr participated in the Egyptian expedition of 333/945 to Syria; he was also involved in the diplomatic exchanges between al-Ikhshīd and the Caliph of Baghdad. Of great significance was his appointment as the supervisor of the princely education of the two sons of al-Ikhshīdīdī. Upon the death of Ibn Tughjī Kāfūr safeguarded the interests of his master's dynastic legacy by securing a formal succession of the Ikhshīdīdī princes, Abū'l-Kāsim Anūdūr (Unūdūr) in 334/946, and 'All ibn al-Ikhshīdīdī in 349/963. Although during that period Kāfūr enjoyed complete executive authority, he found it expedient to operate behind the façade of the Ikhshīdīdī establishment. Only in 355/966, following the death of 'All, did Kāfūr publicly declare himself as the sole master of Egypt. This declaration was justified because of the minority of another prospective Ikhshīdīdī successor, Abūd b. 'All, and was sanctioned by an official diploma of investiture allegedly received from the Caliph of Baghdad. Until his death on 21 Dījumādī I 357/23 April 968, the name of Kāfūr replaced the Ikhshīdīdī names in the Egyptian Ašhūb [q.v.]. His official title was al-usṭadādī [q.v.]. The few sporadic references that exist in evidence, however, that his exalted political status included the prerogatives of sihka [q.v.] or firās [q.v.].

The main significance of Kāfūr in Islamic history lies in the fact that during the twenty-two years of his government he successfully protected the Ikhshīdīdī establishment against dangerous outside pressures (the Fātimids, the Karmatians, the Nubians and the Hamādānīs). All this he accomplished in spite of internal political complications (rebellion of Qāhūn in 335/947-336/948; an abortive coup d'état by Anūdūr in 343/954; persistent spread of subversive Iṣāmīlītī propaganda) and serious economic setbacks (a devastating fire in the business section of Fustāṭ in 343/954; major earthquake in Egypt in 344/955; recurrence of famine, food-price inflation, and consequent civil disturbances in 338/949, 341/954, 343/955, 352/963-357/968). His effective military and diplomatic measures helped secure a advantageous agreement with the Hamādānīs in 335/947 concerning the Ikhshīdīdī hold over Damascus. Above all, Kāfūr was able to delay the Fātimids expansion to Egypt. "The black stone (i.e., Kāfūr) stands between us and thee (i.e., the Fātimids Caliph)" complained frustrated Iṣāmīlī agents in Egypt. (Cf. al-Makritī, Ittiḥād al-ḥunāfī, Cairo 1945, 147.)

In spite of economic adversities and heavy government expenditure, Kāfūr's administration refrained from extortionate fiscal practices. Its gold coinage, though fluctuating in weight, displayed a remarkable stability as to the standard of fineness. Kāfūr's domestic accomplishments must be partially attributed to his ability to enroll the services of competent administrators, one of them the famous Yaḥyā ibn Killīs [q.v.].

Kāfūr also gained popularity in Islamic history because of his patronage of scholars and writers. The most celebrated of them was the great poet al-Mutanabbī [q.v.], who immortalized the black ruler in a number of panegyric and satirical verses. Kāfūr has been credited with the construction of a number of sumptuous palaces, of two mosques (in Gīza and on al-Muqattām), of a hospital, and of the Kāfūrīyya gardens in the capital. No archaeological traces of his architectural contributions have been discovered.

KAFUR — KAGHAD

(1942), 23-46; Ismail Kashif and M. Afzal Mud, Misr fi 'asr al-Juluniyyln wa'l... on the plan of those in Samarkand; al-Fa'far, brother of Djafar al-Barmak, who had been governor of Khurasan in 898/1299 he was taken by the commander Nusrat Khan, probably the recognition as sultan of 'Ala al-Din Muhammad Shāh Khādīl, the six-year-old son of Dīn al-Dīn Barani, ed. A. S. Usha, Madras 1948; Nasir, Tārikh al-amār, Bombay 1360, 1363; Ibn Baṭṭūtā, Rihā, iii, Paris 1855; Farishta, Ta'rikhi i, Bombay/Poona 1832. Secondary works: K. S. Lal, History of the Khaljis, London 1967; R. P. Tripathi, Some aspects of Muslim administration, Allahabad 1959; S. K. Aiyangar, South India and her Muhammadan invaders, Oxford 1921; J. D. M. Derrett, The Hoysalas, Oxford 1957; S. Lane Poole, Mediaeval India under Muhammadan rule, London 1922.

KAGHAD, Kaghad (from the Persian kaghad perhaps of Chinese origin), paper. In the early period of development of Muslim culture the east was acquainted only with papyrus (biṭā) as writing-material. It was Chinese prisoners of war brought to Samarkand after the battle of Atlakh near Talas who first introduced in 1347/55 the industry of paper-making from linen, flax or hemp roots after the method used in China. The various kinds of paper then made were the following: fir'aumī ("Pharaonic"), a kind which was to compete with papyrus even in the land of its origin (the oldest paper with Arabic writing on it found in Egypt dates from 180/996-997/8); sulaymani, from Sulaymān b. Bāghid, the treasurer of Khurāsān under Hārūn al-Rashīd; dīfa'fīr, called after papyrus; dīfa'ī, vizer of Hārūn al-Rashīd (d. 187/803); jahlī, from Ṭalba b. Tāhir, the second ruler of the Tāhirid dynasty; kāhi, from Tahir II of the same dynasty; nābī, after the Sāmānid Nābī I, 331/942-954.

To judge from these names it must be supposed that paper achieved some importance as early as the second half of the 2nd/8th century. About that time or at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century paper had, according to al-Dībājī, the same importance for the east as papyrus had for the west, especially since Hārūn al-Rashīd had ordered the use of paper as a writing material in the government offices because it was not possible to erase a text written on paper, or to scratch it out without this being noticed. In the second half of the 3rd/9th century paper made in Samarkand had already replaced papyrus as well as parchment in Baghdad, although we do not know precisely when the manufacture of paper began in Baghdad or in Cairo. According to al-Tha'labī (350/961-962/1038) the paper made in Cairo was especially fine and smooth, but on the other hand it is stated that the Thālabīd vizier, Dīfa'īr b. Hīnzābī (d. 391 or 392/1001), had brought the paper which he used directly from Samarkand.

Paper-mills were erected elsewhere on the plan of those in Samarkand; al-Fadl, brother of Dīfa'īr al-Barmakī, who had been governor of Khurāsān in contemporary rumour accused Kafur of hastening his end. Kafur secured the recognition as sultan of 'Ala al-Din 'Umar, his bodyguards: in 'Ala al-Din by Chit' al', daughter of Rāmādeva of Devgrī; some sources state that Kafur also married this lady. In the struggle for power he succeeded in having Khidr Khān blinded and two other elder sons of 'Ala al-Din imprisoned, but failed in the case of a fourth, the future Sultan Kūtb al-Dīn Mubārak. About 35 days after the death of 'Ala al-Din, Kafur was murdered by four wealthy Khudās of "Khojda"—see. Nizār Ismā'īl of Kanbāhāyat (Cambay). In the Muslim conquest of Gudjarāt on 698/1299 he was taken by the commander Nūr al-Šāh and presented to Sultan 'Ala al-Dīn in Dihlī. Ibn Baṭṭūtā, (ii, 187) may be in error in stating that the epithet al-Ḍīn, her grandfather, was known as al-Fa'far, brother of Djafar al-Barmakī, who had been governor of Khurasan in 392/1001), had brought the paper which he used for this purpose. In the northern Deccan. He performed this task undoubtedly and he next appears as an outstandingly successful military commander. Ca. 705-6/1305-6 he commanded an army which in the Pandāh defeated the Mongol commander Kōpek/Kebek, but the hostile forces were routed by Kafur, but the hostile forces were taken by Kafur, and presented to Sultan 'Ala al-Dīn in Dihlī. Ibn Baṭṭūtā, Rihā, Paris 1855; Farishta, Ta'rikhi i, Bombay/Poona 1832. Secondary works: K. S. Lal, History of the Khaljis, London 1967; R. P. Tripathi, Some aspects of Muslim administration, Allahabad 1959; S. K. Aiyangar, South India and her Muhammadan invaders, Oxford 1921; J. D. M. Derrett, The Hoysalas, Oxford 1957; S. Lane Poole, Mediaeval India under Muhammadan rule, London 1922. (S. Digby)

KAFUR, Malkī, known as 'IZZ AL-DAWLI, TĀM AL-DIN AND HAZAR-DINAR, EUNUIT AND MINISTER OF SULTAN 'ALĀ AL-DIN MUHAMMAD SHĀH KHĀDĪL ('Azīz al-Ḍīn) is stated to have been of Harthāt (Marthā) (see Ismā'īl, p. 319). In youth he was the slave of a wealthy Khudā of Kanbhaṭ, perhaps of Chinese origin, paper. In the early period of development of Muslim culture the east was acquainted only with papyrus (biṭā) as writing-material. It was Chinese prisoners of war brought to Samarkand after the battle of Atlakh near Talas who first introduced in 1347/55 the industry of paper-making from linen, flax or hemp roots after the method used in China. The various kinds of paper then made were the following: fir'aumī ("Pharaonic"), a kind which was to compete with papyrus even in the land of its origin (the oldest paper with Arabic writing on it found in Egypt dates from 180/996-997/8); sulaymani, from Sulaymān b. Bāghid, the treasurer of Khurāsān under Hārūn al-Rashīd; dīfa'fīr, called after papyrus; dīfa'ī, vizer of Hārūn al-Rashīd (d. 187/803); jahlī, from Ṭalba b. Tāhir, the second ruler of the Tāhirid dynasty; kāhi, from Tahir II of the same dynasty; nābī, after the Sāmānid Nābī I, 331/942-954.

To judge from these names it must be supposed that paper achieved some importance as early as the second half of the 2nd/8th century. About that time or at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century paper had, according to al-Dībājī, the same importance for the east as papyrus had for the west, especially since Hārūn al-Rashīd had ordered the use of paper as a writing material in the government offices because it was not possible to erase a text written on paper, or to scratch it out without this being noticed. In the second half of the 3rd/9th century paper made in Samarkand had already replaced papyrus as well as parchment in Baghdad, although we do not know precisely when the manufacture of paper began in Baghdad or in Cairo. According to al-Tha'labī (350/961-962/1038) the paper made in Cairo was especially fine and smooth, but on the other hand it is stated that the Thālabīd vizier, Dīfa'īr b. Hīnzābī (d. 391 or 392/1001), had brought the paper which he used directly from Samarkand.

Paper-mills were erected elsewhere on the plan of those in Samarkand; al-Fadl, brother of Dīfa'īr al-Barmakī, who had been governor of Khurāsān in
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178/794, probably founded the paper-mill in the Dār al-Kazz quarter in Baghdād. Soon afterwards others arose around Mīsam Thāl, Yemen and Egypt, where paper ultimately drove out papyrus, also in Damascus, Tripoli, Hamāt, Manbūjī, Tiberias, the Maghrib, Spain (at Jativa), Persia and India. Kāghad-khanā, the "paper-makers", was the name taken by the people of the village of Kūnānī or Kūnā in Ḍāhārbāyān, two days' journey from Zāndān, on account of the excellent paper made there. The place was destroyed by the Mongols, who, however, founded a colony, Mughulīyā, there (Barbier de Meynard, Dict. de la Perse, 219: Ṣāḥībī Khālīf, Dīkānānūmā, Istanbul 1145/1733-4, 298, tr. Norberg, i, 365).

On the preparation of paper and the different methods of colouring it, interesting details are given by J. von Karabacek, Neue Quellen z. Papiergeschichte, in Mitt. aus der Samml. der Papyri Prot. Rainer, iv, 75 ff. The raw material for paper-making consisted of rotten linen or hemp ropes, cut into small pieces, cleaned and bleached. It was then pounded in mortars, stampers or paper-mills, and water was added to make a pulp which was dressed with glue made of wheat starch (nābd). The pulp was then led off into a pulp-vat (bāriyya), water was added, and the pulp drawn through a deckle (kālib) and shaken. It was smoothed by hand, left on the deckle as long as seemed necessary, then laid on a table, attached to a clean, even wall and left to dry. Then each side of the sheet was rubbed with a concoction of flour and starch, left to dry and polished. The fineness of the paper depended on the nature of the deckle, the finest, like our vellum, coming from a very fine wire sieve.

In the rubbish heaps of the old towns in Egypt (e.g., al-Uṣhumayn, Madīnat al-Fayyūm, al-Fustāt), great masses of ancient paper of different kinds and colours have been discovered. Besides very white and off-white papers, artificially coloured ones — yellow, pale blue, violet, pink, green and red, have been found. Paper was much cheaper than papyrus; according to a 4th/10th century document in the collection of Archduke Rainer in the National Austrian Library, 15/3 dinars were paid for 100 sheets. The price naturally depended on the quality and kind. That made in Baghdād (al-warak al-Baghddi) was considered the best.

The paper used in the east is now almost entirely of European manufacture. In Persia we still find a Chinese paper called Kūhān Balkī (Turkish name of Peking), a scarce paper, sought after for its durability. The Cairo printers prefer a strong yellow-coloured paper called nābdī (Pers. nābdī, sugar-candy). A paper-mill long ago destroyed (Kāghad-khāna, popularly Kʿst-Hāna) gave its name to the Imperial Kiosk and the public promenade of the "Sweet Waters of Europe" in Istanbul.


KAGHAN [see KHAKAN].

KAHF [see ASHAB AL-KAHF].

KAHL AL-KAHIN [see AL-KAHIN].

KAHIN, a term of controversial origin (cf. T. Fahd, Divination arabe, 91 ff.), belonging to Canaanite, Aramaic and Arab traditions. At the earliest stage known to us it appears to have been used by the "Western Semites" to designate the possessor of a single function with related prerogatives, that is to say, the offering of sacrifices in the name of the group, the representing of this group before the deity, the interpretation of the will of the deity, and in addition the anticipation and communication of his wishes. The evolution of this function and these prerogatives follows the social evolution of these three groups themselves, but linked with their transition from a pastoral to an agricultural civilization, their conception of the deity and of the service due to him changed to suit the conditions of daily life. As the pre-Islamic Arabs were the last followers of the pastoral way of life, their conceptions of the priesthood probably reflect more or less faithfully the earliest stage of the priestly function, so far, of course, as the post-Islamic data at our disposal have remained faithful to their oral or written sources.

In this respect, although the accounts in which the kāhin appears may be fanciful and tendentious, it remains true that, in order to recreate a proper context for these stories and to avoid anarchisms, the people who told them and the people who used them must have tried to reconstitute and preserve the original orientation. With those who knew the Semitic theodicy in particular, the importance of the names and epithets given to the deities in polytheism and to God in monotheism in the elaboration of theology is obvious, bearing in mind above all that the true Muslim theodicy is to be found in the treatises of the āsmāʾ al-ḥusna (q.v.) rather than in those of the mutakallimūn.

We are of the opinion that the same reasoning applies to the terminology designating the personnel and the accoutrements of the cult. Therefore we have chosen as our point of departure the various names and attributes designating the function and prerogatives of the kāhin, in the hope of gaining a clearer picture of his characteristics as they must have appeared in the religious outlook of the greater part of the Arabs, since we lack documents of sufficiently established authenticity that deal with the conception of the kāhin held by the élite of the people and the ruling class.

Like the Greek Ἱεραρχία and the Latin sacerdos, the Arab kāhin combined the functions of sacrificer and guardian of the sanctuary, and those of the μαστίγος and the averter; hence it is possible to render the word kāhin by "priest", in the sense of agent of the official cult. But the predominance of nomadism, where it was usually the head of the family or tribe who offered sacrifices, after the manner of the patriarchs in the Old Testament, and in which frequent migra-
The oracular, manic and augural role of the kāhin is for all practical purposes the only one recognized in the evidence we possess, which derives essentially from folklore. The numerous special divinatory functions which he exercised are known to us only through the various names which designated the exercise of these functions, illustrated by a few examples. These names, frequently used as synonyms for kāhin (as are for example for "diviner and the female equivalent: "augur", "haruspes", "magus", "pythones", "sybil", "seer", etc.), are: afhal, ḥāst, ṣāḥ, ṣādīn, ṣādīq, ṣādīr, ḥāfīn, ḥādīn, ḥādīs, which properly speaking designated the function of guardian in the holy places and the regions where the saera of a tribe or a group of tribes were deposited. This function of the kāhin amounts in practice to no more than the significance of those names and the deductions to be drawn from the stories which illustrate them.

To begin with the term kāhin itself: its etymological origin is obscure (possibilities are the Semitic root k w n, "to be, to stand up", and the Akkadian root kānūn, giving the idea of prostration; but the unaltered permutation of the consonant k is still unexplained). However, it seems to have been part of the earliest religious vocabulary of the Western Semites, after the manner of the bārū at Mari and in Akkad. Like the bārū, he combined the functions of guarding the holy place, transmitting the oracle, offering sacrifices, and interpreting signs by divination. These were the functions of the Hebrew kōhēn before the institution of the Monarchy, as described in the Bible (cf. H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 1966).

The Arab kāhin had not developed beyond this stage when the advent of Islam brought about his disappearance because of the absence, in the nomadic environment in which he lived, of a permanent stable kingdom which, as in neighbouring kingdoms and elsewhere, would have organized the priesthood if only to keep it under control. This lack of organization resulted in making the kāhin the sole repository of supernatural knowledge, dispensed in Israel by the kōhēn and the nābī, and this led them to the practice of both divinatory and ecstatic techniques. Thus, like the bārūm in *Le place du dieu dans la société de Mari*, in *La Divination en Mesopotamie ancienne et dans les régions voisines*, Paris (C. F. A. Finet, 1966, 93), the kāhin of ancient Arabia was held in his hands the fate of the entire tribe, in both peace and war.

The oracular and ecstatic aspects of his functions appear more overtly in the kāhin, who likes the ecstatic prophetess of Mari (*muḫḫitu transliterated as Mari, *Duš., Dūš., Dōš., Dūš.*), had visions and was in charge of an oracle (rabāt bayt: cf. examples and references in *Divination arabe*, 98 ff.). The most famous of these women was Ḥajīnab, daughter of the king of the Arbaštā and bāst (Zubayr b. Ḥajīnab, the sayyid of the Kābl). In fact afhal, from the Semero-Akkadian aphālu and preserved in several Semitic languages with the meaning of high priest (cf. *Divination arabe*, 103 f.), seems to have acquired an ecstatic character among the Arabs (loc. cit.); in the same way the ḥāst, a term of Aramaic origin comparable to the Hebrew roṣḥ, the forerunner of the nābī, must have been originally a "seer", as is indicated by his name; but he became increasingly an observer of omens, and the term became a generic one covering different divinatory and magical practices (op. cit., 112 f.). (On the oracular utterances of the kāhin and the kāhinina see *Sā'ūr*).

The aspect of guardian and sacrificer in holy places and places of worship appears in the following names given to the kāhin: ṭābb, who like the r b of Ugarit and the Kaṭābān ṭ r b y had to manage the affairs of the holy place (territories and entrances); ḥādīn, caretaker of the bethel, the "sacred stone" itself entrusted to his keeping during the movements of the tribe, expressing at the same time the close link arising from the proximity between the deity and his servant (compare with ṣādīn, r taym, i mu'ru, and their Semitic equivalents); sādīn and hādīs, which properly speaking designated the function of guardian in the holy places and the regions where the saera of a tribe or a group of tribes were deposited, therefore, a measure of settlement and all that this implied with respect to institutions, organizations and established customs. The observation of what was happening in other temples of the world around (compare for example the reforms introduced by 'Amr b. Lūḥayy [q.Ş.] after a stay in a Hellenistic spa, and the institutions founded in the 5th century by Kusayy [q.Ş.], who came from a Byzantine area where ecclesiastical and monastic organization were highly developed) aided the development of the office of the sādīn, and stability made possible the creation and preservation of traditions, myths and legends. But the function of the sādīn was not restricted to the guardianship of the holy place; he took the place of the kāhin, and like him performed sacrificial and divinatory rites, as did the Ugaritic ṣā'ād (compare Hebrew nōḥed from the Meššā' stela) who also bore the titles r b and k h n (see *Divination arabe*, 111).

The divinatory aspect of the function of the kāhin is covered generically by the term *ārāf, and specifically by names derived from the divinatory specialities which he practised, such as *ḥāyā' and sā'ādir (see *Ṭā'ara*), ḥā'ī (see *Ṭā'ara*), ḥādīs and several other secondary designations for particular occasions, such as ḥāmā (arbitrator on the occasion of a musāfara), ḥā'īb, (spokesman and messenger), ḥā'īr (incantator and inciter to battle), ṭābbī (medicine man), ḥā'ābīr (valuer).

The *ārāf is the kāhin, even though the former occupies a lower rank than the latter in the hierarchy of seers because he does not more than exercise the divinatory prerogatives of the kāhin; however, since in a nomadic society these predominated, *ārāf and kāhin were eventually applied to the same person. *Ṭarāfa is the knowledge of things unseen or of things to come, on the basis of things visible or present. It implies a gnostic knowledge (compare maʿrū'a in relation to *ihrām*), and consequently a knowledge restricted to the initiated, an implication contained in the Akkadian and Hebrew equivalents of *ārāf: màdād and tādān* unt. Therefore *ṭarāfa, while belonging essentially to the realm of divination, comes close to that of enchantment and magic. *ʿArāf and *ʿārāf are inspired by a lábīc or lábīc
KÄHN — AL-KÄHINA

(familiar spirit) or a ra’iyy or ri*iyy (inspirer for particular occasions); therefore the kähin’s role is called maiba* (flanked by a demon), and *‘arrdf is at times assimilated to sorcery and to sha’badha (lègendarèm, conjuring). The lowest stage of the function of the ‘arrdf and the kähin is rendered by the term nā&hid.

This epithet refers both to his role as exerciser (mundshada) and to his role as finder of lost animals and other objects. It is often in this guise that the kähin ‘arrdf appears in the apologetic folktales of primitive Islam.

Before Islam, the kähin in central Arabia was the spiritual and intellectual guide of the tribe, a role filled by all agents of a cult in underdeveloped societies at every period and everywhere. By reason of the geographic, historic and social circumstances in which he practised, he was an independent holy man, like his Greek counterpart, even though at times connected with an oracle, rather than as an official in the service of a centralizing state, like his Assyro-Babylonian and Roman counterparts.


Her true personality—which must have been highly complex—is very difficult to discern, for only the distorted reflections of her real features can be detected behind the legend. There is no agreement even on her real name, for al-Kähina is only a nickname given to her by the Arabs. It is said that she was named Dīḥā—Ibn Khaldūn (tr. de Slane, *Berbères*, i, 172) mentions a Berber tribe known by this name—of which Dāḥyā, Dāḥīya, Dāmya, Dāmiya, or Dābāy could be merely variant spellings. There is the same doubt about her descent; she is said to be the daughter of Tāṭt, or again of Māṭīya (= Matthias, Matthew) son of Tīfān (= Theophanus). If this means that al-Kähina was descended from those Berbers of mixed blood, the issue of mixed marriages, it would help to explain her authority, not only over her compatriots but also over the Byzantines. Several other indications confirm this hypothesis.

Al-Kähina herself is said to have married a Greek. We are told that she had two sons: the one of Berber descent, the other of a Greek father (Yānānī). She was also, contrary to general belief, Christian by religion rather than Jewish. Her tribe, the nomadic and pastoral Djarawa, a subdivision of the Zanāta, themselves related to the Butr, had indeed first adopted Judaism, but like many other tribes, such as the Nafṣūn, had afterwards been converted to Christianity. When al-Kähina appeared on the scene, she was a widow, and was certainly very old. Legend relates that she lived for 127 years, 35 of them as “queen” (maliqta) of the Aurès, where in 477, following a successful rebellion against the Vandals, a first independent Berber kingdom had already been set up, governed by Ibadas. Like those “Arab queens” cited by T. Fahd (*Divination arabe*, p. 98), she was clearly an “ecstatic”. At the moment of inspiration she became wildly excited, let her hair stream out, and beat her breast. She also practised more orthodox techniques of divination, such as reading the future in gravel, and there is no doubt that she owed a large part of her power to her prophetic gifts.

Al-Kähina took up the challenge thrown down by Kusaya, who had mobilized in particular the settled Berbers of Carthage and destroying the organized Byzantine forces, Hassan turned towards the Aurès, the stronghold of Berber resistance. He regrouped his forces on the banks of the Meskīān and attacked. Al-Kähina did likewise, after demolishing Bāghāya, which was probably her capital and which she wished to avoid falling into the aggressors’ hands. The decisive confrontation took place on the banks of the Oued Nīnī, probably not far from the railway station of the same name which today is situated 16 km. to the south of Aln-Beldā on the railway line to Khenchela. The battle was so disastrous for Hassan that for many years afterwards the Arabs called the oued (river of trials), or, for less apparent reasons, Wādī ‘Audades (valley of the virgins). This campaign, Hassan’s first setback, had an epilogue in the territory of Gabes in the course of a final battle which drove the invaders out of Ifriḳiyya.

Hassan was ordered to halt his retreat four stages to the east of Tripoli, where he established his camp (Ḳuṣṭur Ḥassān) and bided his time. Al-Kähina enlarged the area of her authority, but her power certainly did not spread over the whole Maghribi, nor even the whole of Ifriḳiyya, as is stated in some sources (Ibn ʿIdhārī, Bayān, i, 36; al-Nuwārī, *Nūkhāya*, de Slane, *Berbères*, i, 340). She treated the Arab prisoners well; she had adopted one of them according to the Berber rite of simulated sucking, an influential chief,
Khalid b. Yazid (sometimes called Yazid b. Khālid), who was regarded as a spy from Hassan’s camp. Perhaps he was ensnatched in this role, but the relation with the Arabs and bring them to renounce their designs, of which she was doubtless informed, by means more reliable than divination. It was probably the failure of this policy which forced her in despair to devastate the country, adopting in the face of a stubborn enemy a “scorched earth” policy, which Solomon had completely, but nor should they be seen as a cataclysm. They could not have extended beyond certain regions of Ifrikiya, but they must nevertheless have been sufficiently serious to disfavour large sections of the settled population, who, when they did not seek refuge in the Mediterranean islands or even in Spain, were ready to beg Hassan to intervene.
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The new vizier, Muhammad b. al-Kāsim b. 'Ubayd Allāh, supported the anti-Shī‘ite policy of the caliph, who had Ibn Yabaḥ and Mu'nis put to death, declaring himself al-muntakabī min a‘dā‘dīn Allāh and having this slogan engraved on the coinage. Al-Kāhir wasted no time in ridding himself of his vizier and replacing him with Ahmad al-Khaṣṣībī; but he too soon found himself in insurmountable financial difficulties, while the former vizier, Ibn Muṣlīh, plotted against the caliph and managed to stir up the Sādīṣ guard, who rising on 6 Dū‘ādād I 322/24 April 934, seized the caliph and imprisoned him.

The son of al-Muḳṭadīr, taking the name of al-Rādī, was proclaimed the new caliph. Since al-Kāhir had refused to abdicate, in spite of the pressure put upon him, the chief of the Sādīṣ guard, supported by al-Rādī, had him blinded. Al-Kāhir was released only eleven years later, on the orders of the following caliph, al-Mustakflī, and he died in Dū‘ādād I 339/ October 950.

**Bibliography:** D. Sourdelle, *Vistral*, 471-8; Ibn al-Aḥdr, index. (D. SOURDELLE)

**AL-ḴĀHIRA**, capital of Egypt and one of the most important centres of religious, cultural and political life in the Muslim world. The city is situated on both banks of the Nile, at 30°6’ Lat. N. and 31°6’ Long. E. respectively, at ca. 20 km. south of the delta where the Mukaṭṭam Mountains almost come down to the river. This strategical point dominating the access to Lower Egypt had been inhabited since early times, but became of primary importance during the Arab invasion in 226/643, when ‘Amr b. al-‘Ās established the foundations of a permanent encampment at al-Fustāṭ. The actual name of the city is derived from Miṣr al-Ḵāhirā, a town established in 359/970 by the Fatimid caliph al-Mu'iz, which gradually embraced the surrounding places. The remains of al-Fustāṭ are found in the quarter of modern Cairo called Maṣr al-῾Atika, Old Cairo. See also BABALYUN, AL-FUSTAT, MIHRA, AL-RAWDA. (ED.)

**Monuments**

Numbers in square brackets after monuments are those given in the *Index to the Mohammedan monuments in Cairo* (Survey of Egypt 1951). An asterisk after a monument indicates that it is dated by reference to a foundation inscription (often more than one).

**Nomenclature.** A considerable difficulty in the identification of monuments is orthographic, since current pronunciation of a name (Ṣargẖitmīsh [218]), the literary sources (Ṣargẖitmīsh [Budagov], Suyrughẖitmīsh [Moritz, *Arabic palaeography*]) and the inscriptions (Ṣargẖitmīsh, carefully pointed) often diverge markedly. For the sake of convenience, in reference to the standard art-historical authorities a modified form of the colloquial arabized Turkish has been adopted (Kūḏīn [224] and not Kāwāwawn, as it appears pointed on the perch of his mosque), except when popular etymology has so distorted the name (Ṭaghẖīrīdī/Taḥtīrīdī [200] which has become Ṣaghẖīrīdī) that the original is difficult to reconstruct.

**Topography.** The vast extent of the modern city of Cairo creates problems for the history of its monuments. Exceptionally among Middle Eastern cities, its development has been horizontal, rather than in terms of vertically superimposed layers, extensive rather than intensive. The original enceinte of al-Kāhirā, located well to the north of the agglomerations of al-Fustāṭ, al-‘Askar and al-Ḵāṭāţ, was intended essentially as a centre of government, well outside the main habitation areas, containing a palace complex, the barracks of the Fatimid armies and the new congregational mosque of al-Azhār [97]. For a time the walled city of old Cairo, Kaṣr al-Shāmī, Bābālyūn and al-Fustāṭ maintained their importance as industrial centres with the chief port installations on the Nile and the major blocks of tenements. However, the progressive westward deflection of the course of the Nile, and the attraction of al-Kāhirā as the centre of government led to a steady population movement northwards, so that the original mud (labīn) walls of Diwāhwar (358/969 onwards) had twice to be expanded, by Badr al-Dīmām (6, 7, 190) 480/1087-84/1091 and by Bāḥa’ al-Dīn Karākūş under al-Salāh al-Dīn in 572/1176-83/1173. The 5th/11th-century expansion, allegedly motivated by fear of an attack by the Sādīṣ, Ātīṣ, was less extensive than the latter, which included large areas between the walls of Diwāhwar and the Nile (see Fig. 1), now commemorated only in the names of certain quarters of modern Cairo, the Bāb al-Lūk, the Bāb al-Hādīd, the Bāb al-Khalk (Ḫark), etc. The steady northward population movement led to the desertion of large areas of al-Fustāṭ, which by the mid-6th/12th century had become abandoned (ḫāridā) and which in 572/1176 were partially connected to the inhabited areas by a wall, which remained incomplete at al-Salāh al-Dīn’s death.

From the Fatimid period onwards the areas of al-Kaṭāţ south of the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn became increasingly associated with the southern cemetery (the Karāţa al-Kubrā, see below). The first major expansion outside the Fatimid enceinte was the Citadel built for Salāh al-Dīn, 572-1176 onwards, not to fortify the city but as a place of refuge.

The Citadel was supplied with water from the Nile by means of an aqueduct (78) (bandār) which in its present state dates only from the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (Creswell, *MAE*, ii, 255-9), who in 712/1312 (sic) built four sabāḥīya on the Nile to raise water to the aqueduct of the Citadel and in 741/1341 incorporated into it the remains of Salāh al-Dīn’s wall, which had been intended to enclose the khāridā of al-Fustāṭ. It was restored and lengthened at various times during the 9th/15th century and particularly in the reigns of Kaṣrī Bāy and Kānṣaww al-Ghwārī [99-100], to whom the large water-tower, now known as the Sabā’a Sawāḥīt and still more or less on the Nile, must probably be attributed [78].

A second Ayyūbid fortress, no longer extant and destroyed and rebuilt several times during the Mamūk period, was the Kaṣr al-Rawdā/Kaṣr al-Mīyās, erected on the Island of Rawdā (Rod) by al-Malik al-Sālīḥ, though the island was almost exclusively a residential area, like Dilza (Giza), and very few monuments of any architectural importance now survive there.

Under the Bahri [see AL-BARHIYYA] Mamūlaks the expansion continued mainly outside the Fatimid walls, those foundations within being almost exclusively funerary and royal. The south-western slopes of the Citadel, which had remained unfortified in the Ayyūbid period, were walled by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad but were principally occupied by the sultan’s palace and the houses of his high amirs. In this period we see the creation of the great Mamūlak thoroughfares, the Darb al-ʿAṣmar leading from the Citadel to the Bāb al-Zuwaysa [590], the Shāriʿ al-Ṣalbā leading from the Citadel towards the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn, and the Khalījī, originally a canal (now the Shāriʿ Port Saʿīd). The expansion to the north of the walled city of al-Kāhirā was not so marked:
the only two remaining foundations of any importance are the Mosque of Baybars in the Maydan Dahir (261/557), 666-7/1266-7, built on one of the royal polo grounds (see Pls. 3, 3a, 3b) and Kubba-al-Fadawiyya [5], dated by Creswell to 884-6/1479-81*.

Under the Ottomans the expansion of Cairo appears to have taken a different direction, to the west of the walled city of al-Kahira, particularly in the Bulaq area, which then became the principal port of Cairo. These are only by pre-Ottoman buildings surviving in this quarter, the mosque of the Kadic Yabya [344], 852-3/1448-9, and the mosque of Abu l-Tila [340], c. 890/1485. By contrast, the quarter contains the mosque (kulliya) of Sinan Pasha [349], 979/1571*, a large number of 17th- and 18th-century foundations and many less important but interesting khana ( urbadas) as well as wooden houses of a distinctively Istanbul type. The area has been only cursorily surveyed and stands in need of a detailed study. The change of direction initiated by the Ottomans was continued with the development of residential quarters, at Dijza and 'Ilbama on the west bank of the Nile, at Shubra, where a palace of Muhammad 'Ali built by 1850 (E. Pauty, 'L'architecture au Caire depuis la conquête ottomane', 52-8) attracted a residential suburb, at Abbasiiyya, and ultimately in the development of Garden City and Helioptolis (see Pl. 8).

The history of settlement of al-Kahira shows a secular northward movement continuing from that of al-Fustat to al-Katatt. Al-Kahira itself, at least within the walled area enclosed by Salab al-Din, remained of central importance as the seat of government and in the 19th century, with the Europeanized town plan imposed upon the Ezbekiyya quarter, the centre of commerce as well. The same development, however, was not followed in the quarter which now virtually surrounds the city and which are perhaps the most remarkable architectural feature of Cairo to strike the visitor.

Cemeteries. The great southern cemetery (al-Karafa al-Kubra), the principal burial place of Cairo since the invasion of 'Amr, remained in full use in the Fatimid period, when it was the centre of a veritable cult, which in the context as a Sunnith orthodoxy by the foundation of a madrasa at the tomb of the Imam al-Shafi soon after the Ayyubid conquest of Egypt (the present mausoleum [281], 608/1211, was built by al-Malik al-Kamil; see Pls. 2, 2a). At the south of the cemetery are a group of Fatimid maqbaras, the most important of which is that of Yabya al-Shibli [285], c. 545-6/1151, the mausoleum of the Imam al-Shafi [263] rebuilt by al-Ghawri in 921/1505* and restored in 1200/1883*; the khanqah and mausoleum of Shahn al-Khalawati [212], 945-1358, and the mausoleum of Sidi 'Ukba rebuilt by Muhammad Pasha Silidard in 1066/1655-6* and restored in 1909/1688 [608], better known as the Sadiet al-Wafadiyya. Remains of the Mamlik period in this area are now sparse, though a detailed survey would doubtless permit the location of many funerary foundations mentioned by Maqrizi and others. Behind the mausoleum of the Imam al-Shafi are the tombs of the late royal family, the Hawsh al-Pasha.

The northern part of this cemetery contains a less and more important group of Fatimid maqbaras, including that of Sayyida Naflsa (of which only restoration inscriptions dated to the reign of al-Hafiz now exist; the reconstruction proposed by D. Rennell)

A note on the cemetery of the 'Abbassid caliphs and the shrine of Sayyida Naflsa, in Ars Islamica, vi (1939), 168-74, is highly speculative, Sayyida Rukayya [273], 527/1133*, and Sayyida 'Atika [333], c. 1115. The sequence continues almost without interruption with the mausolea of late Ayyubid and Safer Mamluk sultans or princesses, including Shadjar al-Durr [169], c. 648/1250, the hawsh and mausoleum of the 'Abbasid caliphs [276], possibly as early as 640/1242-3, and the mausoleum of al-Ashraf Khall [275], 687/1288*, the last Mamluk sultan to be buried in this area. Doubtless to be included within the same cemetery, in the area to the south-west of the Citadel, is a group of funerary foundations. The earliest of these is conventionally known as the mausoleum of Mustafa Pasha [279], (? 666/1267-67/1273, and they include the mausoleum of khanqah of Kusun [201], 736-7/1335-7*, and a remarkable mausoleum with minaret, the Sultaniyya [288-9]; by reason of its domes, which resemble superficially Timurid domes at Samarqand and Herat, Creswell dates the latter to the mid-13th/13th century but it may well be a century earlier.

The fringes of the southern cemetery merit attention. The Christian cemeteries appear to have been located, as they are now, in the vicinity of Ksar el-Sham, though nothing of any antiquity remains there (those of the Djibal at-Abmar to the north-east of Cairo appear to date from the present century). The Jewish cemeteries were located, as they are now, in the vicinity of a considerable cult, which was made acceptable to the living in the area of Basatin al-Wazir. The most puzzling of these fringe monuments, however, is the Masjid al-Diyuygh [304], 478/1085*, the mausoleum of Badr al-Djamali, which now stands completely isolated on the Muka'tam hills, though the literary sources refer to pavilions and other buildings (e.g., the Masjid al-Tannur built on the supposed site of the Tannur Firmaun) which no longer remain. It is, in any case, the only buried cemeteries in this area.

The cemetery of the Báb al-Wazir to the north and north-east of the Citadel lies immediately outside the northern walls of Salab al-Din. The most important, as well as the earliest, foundation there is that of Mandjak al-Yusuf [138], 750/1350*, described as a mosque in the Index, but, exceptionally, having a separate entrance gateway, and a tomb attached to the mosque in the fortress. The other monuments are also 8th/14th century, the tabi of Shaykh al [144], 755/1354*, the earliest free-standing tabi in the architecture of Cairo, the masjid and hankah of Shaykh Nisam al-Din [140], 757/1356*, and the mausoleum and hankah of Tankizbugha, situated in an isolated position some distance away on a low spur of the Muka'tam hills (85), 764/1364*. The latest of this group is the mausoleum of Yavus al-Dawadkar [130], 757/1357, pre-783/1382. None of the foundations is royal, and since the foundation of Mandjak is not significantly smaller than those of the Babr Mamluk sultans, the creation of this small cemetery is an index of the pressure upon space created by the grand funerary constructions of the Mamluk sultans imara muros and in the main streets leading from the Citadel towards the centre.

The great northern, or north-eastern, cemetery, known misleadingly as the Tombs of the Caliphs, though almost contiguous with that of the Báb al-Wazir and now apparently separated from it only by a recent road, the Shari Saltim Bank, would appear (al-Maqrizi, ii, 36) to be a separate development; the first tomb to be built in this area (known in his time as the 'Awamid al-Sibak) was that of Yavus al-Dawadker [157], 783-4/1382, actually the burial place of Anas*, father of Barak. There is a topographical problem here, however, since in the southern sector of this cemetery, contiguous to that of Báb al-Wazir,
Both the numbers of the monuments, and the numbers and letters of the sections of the map correspond with those of the Map of Cairo showing Mohammedan monuments, Survey of Egypt, 1950 (enclosed in K. A. C. Creswell, The Muslim architecture of Egypt, i, Oxford 1952), and the Index of Mohammedan monuments in Cairo, Survey of Egypt, 1951.
are three important Bahri foundations, of Tahtúnur (92), 715/1314*, Tāybuhū ḥ al-Tawḥī, pre-758/1356 (37)* and Khwānd Ṭughāy (64), known locally as Umūm Anūk, pre-749/1348 (al-Makrīzī, ii, 66-7), a nausoleum and khānqāh with remains of rich stucco decoration and some interesting faience mosaic at the base of the surviving dome. North of this group all the surviving monuments are Burgīl (in spite of all the maps which indicate, without numbering, Bahri remainders); all are on a larger scale and many are royal. These include the khānqāh complex of Faraḍî b. Barkūk (149), 803/1400-813/1412*, the funerary complex of Kāṭ bī Yāq (94, 99, 101, 104), 877-9/1472-4* (see Pl. 6) and the combined foundations of Sultan Ṭāylū al-jawll, 960/1360 (al-Makrīzī, ii, 162), 911/1506-7*. Once again, it is easy to ascribe the growth of this cemetery to the pressure upon building space within the city, all the more so since expropriation was discouraged and sub-stitution (tabdīl) of waṣf property generally required a special fīṣūd, the practice only becoming general, according to Ibn Ḥaṣūn, in the 9th/10th century. However, the larger royal foundations of this cemetery included elements like the ṭabīr (plural ṭābūr) of a decidedly commercial nature, and there is evidence (Van Berchem, C.IA, iii, 316-31) that Faraḍî b. Barkūk hoped at some time to transfer the Sūk Orthodoxy of his khānqāh. The area has only recently been colonized and was for much of its extent isolated from Cairo itself by the line of rubbish heaps known as the Barqiyya. Access to the cemetery would appear, therefore, to have been not from the Bāb al-Ważr but from the Bāb al-Barfiyya, remains of which, dated 480/1087 by an inscription, were discovered late in the 19th century (Creswell, M.AE, i, 261-3), which exceptionally has vaulted ṣūqān instead of the usual flat roof. The ṣūqān could sometimes be closed off from the durakān by palatial doors, as in the case of a ṣūqān (Dayr al-Bandāt) in the Greek Orthodox monastery of St. George at Old Cairo (Kaṣr al-Sham), a construction of indeterminate date but with such doors of the Fāṭimid period, and as in the case of a similar pair of doors in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo found in excavations at the nausoleum of Kāṭūn (Inventory No. 554 [Pauty, Bois sculptés, Plate ix]).

Fortifications. The mud-brick tabūr fortifications of Dāwjāhīr have disappeared by al-Makrīzī's time, the result not of the instability of the material but of the population pressure on the compound of al-Kāhira, in spite of all attempts to exclude the public from its precincts. (There is an unrecorded mud-brick muṣallā or masjidī in the al-Kārāfī ḥ al-Kubārī near the Sādāt al-Wāfīyya which is almost certainly Fāṭimid in date). The present Fāṭimid fortifications of al-Kāhira, therefore, date from the time of the Caliph al-Mustaṣūr and even before their extensive repair by Sālūbī-Dīn in various sectors were much more characteristic of North Syrian than of Cairene architecture, being of squared stone and strengthened with transversely placed columns. The chief remaining elements of the north wall, in which the wall and the north porch of the mosque of al-Ḥākim are embedded, are the Bāb al-Futūfī and the Bāb al-Nasr (6, 7), 480/1087* (see Bāb); on the east is the Bāb al-Barfiyya of the same date* (not marked on the monuments map) and on the south the Bāb Zuwayla, 484/1091 (al-Makrīzī, i, 381). For a precise reconstruction of the walls of al-Kāhira, showing the fortifications of Dāwjāhīr, Sādāt al-Barfiyya and Sālūbī, see Fig. 1.

Mosques. The earliest of the mosques of al-Kāhira was that of al-Ashār (97), situated to the south of the palace, dated 355-6/1970-2 (al-Makrīzī, Khīṭāt, ii, 273) and built very much on the lines of the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn with a ṣūqān and rūmās surrounding it which are multiplied in the hābra side [see Masqūd]. Very little of the building is original (for a reconstruction see plan in Creswell, M.AE, i, 58-60, Fig. 20). It was not originally founded as a teaching institution though little more than a year after its foundation it had become the centre of the propagation of the Fāṭimid da'wah. It was this change of function, as much as the population increase within the enceinte of al-Kāhira, which doubtless explains...
the foundation soon afterwards of the mosque of al-Hākim [35], founded by al-‘Azīz in 380/1090-1 and completed by al-Hākim no later than 403/1012, outside the walls of Djiawhar, to the north. Creswell has deduced that those parts of the stucco facing of the biḥla riwāt of al-Azhar which are not 19th-century inventions may go back to the original date of foundation; but the courtyard façades and the domed pavilion at the entrance to the raised crossing on the axis of the miḥrāb cannot be earlier than the reign of al-Hāfīz li-Dīn Allāh, 526/1131-534/1140. For the Ayyūbid period there is only the testimony of ʿAli Pāḥā Shubārak (iv, 16) that any upkeep of the mosque at al-Ḥaṣrā was attempted, al-Malik al-Kāmil being said to have erected a biḥla šaṭīra min ḥaṣāb biḥla riwāt al-Sharīfīyya in 627/1230. With the exception of this dubious period, however, al-Azhar was reorganized, restored and added to by almost every important ruler of al-Ḥaṣrā from al-Hāfīz to Kāʿīt Bāy, who added a miḥrāb and a minaret (both undated) as well as a monumental porch (bāwāsūba), and al-Ghawrī, who added its second minaret, also undated. The adjacent madrasas of Tāʾybars and Aḥkūbhā (709/1309-10 and 734/1334-4 to 740/1339*), were enclosed within the complex when the bawāsūba (the bāwāsūba al-Mašāyīn) was added by Kāʿīt Bāy (829/1426*), though the present entrance is Ottoman, 1167/1753-4*, probably the work of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Katkhudā, who considerably enlarged the mosque at this time.

The mosque of al-Hākim was even more traditional in that it boasted a šiyāda or temenos on at least one side (identified by Creswell, MAE, i, 115-7 and dated by him 411/1021-427/1036), though it added two minarets based on north-west and south-west corners and adopted the plan of three monumental entrances, the northern one being subsequently embedded in the wall of Badr al-Dījamāl. The mosque suffered badly in the earthquake of 702/1303 but was restored immediately by Baybars al-Dījamālī (Ǧāshnegīr), who added pyramid-like casings to the two stone minarets and a miḥrāb (or perhaps larger) like those of each minaret to the north and south. In spite of a further restoration attributed by al-Mafṣūlī (Khitat, ii, 277) to Sultan Hasan the mosque is now in a ruinous condition and the decoration judged so important by S. Flury (Die Ornamente der Hakim- und Ashar Moschee, Heidelberg 1912, 9-26, 43-50) can scarcely now be made out.

The other two extant Fāṭimid mosques of Cairo, both modifications of the same plan, merit attention. Al-Akmār [33], 510/1120* (see Pls. 1, 1a), the work of the vizier Maʿmūn al-Batāʿīh, has the earliest decorated façade in Cairo, with a rich complement of foliate and epigraphic ornament, but is equally significant because although the mosque is biḥla-oriented (at least approximately) the façade follows the street, which is not parallel to the biḥla wall, this is the first case of what was to become a standard Cairene practice. The mosque of the vizier al-Ṣāliḥ Talāḥī [116], 555/1159*, the last dated Fāṭimid building of Cairo (misleadingly restored in the present century), also combines architectural interest—a colonnaded narthex or loggia as façade and a basement of shops (dakkhim)—with rich interior stucco decoration, partly restored by the amir Bektāmiş al-Chāndārī in 695/1296 or 703/1304*. This mosque, situated in the judiciously opened gap in the Dījamāl immediately opposite the Bāb Zuwayla, had been intended as a shrine for the head of al-Husayn. This was placed in a mosque-shrine inside al-Kāhirah on a site now occupied by the mosque of Sāyridnā al-Husayn, the work of an unidentified 19th-century architect under the influence of the railway station architecture of the Gothic revival in Europe.

Tombs, Maṣḥāds. The tombs of the Fāṭimid caliphs were inside the palace in the actual region of the Khān al-Khalīfī [53,4,56] and were thus destroyed on the fall of the dynasty. (A fragment of the only remaining inscription has been published in RCEA 2104; see G. Wiet, Inscriptions historiques sur pierre 34-5, no. 52.) Many other funerary inscriptions have been published (see Bibliography), most from the typical Cairene bawwāb, an unroofed burial enclosure, which may be provided with one or more miḥrābs in the biḥla wall, which contains graves covered by cenotaphs, or sometimes one or more domed mausolea, usually biḥla-oriented but following no clear chronological sequence. Some domed mausolea of private persons survive, among which may be the Sābīa Bānt, four mausolea, not all with miḥrābs, to the south of the ruins of al-Fustāt and identified by Creswell on the basis of Bawwāb, ii, 449 with the mausolea of those members of the family of the vizier Abu ʿl-Kāsim al-Husayn b. ʿAlī Maḥrūbī put to death by al-Hākim in 400/1010. More characteristic are the maṣḥāds of the late 12th-13th centuries built over or next to the southern cemetery in various groups. Among the best preserved are the Khaṭān (Ikhwaṭ) Yūsuf [301], c. 500/1100, Sayyida ʿĀṭika [333], c. 510/1120, Sayyida Rūkhāna [273], 527/1133*, the only precisely dated member of the group, Yabāyan Ṣabic al-Sabīnī [185], c. 545/1150 and Umm Kulthum nearby (not marked on the monuments maps, pre-550/1155. Small constructions, sometimes with a central courtyard, the maṣḥāds consisted of sanctuaries of one to three rooms, often in threes, and containing one or more cenotaphs, which were perhaps surmounted by a makhṣara. These were conceived essentially as centres of pilgrimage (ṣiyādāt). Not all Fāṭimid funerary monuments take these forms, however: the ʿKabr Luʾluʾ bint al-Muqarrīkī, among the mysterious remains of al-Kārīfī al-Muqarrīkī, consists of three-storeyed domes on squinches, with richly decorated carved stucco friezes and miḥrābs, often in threes, and containing one or more cenotaphs, which were perhaps surrounded by a makhṣara. This was conceived essentially as a sort.

Ayyūbīds

Fortifications. The Citadel and the walls of Sirābī al-Dīn have been authoritatively described and analysed in detail by Creswell (MAE, ii, 1-460 ff.). The former, the largest Ayyūbīd fortification ever undertaken, occupies a spur of the Muqāṭṭam Hills on its north-west side: the south side is an artificially built up terrace. The Ayyūbīd remains are confined to the more or less rectangular northern enceinte, which had four gates, the Bāb al-Mudarrātī built by the amir Karānbī in conspicuous Ayyūbī times in the Burjī al-Matar and the Burjī al-Imām and the Bāb al-Kullā. To this first period may also be assigned a long stretch of curtain wall with fairly uniformly spaced half-round towers which starts at the east of
the Burdż al-Muk'attam and runs round the south, east and north sides of the enceinte. The ramparts were connected by a chemin de ronde and had round crenellations. These fortifications which, Creswell judges, must have been virtually complete at the time of Śalāb al-Dīn's death, were strengthened by al-Malik al-ʿAdīl in 604/1207-8, when he added three great square towers, the Burdż al-Šufa, the Burdż Kerkyulan and the Burdż al-Ṭurfa, all built aithwart the southern sector of the walls, cutting the chemins de ronde so as to form individually defensible redoubts in case of need. The Bāb al-Karafa at the Burdż al-Ḥaddād (Ḥadīd?) and the Burdż al-Raml were converted into circular bastions. On the completion of these works al-Malik al-ʿAdīl took residence in the palace there. Makrīzī states that the Citadel was built with stone from the pyramids at al-Jīza; most of it is, however, of soft Mutaḵṭam limestone which was quarried on the spot. In Creswell's view the rusticated masonry is easily attributable to al-ʿAdīl since he employed it for fortifications at Buṣrā, Damascus and elsewhere.

The purpose of the Citadel was internal defence, against the possibility of a Fātimid counter-attack or an invasion of the population of the city of al-Ḥārām. A second Ayyubid fortress with the same purpose, a secure palace complex, the Khalvat al-Rawda, was built on Rawda by al-Šāfiʿī Naṣīr al-Dīn Ayyūb, 638/1240-1. It contained a khūba (Creswell, MAE ii, 84-7) with an enlarged ṣarīfā to take a free-standing dome, probably wooden. It also had a Gothic doorway, doubtless carved on the spot by some of the Frankish prisoners taken in the Egyptian campaign. Although nothing now survives of this fortress of sixty towers, it remains of interest, for it was here that al-Ṣāfiʿī installed the garrison of Mamlūks known, from their station on the Nile (al-Bāb al-Nil), as Bahri, which eventually supplanted the Ayyūbīd dynasty (al-Makrīzī, Sulūk, Ziyāda I, 341).

Mosques. There are no surviving Ayyūbīd mosques in Cairo, and no Ayyūbīd restoration inscriptions from either the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn or the mosque of ʿAmr, which under their occupation was the only mosque in which the ṣarīfā was permitted, in an attempt to eradicate the importance of al-Ḥāzir as the centre of Fātimid propaganda. More curiously, the restoration of the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn by the Fātimid vizier al-ʿAfsallāh, who added a mīhrāb c. 687/1094, appears to have been respected, since the ʿAlīyīd khakhāda which appears on it has never been defaced.

Madrasas. It would appear probable that the Ayyūbīds relied more upon the institution of the madrasa to combat the Fātimid da'wa. Time has dealt harshly with these foundations however. One of the first foundations of Śalāb al-Dīn's occupation of Egypt was a Shāfiʿī madrasa near the grave of the Imām al-Ḥadīth in the southern cemetery (begun 571/1176-7). Of this nothing remains but the magnificent teak cenotaph of al-Ṣāfiʿī Naṣīr al-Dīn Ayyūb, 638/1240-1, and the work of the naghdiyī ʿUbayd b. Maʿallī. The combination of venerated tomb with madrasa was an interesting exploitation of the principle of the Fātimid masgad for orthodox Sunni ends. Elements of the madrasa probably survived until the late 12th/18th century, but the tomb of the Imām under went one great transformation, under al-Malik al-ʿAdīl in 604/1207-8, which not only destroyed the magnificent teak cenotaph but also converted the mausoleum into an enormous wooden-domed mausoleum, which has been frequently restored since but is still arguably the most impressive mausoleum-shrine of Cairo (see Pls. 2, 22).

(For the chronology see G. Wiet, Les inscriptions du mausolée de Shāfī, in BIE, xv (1933), 167-95.) Remains of a madrasa in the Suk al-Nahl?asin attest a second foundation of al-Ḵāmil, the Kamāliyya (428), 622/1225 (Ḵhiyāl, ii, 375), but the best conserved of all is a double two-iwan madrasa on the Kaṣaba, the main street of Fātimid Cairo, by al-Ṣāfiʿī Naṣīr al-Dīn Ayyūb [38], 641/1243-4, with a single minaret crowned by a mussābīrā above the porch in the centre of the façade and a street between which separates the madrasa and the mausoleum. Apart from the decorated street façade which depends for its ornament on the tradition of the courtyard façades of al-Azhar, the madrasas are almost in ruins, though the crown of the vault of the west iwan of the left-hand madrasa has inserted of stone vaulting in the brick substructure, which are executed without centring as in Upper Egypt, an architectural practice which has attracted little attention from archaeologists working in Cairo but which is fairly frequent in the 7th/13th-8th/14th centuries. The most significant feature of the foundation, however, is the mausoleum of al-Ṣāfiʿī, 667/1269* but completed (Ḵhiyāl, ii, 374) 68/1243, of which the second post-mortem funerary constructions of Cairo, it is also the first conspicuous funerary foundation, the hibla-oriented mausoleum essentially forming part of the street façade and thus one of the most conspicuous features of the building. This approach was to become so much a standard feature of the architecture of Mamlūk Cairo that where a choice between a hibla orientation and a street façade arose it was often the latter which prevailed.

Tombs. A funerary construction of a more traditional type is the "Tomb of the ʿAbbasid Caliph" [276] near Sayyida Naṣīra, possibly as early as 660/1262-3, with very rich decoration of carved and painted plaster, which contains the cenotaphs of many of the caliphs who lived in Egypt as Mamlūk puppets after the fall of the caliphate of Baġdad. The domed mausoleum is enclosed in a vast baḵsh with seven mīhrābs in the hibla wall and the remains of a monumental entrance. In the post-Ayyūbīd period such isolated mausolea without appurtenances are very much the exception.

Few public works of the Ayyūbīd period survive. The Ayyūbīd elements of the aqueduct which supplied the Citadel with water were incorporated into the works of al-ʾNāṣir Muḥammad. Two bridges on the al-Dīza road remain, however, with inscriptions from the time of Śalāb al-Dīn in the name of Karākūsh (Van Berchem, CIA, 455 ff.) and restoration inscriptions of al-ʾNāṣir Muḥammad, 716/1316, Kāḥtī Bāy, 884/1479 and Husayn Pāḥša, 1087/1676.

Mamlūk Fortifications. There are no considerable Mamlūk fortifications extant in Cairo. The Kaṣr al-Rawda was restored under Baybars and the restoration inscriptions of al-ʾNāṣir Muḥammad on the Citadel relate principally to the building of an irregular southern enceinte and to the construction of a new aqueduct connecting the Citadel with the Nile and incorporating into it part of the wall of Śalāb al-Dīn which had been intended to connect the ḫarībā of al-Fuṣṭašt with al-Ḵāmil but was never completed. The aqueduct was begun as early as 721/1321 (Ḵhiyāl, ii, 450: Casanova's translation erroneously has 711/1311, cf. Creswell, MAE, ii, 255-9 also for the later history of the aqueduct). The buildings of al-ʾNāṣir Muḥammad on the Citadel included a large mosque on the ṣariqā plan [143] with a
foundation inscription of 718/1318, which was considerably modified in 735/1335 (Khdt, ii, 212, 315) when the large wooden dome over the mihrab supported on ten columns of Aswan granite was doubtless less added. The mosque also has two minarets said to have been decorated by craftsmen from Tabriz: if this report is really to be believed the craftsmen appear to have forgotten their skill on the way to Cairo. The palace of al-Nasir Muhammad, the Kasr al-Ablacr (so called from its use of bi-coloured voussoirs for the arches of the main qa'a), also known as the Bayt Yusuf Sallabh al-Dfn, was destroyed in 1824. It has been possible to reconstruct it, however, from descriptions given by Shihab al-Dfn al-‘Umarl, Masalik al-abjar (Bibliotheque Nationale MS arabes 583, folio 190a) and al-Makrzl (Khdt, ii, 209-10, which gives the date of construction as 713-4/1313-5). The palace consisted of a great qa'a (cf. Creswell, MAE, ii, 250-1) and a central qa'a', which appears to have had flat-roofed iwans and a central dome on wooden pendentives. The palaces of the alms which in Makzrl’s time covered the southern slopes of the Citadel have now entirely disappeared, those which still remained doubtless being destroyed when the palace of al-Djawhara [505] was built by Muhammad 'Ali in 1829-30.

Mosques. The earliest of the Batr Mamluk mosques is that of Baybars in the Maydan Dahir [1], 666/1266 (see PIs. 3, 3a, 3b), completed two years later, on a pole-or-well to the north-west of the Fatiimid walled city. Built very much on the plan of the mosque of al-Hakim, though without the siyda and without the two minarets, it has three monumental entrances, the decoration of which is a curious blend of North Syrian motifs and the ornament of the Fatiimid mosque of al-Akmar (see above). The building has been largely gutted; the wood and marble brought for it by Baybars from Djaffa has disappeared and only fragments of the rich stucco decoration of the window frames remain. Its most conspicuous feature is the large square mbsyra in front of the mihrab, doubtless originally covered with a wooden dome and unparalleled in scale in the mosque architecture of Cairo. With the exception of Ldjrn’s restoration of the mosque of Ibn Tulun (see Restorations below), the principal period of mosque construction in Cairo would appear to be from 713/1313 onwards, partly following on the foundation of the mosque of al-Nasir Muhammad on the Citadel and partly taking rather belated advantage of the relaxation of the restriction of the khdsba to a very limited number of mosques inside Cairo. The foundations, often on a large scale, are all of amirs, not of sultans, and are chiefly on the main arteries to the south and south east of the Fatiimid walls leading towards the Citadel. They include 'Alamilik (7) al-Cdcdndar [24], 719/1319, Ahmad al-Mihmdr [113], 725/1324-5, 'Almlds (Yldms, less probably Olmst), 730, 733/1332-90 (Khdt, ii, 307), Kdsrn [202], 730/1332-30, which has a monumental porch on the east at some distance from the mosque itself, Bsghtk [205], 735/1335, and Altinbugha al-Mrdndn [120], 739-40/133940, the grandest and most inventive of the lot, with many columns of Aswan granite complete with Ptolemaic capitals, glazed ceramic window-grilles, carved wooden mashrabiyya screens separating the kula from the main dome, and a very curiously indented facade on the Darb al-Abmar. There are three further mosques of this period, Aslan al-Bahar [112], 745-6/1344-5, 'Alsmunk [123], 747-8/1346-7—better known from its restoration by Ibrahim Aga Mustafabn in 1602/1652, who covered part of the interior with (bad) blue and white tiles and made it known as the Blue Mosque, and Shaykh al-Umar [147], 750/1349-50 (Khdt, ii, 312-3 has 756/1355-6). These foundations vary considerably in their dimensions, but their façades always follow the line of the street in which they are built, any divergences from the kdra orientation which this might entail being reconciled by setting the interior plan askew. None are primarily funerary constructions and some are quite definitely not, for example the mosques of Kdsrn, who built a mausoleum and khanlbk [290-1] in the southern cemetery 756/1355 (Khdt, ii, 425), and of Shaykh, whose khanlbk and mausoleum are directly opposite [152], 756/1355*—.

The Cairene mosques from the time of Sultan Hasan onwards, if even grander in scale, are fewer in number and, even in the case of royal foundations, usually form part of more complex institutions. This is reflected in the terminology of the literary sources, which becomes steadily more diverse. The mosque of Sultan Hasan [133], 757/1356-758/1358* (see Pl. 4), described in its wafsiya as hdsba’-masdja al-dgami wa'l-madrass, is variously described by al-Makrzl as madrasa and dgami. Its central feature is indeed a vast cruciform madrasa for the four madhabts with an open courtyard containing a domed library (wdsra). The principal iwans, allotted to the Hanafs for teaching purposes, contains a marble minbar and a monumental mihrab, leaving no doubt that the functions of madrasa and masdja dgami were not exclusive. Remarkably, the kdra iwans gives on to a palatial tomb-chamber, originally covered with a wooden dome. The madrasas occupy each corner of the main courtyard and consist of many storeys of cells disposed round a small interior courtyard. Annexed to the construction are still to be found a midali or ablation courtyard (in Cairene architecture it is unusual for fountains in the courtyards of mosques or madrasas to be used for ablutions before the late Ottoman period), a high water-tower, a haysariyya with the remains of shops, and a rb, which may also have served as a hospital. Complete specification of the appending spaces, many of which have disappeared in the last hundred years, must await publication of the wafsiya of the institution. In the architecture of 8th/14th-century Islam as a whole, not only of al-Kahira, the mosque of Sultan Hasan is outstanding for the vastness of its conception and scale and is particularly remarkable for its height. The interpretation of its architectural history has not significantly advanced since the publication of Max Herz Bey’s monograph (see Bibliography), except that unconfirmed speculations that the porch might be of Anatolian inspiration have now been confirmed by comparison with the two-minaret porch of the Sallacb Gok Medrese at Sivas (see SALDJS: ARCHITECTURE) 670/1271-2 (J. M. Rogers, Seljuk influence on the monuments of Cairo, in Kustcr des Orients, vii/1 (1972), 60-68). The building, which remained unfinished at the time of Sultan Hasan’s death, had an eventful history under the early Burdji Mamluk sultans and its vast scale made it rather unsuitable for general imitation. The façade was, however, imitated by al-Mu’ayyad Shaykh in his mosque, with its other dependencies, including two minarets placed on top of the Bab Zuwayla (1900, 828/1425-833/1420 (Khdt, ii, 348-50), and he paid the mosque of Sultan Hasan the further compliment of having the great bronze doors from its entrance and a bronze chandelier from the interior for his own construction.

The mosque of al-Mu’ayyad, the last considerable mosque of Mamluk Cairo, is built on the qa’a plan,
and the remains of its courtyard façade show it to have been also the last imitation of the blind arcading and rosettes which were taken over by al-Hâfir 11-Dîn Allâh from the mosque of Ibn Tûlûn for his reception of the courtyard of al-Azhâr. Polychrome marbles on a vast scale were expropriated for the decoration of the kibla wall, and the mausoleum even contains fragments of an kishâbîd cenotaph; decoration of such richness, or rapacity, was not subsequently possible in the architecture of the Mamlûk period. The later 9th/15th-century mosques of Cairo, even royal foundation like that of Dâjânâm in the Darb Sa'dâ, 883/1449*, are comparatively on a very small scale indeed. Their plans become progressively more similar to those of madrasas, chiefly of the two-iwan type with a reduced sahrân, which eventually becomes roofed with a wooden lantern, and the approximation of plan is doubtless due to the fact that the mosque became simply a minor element of complex foundations. Kâfît Bây, the most considered builder of the Bûrjî Mamlûks, built no mosques which were not primarily some other institution, and the chief interest of those few buildings of his reign which might be classified as primarily mosques, like that of Kîdjûm (Sa'âdî) al-Isbâkî [114], 885-6/1480-1*, is not the scale or comprehensiveness but the architectural problems they solve. In principle the mausoleum of the founder was attached, partly explains the labyrinthine convolutions of the street façade in funerary foundations generally took first place.

The exceptional character of the independent, non-funerary madrasa is shown by the fact that in the Burjî period only two madrasas, both founded by Kâfît Bây (on the Kala'un al-Kabîh [233], 880/1475*, and on the Island of Dâjânâm, described also as a mosque by Ibn Ýâs (text ii, 205, 211, 271, 301) and completed by 896/1481, the only standing monument of any antiquity on the island), can be considered as non-funerary foundations. One funerary madrasa did not exclude the possibility of other funerary foundations either. The amîr Karânjûr, who built a madrasa [32] in 700/1301 in Cairo, built a tomb at Aleppo when dâbî of that town and is buried in a tomb, the Gunbad-i Ghâftârîyya, at Mârâgâ [q.v.] in N.W. Iran, whither he had fled in 712/1312. The amîr Tankizbûdî actually built two foundations inside Cairo, one in the southern cemetery [298], c. 760/1359 (Creswell’s dating), and one on a spur of the Muqâta˒m to the east of the Citadel [30], 764/1356*, which contains a canopy mausoleum (sâfârî pûd) completed four years after his death. Even Barbûkî, who had founded a funerary madrasa in cells under [157], 786/1384-6*, is reported to have asked on his deathbed to be buried in a rubba near the graves of various venerated shaykhs, which is one of the motives given by al-Mâfrî (Khitâb, ii, 464) for the location of the hânkâh of Fârâdî in the desert [149], 803/1400-1401/1410*, where Barbûkî is indeed buried. This suggests that whereas institutionally speaking madrasa and hânkâh are not exclusive terms, the latter were preferred as places of burial; in any case Barbûkî’s reported wish is curiously similar to the Timûrids’ motives for the development of Shahr-i Sabz (Kish, Kishkâh) and the Shâh-i Zinde at Samarqand [q.v.] as their family cemeteries.

Regarding the evolution of the plans of Cairene madrasas, in particular of the cruciform madrasa, an authoritative account has been given by Creswell (MAE, ii, 104-34). The institution was imported from Syria by the Ayyûbîds, but no surviving Ayyûbîd monument in Egypt or Syria is cruciform in plan and the lists of the known madrasas of Damascus up to 695/1295 and of Cairo up to 639/1242, mostly Shâfi˒i or Hanîfî, show few for two rites and none at all for four. The Madrasa al-Mustanṣiryya at ‘Askâfî (831/1333) was intended for four rites, but Creswell has shown (MAE, ii, 126-7), that it was not cruciform, whereas the first Cairene cruciform madrasa built by Baybars, the ‘Azhîrîyya [37], 660/1262*, does not appear to have been intended for all four rites. This is also unusual in that it does not appear to have been a funerary construction, Baybars having built his tomb in the Madrasa al-Zâhîrîyya at Dâjânâm (see Dimashq). The cruciform plan was not immediately adopted for the madrasa, that of Kâlûn [43], 683-4/1284-5*, having one dawûn only and a sanctuary three bays deep. The first cruciform madrasa in Cairo for all four rites was that of al-Nâṣîr Muhammad [44], 695/1295-703/1304*, and only two others appear to be recorded by Mâfrî, those of Sultan Hasan (see above) and Dîmârî al-Dîn al-Ustâdâr (Khitâb, ii, 401) [35], 812/1409. The cruciform plan was, of course, more widely employed, for mosques as well as formadrasas, though always with a tendency for the axial dawûn to enlarge at the expense of the side ones. It was, however, most conspicuously employed in the two surviving hospitals (mdrîstîn) in Cairo,
that of Kalâ‘ün [43], 683/1284, and that of al-Mu‘ayyad [257] (see Pls. 5, 5a), 621-3/1428-30 (Khitai, ii, 408), the façade of which suggests some direct acquaintance with the Mengûqûkîd kingdom at Divriği in Central Anatolia (626/1228 onwards). The hospital of al-Mu‘ayyad was, however, turned into a mosque in 825/1421-2.

The great majority of the Mamlûk madrasas of Cairo are modifications of the two-isnâf type. Even if we cannot accept Creswell’s suggestion that the plan of such madrasas was entirely determined by that of the domestic architecture of Cairo, in particular the kâ‘a, we may readily admit that domestic architecture and the madrasas of the Mamlûk period developed pari passu. There are even two madrasas which bear inscriptions proving that they were originally houses, al-Ghannâmiyya [96], 774/1372-3*, and that of Khûqkâdam al-Abîmadî, formerly the palace of Tashghimûr al-Dbaddûr [155], 768/1366-7 or 778/1376-7. The dates of their conversion to madrasas are curiously late: the former must have been a madrasa by 827/1423 when the Khüîat was completed, but according to Ibn Iyâs the first kâ‘iba was pronounced in the latter only in 891/1486. The conversion was, of course, simple: it required only the hollowing out of a mihrâb on the kâ‘ibâ side and the construction of a minaret, both essential features of the Cairene madrasa.

Khânkhâhs. Mamlûk Cairo is rich in religious foundations of a quasi-monastic type, suwarîyas, bîkhânkhâhs (pl. usually bîkawwâních or bîkhânkhâhidh) and rûbîs. The first of these were generally small constructions housing a shaykh, with room for students to group informally round him. They are rarely of architectural importance and are often not endowed. Nor was a kâ‘iba built at the express request of the khânkhâh. Of the only two mentioned in Creswell’s Brief Chronology, the Zawiyat al-‘Abbâr [146] (c. 684/1285-6, Khüîat, ii, 420) consists of two domed mausolea and is equally well known as the Khânkhâh al-Bundukhdîrî, and the Zawiyat Âydmur (Âydmurîn) al-Dhahlabîn [22], the date of which is disputed (see Van Berchem, CJA, 125), was almost certainly a madrasa. Where the sources speak of other suwarîyas they may say no more than that they consisted of a kûnr or a rûbû: they are, therefore, extremely difficult to identify architecturally.

The earliest khânkhâh founded in Egypt was Âyûbîd (569/1173-4), in the palace of Sa‘îd al-Su‘âdâ, a freed slave of al-Mustânîr (Khitai, ii, 415-7, 472). The site may still be identified, but the building has been so often changed that no idea of its original disposition can be formed. Curiously enough, throughout the Ottoman conquest, only seven buildings are named, or implied, in their foundation inscriptions as khânkhâhs: those of Baybars al-Dhâshenkrî [32], 706-9/1306-9, Shaykhû al-‘Umârî [152], 736/1336, Nîthâm al-Dîn Ibrâhîm [140], 757/1355*, Mûkîb al-Zîmâm al-Dâbîdî [177], 797-8/1396*, and the three in the same cemetery, Faridî b. Barûk [149], 803/1400-1, 1310*, al-Asgîrî Bârsbûy [121], 835/1432*, and al-Asgîrî Innâl [258], 854-60/1450-6*. The conception of a khânkhâh as an independent construction, with kitchens, a bath and living quarters either disposed round a central courtyard or in separate blocks, as in that of Faridî b. Barûk, is well established by Makrîzî, Ibn Tughrîbîrdî, Ibn Iyâs and al-Sâkhiwbî; but the extreme divergence in the numbers of khânkhâhs they give, from twenty-nine in the first case to a mere four in the last, and the fact that each gives a slightly different list shows that the term, like madrasa, is far from having an exclusive sense in the architectural history of Cairo. The general tendency in the Burdî period is for bânkhâhs to be subsumed in epigraphy under madrasa or dîwânâ, though reference may be made to a mawshîkîsh or mawshîkîsh sûfiyya, and, as in the case of the foundation of al-Asgîrî Bârsbûy [121] above, the “khânkhâh” of the inscription may become “madrasa” in the wâfîyya (A. Darrag, L’Egypte sous le règne de Bârsbûy, Damasc 1961, 50). Up to the end of the reign of al-Nâşir Mu’âammad, which coincides with the foundation of most of the khânkhâhs mentioned in the sources, it seems to have been the rule for Süffis to live in khânkhâhs, in cells either grouped around a courtyard, as in the foundation of Rukn al-Dîn Baybars al-Dhâshenkrî [32] above, and of Sâlih and Sâdiq al-Dîjwîlî [221], 703/1303-4*, on the Dîjbal Yâshkûr, or in an annexe, usually of cruciform plan, or, finally, as in the foundations of Innâl, Kâ‘în Bây and Kurkûmûs, in a rûbî or block of living-units set within the main enclosure but structurally independent of it. In the latter two types there is no necessary resemblance between the annexe and the main construction.

By the first quarter of the 9th/15th century living quarters were being suppressed from new foundations within the city, though whether this was for lack of space or of Süffis is unclear. A condition of residence within the khânkhâhs of the Burdî period often stipulated in their wâfîyyas (cf. ‘Abd al-Lâtîf Ibrâhîm ‘AIl, Dirassât târijkîyîn wa aljûmîyîn fi wâfîyyîn mîhrâb ‘asr al-‘dîrî, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cairo, 168-9, for the wâfîyya of Baybars al-Dhâshenkrî that was Süfîs, as well as taking vows of poverty and piety, were obliged to relinquish salaried appointment within the administration or in any other religious institution. Non-residential tassawwuf was permitted in the Bahri period under some circumstances, e.g., to married Süffis, but khânkhâhs founded at this time were seen as essentially places for private dîwân to which non-residents were in principle not admitted. From the time of al-Mu‘ayyad Shaykhî on (wâfîyya quoted by ‘AIl Pâshâ Mûbârak, v, 128) the emphasis changed to the communal dîwân, the previous restrictions on alternative employment for Süffis were less rigorously enforced, and the important element of tassawwuf became daily attendance at the dîwân. The later Burdî khânkhâhs were dependent parts of complex funerary foundations, and were sometimes no more than mabâds, like that of al-‘dîrî [66-7], 908-10/1503-4*, a large oriented hall where the daily dîwân dajâmî or dîwân wâfî al-tassawwuf was celebrated at certain specified hours.

Much more work is required on the development of the khânkhâh in Mamlûk Egypt (for a survey see S. Mehrez, The Ghawriyya in the urban context, an analysis of its form and function, IFAO Cairo, forthcoming). It has been suggested that the change from residential to non-residential Süfî centres was at least partly the result of the decadence of the ârâbîs in 9th/15th century Egypt; this may be true, but the sources are extraordinarily silent on the precise târika for which a given khânkhâh was intended or which eventually took control of it. Divergences in the practices of the ârâbîs led in 8th/14th-9th/15th century Iran and in Ottoman Turkey to profound modifications in the architecture of the khânkhâh, and it would not be reasonable to suppose that Cairo was any different in this respect. Only however in stipifying this question appears to lie either in the publication of the Mamlûk wâfîyyas of Egypt (e.g. the wâfîyya of Bârsbûy [Ahmad Darrâg, L’Egypte sous le règne de Bârsbûy, Damasc 1961, 50].)
to the west of his **khānkal** in the desert, a **zdwiya** for the benefit of the **ṣufis** (Rifd'is)) or in a **prosopos** during the 8th/14th-9th/15th centuries. **Ribāţ.** Ribāţs (used always in the religious sense and not in the sense of **khānkal** are rare foundations in Cairo and the only foundations named as such in inscriptions are the **Burdi**, that of Yābūy Zayn al-Dīn [141], 856/1452* (CIA, 746, No. 270), and two of al-**Aqharīf Ināl, one attached to his mausoleum in the desert [158], 854/1450-856/1452, and one inside al-**Kahira in the Khurunšah [61], 857/1453-865/1461*. There is little evidence that the foundations were intentionally associated with the early Islamic ribāţs for the **muqaddam** [see ribāţ], and the occurrence in the ribāţ of Ināl [138] of a second foundation describing it as a **khānkal** (Van Berchem, CIA, 399 No. 274) suggests that the two terms were by this period virtually synonymous. **Tombs.** The most splendid of the mausolea of the Mamluk period are, of course, those “attached” to the great funerary foundations—of Kala‘un, al-Nasir Muhammad, Barkūk *intra muros* and of Faradī b. Barkūk on to Kā‘bit Bāy in the eastern cemetery, though, as C. Kessler has observed, it was really the foundation which was attached to the mausoleum providing its justification, so that, as the present judgement against monumental mausolea gradually waned, the tombs took over a progressively greater part of the foundation or became even more central to its plan. On the other hand there are a number of smaller mausolea from this period, if not exactly isolated then certainly worthy of remark. That of Kūkīṭ* for, example, incorporated into the mosque of Aṣṣūnūr [213], 747-8/1346-7*, is exceptional in being neither oriented nor having a **kibla.** That of Aṣzāb (Ozbek) al-Yūsufī is simply one of the side niches of his two-tūn madrasa [211], 900/1494-5*, with a wooden maghribiya grille to separate it from the **durğâ.** The Kubbā Āsūrī [al-Āṣūrī?] in the eastern cemetery [132], post 913/1507, is attached merely to a **sabil.** So concerned was al-**Qāhīrī that his mausoleum [67], completed 909/1504*, should be on the **Kasba** that the depañas are almost eliminated and the mausoleum reaches right from the street to the **bibla** wall. The mausoleum of Khayr Beq is attached to his palace, [249], pre-910/505, and the space between filled by a mosque or **musalla** with a **muhrāb** which deviates 28° with reference to the **bibla.** There are a few Mamluk canopy tombs (laḥār lābās), notably those of Tankizbūgh [85], 764/1362*, and a mausoleum within the **khānkal** of al-**Aqharīf Barsībāy in the desert [121], 835/1432*, though most Mamluk tombs are domed chambers (hence the general use of the term **kubba** for mausoleum). Most interesting of these isolated constructions is al-Kubba al-Fadāwiyā at ‘Abbaṣiyā [5], a vast domed edifice datable to 884/1479-81* on a high basement, part of which serves as a **musalla,** but which has no ground floor porch and which is reached by a grand staircase on the exterior. **General considerations.** It is often asserted that the architecture of Cairo shows a progressive decline from the Bahri to the Burdi periods. There was certainly a change of taste in the later period with an elaboration of surface ornament on both exterior and interior surfaces, in marble veneer, glass paste or simply carved stone, the exterior surface of the domes of the larger central foundation, from that of Faradī b. Barkūk onwards, being carved with elaborate tracery in high relief. Wood was scarce and an expensive import, no marble appears to have been quarried after the Byzantine period, and despite all expedients the supply of antique material had almost dried up by the mid-9th/15th centuries. The devices resorted to supply this deficiency, for example the use of bitumen or red paste to fill in grooved designs on white marble and thus create the illusion of polychrome marble veneer (**madrasa** of the kā‘ī Abū Bakr Muṣḥīr [49], 884/1479-80*; Qīdīmās [Kā‘īn], al-**Ishbāl** [144], 885-9140-1*; funerary **madrasa** of Kā‘īt Bāy [99] completed 875/1474* (see Fl. 8); **madrasa** of al-‘Qāhīrī 960 completed 997/1491* show technical inventiveness rather than decadence. Pressure on space within the confines of al-**Kahira** doubtless explains the smaller size of funerary foundations, in order to accommodate the standard appurtenances, and there is a tendency for the proportion of height to ground area to increase. There also does seem to have been a misguided preconception among Mamluk builders that a plan or elevation could be reduced by a factor of two or four without losing in effectiveness, and this smaller scale naturally makes all-over surface decoration even more conspicuous. However, where space was freely available, as in the eastern cemetery, the Burdi monuments of the whole of the 9th/15th century remain architecturally imposing. This period also saw a tremendous development in the technology of vault work. The few stone domes of the Bahri period are small and mainly experimental constructions: where a large area was to be covered the dome had necessarily to be wood (as in the mausoleum of the Imām al-**Shāhīfī** or of Sultan Hasan, both incidentally restored in their original material by Kā‘īt Bāy) or of brick, as in the mausoleum within the **madrasa** of Sarghāmish [218], 757/1356*. In the Burdi period the enormous span of the domes of the **khānkal** of Faradī b. Barkūk represents perhaps the apotheosis of Mamluk stone-work in Egypt, but the technique was maintained right up to the fall of the Mamluks, in the tomb and palace of Khayr Beq [248-9], 906-8/1501-2*. These are scarcely grounds for speaking of decadence. **Domestic Architecture.** In the discussion of the Cairene **madrasa** the central role of the **kha‘a** in the grand domestic architecture of al-**Kahira** has already been stressed. In many cases a **salsabilī** in the wall of an **iwan** emitted a trickle of water which flowed down into a pool in the centre of the **durğâ** (kā‘ī of Muḥammad Muṣḥīb al-Dīn [50], otherwise known as the **mabāb** of ‘Ummān Kātkhūdā, dated 751/1351* not 851/1253 as in Creswell, Brief Chronology). Ventilation was assured by wind-funnels or towers (**malakf, plur. malakīf**), facing north to catch the evening breeze, and these also occur in some religious buildings (the mosque of al-**Sāhib** Tālīyat [116], 555/1160*, where the shaft inconveniently issues at the top of the **minbar**, and in the **khānkal** of Baybars al-Dāshenār [32], 706-9/1306-9*). The main kā‘ī may not be on the ground floor, and as in the case of the palace of Beṣḥāk [34], 738 or 740/1337 or 1339, the **piano nobile** is reached by an exterior staircase up the side of a basement which contained the stables as well as a street façade of shops incorporating a **masджid** of Fātimid foundation, the Masджid al-**Fiqhī.** In the storeys above the kā‘ī were the private apartments, often looking on to it through wooden maghribiya screens: the result was to make some of the great houses of Cairo extremely high. Of most of these palaces the chief remains are the monumental porch giving on to the street (Mangjak al-Sāḥīdīr [247], 747-8/1346-7*; the Amir Tās [267], 753/1352, on the Sharī‘i al-Sūfiyya), but one palace, of the amir Yūshāb, who to judge from an inscri-
tion of 880/1475-6 was the last owner of the building, has been preserved almost in its entirety [266]. Its other current name, the "Hawsh Bardaš, suggests that it should be identified with the ḥāǧa (both stables and residence) built by Košun as an enlargement of a palace of Sandjar and pillaged in 742/1341-2. After Yushak's death in 887/1482 the palace was given by Kāṭīr Bāy to yet another amir, Āḳbārdī, who recorded occupant, who died in 904/1498-9. The sequence of owners suggests that this palace, and possibly others as well, may have been an official residence, but this is so far undemonstrable and its continued use may simply be due to the lack of suitable housing for amirs holding high positions. It became customary, indeed, to incorporate earlier palace buildings within later structures, or to amalgamate adjoining buildings, so that they came to form rambling complexes of ḥā[a]s and maḳṣ[a]s, north facing loggias generally at mezzanine level on a basement of storerooms or servants' quarters (e.g., that of Mamāky [51], 901/1496*), now known as the Bayt al-Kādī) disposed round irregular courtyards. The Rabī Ṭrdaḇn Bey [406] near the Bāb Zuwayla and the Bayt al-Kirtīliyya, adjoining the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn [321], both 11th/12th-century constructions, incorporate earlier elements, and the same would appear to be true of the 13th-century, for example, the "palace" of Kāṭīr Bāy [228], 860/1458*, in the Darb al-ʿAhmar. This tradition of appropriation of earlier houses and the resultant constructions rambling round a ḥā[a] probably changed little from the Fatimid period onwards. It was certainly little affected by the Ottoman occupation, and Turkish influence on the architecture of al-Kāhira was probably at its least in this sphere. The Mūsāfirīḡhāna palace [20], 1193/1779-1203/1788, is arguably more of an Istanbul-type construction, and Muḥammad ʿAlī's palace of al-Djawharā [505], 1229/1814, shows much French influence. But the less elaborate houses of Ottoman Cairo continued the local tradition.

Commercial Architecture. The tenement houses or ṭarāb of Cairo have never been studied architecturally as a group (most appear on the Index as "house-maḳṣ[a]s"). The Mamluk baths of the city, numerous as they once were, scarcely survive. The entrance to the bath of Beṣhtāk [244], pre-742/1341*, and the central hall of a bath which formed part of the endowments of the mosque of Muḥammad ʿAlī [410] (cf. `All Pāḡā Mūbrārk, v, 36-6, vi, 71) are the only important remains of the Mamluk period. The ḥāns of the Mamluk period are slightly better preserved, though, given the lavish documentary evidence from the Fatimid period onwards for ḥāns in foreign merchant lodges and the fact that many of the high Mamluk amirs engaged in trade, it is surprising that there should be only one surviving ḥān of the Ǧārīm Mamluk period, the earliest in Cairo, that of Košūn [11] in the Djamaliyya quarter, pre-742/1341, the date of his death. Two ḥāns founded by Kāṭīr Bāy are preserved (the inscriptions use the word ḥān, though the literary sources almost invariably use the word wakāla[wakāla], one at al-ʿAẓhar with a sabīl-kutṭāb attached [75-6], 882/1477*, and one [g] at Bāb al-Nāʿār, 883/1481. The best preserved, however, is the Wakālat al-Naḥkha [64]*, which bears the cartouches of al-Ghūrī, 906/1501-922/1516. It consists of a court approached through a monumental entrance surrounded by a ground floor of booths (dakāḥīn) or depōts (maḥāṣīn) with two upper storeys of rooms for lodging and, possibly, originally another storey as well. The plan differs little from that of contemporary ḥāns in Aleppo and Damascus, though the building is much higher in proportion to its ground area, and the street façade has windows for each storey above the ground floor. These late Mamluk wakālas, organized, as in Syria, according to trade as well as to the nationality of the merchants who inhabited them, changed very little after the Ottoman occupation, most of the surviving ḥāns being 10th/16th-12th/18th century in date.

Al-Ǧhūrī also built a ḥāṣa[y]īyya [53, 56] (undated), now known as the Ḥān al-Khālīṣī, which was in fact a ḥān of 8th/14th century date (`All Pāḡā Mūbrārk, v, 90, 301). It has been assumed that al-Ǧhūrī merely restored the ḥān, but the incomplete foundation inscription in his name (Van Berchem, CIA, 906, No. 406) leaves no doubt that it was a new foundation.

Ottomans

Most assertions of the disruptive effect of the Ottoman conquest upon the architecture of Cairo are based on prejudice or on superficial acquaintance with the monuments. The Mamluk tradition as it had evolved under the Ǧurdi Mamluks was extraordinary persistent, and, in contrast to Damascus, the Ottoman metropolitan tradition of architecture made itself felt only sporadically. Changes of various sorts did take place. The Ḥāṣa[y]īyya Khāzīnī, a tax first fixed under Khādim Sulaymān Pāḡā [931/1524-941/1534] (see Ḥāṣa[y]īyye), left the Ottoman wālis with little money for building, and most of them left Egypt with heavy debts. In the later 11th/12th and 12th/13th centuries, when the Mamluk beys prevented its remission to Istanbul, larger foundations were undertaken, like the mosques of Iskandar and the central hall of a bath which formed part of Muḥammad ʿAlī's palace of al-Djawharā [505], 1229/1814, shows much French influence. But the less elaborate houses of Ottoman Cairo continued the local tradition.
by considering the history of the sabil, the earliest surviving example of which is that in the name of al-Nasir Muhammad [561] at the porch of the foundation of Kalāūn. The cistern cannot be located, and the later elements of Cairene sabils, a carved stone salsabīl or khāshāruwān down which the water flowed into an interior pool and bronze grilles through which the water could be taken with a dipper, do not survive. The date is disputed: Kalāūn, ii, 97 (followed by Creswell, MAE, ii, 274-5) gives 726/1326, but there are clear signs of a subsequent restoration, when a kūtāb (Kūrât school) may have been added above. One free-standing Bahri sabil, that of Shaykhū [144], 755/1354*, appears to be without a kūtāb, but by the early Burdji period the joint construction, generally at the corner of a façade so that it might be accessible from two or three sides, becomes a feature of larger foundations, for example that on the façade of the khānkāh of Shaykhū [152], later than the foundation of 756/1355*, and the pair at either end of the façade of the khānkāh of Faradż b. Barkūk in the desert [149], 803/1400-813/1414*. However, where a site at an important street junction could be employed, the sabil-kūtāb might become free-standing in the later Burdji period, for example, that of Kāfît Bāy [324], 884/1480, with a magnificent revetment of marble veneer and a complex of small rooms behind.

In the Ottoman period one of the most frequent of all commemorative foundations, doubtless for reasons of economy. It was almost invariably an independent foundation, even when built up against some earlier building. That of Khusraw [96*] (Husrev) Pāshā [52], 942/1535*, is both typical of the genre and symptomatic of general Ottoman practice. Governor of Egypt from 940/1534 to 942/1535, he had built mosques at Diyarbakr (925-35/1519-29), Sarajevo (actually a kulliyiya (kuliyiye); cf. Mayer, Architectes... , 50 (938/1532) and Van (975/1567), and a mosque and double madrasa, the Khusrawiyya, at Aleppo (953/1546-7), and a türbe in Istanbul, all these three built by Sīnān, a canopy tomb at Van (989/1581) and a khān on the Van-Bitlis road. His architectural activities are far by the most frequent examples of his architecture. The Ottomans neglected Cairo, although his case is paralleled by that of Sīnān Pāshâ, twice governor of Egypt, whose numerous constructions in Syria and in Istanbul are represented in Cairo now only by his mosque at Būlāk [349], 979/1571*, which was subsequently imitated by that of Muhammad Bey Abū Dhabāb [98], 1187/1774*. The use of a dome similar to that of the Kubba al-Fadāwiyya [5], 884-6/1489-90*, rather than one of the dome types evolved in Istanbul, as a model for both mosques appears at first sight remarkable, however, Hasan 'Abd al-Wāhhab (Ta'rikh al-masādiid, i, 671) has added evidence that by the late 17th/18th century at least this Mamluk mausoleum had been used only of the sights for visitors to Cairo. Both mosques, like others of the 19th/16th to 17th/20th centuries, introduce certain features which are more characteristic of the Ottoman architecture of Istanbul: a narthex with mīrābās, allegedly for late-comers to prayers, and, inside, a balcony above the entrance (it is not always clear whether a royal box or a gynaecium was intended), and a sunken transverse passage across the sanctuary, a reconciliation, perhaps, of the Istanbul practice of entry into the sanctuary directly from the street rather than via a sāhr or a midāt, as in Cairo. The balcony above the entrance first occurs in the architecture of Cairo in the mosque of al-Nāṣir Muhammad on the Citadel, when it may actually have been a royal box; there appears to have been a gynaecium right from the start in the mosque of Aṣlām al-Bahā' [112], 745-6/1344-5*, and the sunken passage across the sanctuary occurs in various Burdji monuments, including the mosque within the khānkāh of al-Aṣgār Barsbāy in the desert [121], 835/1432*. Such Ottoman modifications, therefore, were mainly ritual rather than architectural.

This general point also applies to other Ottoman mosques of Cairo, for example the Mārūndiyā [135], 973/1568, very much a Burdji Mamluk building in construction but based on the mosque of Sultan Hasan opposite, even to the tomb-chamber behind the kūba wall, though the choice of a steep hill as a site makes the whole idea rather ineffective. The mosque of Dā'ūd Pāshâ [472], 955/1548, combines an
irregularly shaped musallā of late 9th/15th-century type with an entrance more like a ʿabā with a stair-case instead; and the Ribāḥ al-Āṣār [120], 1073/1662-1224/1809, a much restored building which is now in part a basilical mosque, has a ḥubbah attached which is no mausoleum but a repository for two limestone feet of Pharaonic workmanship, now revered as the ʿāṣār al-nabaʿuwyyya [see Ḫadām al-Safārī]. [For earlier restoration, in the name of Faraj b. Qāsim b. Ḫadhīr, see Wiel, Inscriptions historiques sur pierre, nos. 79-80, 107, 129]. There is a general tendency for basilical mosques, sometimes with a central lantern, like that of Muṣṭafā ʿṢurbağī [Corbajād] Mīrzā, [343] 1104/1698*, to replace those with an open ʿabān, the last of which is the mosque of al-Fakahānī [109], 1148/1736*, but this again is the conclusion of a Burdīj development. In general, the continuity of Mamlūk plans and materials is striking, and while, to judge from the extant remains, tile revetments of low quality were employed in some Ottoman buildings, when a flashy marble mosaic was required it could easily be executed by local craftsmen (mosque of al-Burdayn [201], 1025/1616-1038/1629*).

Madrāsas and tekkes. The Cairene madrasas of the Ottoman period are conspicuous only by their absence. The Takhkiya Sulaymānīyya [225], 950/1543-4*, and the takhkiyya and saḥbī of “Ṣultan Mahmūd” [308], 1164/1751*, which closely follows it in plan, are both described in their foundation inscriptions as madrasas, but there are scarcely any others known and a complete survey of the Ottoman epigraphy of Cairo is required to determine the question. Both these buildings follow the plan of an Istanbul madrasa with a raised courtyard surrounded by arcades with cells and a large dār al-khāna: unlike their Istanbul counterparts they are oriented, so that the dār al-khāna also serves as a masjīd. If they were also tekkes we have no information regarding the farīka which occupied them. The situation is little better regarding the foundation of ḥanākahs in the Ottoman period. There is a tekke of the Mawlawiyya (Mevlevi) order attached to the tomb of Masʿūd as-Saḥāra[263], 715/1315*17/1322*, with a late 12th/18th-century wooden semāʾ khāne on an upper floor, and there is also a tekke of the Rivāfiyya [442], 1185/1774. Yet a third extant tekke of the Ottoman period is a Bektāshī convent at the foot of the Muṣṭatīm, an early 17th/16th-century foundation of considerable potential interest but which has long been totally inaccessible and has never been surveyed.

Commercial architecture, etc. It has already been remarked that the commercial and domestic architecture of Cairo appears to have changed little from the Mamlūk to the Ottoman period: almost all the major architectural changes in these spheres have been from the time of Muḥammad ʿAlī onwards. This impression remains to be confirmed, however, and on this, as on the architecture of the 19th-century city, the basic work remains to be done.

Restorations. Any account of the architecture of al-ʿĀṣār would be incomplete without some reference to the major restorations which the monuments have undergone. Almost all those still standing have undergone generally accurate major restoration at the hands of the Commis de conservation des monuments de l’art arabe over the past ninety years. By no means all earlier restorations are commended by inscriptions (for example those of Kāʾit Bāy in Sultan Hasan and the Imām al-Ṣāḥīfī or thought worthy of record by the literary sources: much of the Islamic architecture of the city owes its relatively well preserved state to the fact that for most of the time waḥd revenues must have been adequate for the upkeep of the building. Where this was not the case, in the Mamlūk period at least, money available for building was usually spent on a new foundation to commemorate the individual donor rather than on the repair of another’s monument. Only this can explain the rarity of inscriptions commemorating major restorations in the architecture of al-ʿĀṣār: it was, ultimately, more costly to demolish a dilapidated building than to restore it.

The major restorations, therefore, are generally explained by special considerations. The Fāṭimid restorations of the mosques of ʿAmr, Ibn ʿUmar and al-Azhār had a political motive, the propagation of the daʿwā, as well as the necessity of coping with a population increase, and the Mamlūk and Ottoman restorations of the Citadel, the aqueduct and the main bridges extant in the Cairo area are readily comprehensible in terms of the necessity of maintaining public, or royal, utilities. The continuous series of inscriptions attesting additions to or restorations of al-Azhār by the ʿAbbāsids and Burdīj sultans is an index of its importance in the 8th/14th-9th/15th centuries as a teaching institution; while the restoration of the mosque of Ibn ʿUmar [109] by Lādīl, 968/1265-67*, the most considerable of the whole period involving two mihrābs, a domed fountain (jawwār) in the centre of the courtyard, a sundial and the virtual rebuilding of the minaret as well as, doubtless, unspecified structural repairs, was in prompt fulfilment of a vow, as is shown by the dating of the minbar he also erected there a fortnight after his accession, 696/1296. The earthquake of 702/1303 was evidently destructive enough to demand widespread repairs, of the mosque of al-Ḥakim by Baybars al-Djashenkalī, of the mosque of al-Sāḥīr Ṭalḥī[216] by Bekṭūmūr al-Ćūkandrī, and the mosque of ʿAmr by the amir Ṣalār, who probably built the mihrāb on the outer wall by the main entrance.

The other recorded Mamlūk restorations appear capricious in the extreme: a further restoration of the mosque of al-Ḥakim by Sultan Hasan, 1082/1671-2*, the latter of which may in any case refer only to the rebuilding of the fountain in the courtyard. Other Ottoman restoration inscriptions indicate a curious revival of interest in Fāṭimid maqṣāds: the Maṣḥād al-Diyūyīṣīlī to which are attached the remains of an undated Ottoman tekke, Sayyida Naṣīfa, which was apparently burned down at the Ottoman conquest, by Sayyida Ḥakimīya b. Ḥakimīya al-Misīrīya al-Ṣāʿīfīya, 1207/1792; the mausoleum of Ṣaltu ʿUkbā, by Muḥammad al-Pāshā al-Silāḥī (first rebuilt 1066/1655-6* and
now known as al-Sādiq al-Wafā'īyya [463]); and the shrine of Zayn al-Abidin [599], which bears a somewhat defective Ottoman copy of a foundation inscription dated 549/1154, restored by ‘Ughmāni Aḥma Mustafāzān (1225/1810, cf. ‘All Pāshā Mubārāk, v, 4). Two earlier Fatimid buildings were completely rebuilt: a mosque founded by the amīr Āḥā Manṣūr Kūstāh, 533/1141 (Ṣīdī Sāriyya), in the Citadel, which re-appears as the mosque of Khādidīm Sulaymān Pāshā [142], 933/1528, and the mosque al-Zāhir ibn Naṣr Allāh, 543/1148, rebuilt by Abūmā Khātūdā Mustafāzān Khāṟpublī, 1148/1735, as the mosque of Faĥāhānī [209], into which the wooden doors of the Fāṭimid mosque were incorporated.

The Ottoman inscriptions of al-Azhār (given in Mehren, ii 59, see Bibliography) chiefly coincide with the substantial enlargements of the mosque undertaken by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Kāthūdā. The only other inscriptions which demonstrate a concern for public utilities are those of the Great Aqueduct, restored by ‘Abd Pāshā, 1139/1727, with a chronogram also giving the date 1140/1728 (Van Berchem, CIA, 591).

This brief account of restoration work in al-‘Uṣur′a over a period of seven hundred years or so is based mainly on the published inscriptions: if suggestive in certain respects, it is clearly lacunary. It is more than possible that not a few inscriptions which claim to refer to the founding of a building are really recording pretentious restorations. However, if the record of restoration under Ottoman dominion is poor, it is scarcely worse than in the earlier history of al-‘Uṣur′a. Concern for the monuments of others, one may conclude, was not a pronounced Cairo characteristic.

Bibliography: (apart from references cited in the text): The bibliography of the monuments of al-‘Uṣur′a is so scattered that no complete survey of the source material can be attempted. Much work remains to be done even before a corpus of the Islamic architecture of Cairo can be assembled, and the present brief account demonstrates the extent to which generally received opinions are based upon a priori generalizations rather than detailed publication. The most recent and complete bibliographical work is K. A. C. Creswell’s A bibliography of the architecture, arts and crafts of Islam to ist January, 1960 (American University in Cairo Press 1961); Supplement, to ist January 1970, in the press. The monuments of al-‘Uṣur′a up to 1260/1326 have full chronological bibliographies in idem, The Muslim architecture of Egypt, abbr. as (MAE), i, Oxford 1954, ii, Oxford 1959, those for monuments founded before 358/969 being found in Early Muslim architecture, (EMA), ii, Oxford 1940, which gives details of repairs and additions to them subsequent to the foundation of al-‘Uṣur′a. The latest general bibliography of Cairo by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Zāklī, A bibliography of the literature of Cairo, Cairo 1964, is to be consulted for recent articles in Arabic, though in general it supersedes none of Creswell’s works cited above.

The material available falls into six classes: (1) maps; (2) primary sources and accounts based directly upon them, rather than upon the monuments; (3) detailed publication of the monuments themselves; (4) epigraphy; (5) general studies, including less pretentious works which aim to be partly guide books; (6) guide books proper. Work in hand will be indicated at the end of the account.

For (1): The maps of Cairo which have become built up during the present century, for example the island of Rūdā (Rawdā), appear as misleadingly unimportant, and for a more accurate impression of their constitution in the post-mediaeval period the maps in M. Jomard, Description de l’Égypte. État moderne, 1809-22, ii, 579-788, should be consulted. There are many differences of detail between the 1951 maps and those attached to MAE, i-ii: in cases of divergence the latter are generally more reliable. The Indexes do not correspond exactly in their Arabic and English versions, showing discrepancies of orthography or even classification; and, particularly for the Ottoman period, some monuments numbered on the maps do not appear in the Indexes. The basic work of their collation and revision is at present being undertaken by a seminar of the American University in Cairo under the direction of C. Kessler.

For (2) primary sources: For the reign of al-Nāṣir Muhammad ibn Khālid, D. P. Little, An introduction to Mamlūk historiography, Wiesbaden 1970, is a useful guide to the material available. It is regrettable that no similar survey has yet been attempted for any other period of the history of al-‘Uṣur′a. Of all the primary sources, al-Maḥritī, Mauritī (Khātil), for the period up to the reign of al-Muḥammad al-Shāykhī is by far the most useful and is generally the first-hand source (ed. Būlāk 1570/1853; ed. G. Wiet, in MIFAO, xxx, xxxiii, xlv, xli, (Cairo 1927- ), covering i, 1-322 of the Būlāk edition; tr. U. Boutrant, in MMAF, xvii, fascicules 1-2 (Paris 1895-1900), covering Būlāk ed. i, 1-250; tr. P. Casanova, in MIFAO, iii (Cairo 1906), covering Būlāk ed., i, 251-347). This should be supplemented by the recent works of S. Zāyiyya, i-i, Cairo 1934-70; tr. E. Quatremère as Histoire des Sultans mamlouks, i-i, Paris 1837-44; continued by Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī, al-Tābr al-masīḥī fi ḥayāl al-Sulīk, ed. A. Zeki Bey, Revue d’Égypte, ii-i, Būlāk 1866-7; E. Gaillardot (Cairo 1897), also al-Sakhāwī, Thābfal al-`albāk, i, Cairo 1937. Among other sources of primary importance are Ibn Dukmaḳ, Kāthī al-inīṣād li-waṣṣīat ʿād al-amār, Būlāk 1310/1891-2; Ibn Taḥtabbdīl, Cairo (see Abu l-Makhrī); Ibn al-Zayyāt’s guide to the Karāfā, al-Kawākbīl al-sayyāra fi tāltāb al-siyāra fi l-Karatāfayn al-hurbā wa-l-fujrā, Cairo 1325/1907; and Ibn Iyās, Badāʾī al-zuḥūr, Būlāk 1311/i-1393-7 (for other editions see ibn Iyās), translated G. Wiet as Histoire des Mamlouks circassiens, IFAO, Cairo 1945, covering the period 1487-1500, and as Journal d’un bourgeoise du Caire, i, Paris 1955-6, covering the period 1500-16; ii, Paris 1960, covering the period 1516-22.

For the Ottoman period the chief source remains ‘All Pāshā Mubārāk, al-Khātil al-tawṣīḥīyya al-gaḍida, Cairo 1306/1889-9 (new edition, Cairo 1969- ). With the exception of Ahmad Darrādī, L’Acte de wafàd de Barsîb (Huddādi waṣf al-azkha r Barsîb), Cairo 1963 and of L. A. Mayer’s valuable study, The buildings of Qaybāy as described in his endowment deed, Fasculōe i (all pub-
lished), London 1938, the substantial collections of wakfiyyas in the Ministry of Wakfs in Cairo remain wakfiyyas (cited (i) above) is sometimes useful. For the 19th century onwards, with the exception of A. Bahgat and A. Gabriel, Les fouilles d'al-Foustat et les origines de la maison arabe en Égypte, Paris 1921. Owing to the unfortunate fact that the rebuilding operations within Medieval Cairo have rarely been accompanied even by salvage excavations, the curious apparent incongruity between the Ṭulfânid-Fâtîmîd-Ayyûbid domestic architecture of al-Fustat and the Mamlûk architecture of al-Kahîra inra muros has remained so far unexplained, though it is to be hoped that the forthcoming publication by R. Mantran and the late A. Lézine, under the general title, Étude scientifique des palais et maisons à dôme et de Rosette (XVIe-XVIIIe siècles), will throw light on this problem. E. Pauty's, "Les palais et les maisons d'époque musulmane au Caire, MIFAO, lvii (1932), and Les hammâms du Caire, MIFAO, lviv...
(Cairo 1933), are poorly documented general studies with few plans and give little idea of the history of the domestic architecture of Cairo.

For the Coptic architecture of Cairo in the Islamic period, A. J. Butler, *Ancient Coptic churches of Egypt*, i-ii, Oxford 1884; reprinted with Butler's corrections, Oxford 1970, is to be supplemented with discretion by M. Simaika Pasha, *A brief guide to the Coptic Museum and to the principal ancient Coptic churches of Cairo*, Cairo 1938. On the architecture of the other non-Islamic periods of which is apparently 18th century or later, there appears to be nothing published at all.

(4) Epigraphy. The epigraphy of the monuments of Cairo, the most valuable source for their history, should be approached with the caution that, especially in the Burdi [g.v.] Mamluk period, a foundation inscription may specify only one of the buildings of the complex to which it applies. This custom partly accounts for the misdescriptions or inconsistencies in the Arabic and English Indexes to the *Special 1:5,000 scale maps of Cairo* (see (1) above). The still incomplete *RCEA*, a secondary compilation, has not superseded M. Van Berchem's *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum* (CIA). *Première partie, Egypte* and *Palestine*, Paris 1933; *Watte, MMAF*, iii, Cairo 1929-30. The two volumes contain only a selection of the inscriptions from the Ottoman period. *CIA*, i-ii, superseded Van Berchem's *Notes d'archéologie arabe*, in *JA*, 8e série, xvii (1891), 411-95; xviii (1891), 46-86; xix (1892), 377-407. The *CIA* should now be completed with G. Wiet, *Inscriptions historiques sur pierre* (*Catalogue général du Musée d'Art Islamique du Caire*), Cairo 1971. Some volumes of the *Catalogue général du Musée Arabe du Caire* are also relevant, particularly because of the striking rôle which wood plays in the architectural decoration of all periods in Cairo: J. David-Weill, *Bois à épigraphes*, i, *Jusqu'à l'époque mamlouke*, Cairo 1931; ii, *Depuis l'époque mamlouke*, Cairo 1936; E. Pauty, *Bois sculptés d'églises coptes* (*époque faïmolide*), Cairo 1930, and *Les bois sculptés d'églises byzantines et de Madiria*, Cairo 1931. The volumes of the *Catalogue général* dealing with the tombstones in the Islamic Museum in Cairo, *Stèles funeraires*, i-ix, Cairo 1932 onwards, to which Hasan al-Hawwád, Husayn Ráshíd and G. Wiet have all contributed, are of less value, partly because in most cases the tombstones have only the vaguest provenance and partly because of the common Cairene practice of building earlier stele into a mausoleum of later date. C. Frost, *Les revêtements céramiques dans les monuments musulmans de l'Egypte*, i (all published), in *MIFAO*, xi (Cairo 1916), is a preliminary study of the curious problems, epigraphic and technological, raised by the scanty use of ceramic revetment in Mamluk and Ottoman architecture. Hasan 'Abd al-Wahháb *Ta'khif al-jumud* 'alá dâkhil Misr, in *BIE*, xxxvi (1955), 533-58, gives craftsmen's signatures, generally of workers in the minor arts and not of architects proper, on the monuments of Cairo, with comment upon their exceptional rarity for Islamic architecture. It is on this work that Mayer, *Architects*, largely depends. Mayer, *Saracenic heraldry*, Oxford 1933, includes occurrences of Mamluk blasons on the architecture of Cairo, but it is still a basic adjunct to the epigraphic material relating to al-Káhirá.

On the difficult problems raised by Mamluk names there is a preliminary study by J. Sauvaget, *Noms et surnoms des Mamelous*, in *JA*, cxxviii (1955), 31-45. On the Turkish rôle this may be supplemented by P. Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*, Paris 1949, and by L. Rásonyi, *Sur quelques catégories de noms de personnes en turc*, in *Acta linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, iii (Budapest 1953), 323-51, though many Mamluk names of Turkish origin remain problematic. Further enlightenment may be obtained from G. Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neuzeitlichen*, i-iii, Wiesbaden 1963, 1965, 1967, which is all the more important since the studies of the Mongol and Circassian Mamluk names, by L. Hambis and G. Dumézil respectively, announced by Sauvaget (art. cit.), do not appear to have been published.

(5) General works. Apart from C. H. Becker's still useful short account *Cairo in EJ*, there is no adequate, comprehensive work on the architecture of Cairo. Of those so far attempted that of Hasan 'Abd al-Wahháb, *Ta'rikh al-másajjid al-ḏāḥāriyya allatī sallâ fis-hā fardad al-djum'ah hadrat sâhib al-ḏjâlālā al-Malik al-Ṣalih Faruk al-awwal*, i-ii, Cairo 1946, which, as its title indicates, is selective, is the most useful compilation of historical, epigraphic and architectural information. L. Hautecoeur and G. Wiet, *Les mosquées du Caire*, Paris 1932, volume of text with album of plates, is a premature attempt to order the monuments, hastily compiled and with some prejudices which have evoked little sympathy (cf. review by K. A. C. Creswell in *JRAS* (1934), 199-203). Nevertheless, while many of their generalisations have turned out to be unjustified, some chapters on technology, particularly the Mamluk taste for marble revetment, contain much valuable, if not precisely documented, information. The lavishly illustrated production of the Ministry of Waft, *The mosques of Egypt from 641 to 1946*, i-ii, Giza 1949, has a text which is too brief to be informative. Ahmad Fikrî, *Masjīd al-Kâhirâ wa-madārisuhâ*, i-ii, Cairo 1965-9, in fact covers only the Fátimid and Ayyúbíd periods. D. Brandenburg, *Islamische Baukunst in Ägypten*, Berlin 1966, 726/1326, and upon a not always critical reading of Hautecoeur and Wiet. The most recent general work on Cairo, 'Abd al-Rahmân Zákî, *Mawâdât madinat al-Kâhirâ fi alf ʿâm*, Cairo 1969, gives much information, particularly relating to the architecture of Cairo in the 18th-19th centuries, which is not otherwise available, but the work is too short for completeness and the treatment of the earlier monuments is highly selective. It is, indeed, a significant comment on the paucity of recent published work on the monuments of Cairo that for the period after 726/1326 two of the best general works should still be A. F. Mehrën, *Câhirâr* and *Kerdâf*: i, *Gravmonumenter paa Kerdâf eller de Dodes Stad udenfor Câhirâr*; ii, *Religieuse Monumenter i Câhirâr*, Copenhagen 1869-70, which record many otherwise unpublished monuments, and M. S. Briggs, *Muhammedan architecture in Egypt and Palestine*, Oxford 1924.

Recent collections of essays relating in general with the history or archaeology of Islamic Egypt contain some material directly related to the architecture of Cairo, in particular, *Mêlanges Massép,* iii, = *MMAF*, lxvii (Cairo 1940), and *Studies*
in Islamic art and architecture in honour of Professor K. A. C. Creswell, Cairo 1965. However, it is noteworthy that in the most recent collections of essays on Cairo to appear, Annales Islamologiques, viii, Volume commémoratif du Millénaire du Caire 969-1969, IFAO Cairo 1969, and Colloque international sur l'histoire du Caire, Ministry of Culture of the ARE, Berlin 1973, the emphasis of recent research—following the lead established by M. Clerget, Le Caire, Étude de géographie urbaine et d'histoire archéologique, i-ii, Cairo 1934, a work which can still be consulted with profit—has been upon the problems of urbanism in Cairo and the extent to which the architecture of the mediaeval city was successful in resolving them. The most recent work of this kind, best for the late 18th-20th centuries, is J. Abu Lugbod, Cairo. One thousand and one years of the City Victorious, Princeton 1972.

In the light of the unbalanced publication of the monuments such a shift of emphasis may appear premature, but it is to be hoped that it will lead to a revival of interest in the basic archaeological problems.

Among what may be best described as informative guide books to the monuments of al-Káhira, D. Russell, Medieval Cairo, London 1962, is the most detailed and to a considerable extent succeeds in overcoming its defects of organization (into tourist itineraries rather than historical periods or coherent quarters), occasional inaccuracies, lack of plans and a perhaps excessive prejudice in favour of the monuments of the Fátimid period. Other useful works of the same type, though they aim to cover more limited areas of Cairo, are Mabnúd Aḥmad, Tašrít al-damá al-Tuláni, Cairo 1346/1927; R. L. Devonshire, Rambles in Cairo, Cairo 1931; E. Pauthy, La mosquée d' Ibn Touloun et ses alentours, Cairo 1936; Mabnúd Aḥmad, Concise guide to the principal Arabic monuments in Cairo, Böllák 1939; and Hasan 'Abd al-Walhāb, Šāmih al-Sultān Ḥasan wa-mā Baalahu, Cairo 1962.

For much of the Ottoman architecture of Cairo these general works remain the only source, though they may with discretion be supplemented by E. Pauthy, L'architecture au Caire depuis la conquête ottomane, V'ue d'ensemble, in BIFAO, xxxvi (1936), 1-69, a general work in spite of its apparently promising title. The author's lack of acquaintance with Metropolitan Ottoman architecture and the small number of Cairene monuments he considers in detail have contributed to the generally held, though highly misleading, impression of the Ottoman period in Cairene architecture as one of decadence and inactivity. It remains for subsequent research to correct this. See A. Raymond, Artisans et commerçants au Caire au XVIIe siècle, 2 vols., Damascus 1973, and G. Wiet, Cairo, city of art and commerce, Norman, Okl. 1964.

(6) Guide books. The text of the Guide Bleu, which has not substantially changed for the mediaeval monuments of Cairo since its first edition (compiled by M. Baud Paris 1950), is of little use for all but the most obvious of the Islamic monuments. Murray's Handbook for travellers in Egypt (many editions: I cite the 10th edition edited M. Brodick, London 1900) depends largely upon the work of S. H. Poole and other late 19th-century authors and, despite its literary bias, is both more complete and less misleading, containing much information on no longer extant buildings of the 18th-19th centuries. K. Baedeker, Handbuch für Reisende, Ägypten und der Sudan, 8th edition 1928, with preface on the monuments by K. A. C. Creswell, is particularly useful for its description of monuments on the outskirts of Cairo, which do not always appear on the Special 1:5,000 scale maps of Cairo and for its directions for reaching them.

Work in progress. Apart from works mentioned above, in particular G. T. Scanlon's Final Report on his excavations at Fustat and the publication of Cairene houses and palaces by R. Mantran and the late A. Lézine, work in hand includes a major publication of the funerary architecture of Cairo, Fátimid to Mamluk periods, by C. Kessler, to appear as a volume of the Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Islamische Reihe, with contributions by Layla 'All Ibráhím on the Mamluk foundations of the 14th century. The work of these authors, to which should be added that of M. Meinecke, Šahbír Muhirz, J. Raghb and M. Keane, may be expected in the course of the next few years to advance substantially the present state of knowledge on the monuments of al-Káhira and their history.

(J. M. Rogers)

**THE MODERN CITY**

General outline. Modern Cairo took shape under Muhammad 'Ali (1805-49), from whose reign date the first beginnings, modest as yet, of new institutions. Once begun, the movement could no longer be stopped. So far as town-planning, the press, and the birth of Egyptian nationalism are concerned, the reign of Khidive Ismá'il (1863-79) was a watershed. During this period, Cairo began to take on the appearance of a modern city. Owing to a fortunate run of production in the United States following the American Civil War (1861-5), Egypt easily found markets for her crop and money poured in. Besides this, the opening of the Suez Canal in November 1869 drew the eyes of the world to Egypt; control of this area appeared even more of a decisive element in the struggle for worldwide power. For this reason the debts of the Khedive were made the pretext for the first stages of foreign intervention and in due course this was also the reason for the British occupation (1882).

Throughout all these events the city developed and public services such as gas, water and tramlines were laid on. Foreigners as well as migrants from other Ottoman territories settled there. The First World War marked the definitive separation of Egypt from the Ottoman Empire. With the Cairo demonstrations which followed immediately after the armistice in 1918, Egyptian nationalism became a genuinely popular movement, given concrete expression in the Wafd Party. Political pressure was still held to be the best means of achieving liberation, and the importance of economic factors on the road to freedom was given but scant recognition through the establishment of the Bank of Egypt in 1920, and that within the framework of a national capitalism. A measure of independence was proclaimed under the aegis of King Fu'ád (1922). The opening of the first state university in Cairo in 1925 was a significant moment, and indeed, in his novels Nadfíb Mahfíz presents this event as the dawning of a new era in the history of the Egyptian middle classes.

One after another the institutions characteristic of a large modern city were set up. The Free Officers' revolution (23 July 1952) brought in its train the abolition of the monarchy and the eviction of the old ruling classes. The new political orientation was
demonstrated in the city even at the level of urban development through the opening up of thoroughfares, the establishment of workers' housing, institutions and factories and by the development of radio, the building of new mosques, etc. The Anglo-French military intervention of October to December 1956 led to wholesale nationalization of French and British enterprises. With the ending of the three-year long union with Syria in 1961, the country clearly took the path of Arab socialism, with the stress on the essential economic struggle facing the Third World. Finally, the Palestine war of 1967, on both the political and the military fronts, continued to impose a burden on Cairo which remained very heavy.

Today Cairo is undoubtedly one of the liveliest capitals in the world. The city has a dual aspect, truly Egyptian and yet at the same time cosmopolitan, the latter arising from her geographical situation.

The genuinely Egyptian aspect is revealed in the drama of a people rudely forced into changing their way of life by demographic pressures. Thanks to modern medicine, both pressure and change have led to the disappearance of many ancient customs and the proletarianization of a section of the population.

The efforts of the present-day authorities to create a new Egypt are a response to this demographic challenge. As for the cosmopolitan aspect of the city, this is partly related, as in former days, to the presence of students and teachers who come from all over the world. It also arose because of the succession of foreign rulers (Mamluk, Turkish and British). Now that Cairo is governed by Egyptians, the foreign element is confined to tourism, technical aid and so-called operation.

Town planning. The map drawn up by Bonaparte's expedition depicts the city as bounded in the west by the Ezbekiyya, with fields lying between it and Būlāk. “The great builder and earth-mover”, Muhammad 'Ali, embellished and cleared façades and drained the Ezbekiyya but built very little apart from a palace and mosque in the citadel (between 1830 and 1848) and a large palace at Shubra (1868, rebuilt in 1823); he had a road built across the fields so that there was a direct route to the latter (now Shari'a al-Husaynī) or Faggala (Fadjdjaia), which began around 1880, or residential areas like Garden City (which dates from 1905) could be populated without the need for trains and tramlines. But Zaytūnah and Matarīyya in the suburbs could only come into being after the construction of the railway from Pont Lemoun (Kūbrī Limūn) to Matarīyya and al-Mardī (1889-90). The same was true of the tramlines which were laid in 1896 and linked the 'Ataba al-khādra' with ‘Abbāsīyya (1896), via Faggala, or with Shubra in 1903 (the first large-scale development in Shubra took place in 1898). The Khālīdī seems to have been filled in on the 1897 plan of Cairo; the process was completed in 1899 and the tramline from Da'her (al-Zāhir) to Sayyidah Zaynab made use of it in 1900.

The malek of the Zāhirī district, south of the road which later became the Umar Khayyam Hotel. The sikka djadlda, mddīh wa mustakhbaluhd, dates from 1863. In 1867 Khedive Ismail saw Hauss-Hammād (al-Zahir) to Sayyida Zaynab made use of it in 1900. In the desert to the north-east of the city, Heliopolis (Miṣr al-gjadlda) arose in 1906 following the granting of a concession to a Belgian company in 1905. An express tramline, called the “metro”, connected Heliopolis to Cairo (cf. the commemorative album published by the company, nationalized since 1960, Dāhiyat Miṣr al-gjadlda, mādīkh wa mustakhbaluhd, 1960). On the southern suburban line to Helwan (al-Ḫulwān), which is 27 km. long, the area of present-day Maadi (al-Ma'ādī) 11 km. from the city began to be developed by a company in 1907. Only Helwan was undeveloped, and so it remained until the 1952 revolution when it became an industrial centre with iron and steel works, armaments factories, etc.

Apart from those already mentioned, notable bridges are the Embabeh (Imbābā) railway bridge (1890-91, rebuilt in 1925); the Giza bridge (formerly Abbās: 1907, rebuilt in 1966-7); and the bridge from Zamalek to west bank (1912). The University Bridge, constructed in 1958, should be added to this group.

All these developments in Cairo were brought formerly the seat of the Turkish pağhas. A canal, al-Tira' al-İsmā'īliyya, was dug between the Nile and the Khālīdī, passing between Būlāk and the Ezbekiyya, then to Bāb al-Hadid and finally to Gharmā (it was filled up shortly after 1867). The Kubba palace dates from 1863. In 1863 Khedive İsmail saw Haussman's Paris. He too had new quarters laid out: the streets of the İsmā'īliyya district, south of the road from the Ezbekiyya to Būlāk, have the same layout today (cf. the 1873 plan of Cairo). For the celebrations which marked the opening of the Suez Canal (1869), the Opera House (destroyed by fire in 1972) was built near the Ezbekiyya; a building was added to the Khedive's palace on the island of Gezārah (al-Diāzrā) which later became the 'Umar Khayyam Hotel. The road from Giza (al-Dița) to the Pyramids was transformed into a splendid boulevard. In 1871-2 a modern bridge spanned the Nile (the Kāsr al-Nīl, now the Kūbrī 'l-tahrīr, which was rebuilt in 1931), with another over the other arm of the river (rebuilt in 1914). In 1872 two large arcaded thoroughfares were laid out: Clot Bey street from the station to the Ezbekiyya and Muhammad ʿAll street from al-'Ataba al-khādra' to the Citadel.

The establishment of modern means of transport played an essential part in the development of both suburban and peripheral areas. Relatively central districts like Tawfiqiyah (named after Khedive Tawfiq, 1879-92) or Faggala (Fadjdjaia), which began around 1880, or residential areas like Garden City (which dates from 1905) could be populated without the need for trains and tramlines. But Zaytūnah and Matarīyya in the suburbs could only come into being after the construction of the railway from Pont Lemoun (Kūbrī Limūn) to Matarīyya and al-Mardī (1889-90). The same was true of the tramlines which were laid in 1896 and linked the 'Ataba al-khādra' with ‘Abbāsīyya (1896), via Faggala, or with Shubra in 1903 (the first large-scale development in Shubra took place in 1898). The Khālīdī seems to have been filled in on the 1897 plan of Cairo; the process was completed in 1899 and the tramline from Da'her (al-Zāhir) to Sayyidah Zaynab made use of it in 1900.

The malek of the Zāhirī district, south of the road which later became the Umar Khayyam Hotel. The sikka djadlda, mddīh wa mustakhbaluhd, dates from 1863. In 1867 Khedive Ismail saw Hauss-Hammād (al-Zahir) to Sayyida Zaynab made use of it in 1900. In the desert to the north-east of the city, Heliopolis (Miṣr al-gjadlda) arose in 1906 following the granting of a concession to a Belgian company in 1905. An express tramline, called the “metro”, connected Heliopolis to Cairo (cf. the commemorative album published by the company, nationalized since 1960, Dāhiyat Miṣr al-gjadlda, mādīkh wa mustakhbaluhd, 1960). On the southern suburban line to Helwan (al-Ḫulwān), which is 27 km. long, the area of present-day Maadi (al-Ma'ādī) 11 km. from the city began to be developed by a company in 1907. Only Helwan was undeveloped, and so it remained until the 1952 revolution when it became an industrial centre with iron and steel works, armaments factories, etc.

Apart from those already mentioned, notable bridges are the Embabeh (Imbābā) railway bridge (1890-91, rebuilt in 1925); the Giza bridge (formerly Abbās: 1907, rebuilt in 1966-7); and the bridge from Zamalek to west bank (1912). The University Bridge, constructed in 1958, should be added to this group.

All these developments in Cairo were brought
about by companies, especially foreign ones, who were given contracts for the work. Public services were also carried out by non-Egyptians: the post office in 1843, water in 1865, gas and then electricity, run by the Le Bon company from 1873 to 1948, telephones in 1881, trams in 1896, etc. Much later the Egyptian government recovered these concessions, some when they expired and others through buying them back or through nationalisation. The part played by foreign architects can be seen in a number of façades in the Italian style. Telegraphic communications began with the railways, and Cairo was connected by submarine cables with Bombay, Aden, Malta, Gibraltar and Great Britain as early as 1870.

Health services, types of housing and a study of the population have been covered by Clerget. The various groups of citizens moved to different districts: thus the Greek minority could be found in the south and south-west of al-Azhar, the Jews south of Khoronfish and later at Sakakini, the Europeans around the Rossetti Garden and Muski, where the different Catholic churches also sprang up, and later in Garden City or Zamalek, and the Copts around the patriarchate at Clot Bey and later in Shubrá. The Syro-Lebanese Christians were particularly attracted to the new district of Abbasiyya where churches and schools were to be found (the Jesuit school opened there in 1885); later many moved to Heliopolis and Zamalek and the Copts settled there. In the heart of the city the Muslim bourgeoisie still lived in the palaces and traditional dwelling houses, the exodus to Hilmiyya or to cooler districts not yet having become general. The Gamaliyya quarter is the subject of a special study by J. Berque.

After the 1914-18 war the expansion of the town continued. Gardens and villas made way for large modern blocks. Around 1926-8 two large thoroughfares were built connecting al-Ataba with al-Azhar (al-Sharīf al-Azhar) and al-Ataba with al-Abbāsīyya. The widening of Khalldj street, decided upon in 1937, was not effected until after the revolution, in 1956. On the west bank of the Nile, Giza was developed between the world wars although the bank opposite Abbasiyya was superseded by an international airport situated in the desert further to the north-east. It was equipped with a new air terminal in 1963.

To relieve the pressure on the over-crowded city, the revolution established new housing estates, such as Naṣr, which lies between Heliopolis and al-Abbāsīyya on military land turned over to civilian use and to which it is hoped to move the greater proportion of governmental departments. A stadium holding 100,000 people has been built here. A large trunk road joins the airport and the citadel via Naṣr then links up with the Nile corniche at Fustat. An attempt to set up a semi-touristic estate was made in 1954-6 at Muktaṭam on the flat area to the south of the tomb of al-Djuyūqī, but the date was inopportune and the enterprise stagnated.

In which directions will the present-day city develop? Committees are discussing this problem at this very moment. But in the meantime the lack of suitable legislation has caused historic sites to be swamped by ugly housing and the splendid buildings of the past are vanishing, gutted or abandoned. Some determined Egyptians are fighting to ensure that the necessary expansion respects some of the legacies of the past. The public services face problems which grow daily more complex in the realms of transport, sewage and the road network posed by the ever-increasing number of inhabitants.

The American University in Cairo Social Research Center, 1963). Taking into consideration the whole metropolitan area of Cairo, including Helwan and Maṭariyya. In 1947 Cairo had two million inhabitants, discounting the population of the outlying suburbs but including the people of Dūkki and Ṭugāzila in the kisim of Ṭābidn (cf. Janet Abu-Lughed and Ezz el-Din Attiya, Cairo Fact Book, Cairo, The American University in Cairo Social Research Center, 1962). From his work we learn that there were 1,070,857 inhabitants in 1927 and 3,348,799 in 1960, the latter figure covering the whole metropolitan area of Cairo, including Helwan and Maṭariyya. The hotel infrastructure had been in private hands for many years; now numerous hotels have been nationalised. According to the 1965 statistics (as noted by P. Marthelot), 66.8 % of the active population of Cairo was employed in some undefinable activity; 23.5 % held regular jobs in the administration; and only 7.5 % was employed in industry. From such figures we can only guess at the number of underemployed, a considerable proportion, though only a minority are totally unemployed.
The question of accommodation has always been difficult. With the initiation of Arab socialism in 1961 and the creation of the Ministry of Housing and Utilities in 1965, the state became a builder on a large scale. But private activity also continued in this sphere, facing, with considerable difficulty, the influx into the capital.

"The same is true of Cairo as of many cities in the so-called Third World," writes F. Marthelot (p. 197), "which stand out against a rural back- ground subject to demographic tension or marked by structural flaws: the city is the receptacle in which are concentrated all those whose lives tend to be disturbed because of this, whether or not it is able to answer to the demands made on it. But this is at the price of the stagnation at a very low standard of living of a very important section of the population!"

In both Clerget and Marthelot there are numerous data about town planning—the density of the inhabitants varying a great deal according to district (cf. al-Tal'a, February 1970, 70, pointing out that in Bulaq over 60% of families live in one room)—the expansion of the city, transport, etc. They are based on statistics compiled by the governmental department concerned. As far as health is concerned, Cairo has one doctor per 910 inhabitants, as opposed to one per 3,420 in Lower Egypt and one per 2,990 in Upper Egypt. Similarly, the city has one hospital bed for every 233 people, as against one in 384 and one in 636 in Lower and Upper Egypt. There is one telephone for every 27 inhabitants, while in Lower and Upper Egypt the figures are one in 362 and one in 301 respectively (cf. al-Tal'a, ibid., 74-5).

The government is making a determined effort to remedy this state of affairs and to this end has enacted new socialist laws.

Culturally speaking, Cairo has two aspects, on the one hand the development of national institutions—schools, universities, specialised institutes—and on the other the holding of international meetings and congresses. A large number of schools have been opened. Around 1950 only 40% of children in Egypt received a primary education; by 1970 the number had risen to over 75% for the country as a whole and was said to exceed 90% in Cairo (cf. Cairo Fact Book; education in 1947 listed by šīyādī, a subdivision of the kism). Examples from higher education are the Dār al-Ui'm (s.v.), the Free University of Cairo (1908; converted in 1925 into Fu'ād al-Awwal University and now the University of Cairo), and ʿAyn Šams (1950), the former a religious educational establishment attached to al-Azhār (s.v.). Since the publication of the article al-Azhār in EI, considerable changes have been wrought by a law of 1961, with a remodelling of curricula and the creation of new faculties of secular studies—medicine, polytechnic, etc.—in addition to the three formerly in existence. There are a number of advanced institutes in Cairo (see ʿAbd al-Rahmān Zaki, Muṣāʾarat mimānat al-Khādir 1 al-ʿāḏām, Cairo 1969; J. Berque, L'Égypte, impérialisme et révolution, Paris 1967 (Eng. tr., Egypt, imperialism and revolution, London 1972); M. Berger, Islam in Egypt today; social and political aspects of popular religion, Cambridge 1970; G. Baer, Egyptian guilds in modern times, Jerusalem 1964; P. J. Vatikiotis, The modern history of Egypt, London 1969; Anouar Abd el-Malek, Egypte, sociétés militaires, Paris 1962. For particular aspects of the cultural life of Cairo see the publications in the series MIDEO, Cairo.

KAHRAMĀN-NĀMĀ, or Dāštān-i Kahramān, a popular romance in prose, several versions of which are known in both Persian and Turkish. It belongs to a series of prose works which develop themes from the Iranian epic tradition, embellishing them with fabulous touches borrowed from folk literature. Like the Hindūkūsh-nāma, the Tahmūratī-nāma and the Kīsī-ī Djamshīd, the story takes place in the earliest period of the legendary history of Iran, the times of the pīghādīyān. The central hero is Kahramān, nicknamed Kāṭīl, "the slayer". His name is in fact a common noun, the arabicized form of an Iranian word, probably of Median origin, the Middle Persian counterpart of which is kāhrūmān, meaning "manager, superintendent" (cf. W. B. Henning, Handbuch d. Orientalistik. Iranistik. Linguistik, Leiden 1958, 49, n. 2). This meaning was also attached to the word in classical Arabic (cf. Dozy, Suppl., s.v.) and in mediaeval Persian (cf., e.g., Nāšīr-i Khusrāw, Divān-i ʿabāʾī, Tehran 1355 šh., 5; Sanāʾ, Divān, Tehran 1341 šh., 20; Abu ʿl-Maʿālī Naṣr Allāh Munjih, Targāmān, Kāšī va Dimna; ed. M. Minowī, Tehran 1337 šh., 11). In modern Persian and Turkish, however, the word kahramān has acquired the meaning of "hero, champion", a semantic change which might very
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well have resulted from the existence of the romance. It is also not unlikely that the name of the hero was derived from the rôle of superintendent which he seems to play with regard to the shah of Iran, Hōshang. On behalf of this king, Kahramān subdued divs and sorcerers and acted as the leading champion of the Iranian army when Hōshang invaded India in order to complete an empire comprising the seven climes of the world. The story varies greatly in its particulars in the existing manuscript and printed versions of the romance, a confusion undoubtedly resulting from the long history of its development in popular literature. A few versions, all in Turkish, have been summarized in a more or less detailed form (cf. H. O. Fleischer, Catalogus libr. manusc. qui in Bibl. Senatoria Civilis Lipsensis asservatur, Grimae 1838, 524 f.; Th. Menzel, in EJ, s.v. Kahramān-nāma; E. Blochet, Catalogue des manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris 1932-3, i, 137-8, 144-5, 356, ii, 23).

According to some of these, Kahramān (or a another person called Kahrām, who sometimes takes over part of his functions) was the king of the man-eaters living in Sistān who at first opposed the king of Iran. But he is also represented as a prince of royal Iranian blood who as a youngster had been carried off by divs in the manner of the 3rd/9th century Kāf. Thāthīgh his enormous strength he is able to master the demons. When he returns to the world of human beings he rides a monstrous creature which he has caught and tamed himself. Woven into the main plot of the romance is a tale about the king and queen of the fairies and their son Bahram-i Diaballāh, as well as a series of picaresque stories of the ʻayvārūn (q.v.). The origin of the early history of the Kahramān-nāma is still obscure. A reference to Kahramān as the guardian of the treasures of Hōshang in the Divān of ʻUnṣurf (ed. Y. Karīb, Tehran 1323, 129; ed. M. Dābrī Siyākī, Tehran 1342, bayt 2416) proves that at least the kernel of this romance already existed in the time of Firdawsi. It would seem that elements of the legends about Hōshang (q.v.) and Rustam have been used to build up a new epic cycle. The composition of a voluminous version in Persian is attributed to Abū Tāhir Tarsus! (see Abū tāhir ṭarsūs). Of this only some manuscripts of a Turkish translation are known, and for a relevant discussion Schmucker, loc. cit., 186 f., cannot be sure whether this mention of the word is the oldest known. Anyhow, two Arabic authors of the 3rd/9th century use the word: Abī B. Sahī Rābān Ṭabarī, Firdaws al-šikmā, written 236/850 (see for a full list of references Wörterbuch, loc. cit., and for a relevant discussion Schmucker, loc. cit. ("Qurt") means Maimonides, ʻarṣa asmāʾ al-ʻukhrāh, ed. Meyerhof, 1940) and al-Kindī, Ahrāb bddih (see M. Levey, The medical Formulary, 1966, no. 224 and p. 320). Today the word is also used for "electricity" (Khwā znaj). The very name of the substance, the only one used in Islamic sources, points to the lands from which the knowledge of amber reached Islam. Al-Muqaddasi includes it in a list of goods imported from Khwāẕram via the Bulghars (q.v.; this corresponds to Scythia mentioned by Theophrastus and Pliny. The origin of the amber imported from there is the shore of the Baltic Sea.

KAHTABA

a nickname derived from the verb k-f-d-b, which means, inter alia, "to strike with a sword" (LA, s.v.). In one place his kunya is given as Abū Hanzra (Muḥabbār, 469); it is quite possible that he had two kunyās, like some other leaders of the da'wa who took the precaution of adopting a new one on becoming active in the movement.

Practically nothing is known about Kahtaba before his appearance as one of the Abbasid emissaries in Kūfrah. Some information, however, exists about his grandfather, Khālid b. Maʿdān, which may explain the origins of Kahtaba’s connections with a Shiʿīte movement. Khālid b. Maʿdān supported ʿAll in the Battle of the Camel and was on that occasion the standard-bearer of his tribe, the Banū ʿAmr b. al-Šāmit (Dīmāḥara, loc. cit.). Later, in the year 38/558, he was commander of ʿAll’s army at the battle against the Khwārīdī at Nahrawān (Tabarī, ii, 3431; Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, iii, 309). He took the field against the Khwārīdī once more in 43/653-4 (Tabarī, ii, 54), but this time he refused to pursue them after they had been expelled from Kūfrah, asserting that his sole responsibility was the defence of his miṣr. It can thus be deduced that Kahtaba’s family settled in Kūfrah at least as early as in ʿAll’s time. An isolated apocalypse tradition in Taḥrik al-ʾumām mentions that as a young man Kahtaba was also resident in Kūfrah (Yaʿqūbī, ii, 421). As such he must have been familiar with the ʿAlīd ideas and Shiʿīte activity in the town. His name, however, does not feature in the detailed list of Abū Hāshim’s supporters in Kūfrah which appears in Abhār al-ʿAbbās (183-4, 191-2). The list is mentioned on the occasion of Abū Hāshim’s death, in 63/687-8, and it is highly likely that by that time Kahtaba was already in Kūfrah, although there is no mention of this in the sources.

That Kahtaba was familiar with the Hāshimiyah and its ideology, and that in Kūfrah he actually joined the clandestine movement, is demonstrated by his election as one of the nukabāʾ, the twelve most prominent leaders, when the movement organized its leadership in Marw. According to the tradition transmitted by al-Ṭabarī (ii, 1358), the ʿAbbāsid daʿwa in Kūfrah was inaugurated by the visit there of the emissary Abū ʿIrīkma and his nomination of the nukabāʾ in the year 100/718-9. In later Islamic tradition this acquired apocalyptic significance through the messianic expectations associated with the beginning of a new century—an association somewhat similar to the millenarian hopes in Christianity. It was thus politic of the ʿAbbāsids, after they had come to power, to link the inception of their daʿwa to the year 100, stressing that the new order brought to Islam by their daʿwa was the embodiment and fulfillment of the messianic hopes attached to the turn of the century.

The discovery and publication of the Abhār al-ʿAbbās has permitted a detailed reconstruction of the history of the daʿwa. From the unique traditions contained in this source it is quite clear that the Hāshimiyah movement in Kūfrah pledged itself to the ʿAbbāsid cause only around the year 126/743-4. Until then it had been organized in secret, mainly in Marw and in Nīṣāḥārū, in the form of small, clandestine groups. Towards the year 117/730, Marw took the lead with the arrival there of Khiḍāsh [q.v.], the competent Hāshimite leader from Nīṣāḥārū, who was undoubtedly responsible for the creation and development of the organization that had existed there from the time of Khiḍāsh. This included a supreme council of twelve nukabāʾ in Marw and a great number of daʿwāʾ (formally 70), 40 of whom were in Marw and its vicinity and the rest scattered throughout the main urban centres in Khurasan. At the end of 125 or 126, soon after the death of Muḥammad b. ʿAll and the succession of his son Ibrāhīm [q.v.], a delegation of three nukabāʾ, Kahtaba amongst them, met the new imām during the Ḥādīdī in Mecca and swore allegiance to him in the name of their Kūfrahī sīḥa. Henceforward Kahtaba was the chief link between Kūfrah and the imām. The stringent secret measures, undertaken by the daʿwa in order to keep the identity of the imām hidden from the movement’s followers as much as from most of its leaders, demonstrated the importance of his role. A later tradition, attempting to legitimate the status of Abū ʾl-ʿAbbās al-Saffār [q.v.] as the first ʿAbbāsid caliph, made Kahtaba the man who met Ibrāhīm before his death in the prison of Marwān II and received from him his testimony in favour of the imāma of Abu ʾl-ʿAbbās (Frag., 190:1; cf. Ibn Khuldun, 251).

Kahtaba’s real genius was revealed when he served as general in the army of the daʿwa. When Abū Ṭūlūm [q.v.] was sent to Kūfrah in 128/745-6 to organize the movement according to the imāma’s specifications, he must have ratified the organization that had existed there from the time of Khiḍāsh. This included a supreme council of twelve nukabāʾ in Marw and a great number of daʿwāʾ (formally 70), 40 of whom were in Marw and its vicinity and the rest scattered throughout the main urban centres in Khurasan. At the end of 125 or 126, soon after the death of Muḥammad b. ʿAll and the succession of his son Ibrāhīm [q.v.], a delegation of three nukabāʾ, Kahtaba amongst them, met the new imām during the Ḥādīdī in Mecca and swore allegiance to him in the name of their Kūfrahī sīḥa. Henceforward Kahtaba was the chief link between Kūfrah and the imām. The stringent secret measures, undertaken by the daʿwa in order to keep the identity of the imām hidden from the movement’s followers as much as from most of its leaders, demonstrated the importance of his role. A later tradition, attempting to legitimize the status of Abū ʾl-ʿAbbās al-Saffār [q.v.] as the first ʿAbbāsid caliph, made Kahtaba the man who met Ibrāhīm before his death in the prison of Marwān II and received from him his testimony in favour of the imāma of Abu ʾl-ʿAbbās (Frag., 190:1; cf. Ibn Khuldun, 251).

Kahtaba’s real genius was revealed when he served as general in the army of the daʿwa. When Abū Ṭūlūm [q.v.] was sent to Kūfrah in 128/745-6 to organize the movement for the decisive campaign against the Umayyads, Kahtaba was appointed to lead his army. His son Hasan was his lieutenant. In the middle of Ḍuʿālīmīh 129/March 747, Kahtaba accompanied Abū Ṭūlūm in a tour of the daʿwa centres in western Kūfrah in preparation for the revolt, which was to begin in Mubarram 130/August-September 747. When they reached Kūmis, Abū Ṭūlūm returned to the vicinity of Marw and Kahtaba continued westwards at the head of a small delegation in order to meet the imāma during the Ḥādīdī of that year. After meeting the imāma in Mecca and informing him of the detailed plans for the revolt, he returned to Kūfrah, having been formally nominated by Ibrāhīm as head of his armies.

Meanwhile the plans for open revolt in Kūfrah received a setback through some unforeseen development in the province. The black banners of the daʿwa were hoisted on 25 Ramaḍān 129/17 September 747, but military activity was delayed until after the coming of winter, affording ample time for Kahtaba to return to Mecca and for Abū Ṭūlūm to recruit large numbers of warriors (mainly the muḥāṭīla of the Yaman tribes) and thoroughly organize the army. In Rabīʿ II 130/January 748, Abū Ṭūlūm entered Marw and drove out Naṣr b. Sayyār [q.v.],
the last Umayyad governor of Khurāsān, who fled to the west (Akhbār, 315 f.). Soon afterwards Kahtaba returned to Khurāsān and took over from his son Ḥasan as the head of the army. He was accompanied by a group of military commanders, most of whom were Arabs, and by two competent administrators, Khalīd b. Barmak (q.v.) and Dājīm b. Ḍāṭiyā, whose task was the organization of the campaign, including the regular payment of the troops, and the administration of the occupied territories.

The winter over, the campaign opened in Shabān 130/April 748 (Akhbār, 321). Kahtaba marched on Sarakhs, there encountering his first adversary, the Khāridjīt Shaybānī, whom he defeated and slew. After the fall of Sarakhs, Kahtaba advanced swiftly westwards, revealing his military genius in the short way to ‘Irāk. The main campaign started out from Abīward. Advancing on Ṭūs, Kahtaba met an Umayyad army led by Tamīm b. Naṣr b. Sayyār. Defeating and killing his adversary, he captured Ṭūs then swiftly pressed on to Nihāwān, which he took at the end of Shabān 130/July 748. Meanwhile a strong Umayyad army, commanded by Nubātā b. Ḥanẓala al-Kilablī, captured Gurgān and endangered Kahtaba’s right flank. At once Kahtaba diverted the whole of his army northwards. He met Nubātā on 1 Dhu ‘l-Hijdād 130/August 748, defeated and killed him, and dispersed the remnants of his army. Having secured his right flank, Kahtaba resumed his original route and captured Kūmīs in the beginning of Aḏrād 130/September 748. A grave danger now emerged from the south. Ṭāmr b. Ḍūbārā al-Murri assembled a huge army in ‘Iṣfāhān (‘askar al-‘asādīr, Ṭabarī, iii, 4). Leaving Ravy, which had fallen without a struggle, Kahtaba entered with the main body of his army against this new threat. At the same time his son Ḥasan was sent to advance on the main route of northern Khurāsān, commanded by Malik b. Adham al-Bahill. The battle of Ḥayrat, leaving the highroad and outflanking Ibn Hubayra’s camps in Daskara and Dijālūla. Crossing the Katīl canal near Bāḏjarā, he assembled his army near Awânā and crossed the Tigrīs there on a bridge of boats. Once safely on the right bank of the Tigrīs, he hastened to Anbār, captured it and crossed over the Euphrates at Dimimma. Ibn Hubayra, too late to intercept these swift moves, had to retreat with speed towards Kūfah. Meanwhile Kahtaba advanced southwards along the western bank of the Euphrates. On reaching the eastern bank, Ibn Hubayra moved simultaneously opposite him. A few miles to the south of Fām al-Furat, Kahtaba caught sight of a shallow stretch of the river which he decided to ford. During the night of 8-9 Muḥarram 132/27-8 August 749, he mounted a surprise attack on Ibn Hubayra and defeated him, forcing him to relinquish Kūfah and retreat with the remnants of his army along the Nile toward Wāṣīt. In the confusion of the battle, Kahtaba was either slain or drowned. His place was immediately taken by his son Ḥasan, who led the victorious army into Kūfah on 10 Muḥarram 132/29 August 749. Bibliography: Akhbār al-Dawla al-‘Abbāsiyya wa-fihī akhbār al-‘Abbās wa-wulidhī, ed. A. A. Duri, Beirut 1971, index; Ya‘kūbī, 392, 393 f., 410-2; al-‘Uyūn wa l-kādārī, in Fragmenta Histori-orum, ed. de Goeje, 181, 182, 190-5; Ṭabarī, index; Ibn Katiba, Ma‘drīf, ed. Wustenfeld, 188; Ibn Durayd, ‘Iṣḥākāb, ed. Wustenfeld, 237; Ibn Ḥalikān, ed. Wustenfeld, 828, tr. de Saran, iv, 205; Ya‘kūt, i, 463, ii, 3, 413; Ibn al-Kabīl—Casket, tab. 257 and Register; Balādhuṣrī, Anbār al-‘Arḍīl, Ms. Rabat, iii, 379, Ms. Asir Efendi, Ms. Rabat, i, 343; Ibn al-Athīr—Dozy, index; Ibn Ḥalibī, Kūhāb al-Muhābbāb, Hyderabad 1942, 465; Ibn Khaldūn, al-‘Ibar, Beirut 1937, index; Ibn al-Athīr, ind. (M. Sharīn) Kāhtān, according to the consensus of opinion among Muslim genealogists, historians, and geograph-
ers, and in popular tradition, the ancestor of all
the South-Arabian peoples [see YAMAN],
whence he is sometimes known as "father of all
Yaman", the Yamanis themselves being called
banū Kahtān, habūl Kahtān, or simply Kahtān.
He thus corresponds to Ḥadānī [q.v.], the common
ancestor of the northern Arabs, though some authori-
ties prefer to contrast him with one or other of
"Adnān's descendants, e.g., his son, Maʿadd (al-
Dinawarl, 287; al-Tabarī, ii, 1056, 1084; al-Masʿūdī,
al-Tanbūḥi, 88), or his grandson, Nūr (al-Masʿūdī,
Murūḏī, v, 223, vii, 42 f., 46, 143, 150; Ibn al-Athīr,
iv, 273). The normal genealogy given for Kahtān is
Nūr—Ṣām—Arfakhshadh—Shaḥāb—ʿĀbar—Kahtān,
and he is also credited with a brother, Fālah." In this
we may see an adaptation of the Yahwist tradition in
the Table of the Nations (Genesis, X, 21-5; 1 Chronicles,
1, 4, 17-9); Noah—Shem—Arphaxad—Shelah—Eber—Peleg + Joktan, and this is
confirmed by the Arab insistence on the identity of
Kahtān with Joktan (Yaḵtān), who was the
ancestor of several peoples of pagan South Arabian
reference. Some genealogists do admittedly make
Yaḵtān a brother or son of Kahtān (e.g., Ibn Kutay-
ba, 14; al-Masʿūdī, Murūḏī, i, 79 f.; al-Tabarī, i, 217),
but this is certainly a confusion on their part. The
elaboration, however, that the term Kahtān is an Arabiza-
tion of Yaḵtān (e.g., Tāḏi al-ʿArās, s.v.) is phono-
logically hazardous and need not be pressed. Hebrew
Yaḵtān is rather to be related to the verb ʾāḏān "to
be small, weak", thus "the younger (brother)", and
one might compare the occurrence in Old South Ar-
bian of the term qin to denote collateral descent from
a clan-head. Kahtān, on the other hand, is now
attached as a tribal name before Islam. An in-
scription of the time of the second century Ḥamdānī
dater, 528 R. m 532 AR (Jamme 635/26-7) alludes to
campaigns in the country to the north of Ṣajdān
against a king of Kinda and Kahtān (mīkhiḍiʾIQbn),
and this may provide additional support for the
identification of Polen's Kaṭvaṭa (Geogr., book vi,
chapter 7, §§ 20, 23) with Kahtān. Though
virtually nothing is known of this people in pre-Islamic
times, it seems reasonable to suppose that
the apparent similarity of the name with Yaḵtān led the Arab genealogists to make the
identification in order to provide the South Arabian
peoples with a respectable biblical ancestry, just
as the Northern Arabs, under the influence of the
Bible and the Kurʿān, had been linked with Ishmael,
son of Abraham, through the fictitious "Adnān.

The tribal confederation of the Kahtān is sub-
divided into two groups, the smaller of the Himyar
and the larger of the Kahtān. The two were officially
regarded as brothers and their descent from Kahtān
was established by the interpolation between biblical
Joktan and his son Sheba of two further generations
represented by Yaʿrub and Yashhdub. The Himyar,
as progenitors of the great pre-Islamic kingdoms of
South Arabia, were probably settled, while the Kahtān
were essentially nomads (cf. Landberg, Arabica,
v, 116 ff.). Most, indeed, of the Southern tribes which
had settled in North Arabia, Syria, and "Irāk by the
advent of Islam claimed descent from Kahtān.

The hostility between the Kahtān and the Maʿadd seems to go back to pre-Islamic times and may find
its origin in the opposition between the desert and the
sown. This enmity was intensified by the repeated
raids of the Yamanis into the lands of the Ismaelites
as well as by the later antagonism between the Ansār
(Medinans) and the Kurayḥ, which came to a head
after the death of the Prophet and influenced the

KAHWÀ, an Arabic word of uncertain etymology, which is the basis of the usual words for coffee in various languages. Originally a name for wine, found already in the old poetry (see Landberg, Etudes ii, 1057 and al-Akhrán, 1st ed., vi, 110, viii, 794, xx, 180), this word was transferred towards the end of the 8th/12th century in the Yemen to the beverage made from the berry of the coffee tree. The assumption of such a transference of meaning is not, it is true, accepted by some who consider kāhwā —at least in the sense of coffee—as a word of African origin and seek to connect it with the alleged home of the coffee tree, Kaffa, although they also assume contamination with kāhwā “wine” (see Ritter, Erdkunde, xiii, 566; Vollers, in ZDMG, i, 657; Hobson-Jobson; Landberg, op. cit., ii, 1057-66). On the other hand, it should be noted that the holders of this view do not prove that coffee was exported from Kaffa as early as 1400, and do not quote a similar word in the languages of Ethiopia and adjoining lands, while the usual word for coffee there (bān for tree, berry and beverage; see Armbruster, Imita Amharica, ii, Cambridge 1910, 58; Coulebeau and Schreiber, Dixc. de la langue tigréa, Vienna 1915, 408; I. Reinisch, Die Kafa-Sprache etc., ii, in Sit- zungsber. der Kais. Akad. der Wiss. zu Wien, phil.-hist. Cl., cxvi, 1888, 273; see also Landberg, op. cit., ii, 1055) has passed in the form būn in (rhyme also būn) as a name of the tree and berry into Arabic. But as it is probable that the drinking of coffee spread in the Yemen out of Sūfi circles and a special significance was given to wine in the poetical language of the mystics, a transference of the poetic name for wine to the new beverage would not be at all impossible.

The coffee tree was not indigenous to South Arabia and was probably introduced from the highlands of Ethiopia, where it is found in profusion growing wild, notably in Kaffa. But there is no trace of authority for the assertion (Deflers and Handbook of Arabia) that the coffee tree was already introduced into Yemen in the period of the Ethiopian conquest and of the fall of the Himyar kingdom, about a century before the Hidjra. In this case the older literature would hardly have left it unnoticed.

The earliest mention of coffee so far found is in writings of the 10th/16th century. According to (Ab- mad) Ibn ʿAbd al-Ghaffār, quoted by ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Dzhārī in his essay (see below, Bibliography), the popularity of kāhwā as a beverage in the Yemen was first known in Cairo in the beginning of the 10th/16th century. It was there taken especially in Sūfi circles, as it produced the necessary wakefulness for the nightly devotional exercises. According to this authority, it had been brought to Aden by the jurist Muḥammad b. Saʿīd al-Dhahabīn (died 875/1470-1), who had become acquainted with it during an involuntary stay on the African coast and on his return devoted himself to mysticism; it soon became popular.

Another reference in al-Dżārī, however, ascribes the introduction of the beverage to ʿAll b. ʿUmar al-Shāhī, Abu l-Ḥasan ʿAll b. ʿUmar of the family of Daʿṣayn died in 821/1418 according to al-Shārījī. He also might have become acquainted with coffee in Ethiopia, for after entering the Shāhālīiya order, he lived for a period in the entourage of the king Muḥammad b. Saʿīd al-Dīn (i.e., between 788/1386 and 805/1401-2 or 807/1404-5), cf. al-Maqrīzī, al-Imām bi-Akkhār man bi-ʾArḍ al-Hābādīn min ʿUluḥ al-ʿālam, ed. Rinck, Leiden 1790, p. 24; Faultschke, Harar, Leipzig 1888, 504 (infra), who gave him his sister to wife. Even after he had founded his ʿawāra in al-Makhā (to follow al-Shārījī) gifts continued to reach him from admirers in Ethiopia.

In the treatise by ʿAbd al-Kādir (Ibn) al-ʿAyyārūs (see below, Bibliography), ʿAll b. ʿUmar, the saint of al-Makhā, alone is mentioned as the introducer of the beverage kāhwā (muhīḍāt al-kāhwā, fol. 347b; wādīʿukhā, fol. 347b, in a verse by Shaykb b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAyyārūs, died 990/1582). His claim to fame is, it is true, qualified by the note “that, before he prepared the beverage, only the kernel of the husk, i.e., the būn, was used and the husks were thrown on the dung-heaps (fol. 348a). In a verse attributed to him, however, he praises the kāhwāt al-būn as a dispeller of sleep and aid to devotional exercises (fol. 342b). While al-Shārījī says not a word of his connection with coffee, ʿAbd al-Kādir al-ʿAyyārūs numbers the introduction of the beverage among his miracles (harāmāt, fol. 344a).

The legend as given by Hājīdjī Khalīfa seems to have made two individuals out of ʿAll b. ʿUmar, of whom All represents the founder of the Shāhālīiya order, Abu l-Ḥasan ʿAll b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 656/1258); see al-Ṣar’ānī, Lawdīkh al-Amūr, Cairo 1292, i, 5) and his disciple ʿUmar the saint of al-Makhā (Mūkhā). The latter was ordered to settle, by command of his teacher who had appeared to him at his own funeral, at the place where a wooden bull which he gave him shone the rest. This is how he came to Mūkhā. On the charge of having misconducted himself with the daughter of the king who was staying with him for a cure, he was banished into the mountains of Uṣāb (Wuṣāb, N.E. of Zabīd).
He and his disciples, who followed him into exile, are said to have sustained themselves with kahwa (here the berry) and finally to have made a decoction from it. His visitors were cured of an itch, epidemic in Mughāẓ, by taking coffee and this procured the saint an honourable return.

The third person who is given credit for the introduction of coffee is Abū Bakr b. 'Abd Allāh al-'Ayarūs. An essay by 'Alawi al-Sakkāf (see below, Bibliography) contains a statement from the 'Ardīkh of al-Nadīm al-Ghażlī (i.e., apparently al-Khdūkī al-sā'rā bi-mānāsī il-mi'a al-shāhīra by Nadīm al-Dīn al-Ghażlī, Brockelmann, II, 376), according to which the Sūffī, who is called a Shadhīlī, once came upon a coffee tree in his wanderings and ate the berries. As he noticed their stimulating effect he took them as a food and recommended them to his disciples, so that they became known in different countries. The reference here is probably to the Sūffī of this name who died in 914/1508-9 (Abū Makhrāma, Leiden Ms. 1956, fol. 188; al-Nabhānī, Dīmūt kardma t al-awliyā', Cairo 1329, i, 263), whose grave is still honoured there. 'Abd al-Kādir (Ibn) al-Ayarūs only mentions his fondness for coffee and quotes his表扬 in praise of it. On the other hand, Abū 'ṣ-Ḥasan Muhammad al-Bakrī in his treatise 'Īdālī ma'nawīya al-kahwa, fol. 2b mentions Abū Bakr al-'Ayarūs as the introducer (mursī) of kahwa.

According to Glaser (Mitt. der Geogr. Gesellschaft in Wien, xxx, 25), it is stated in a Turkish source (which he does not name) that in the 10th/16th century the wālī Özdemir (cf. Ahmed Rā’hīd, Tārīḫī Yemn ve Sanā’, i, 83 ff.) transplanted coffee from Africa to Yemen.

The fact that the merit of introducing coffee as a beverage is given to different individuals, suggests that we have to deal with various local traditions. The tradition of Mughāẓ is the most firmly established and most widely known; therefore 'All b. 'Umar al-Shadhīlī—who is frequently confused with the founder of the Shadhīlīya order (d’Ohsson, von Hammer, Rinn)—should precede it. Shaykh b. Ismā‘īl Bā Alawi of al-Šīhīr, however, prescribed the fourfold repetition (futūfrdt)” (op. cit., supra, i, 330), who in his last years is said to have lived on nothing but coffee:—”He who dies with some kahwa in his body enters not into hell-fire” (Safwat al-Sahwā, fol. 344b).

Coffee was probably not known as a beverage in South Arabia much earlier than the turn of the 8th/14th century. Whether the tree was introduced long before this is doubtful. Ibn Ḥādal al-Haytami (q.v.) speaks in his ʿĪsāb (commentary on al-ʿUdhīb, probably by ‘All b. ‘Umar al-Sayfī; cf. Brockelmann, II, 531) of a beverage which appeared (viz. in Mecca) shortly before the 10th/16th century and was prepared from the husk of the būn, a tree introduced from the region of Zaylā’, and called kahwe (quotation in ‘Alawi al-Sakkāf, p. 9). Among the jurists who gave an opinion in favour of coffee, the oldest is Dīmāl al-Dīn Muhammad b. Sa‘īd b. ‘All b. Muḥammad Kabbīn al-ʿAdānī (died in Aden 842/1438, cf. Abū Makhrāma, fol. 149 b f.; according to al-Nabhānī, op. cit., i, 155 f.: 829/1425-6).

An ʿurdīza of Sharaf al-Dīn al-ʿAmrīfī gives the year 817/1414-5 as the date at which coffee became domesticated in Mecca (Persch, Die Arab. Handschr., zu Gotta, iv, no. 2107). According to the ʿUmdat al-safwā, however, the drinking of a decoction of coffee husks first appeared towards the end of the 9th/15th century, while previously only the eating of the fruit as a delicacy (nabī) was known. The drinking of coffee dropped out of use again for a time, but it finally established itself and soon people drank coffee even in the sacred mosque and regarded it as a welcome tonic at ʿakhir and mawlid. Coffee-houses (buyūl al-kahwe) were soon opened, where men and women met to listen to music or where they played chess or a similar game for a stake. This and the custom of handing round the coffee in the manner of wine naturally aroused the indignation of the ultra-

The legends are probably correct in saying that the taking of coffee in Arabia first began among Yemeni Sūffīs. They were particularly fond of the beverage because its effect facilitated the performance of their religious ceremonies. They therefore considered this as its original “destination” (mawṣūla‘iṣ). They did not, however, consider it as its original “destination” (mawṣūla‘iṣ). It received a ceremonial character, being accompanied by the recitation of a so-called ṭūbīs. This ṭūbīs consisted in the repetition 166 times of the invocation ʿād hāni. This usage is based—apart from the similarity in sound between ʿād hāni and ṭūbīs—on the fact that the numerical value of ḥāμk, i.e., 116, is the same as that of ʿād hāni, i.e., ʿād hāni, “strong”, one of the most beautiful names of Allāh (see al-ʿASMA‘ AL-HUSNĀ). According to Shaykh b. ‘Abd Allāh al-ʿAyarūs, the recitation of the ṭūbīs should precede it. Shaykh b. Ismā‘īl Bā Alawi of al-Šīhīr, however, prescribed the fourfold repetition of the Sūra Yā-Sīs (Sūra XXXVI) with a hundredfold tasliya on the Prophet as ṭūbīs (Safwat al-Sahwā, fols. 341b, 345b, 347a). Thus when taken with a righteous intention and devotion and genuine religious conviction, coffee-drinking leads to the enjoyment of the kahwa ma'nawīya, the “ideal kahwa”, also called kahwe al-Sāfīyya, which is explained as the enjoyment which the people of God (Allāh) feel in beholding the hidden mysteries, the wonderful discourses (mukhāṣṣāfat) and the great revelations (futūfrdt)“ (op. cit., fols. 341b, 345a, supra, 345b infra f.),—All b. ‘Umar al-Shadhīlī is reported to have said that coffee, like the water of Zamzam, serves the purpose for which it is drunk (op. cit., fol. 348a, cf. above ii, 588a, infra), and the saying has been handed down of Aḥmad b. ‘Alawi Bā Djabbāh (d. 973/1566; cf. al-Nabhānī, op. cit., i, 330), who in his last years is said to have lived on nothing but coffee:—”He who dies with some kahwa in his body enters not into hell-fire” (Safwat al-Sahwā, fol. 344b).
pious, many of whom had from the first set their faces against the beverage as an objectionable innovation. They found a champion in Khā'ir Bey, who was appointed chief of the police in Mecca in 917/1511 by Kānṣūb al-Ghaqri [q.v.]. He carried through the proclamation of coffee as forbidden (ḥārām) in the same year, in an assembly of jurists of the different schools in which the unfavourable judgment of two well-known physicians and the evidence of a number of coffee-drinkers regarding its intoxicating and dangerous effects ultimately decided the issue. The kādīs signed the protocol of the assembly. Only the then muftī of Mecca dared to declare his co-operation and became therefore the object of damaging suspicions. By putting the questions in a clever way they were at the same time able to get an opinion condemning coffee from the fakih of Cairo. The rescript which Kānṣūb issued in reply to the protocol sent to Cairo did not completely fulfill the hopes of the opponents of coffee as it contained no absolute interdiction but only allowed measures to be taken against any concomitant features contrary to religion. Ibn Ḥaḍjar al-Haytami, as late as about 950/1543, had a vigorous discussion, at a wedding feast (nīlmati 'urūd) where coffee was offered to the guests, on the new beverage with a prominent muftī, who declared it intoxicating and forbidden. Ibn Ḥaḍjar refers to the assembly above-mentioned and cannot find words strong enough to condemn its decision and the manner in which it was reached (ṣafwat al-safwa, fols. 352b-356a, quotation from the Muwādīan Mādhkārī). In accordance with this verdict, Khā'ir Bey forbade the taking and sale of coffee and had a number of vendors punished and their stocks burned, so that coffee husks (īshīr) disappeared from the market.

But Kānṣūb's rescript again gave the coffee-drinkers courage and when in the next year one of the leading opponents of coffee was subjected to disciplinary punishment by a high official from Egypt and Khā'ir Bey replaced by a successor who was not averse to coffee, they were again able to enjoy with impunity the beverage, to which these measures had only attracted the attention of wider circles. Only occasionally do we read of action being taken there-again against disgraceful proceedings in coffee-houses. An edict forbidding coffee issued by the Ottoman sultan during the Ḥāḍidī in 950/1544 was hardly respected at all.

In Cairo coffee was first made known in the first decade of the 10th/16th century in the Azhar quarter by Sūfīs from Yemen, who held their ḥārās in the mosque with their associates from Mecca and Madina while partaking of coffee. After it had been publicly sold and drunk there for a time, the ḥārāb Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Ḥaḳḳ al-Sunbā̀tī, famous as a preacher, declared it forbidden in 950/1543-2. Two years later in a meeting for exhortation in the Azhar mosque he so incited his hearers against the beverage that they fell upon the coffee-houses, made short work of their contents and maltreated the occupiers. The difference of opinion thus emphasized caused the kādī Muḥammad b. ἱlyās al-Ḥanāfī to take the opinions of prominent scholars; as a result of personal observation of the effects of coffee he confirmed the opinion of those who considered the beverage a permitted one. Although in the following years coffee was from time to time for brief periods forbidden in Cairo, the number of its devotees, even among the religious authorities, steadily increased.

Several notable theologians had given ṣafwatūs in favour of coffee, for example, Zakariyā al-ʿAnṣārī (died 926/1520), Ṭabīb al-Ḥasan al-Suyūṭī (d. 929/1523-4), Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad al-Bakrī al-Siddīkī (died between 950 and 960/1543-553), who in verses in praise of coffee also gives the advice that the opinion of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥaḳḳ should be set aside and the fatwā of Abu 'l-Ḥasan followed (ṣafwat al-safwa), fols. 349a, b; cf. also al-Siddīkī's verses in Bahāzl al-Dīn al-Ṣāmilī's al-Kāgbāl, Bulāk 1286, i, 19; 'Abd al-Rahmān b. غ buds al-Zāhirī (d. 883), and others (ṣafwat al-safwa, fol. 348b).—Gradually the view came to prevail that coffee was in general permitted (nīlmati), but that under certain circumstances the other legal categories could be applied to it also.

Intercourse with the holy cities and with Egypt brought coffee to Syria, Persia and Turkey. Rauwolf in 1573 found the beverage widely known in Syria (Aleppo). In Istanbul and Rūmūlī coffee first appeared in the reign of Sulaymān I (926/1520-927/1566). In 962/1554 a man from Aleppo and another from Damascus opened the first coffee-houses (kahwet-i 'irfk) in Istanbul. These soon attracted gentlemen of leisure, wits and literary men seeking distraction and amusement, who spent the time over their coffee reading or playing chess or backgammon, while poets submitted their latest poems for the verdict of their acquaintances. This new institution was jokingly called also maktub-i ʿirfān (school of knowledge). The coffee-house met with such approval that it soon attracted civil servants, kādīs and professors also (Ṭārīkh-i Peşest, i, 361 ff.; English translation in B. Lewis, Istanbul and the civilization of the Ottoman Empire, Norman, Oklahoma 1968, 132 f.). Kātūb Celebi, The balance of truth, tr. G. L. Lewis, London 1957, 60-2). Poets like Mānūjīya al-Rūmī (cf. Bahāzl al-Dīn al-Ṣāmilī, op. cit., p. 147) and later Beliğār sang the praises of coffee, and the opinion expressed in 928/1522 by Sulaymān's court physician, Badr al-Dīn al-Kūṣûnī (Leiden Ms. 945, fol. 58) was not unfavourable. The coffee-houses increased rapidly in number. Among the servants of the upper classes were ḥalawati, whose special task was the preparation of coffee, and at the court they were subordinate to a kahwet-i 'irfān (Gibb-Bowen, i, n. index). In religious circles, however, it was found that the coffee-house was prejudicial to the mosque, and the 'ālamāt thought the coffee-house even worse than the wine-room. The preachers were specially eager for the prohibition of coffee and the way was paved for them by the muftīs (according to d'Ohsson: Abu 'l-Ṣawād) with an opinion that (roasted) coffee was to be considered as carbonized and therefore forbidden (the same argument is found in the treatise by Muḥammad ('Ali?) Dede, Leiden Ms., 682, i, fol. 4b). The fact that current politics were discussed in the coffee-houses, the government's acts criticized and intrigues concocted, was the principal cause for the intervention of the authorities. Both were issued in the reigns of Murād III (982/1574-1003/1595) and Ahmad I (1012/1603-1016/1617) were not strictly enforced and still less obeyed. The religious authorities met public opinion by declaring coffee legal, if it had not reached the degree of carbonization.

Murād IV 1032/1623-1049/1640 issued a strict prohibition of coffee (and tobacco). He had all the coffee-houses torn down and many forfeited their lives for the sake of coffee. Under Mehmed IV 1058/1648-1068/1678, while the sale of coffee in the streets was allowed, the prohibition of coffee-houses was at first renewed by the Grand Vizier Köprülı for political reasons. This prohibition could not possibly be kept in force permanently, and later we even read of measures taken by the government to lower the high
price of coffee. From Sulayman’s time a tax was levied on coffee which was at a rate of 8 aspers per okka. In the Mufaiteh mountains and in the east for Christians; in 1190/1697 there was added an extra tax of 5 paras the okka, which was called bid’at-i kahwe, for both.

According to Hammer-Purgstall, GOR, v, 713, the question of the correct spelling of kahwa with h or k has been disputed in Turkey. Kahwa is actually found in several manuscripts e.g., in the opinion of al-Kūfīn above mentioned.

The coffee tree flowers in south-western Arabia and does best on the western side of the Sarât at a height of 1100 to 2200 m., where it finds in the depths of the valleys and on the slopes a fertile, moist soil and the uniform warm temperature necessary for it. The plantations on the slopes arranged in terraces (see the picture in Handbook of Arabia, Pl. xiv), however, needed regular watering; in addition, the mist (mu’dd, sukhayd-ni) that rises in thick (nmd*, sukhaydn) cloud, or fog, at a height of 1000 to 2200 m., where it finds in the Djawf. But it is the Haraz mountains, the east we find coffee grown in the land of the Yafi and southern areas of coffee cultivation are Bilad al-Sh-dh-y (Shadha?) in the land of the Zuhran (north of Cairo 1330, 16; cf. J. L. Burckhardt, Handbook of Arabia, 136, 137). The most southern areas of coffee cultivation are Bilad al-Aslr see infra; x, 306 infra; K. al-Dhakhd*ir wa ‘l-tufraf, Cairo 1302, 8-10; Hadidji Khalifa, Dhikannam ud, Istanbul 1145, 535-6; (French tr. in De Sacy, Cerise, i, 830-3, cf. also Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgesch. der Araber, vii, Vienna 1856, 435); Pecew, Tārtīk, Istanbul 1283, i, 363-5; Na’mā, Tārtīh, Istanbul 1140, i, 551-4; Rāshid, Tārtīh, Istanbul 1282, ii, 425 f., 144 f.; Mehmend Hafid b. Muṣṭafā, al-Durar al-munṣūbara’ bi al-manṣūra’ fi ṣīlah al-khaliṭa al-maghara, Istanbul 1221, 367 f.; al-Fīrusūkbandī, Kāmāt, Trk. tr. by tfamza b. Abd Allah al-Nashīrī in a (Saf- chrid, Aydarus, Abd al-Kadir b. Shaykh. . . b. al-Abbas Afcmad al-Shardī, LXXXVIII; Abu ‘l-Abbas Ahmad al-Sharjī, Tabakāt al-khawāṣṣ, Cairo 1321, 100; ‘Alawī b. Ahmad al-Sakkāf (wrote in 1295/1878), Risāla fi ḫām al-kahwa ‘an tanawul al-tunbāh wa ‘l-haffa wa ‘l-kāli wa ‘l-khawāṣṣ, Cairo 1302, 8-10; Hadidji Khalifa, Dhikannam ud, Istanbul 1145, 535-6; (French tr. in De Sacy, Cerise, i, 830-3, cf. also Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgesch. der Araber, vii, Vienna 1856, 435); Pecew, Tārtīk, Istanbul 1283, i, 363-5; Na’mā, Tārtīh, Istanbul 1140, i, 551-4; Rāshid, Tārtīh, Istanbul 1282, ii, 425 f., 144 f.; Mehmend Hafid b. Muṣṭafā, al-Durar al-munṣūbara’ bi al-manṣūra’ fi ṣīlah al-khaliṭa al-maghara, Istanbul 1221, 367 f.; al-Fīrusūkbandī, Kāmāt, Trk. tr. by tfamza b. Abd Allah al-Nashīrī in a (Saf-

For Arabic and Persian works on coffee in addition to those quoted above and in the Bibliography, see Ahlwardt, Verzeich. der arab. Hand. . . zu Berlin, nos. 5476-5480; Fertisch, Die arab. Hand. . .
The arrival of European merchants in Mukha and the Red Sea in general was significant for the coffee trade in more than one way. Hitherto, the southern Yemeni rulers, governed by the more conservative Imam, had supplied the entire Islamic world with coffee beans. Indeed, the Yemeni rulers passed stringent rules against any attempts made by foreigners to export coffee seeds and seedlings (see Ellis, 29). But with the rapid spread of the habit of coffee drinking in Europe and other parts of the world during the 17th and 18th centuries and the consequent rise in demand, the monopoly enjoyed by the Yemeni rulers of the Red Sea was broken for ever, and its cultivation extended to Ceylon, Java, the Caribbean and South America (India Office Records, London, letter of 22 August 1732; Factory Records Egypt, vol. 2, no. 301, 160). Another unforeseen consequence was the greater availability of documentation on the volume and structure of trade, which the purely Islamic sources seemed to lack. The descriptions left by European travellers and traders and the records of the English and Dutch East India Companies not only provide general accounts of the trading conditions at Mukhā and Bayt al-Fakhr, the chief centres of the coffee trade, but also detailed information on exports of various nations, prices, methods of purchase, commercial regulations, the areas of coffee growth, and the economics of marketing. There can be little doubt that coffee was one of the most valuable commodities entering the international trade of the Middle East and played a vital part in the flow of silver specie it insulinward journey from Europe to India, bringing in the process considerable prosperity to regions that had few alternative sources of wealth.

The existence of coffee as a plant and a beverage became known in Europe towards the end of the 16th century. Jean de Lécluse, a herbarium collector, was the first scholarly historical treatise on the origins of coffee both in the Near East and Europe, attributed its first botanical reference to Prosper Alpinus, whose book was published in Venice in 1592. The work of Alpinus went through several editions in the 17th century and was followed by the treatises of Philip-Sylvestre Dufour, Nicholas de Bégny and John Ray. The interest aroused by coffee among the scientific world of Europe was matched by its economic and commercial prospects as seen by merchants. As early as 1660-19 the ships of the English East India Company were sent to Mukhā to inquire about trading possibilities, and the commander of the Sixth Voyage, Sir Henry Middleton, succeeded in making a journey to San‘ā’ (The First Letter Book, 240). In 1661, the Dutch merchant, Pieter van den Broecke, learned about coffee at Mukhā and managed to obtain very favourable commercial terms from the imām, much to the surprise and annoyance of Arabian, Persian and Indian merchants at San‘ā’ (F. de Haan, Friangan, iii, 804; K. Glammann, 183; E. Macro, 37). But it was not until the middle of the century that coffee began to be regularly imported into Europe by the Cape route. In the 1650s coffee was sold under the name of “coba de Mocha” in the public sales of the English East India Company in London, while the first reference to “cauwa de Mocha” in the Amsterdam auctions of the Dutch Company occurs in 1661-62 (A Calendar, 27; Glammann, 183).

Although the servants of the Dutch East India Company were perfectly aware of the economic importance of coffee in Middle East trade and often exported it from Mukhā to other Arabian and Indian ports, they made little effort to import it to Europe on a regular basis before 1690 (Daghi-Register 1664, 311). In contrast, the English imports were much greater during this period and there were few years between...
1664 and 1700 when coffee was not imported and sold in London. In 1664 the total quantity listed in the account books amounted to 44,932 lb. valued at £1,138, while in 1690 there was a peak import of 298,816 lb. worth £9,821 (India Office Records, London, vols. 26 etc.). In the first half of the next century the average annual imports were well over a million lb., the peak being reached in 1724 when the total imports were 2.67 million lb. The English sources also provide interesting information on the total exports of coffee from Yemen and the share of the different trading groups in the total. In 1726, for example, out of a total estimated export of 19,267 bales (each bale containing approximately 280 lb.), the Arab and Turkish merchants handled 10,330 bales or 54 per cent. The next largest exports were those of the English, both the Company and private, with 5020 bales (26 per cent), followed by the Dutch with 2000 bales (10 per cent), the French (1300 bales or 7 per cent), and the Persian and Indian merchants with 617 bales (3 per cent). However, it is probable that these figures were either underestimated or the season for this year was exceptionally bad. For in 1731 the chief merchant of the English factory stated that in good years the quantity of coffee exported varied between 60,000 and 70,000 bales, although in none of the actual reports sent home by the servants of the East India Company did the exports exceed 40,000 bales (Factory Records Egypt, vol. 1, no. 201, p. 518; vol. 2, no. 261, pp. 79-80). A possible explanation for the discrepancy lies in the difference between the weight of coffee in an English bale and in an indigenous bale, the latter being much smaller. (For the weights and measures of Mughā, see Factory Records Egypt, vol. 2, no. 209, p. 11, no. 311, p. 106). It is evident from these figures that the share of the Middle East as a consumer of coffee was overwhelmingly large. But with European demand at 40 per cent, its effect was both a rapid increase in cultivation and a progressive rise in the price of coffee. In 1672, a year of high demand, the price of coffee in Mughā was 45 Spanish dollars per bahar (approximately 450 lb.). The coffee was frequently sold at 100 dollars and in years of short harvest the price could rise to well over 170 dollars per bahar (Factory Records Surat, 16 Sept. 1672, vol. 3, fol. 16; Ovington, 271; Factory Records Egypt, vol. 1, no. 29, p. 56; vol. 2, nos. 334, 347, 344, 348 pp. 302, 324, 330, 342; Abstract, vol. 449, p. 406). The Turkish and Arab merchants seem to have purchased their coffee exclusively in the great inland mart of Bayt al-Fakhī [q.v.] and seldom used Mughā. Coffee was brought down to the coast by camels and shipped off through the ports of Luhayya and al-Hudayya. According to Ovington, Luhayya came into prominence when the trade of Mughā was disrupted by English warships during the short war with the Mughal emperor in 1687-88 (Ovington, 273). But it is also possible that the proximity of al-Hudayya and Luhayya to Djudda, which was the main intermediate market for coffee in the Middle East, was the reason why these ports were used by the Muslim merchants in preference to Mughā. Coffee was distributed in the Ottoman Empire through two separate routes. The most important one was through the Djudda, Suez, and Cairo, but substantial quantities also went through Basra and up the Euphrates. The demand in India and Persia was small and seldom exceeded 500 bales unless the Sūrat merchants were especially commissioned by the European trading companies in western India to purchase coffee on their behalf. However, with the increase in the consumption of coffee in Europe towards the end of the 17th century, the chartered companies fell into the practice of buying coffee directly in Mughā. The Dutch Company re-opened its factory in Mughā in 1696 after previously closing it in 1684 (Glamann, 186, 188). The English East India Company had sent their servants from Sūrat to Mughā during the trading season and had also despatched ships direct from London with superfugiaes who had the responsibility of purchasing coffee in Yemen. But in 1716 the Bombay Council decided to establish a permanent factory in Mughā with the aim of buying coffee all the year round and thus avoiding the high prices of the main trading season (Bombay Public Proceedings, 6 February 1716, vol. 4; Abstract, vol. 449, para. 49, p. 229). From Mughā it was only a short step to Bayt al-Fakhī, and during the early 18th century English, Dutch and French merchants regularly made their appearance alongside the Arab, Turkish and Indian traders in the coffee market of the inland town.

One of the reasons why the directors of the English East India Company had hesitated before opening a regular trading post at Mughā was the fear of religious intolerance and on one occasion it was definitely stated that the Muslim pilgrims on the Hajjī considered it a meritorious deed to insult and abuse any Christians they met with in the Red Sea region. The treatment of Europeans by the imam of Mughā and Bayt al-Fakhī were consistently more favourable than those given to the indigenous or Indian merchants. The export duty paid by the former was only 3 per cent ad valorem while the latter paid 5 per cent (Hamilton, i, 36). In addition, after the civil war of the late 1720s in Yemen, the new İmâm allowed the European companies to import coffee duty-free each year (Factory Records Egypt, vol. 2, no. 271, p. 10). It is true that the formal commercial capitulations given out at San'ā were often violated by the local governors who demanded additional payments for themselves, and the sellers of coffee to some extent had to make up the fiscal loss in the shape of a special levy on coffee sold to the Europeans. In 1721, for instance, it was reported from Mughā that very little coffee had come onto the market that season because the normal excise duty of one dollar per bahar had been suddenly raised to five dollars (Abstract, vol. 449, para. 8, p. 406). In Bayt al-Fakhī, according to La Roque, the tax was paid only by the seller (La Roque, 105). That the coffee trade yielded to the local rulers a lucrative source of income is shown by the high transit duty imposed on it by the governors of Mecca and Djudda and the pasha of Egypt, who raised the duty to 12 1/2 per cent in 1699 (Alg. Rijksarchief, The Hague, Koloniale Arch. Oost-Indië en de Kaap, no. 1810, 7 and 10 July 1719; Glamann, 192). There was also evidence that the Porte was alarmed by the effect of European competition on the trade of the Turkish merchants and sent several diplomatic missions to Yemen to try to persuade the İmâm to prohibit the export of coffee by the Europeans. The missions ended in failure when the İmâm demanded a compensatory income equal to the duty and the total purchase
value paid by the Europeans (ibid.). It is no exaggeration to state that the place formerly occupied by pepper and spices in the Levant trade was in some measure taken by coffee.

The international demand and the commercial expertise of the visiting merchants were responsible for creating a fairly sophisticated organization in the coffee trade. Very little information is available on the economic structure of its cultivation, but it seems that coffee was grown mostly by smallholders who brought the ripep and dried berries to the market themselves, although there were also large growers who employed the big merchants of Bayt al-Fakih to market their products (Factory Records Egypt, vol. i, no. 166, p. 481). The markets of Mukhā and Bayt al-Fakih were served by distinct and separate growing areas, the supplies coming to Mukhā being from villages to the south. The areas supplying Bayt al-Fakih were much more extensive and varied from one and a half day's journey from the latter to six days. The best coffee came from Wosab and Saffal, but the output of this type was generally small. The next grade purchased by the Europeans was grown in Harrass, Rimah, Himmah and Doran, while coffee from Selba, Sinan and Aden was brought to the market in a very dirty condition and seldom bought for market in the hope of higher prices. On several occasions the Dutch servants made competitive bids, but the output of this type was generally small. The beans were nearly always cleaned and given an initial degree of processing before being sold, although in years of high demand they could be offered "ungarbled" and protests made by the English and the Dutch against such practices met with the rejoinder from the governors that they could not compel their subjects to sell coffee only in a particular state if the Turkish and other merchant were prepared to buy what was offered (Factory Records Egypt, vol. 2, no. 319, p. 227).

The main trading season in Mukhā and other ports extended from March to August, when ships from Suez, Djudda, Baṣra and Sūrat arrived to buy coffee and exchange their cargoes of foodstuffs and Indian piece goods as well as European woolen goods. The coffee market was particularly sensitive to the timing of the ships' arrival and departure, and the mere rumour of the sighting of a European or Turkish merchantman at sea could send up the price at Bayt al-Fakih or lead to the withholding of supplies from the market in the hope of higher prices. On several occasions the Dutch servants made competitive bids, but each time gave way before the higher bids of other Europeans and ended up without purchasing any coffee. It was only later that the servants of the English Company discovered that this was a deliberate plan in order to keep up the price of Yemen coffee, so that the product of their own plantations in Java could be sold more advantageously in the home market (Factory Records Egypt, vol. 2, no. 216, p. 9). But in general the most important influence governing the price at Mukhā or Bayt al-Fakih was the wholesale price obtaining at Djudda and Cairo, the Yemeni merchants keeping themselves fully informed by a system of local correspondence. One of the by-products of the coffee trade was a very large influx of precious metals, largely silver, into the Red Sea area, which enabled the traders to import luxury goods from India and elsewhere, and the Indian ships returning to Sūrat mostly carried specie. There was also an active banking system in the Eastern Ocean and the Red Sea being the first made by the French in the years 1708, 1709 and 1710 (first published in French in Amsterdam 1710); Prospérité Alpint de Plantis Aegypti liber...accessit etiam liber de balsamo alias editus, Venice 1592; Philip-Sylvester Dufour, Traites du Café, du Thé et du Chocolat, Lyon 1585; Nicholas de Blegny, Le Bon Usage du thé, du café et du chocolat pour la préservation et pour la guérison des maladies, Paris 1687; John Ray, Universal History of Plants, London 1687; The First Letter Book of the East India Company 1660-1619, ed. George Birdwood and William Foster, London 1892 (for Sir Henry Middleton's account of the journey to Śanṭāb, see La Roque, A Voyage to Arabia, 1742 ed.); F. de Haan, Priagan. De Preanger-regsenten under het Nederlands Bestuur tot 1811, 4 vols., Batavia 1901-12; Kristof Glamann, Dutch Asiatic Trade 1620-1740, Copenhagen-The Hague 1958; Eric Macaro, Bibliography on Yemen and Notes on Mocha. Florida 1960; A Calendar of the Court Minutes of the East India Company 1660-1663, ed. Ethel Bruce Sainsbury, Oxford 1922; Dagh-Register gehouden in 't Casteel Batavia, anno 1664, ed. I. A. van der Chijs, Batavia's-Gravenhage 1893; John Ovington, A Voyage to Surat in the year 1689, ed. H. G. Rawlinson, London 1929; Abstract of Letters received from Bombay, Alexander Hamilton, A new account of the East Indies, ed. Sir William Foster, 2 vols., London 1930.

KAHYĀ (KETKHUDA) or DJENAZE HASAN PASHA. Ottoman grand vizier under Sultan Selim III. A slave of Circassian origin, he served different Ottoman dignitaries until he became KAHYĀ (KETKHUDA [q.v.]) of Melek Mehmed Pasha [q.v.], thus being known later as Ketkhudā Hasan Pasha. His military skill first became evident during the Greek rebellion in Morea, when as mütesellim of Tripolitza he defeated the rebels besieging the town on 23 Dhu l-Hijja 1183/19 April 1770. He was appointed commander of the fortress Vidin with the title of vizier in Muharram 1202/November 1787 while Melek Mehmed Paša became serlacher of Vidin. On the latter's dismissal in Rabī' II 1202/January 1788, Hasan Paša succeeded him. During the Russian and Austrian war his victories in the summer of 1788 at Orsova, Mehadiya and Sebes against the Austrians won him such a reputation that the new sultan, Selim III [q.v.], appointed him grand vizier on 3 Ramaḍān 1203/28 May 1789. As he was ill, he arrived at the army headquarters in Rusuk on a stretcher, thus acquiring his second nickname of Djenaze (corpse). His grand vizirate proved to be unhappy. Indeed an Ottoman army under the command of Kemānḵesh Mustafā Pasha was beaten by the Austro-Russian allies at Fokshani on 9 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1202/August. Furthermore, the main army under his own command was defeated at Martineshti, near the Rimnik River, on 2 Muharram 1204/22 September 1789. With the ensuing capture of Vidin and Bucharest by the Austrians and that of Akkerman and Bender by the Russians, Hasan was dismissed from the grand vizirate on 5 Rabī’ II/23 November and replaced by Djezārīlī Ghaṭī Hasan Paša [q.v.], who had success-
fully defended Isma'il against the Russians. Nominated commander of Rusçuk, he was exiled to Bursa. HisAda (Temple) in Dumlupınar in January 1790. Two years later, in Dhu'l-Qa'da 1206 (June 1792), he was appointed governor of Silistre, but was later transferred to Crete. He was governor of the Morea when the French landed in Alexandria on 1 July 1798. After a period of retirement in Yefi-Shehr (Larissa), he later became commander of Bender, but a sudden attack by the Russians obliged him to surrender it on 27 Ramadan 1221/8 December 1806 and he was taken to Russia as a prisoner of war. After being released, he lived in Yefi-Shehr until his death around 1225/1810. Although a brave soldier, he possessed the qualities neither of a military leader nor of a statesman.


— KÂ'İD (A.), an imprecise term, but one always used to designate a military leader whose qualities might vary from captain to general. Semantically, it is the equivalent of the Latin dux. The plural most frequently employed by historians is ḍawwâd. For the army in Muslim Spain, this title corresponded to general or even commander-in-chief. In the navy, kâ'id al-usūl (= kâ'id al-uṣūl or kâ'id al-baḥr (= kâ'id al-baḥr, kâ'id fi l-baḥr) was equivalent to "admiral". But Ibn Ṣaḥādīn intimates that the term current among sailors of his day was al-milân (pronounced with a back lâm), a Catalan loan-word (lughat al-Ifrandia) which is evidently related to the Castilian and Portuguese almiránte. The kâ'id al-ṣaṣīl was the admiral-in-chief. On a warship the kâ'id commanded the fighting men on board (mufyidtīlun), while the raṣīl directed the fighting chief. On a warship the kâ'id was the admiral-in-chief and the government deemed it dangerous for him to dwell within his native tribe, he was compelled to live at court, with the honour due to his rank. This power was known as a kâ'id raṣīl (admiral kâ'id), "governor of himself".

**Bibliography:** Ibn Ṣaḥādīn, Muḥaddima, Bûlāk 1274, 123; tr. Slane, ii 37; AM, iv (1905), 135, xx, 141.

— KÂ'ÌF (see kiyâfa).

**KÂ'İM ÂL MUHAMMAD,** "the Ka'im of the family of Muhammad", in Shi'i terminology commonly denotes the Mahdi (q.v.). The term kâ'im, "riser", was used in Shi'i circles at least from the early 2nd/8th century on in referring to the member of the family of the Prophet who was expected to rise against the illegitimate regime and restore justice on earth, evidently in contrast to the kâ'id, or "sitting", members of the family, who refused to be drawn into ventures of armed revolt. The term thus was often qualified as al-Kâ'im bi 'l-sayf, "the one who shall rise with the sword". It also appears frequently qualified as al-Kâ'im bi-amr Allāh meaning both "the one who shall rise by the order of God" and "the one who carries out the order of God". With the latter connotation the term could be applied to any imām. Thus some Imāmīs kādākhs stress that every imām is the Ka'im of his age (Kâ'im ahl samānīh). In its specific sense the term meant, however, the eschatological Mahdi, who as such was sometimes called Kâ'im (more commonly: Šāḥb) al-samān, "the Lord of the (final) age". Various early Shi'i sects expected the return of the last imām recognized by them, whose death they usually denied, in the role of the Kâ'im. In Imāmī and Isma'īlī usage the term Kâ'im has widely replaced that of Mahdi.

Among the Imāmīyya, whose imāms, especially
from Dja'far al-Sādīk [q.v.] on, made it a principle to refuse involvement in revolutionary activities, numerous traditions were related concerning the rising (khīyām) of the expected Kāʿim imām, the signs (ʿalāmātāt) indicating his appearance, his acts and his conduct. After the death of the eleventh imām, the twelfth, Hidden Imām was identified with the Kāʿim who on his appearance will fulfill the predictions about his actions and miracles. Imāmī doctrine distinguishes between inevitable (maḥdīāmāt) signs for the coming of the Kāʿim and conditional (mustaʿṣarāt) ones which may be cancelled by God. The traditions do not fully agree as to which signs are inevitable. Most often mentioned are: 1. The coming of the Yāmānī who shall appear in the Yamanī calling for the support of the Kāʿim; 2. the appearance of the Sufyānī [q.v.] who will rise in the Dry Wādi (al-Wādī al-Yābīs) in the month of Rāqiq in the same year as the Kāʿim and will seize Damascus and the five provinces of Syria before being killed by the Kāʿim; 3. a voice (nīdāt or ṣayba) from heaven calling the name of the Kāʿim; 4. the swallowing up (ṣuṣaf) of an army sent by the Sufyānī against the Kāʿim in the desert (al-baydāʾ); and 5. the killing of the Pure Soul (kāl al-nafs al-ṣahīya), whom the Kāʿim will send to Mecca as a messenger, by the Meccans between the Rukn and the Makām, concerned with the coming of the Kāʿim in Imāmī doctrine is the raḍīa [q.v.], the return to life of some of the wicked and the righteous of earlier generations, giving the latter the chance of taking revenge for the injuries they had previously suffered. The Kāʿim is expected to proceed from Mecca where he will reside and rule the world. His reign, according to a well-attested tradition, will last forty days of turmoil after the passing of the Kāʿim until the Resurrection and the Judgment.

Imāmī doctrine added a further dimension to the concept of the Kāʿim describing him as Kāʿim al-ḥiṣāmā, "the Kāʿim of the Resurrection", who shall act as the Judge of mankind, and attributing a cosmic rank to him above that of prophets and imāms. For details see ISMĀʿĪLIYYA, Doctrine. Druze doctrine recognizes Ḥamzā b. ʿAll as the Kāʿim al-samān. See DURŪʾ.


AL-KĀʿIM BI-AMR ALLĀH, 26th ʿAḥādīs calīph, whose rule lasted from 422/1031 to 465/1075, corresponding with the end of the Buwayhīd period and the beginning of the Saljuq period in Irāq. Born in 391/1001, the son of an Ethiopian concubine, he was named heir shortly before the death of his father, al-Kādir [q.v.] and succeeded to the throne unopposed. The usual oath of allegiance was taken on 13 Dhu l-Hijjah 422/12 December 1031.

At this period, although the caliph had only very limited personal resources at his command, he had recovered a measure of freedom, to the extent that he was able to arbitrate in the rivalry between the Buwayhīd amīrs. The amīr al-umārāʾ Djaʿlāl al-Dawla [q.v.] was in fact threatened by his nephew, Abū Kālīqdār [q.v.], ruler of Fars, and was trying to impose his authority. As early as 423/1032, al-Kāʿim entrusted the jurist al-Mawardi with a confidential mission to Abū Kālīkūr, refusing to grant the latter any title but that of Malik al-Dawla; soon after, Djaʿlāl al-Dawla, who had invited the Turks against the caliph, was reconciled with al-Kāʿim and even agreed, after an incident which cast doubt on the morality of the amīr, to apologize to him. A few years later, in 428/1039, Djaʿlāl al-Dawla had Abū Kālīkūr recognized as his delegate, then requested new titles, those of gāhānādāk al-ʿamār and malik al-mulk; in spite of hostile public opinion, the caliph awarded these exceptional titles to the amīr after he had obtained the consent of the principal fīqāhīs. The situation remained tense, from a political as much as from a religious point of view, in 435/1043 Abū Kālīkūr thought it opportune to give a new reading of his father’s profession of faith, al-risāla al-khādirīyya. Then in 434/1043 he had to make a vigorous protest against Djaʿlāl al-Dawla’s wish to take from him the collection of taxes paid by tributaries or diwānīs; after having threatened to leave the capital and have the mosques closed, he managed to make the amīr al-umārāʾ capitate on this point.

The following year, the authority of the caliph of Baghhdād was once again recognized in Irāk by the Zirid sovereigns, who had been formerly Fāṭimid vassals, and when the town of Aleppo similarly escaped from the control of the rulers of Egypt, a new problem arose through the approach of the Saljuq amīrs. In 435/1044 Tughrīl Beg seized the city of Rasyī, and the caliph sent al-Mawardi to him as ambassador. The object of this embassy is explained in different fashions by the chroniclers, but it seems that the caliph, while bestowing the title of maṣūla Amīr al-Muʾminīn on Tughrīl Beg, wished at the same time to protest against the pillage of the recently captured town. However, the policy of keeping a balance between the Buwayhīd amīrs and the Saljuq amīrs which the caliph initiated was speedily compromised by various events.

The death of Djaʿlāl al-Dawla in 435/1044 brought the fulfilment of Abū Kālīqdār’s ambitions; proclaimed amīr al-umārāʾ, he received the title of Muḥsyīʿ l-dīn and applied himself to limiting the caliph’s freedom of action. After first opening hostilities with Tughrīl Beg, he made peace with him in 439/1048; he died soon after and was replaced by his son, who received the title of Malik al-Rahīm [q.v.]. Until 444/1052-3, Tughrīl Beg, after having seized Isfahān and approached Irāk, remained at the borders of the country, where troubles multiplied: incidents between Sunnis and Shiʿīs, agitation by the ʿayyarīqūn [q.v.], and Fāṭimid propaganda. When the Turkish amīr al-Basāṣīr [q.v.] accused the caliph’s vizier, Ibn al-Muslima, of summoning the Saljuqs to defend the caliphate, the vizier denounced him as a Fāṭimid agent; whereupon the caliph was informed that al-Basāṣīr was preparing to overthrow him. Then, according to some chroniclers, the caliph himself or his vizier Ibn al-Muslima decided to appeal to Tughrīl Beg for help. In fact, the outcome of these events suggests that the caliph, who never willingly accepted the advent of the Saljuq amīr in Baghhdād, was not responsible for this action, which in any case was inevitable, whatever the vizier’s true attitude might have been.

At the end of Ramādān 437/December 1055, Tughrīl Beg entered Baghhdād, though declaring that he was simply passing through, and the ḥudba was
proclaimed in his name. A few days later, on 2 Shawwal/25 December, he took up residence in the "royal palace" and received from the caliph the titles of ruhn al-dīn, šāhānšāh, and sultan. The caliph also consented, despite himself, to give Tughhrī Beg the hand of his own daughter. Only two years later, in 449/1057, he was received in solemn audience by the caliph, who conferred on him the new title of Malik al-muṣṭafīr wa l-maḏāhib and gave him authority over the lands controlled by the Fāṭimid caliphs.

The rebellion of al-Basāsīrī broke out in 450/1058; for a few months the rebel succeeded in having the ḥuṣnīya pronounced in the name of the Fāṭimid caliph while Tughhrī Beg was occupied in Iran in suppressing a revolt by his brother. Though first choosing to stay in Bāghdād, al-Kāɨm was exiled on the order of al-Kūndurī, the former imprisoned caliph, and the death of al-Basāsīrī soon enabled him fully to exercise his powers as sultan once again. The caliph could therefore no longer continue to play off rival amirs one against the other and found himself confronting Suldūq sultans as he had earlier confronted Buwayhī amirs. The only difference, though that an important one, was that the new controller of the reins of military power supported a policy of Sunnī restoration that was closer to the caliphal position than Buwayhī policy had been.

In spite of appearances, relations between the caliph and Tughhrī remained no less strained. The sultan’s reign was dominated in this respect by his marriage with the caliph’s daughter; not only did he succeed in marrying her, he also managed to take her far from Bāghdād in spite of her father’s opposition.

The death of Tughhrī Beg on 8 Ramadān 453/3 September 1063 inaugurated a somewhat confused period during which Alp Arslān [q.v.] was mainly concerned with eliminating rivals and lighting the Byzantines. Al-Kāɨm smoothed matters for him by opposing the ambitions of the ʿUqaylid amirs and refusing the offer of the Kurdish amir, Hazarasb, governor of al-Ahwāz. For his part, Alp Arslān showed himself desirous of gaining the favour of the caliph by returning his daughter to him and having imprisoned, then put to death, al-Kundurī, the former vizier of Tughhrī Beg who had been held responsible for the intrigues leading up to the marriage. Alp Arslān was thus recognized as amīr al-umārāʾ and sultan in Rabīʿ II 456/March-April 1064. He never lived in Bāghdād and died in Rabīʿ I/January 1073. After receiving the privilege of the ḥuṣnīya from the month of Raḏāb, his son Malik Ṣaḥḥ [q.v.] obtained the official investiture from the caliph a few months later. The latter died on 18 Ḡaḏār 457/March 1065, having in the usual way named as his heir his grandson ʿUbayd Allāh, who was to take the name of al-Muḍṭaddī [q.v.]. Religious strife was a particular feature of this latter period. The foundation of the Niẓāmīya madrasa in 459/1067, which was put under the direct protection of the sultan and aimed at the diffusion of Ṣaḥīḥ law, triggered off the hostility of the Ḥanbalīs. Various incidents took place in the capital and the caliph, who hesitated to make a stand without consulting the sultan, was unable to control them.

Thus al-Kāɨm, who had followed in his father’s footsteps, was unable either to restore the power of the caliph or to impose the doctrine defined in the Risāla ḥadīṣyya; all the same, the caliphal concept had been successfully defended in his day by the first authors of treatises on public law, al-Ḥaḏrī [q.v.] and Ibn al-Farrāʾ [q.v.]. It was up to his successors to try to pursue his policy.


(D. Sourdel)
the tutor, the spiritual father of al-Ka'im, the musta-
ika'im Imam, to whom he handed over the imamate of which he was the "trustee". The first genuine Fatimid caliph was thus al-Ka'im, and the Fatimids' nasab can be traced back from al-Ka'im to Fatima, through her son al-Ḥusayn.

Criticised by Ivanow in his Rise, discussed in detail by S. M. Stern in Heterodox Ismā'īlism and again in the present author's (unpublished) thesis Le Califat fatimid au Maghreb, the idea put forward by B. Lewis remains attractive. The notion of istiṣāda would correspond to an established fact: the persecutions endured by the Fatimid pretenders, under the 'Abbāsids, compelled them to act in a clandestine manner and to entrust the imamate during the period of occultation (ṣaīr) to their "trustees" (muṣtaʿda) or "proofs" (muḥāda).

On his death, al-Mahdī had left a critical situation in the remoter part of the Maghrib, caused by the volte-face of the lord of the Miknās, Mūsā b. ʿAbī ʿl-ʿAyyās, who had transferred his allegiance to the Umayyads of Spain. Immediately after his accession to the throne, al-Ka'im launched an expedition aimed at re-establishing his power in Morocco and expelling the influence of his rival, the Umayyad al-Nāṣir. The Fatimid army, under the slave Mayṣūr, crossed the Maghrib in a single thrust and reached Fez. Another of al-Ka'im's officers, the slave Ṣandal, had meanwhile descended upon Naktūr, which he captured, killing the local Shālīb ruler in Shawwal 324/September 936. He then rejoined Mayṣūr outside the gates of Fez, which at that time was under siege. Finally the city surrendered, and the Fatimid general re-established the authority of the Idrīsid Bani ʿAbd al-Muḥammad, who had remained loyal to the Fatimids, before returning victorious to Ifrīkiya.

In order to restrain the hostile Berber tribes who had settled on the frontiers of his kingdom, al-Ka'im took steps to strengthen the authority of ʿAll b. Hamdūn, an Arab of ʿDhul-Qarnayn origin and ruler of Masiṣa (q.v.), over the territory of the Kamlān who, during the Idrīsiyan campaign, had been moved to the southeast of Kagrawān. To counter the Maghrawa, a powerful branch of the indomitable Zanātka, he pursued an alliance with the ʿṢanḥāda of Zīrī b. Manād, whom he helped to find the city of ʿAshīr (q.v.), in 324/936, in the heart of the Algerian Atlas. The Huwārā of the province of Tripoli, who had risen in revolt under the leadership of a Kurāqhi named Ibn Tālīb, a pseudo-imām, were swiftly brought to heel.

His authority being thus re-established in the south of his realm, al-Ka'im at once considered a resumption of hostilities against the ʿAbbāsids in their Egyptian province. As it is recorded under the year 323/935, this campaign against Egypt appears to have been organized by al-Mahdī himself shortly before his death. In fact, as soon as he succeeded to the throne, al-Ka'im must have resolved to employ the troops stationed at the base at Barka, reinforced with elements from Ifrīkiya, to attack Egypt, where he had already suffered two successive defeats. It was therefore in his reign, as al-Kindī states categorically, that the third raid on Egypt took place, again without success. This time, however, the Fāṭimid attack was made at an unpropitious moment. Having rebelled against the Idrīsid governor Muḥammad b. ʿUsbādī (q.v.), the officers commanding the fleet, ʿAll b. Badr and Badjīm, and also the commander of the garrison of Alexandria, Ḥabāshī, fled to Barka where they placed themselves under the authority and in the service of al-Ka'im. To re-

inforce them, al-Ka'im sent troops under the command of his freedman Zaydān and his officer ʿAmīr, known as al-Majdūnīn. The Kutāma occupied Alexandria on 6 Dhuʾal-Ḥiḍādhi I 324/1 April 936, but Ibn Tughdī, reacting swiftly, succeeded in freeing the town and forcing the Fāṭimid troops to withdraw towards Barka.

In the year of his accession, al-Ka'im resolved to resume naval operations against the Christians. A strong squadron of twenty sailing vessels, under the command of an Arab officer from the jund of Tripoli, Yaʿqūb b. Ishāq b. al-Lard, left Mahdiyya on 7 Radjab 323/23 June 934 and sailed towards Italy. Yaʿqūb intercepted a number of Christian merchant ships on their way from Spain and proceeded as far as Genoa, which his men captured after a fierce siege. Having sacked the town and carried off much booty, the Fāṭimid admiral set sail for Mahdiyya, arriving on 25 Ramadan 323/28 August 935. In addition to this attack, al-Ka'im endeavoured to intensify the dijihād in the Byzantine territories in eastern Sicily and Calabria. To Palermo he sent a new governor, Khallī b. Ishāq, the brother of the admiral Yaʿqūb and a talented poet and his favourite general, who subjected the island to a reign of terror. For four years, from 325/937 to 329/941, Khalīl made himself notorious by his tyranny over Muslim and Christian alike. Some Arab elements who had settled there under Aḡhlabīds were forced to flee to Christian territory, and a number of them were constrained to adopt Christianity. Native Sicilians were dispossessed of their lands and compelled to settle in forts situated along the frontiers of the Christian territories. The cadastral register (see Xānūn) was burnt, thus rendering the verification of land taxes impossible in certain regions such as Agrigento.

After his accession al-Ka'im proved particularly anxious to increase his military strength and to consolidate his authority in the interior of the kingdom. For this reason, from the time of his reign the internal policy of the new rulers of Ifrīkiya became more severe. Under al-Ka'im, the country seems to have suffered to a greater extent from excessive taxation and religious persecution, and the Khāridjī agitation which sprang up in the Aures and Kasīliyya thus found suitable soil.

However, al-Ka'im's attitude towards this agitation seems strangely passive. He allowed the rebellion to take root among the hostile tribes of the Aures whom the garrison of Baghaya were unable to hold in check and, when the Berbers poured through the valley of the Oued Mellegue under the banner of their Nukkār leader, Abū ʿYāzīd (q.v.), capturing in succession Tebessa, Marmādžījān, Larībūs, Sībība and Dougga (Tugga Terebinthina), in 323/936, he limited himself to a static defensive strategy. His reaction was lacking in both energy and foresight. Yet he had at his disposal large numbers of troops (70,000 men, according to al-Ḥuṣayn), well equipped and well organized. Instead of launching a vigorous counter-offensive and sending his powerful forces directly against the enemy, he adopted the unfortunate idea of dividing his troops among different strategic points, thus compelling them to remain stationary and to await the invaders, and also dividing his own effort, while leaving the enemy free to take the initiative in operations. In this way, a body of troops under the command of the slave Bushra took up their position at Bēja, another at Kagrawān under the command of Khallī b. Ishāq, and a third was on the road between Kagrawān and Mahdiyya, led by the slave Mayṣūr. Abū ʿYāzīd had no difficulty in defeating each of these
three adversaries in turn, and in Dījamād I 333/January 945 he began a siege of the capital, Mahdiyya. Al-Kā'im, however, succeeded in arousing vigorous resistance to Abū Yazid in this maritime stronghold. Repeated attacks by the rebels were checked at the gates of Mahdiyya, which remained impregnable despite the rigours of the siege. The ardour of the rebels ultimately evaporated, and many tribal contingents returned to their mountains since there was nothing more in Ifrīqiyya to pillage. Harrassing operations were successfully conducted by Fātimid troops outside Tunis and Sousse, at Cape Bon in particular, and on Abū Yazid’s rearguard, and his threat to the capital was reduced considerably. Thus, when al-Kā'im died there in Shawwāl 334/May 946, the moment had already come for his son and successor Ismā‘īl, the future al-Manṣūr, to pass over to the offensive and to spend many months on the task of crushing the revolt.


Kā‘īm (., originally a; cf. ʿkām), the name formerly used for paper money in Turkey, an abbreviation for kā‘īm-i muṭṣeber. The word kā‘īm was originally used of official documents written on large, long sheet of paper; the first paper money was also manuscript on large sheets, and was also known as sekim kā‘īmesi, kā‘īm-i naḥāisi, ewrāk-i naḥāisi, and ʿenām-i muṭṣeber. Although in the 20th century bank notes have been called kā‘īm, this term was not used for notes of the Imperial Ottoman Bank, a private bank under government charter, but only for paper issued by the government itself. The early kā‘īm were interest-bearing treasury notes; they are, however, to be distinguished from the many other kinds of short and long-term interest-bearing paper issued by the Ottoman government or its individual departments and known variously as hāsāmī tama‘ā, serqi, ekṣām-i ʿedāid, ekṣām-i mīmātā, etc. (see asḥām), and also from the Ottoman bonds sold principally to European investors from 1854 on. The kā‘īm became paper money, while the other sorts of paper did not, since from the start kā‘īm were intended to circulate on a par with coin and to be accepted as such by state offices and tax collectors. When, in the middle of the 19th century, the forced circulation, later issues of kā‘īm were in low denominations and without interest, it became even more obvious that this was paper money.

The first issue of kā‘īm probably occurred in July or August of 1840, in the crisis period, as ‘Abd al-Ma‘ṣūl [q.v.] began his second year as sultan. (Taḥrim-i Pākā‘ūl, 15 Rājdāb 1256; London Times, 18 September 1840). These handwritten treasury notes had a face value of 500 piastres, matured in eight years, and bore interest payable semi-annually to the bearer. Modern Turkish scholars uniformly put the interest rate at 8%, but it appears that the first issues bore 12%/ year. The total value of the first issue amounted to 150,000 Turkish pounds. Other larger issues followed in September and October in denominations of 50, 100, 250, 500, and 1,000 piastres; the format was somewhat that reduced for convenient circulation. These series were unnumbered and easy to counterfeit, although in the second issue indelible ink was used and the tughra [q.v.] and seals of the finance minister and ministry were affixedas a further measure against the growing counterfeiting, new printed kā‘īm were decreed in 1841 (though perhaps not issued until 1842) and the holders of manuscript issues were given three months to exchange theirs for the new. The circulation of the kā‘īm was now restricted effectively to Istanbul, since provincial officials were unable to distinguish the counterfeit from the genuine. These issues were regularly called ʿAṣār Pāshā kā‘īmesi after the then finance minister. When the printed kā‘īm were counterfeited, a new printing (1842?) was done in ṣarḥ letters. Interest was reduced in 1844 to 6%.

Interest was regularly paid in the 1840s, and some holders simply kept the kā‘īm as an investment. But new issues included smaller denominations, down to 10 and 20 piastres at the time of the Crimean War (known as ordu kā‘īm), that bore no interest. An estimated 1,750,000 pounds of kā‘īm circulated at the start of the war. During the war this amount was more than tripled, and the value of kā‘īm declined seriously. Three efforts to retire the kā‘īm after the war, through two foreign loans and a capital levy on the Istanbul populace, narrowly failed. A very large issue of 12,500,000 pounds to meet current needs in March/April 1861 produced chaos. On December 12 of that year, when the kā‘īm had depreciated to one-third or less of face value, merchants refused it, shops were sacked, and panic gripped Istanbul. Fu‘ād Pāshā, newly appointed grand vizier, drew up a plan involving a new foreign loan to retire the kā‘īm, government economies, the institution of a central government budget, and the creation of the Imperial Ottoman Bank. With English backing, the loan of 1862 sufficed to retire all kā‘īm, which were redeemed 40% in coin and 60% in so-called Konsolide (Consols) or ekṣām-i ʿedāid; government bonds at 6% interest.

No further kā‘īm were issued until the crisis period initiated by the revolt in Bosnia-Herzegovina: two million pounds on 13 August 1876, one million
on 11 November, seven million on 5 January 1877, and six million on 3 September. Denominations ranged from one piastre to one hundred piastres, none bore interest. Only about two million were retired as intended, and the value plummeted rapidly to a bottom of 1200 piastres in 1879–80.

Again, the critical years of World War I brought further issues of paper money. When the Ottoman government pressed Germany for gold shipments to meet war expenses, the German government urged the Turks to issue paper money instead. This they refused to do without gold cover. The solution conceived was that the Ottoman Public Debt Administration acted as a bank of issue for seven issues of kâ'ime, 1915 to 1918, totalling 160 million Turkish gold pounds. Each issue but the last was covered either by gold or by treasury certificates deposited by the Ottoman government in Berlin under the seal of the Ottoman Public Debt.

The Turkish Republic inherited this same paper currency, which was not increased in amount after 1918, but decreased somewhat through wear. After 1923 the value remained relatively stable. Worn bills were replaced in 1927. From the 1930s to the present (1973) the Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Merkez Bankası has issued paper money, earlier referred to as evrak-i nakdiye and now usually just as kâşi para or banknot; the term kâ'ime has become obsolete.


KĀ'IME — KĀ'IM-MAKAM  Taşkin, Germany and the Ottoman Empire, 1914-1918, Princeton 1968, 271-82; Mine Erol, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kâşî para (kâ'ime), Ankara 1970 (now the best study, partly based on archives, many illustrations); Tahtım-i Wehdâ'ı 1256/1840, nos. 206, 210, 213, 216. See also ASHĀM, DUVÜN-i ÜMÜMİYE. (R. H. DAVISON)

KĀ'IM-MAKAM In the Ottoman Empire the title of kā'ım-makâm was borne by a number of different officials, the most important of whom was the sa'dâret kā'im-makâm or kā'im-makâm pağâ'î who stayed in the capital as deputy when the grand vizier had to leave for a military campaign. The appointment of a kā'im-makâm seems to have begun in the 10th/16th or even in the 9th/15th century and it lasted until the end of the Empire. The kā'im-makâm enjoyed almost all the authority of the grand vizier, issuing firmans and nominating functionaries, but he was not allowed to intervene in the area where the army was operating. He was especially influential in the administration of the capital. Selected earlier from among the viziers, he often intrigued against the grand vizier with the aim of succeeding him. A kā'im-makâm was also appointed at the removal of a grand vizier when the successor had to travel from some provincial governorate. In this case the tenure of the kā'im-makâm lasted only for a short period without having much distinction. During the last decades of the Ottoman Empire a cabinet minister or the şeyhâh-i İslam [q.v.] was usually nominated kâ'im-makâm upon the grand vizier’s illness or his absence from the capital.

The reform movement in the Empire added new meanings to the term. The position of a kā'im-makâm was now instituted as a military rank corresponding to lieutenant-colonel in the ‘Âsâkir-i Mânsûr-i Mümâmedîye Army, established by Mahmut II in 1245/1826. The term remained in common use until the 1930s, to be replaced then by that of yarbay. The governor of a sandîq [q.v.] was equally called kâ'im-makâm when the Ottoman civil administration was reorganized in the first years of the Tanzimât [q.v.]. By the law of 8 November 1864 revising Ottoman provincial government, the kâ'im-makâm became the governor of a bâdâ’i [q.v.], appointed by the sultan. The republican regime, maintained in essence the 1864 law, and thus the kā'im-makâm (“kâymakâm”) still continues to be the administrator of a bâdâ’ı.


In Ottoman Egypt, while possessing in general the sense of “lieutenant” of a higher official, kâ'im-makâm had a number of specific usages.

(a) Before Muḥammad ‘All Pâgha, the term was applied (i) to the acting viceroy, who held office between the death or removal from office of one viceroy and the installation of the next. After 1913-16, the office seems invariably to have been held by a boy, hence, in practice, by a Mamlûk household. The deposition of a viceroy and the appointment of a kâ'im-makâm became, particularly in the 12th/18th century, a device by which a
Mamluk faction would legitimize its ascendancy. The term was also used in this period, (ii) for the general agnates of mulasim in the administration of his iltsam; he would usually be a member of the mulasim's Mamluk household; (iii) for the head of a naval commander (kapudan), administering his master's financial assignments in emanat.

(b) Under Mu'ammad 'Ali Pagh'a, the old usages of the term became obsolete, and it was applied to specific grades in the military and administrative hierarchies: (i) In the reorganized and westernized army, the rank of ka'im-makam was equivalent to lieutenant-colonel; (ii) in the administration the ka'im-makam was in charge of a nahiya (subdistrict) and had special responsibility for the maintenance of the irrigation-system. His immediate superior was the hakim al-khuft (district officer).


KA'IT BAY, AL-MALIK AL-ASHRAF ABU 'L-NASR SAYF AL-DIN AL-MAMHUD AL-ZAHIRI, sultan of Egypt and Syria (872/1468-901/1496), was purchased by Barsbây [q.v.], manumitted by Sultan Diakmak, became a life-guard, then Dawuddar Saghir, i.e., assistant dawuddar in the office of the Grand Dawuddar [see DAWuddAR], then amir of 10 Mamluks under Inal [q.v.], Tablakhdna (i.e., amir with the right to have a band accompanying him), under Sultan Khughdadam [q.v.], inspector of houses of refreshment and shortly afterwards commandar of a thousand (muhammad Alif). In 872/1467-8 he became Ra's nawbat al-Nawwâb (i.e., Commander of the Mamluks of the guard).

When Temirbogha ascended the throne in Djamada 1392/Nov. 1467, he appointed his friend Ka'it Bay alâbèk but the sultan had no real power, as he had very few supporters among the Mamluks under his command. He had not the means to win over new followers; the treasury was empty. After an unsuccessful rising by the Ustadar Khârî Bey the crown was offered in the month of Rajab of the same year (Feb. 1468) to Ka'it Bay, who accepted it after some hesitation. Temirbogha retired into private life to Damietta, to which he was not taken as a prisoner but travelled in perfect liberty accompanied by some friends. Unlike other Ottoman Mamluks, Ka'it Bay never allowed deposed sultans or descendants of former sultans throughout his reign with magnanimity and honour, frequently invited them to polo tournaments in Cairo, allowed them to make the pilgrimage to Mecca and even allowed them to visit the capital in his absence without any suspicion or fear of conspiracies.

Ka'it Bay's chief political problem was his relations with the Ottomans. The rivalry between them and the Egyptians found expression in the fighting among their vassals in Asia Minor. The ruler of Albistân [q.v.], Shâh-suvâr [see Shâh 'L-Kadr] was at war with Egypt [see KURSHADAM] and was secretly supported by the Ottomans, while Ka'it Bey assisted prince Ahâm of Karamân in his war with Mehemmed II. The first two expeditions sent against Shâh-suvâr (872 and 873) ended disastrously through the carelessness of the Egyptian commanders and more especially the lack of discipline among their troops and the rivalry between the Egyptian and the Syrian corps. Ka'it Bay later succeeded in depriving Shâh-suvâr of the help of the Ottoman sultan by agreeing to cease assisting Ahâm of Karamân. Thus weakened, Shâh-suvâr was decisively defeated in 876/1471 by the Atâbek Ezbek. Shâh-suvâr fell back to Zâmulû. Desisting there, he castigated his people, against that he was allowed to remain in possession of his kingdom as vassal of the sultan; but he was taken prisoner, brought to Cairo and executed contrary to the laws
of war. The prince of the Ak-Koyunlu, Uzun Ilasan, the ruler of Diyar Bakr and a part of Persia, was a dangerous rival to Ka’it Bay, and advanced from triumph to triumph; in 892/1488 he defeated the sultan of the Kara-Koyunlu and in 873 the sultan of Samarqand, but when in 876/1471 he declared war on Mehmed II he was defeated and thus became less dangerous for Ka’it Bay. He died in 880/1475 and was succeeded by Ya’kub Bey. A quarrel arose between Bayindir, the latter’s governor in al-Ruhâ (Edessa), and the sultan’s general Yeshbek, because Bayindir had given shelter to Sayîf, the rebel chief of the Beduins of Hamâ. Yeshbek advanced on al-Ruhâ and, although satisfaction was offered in every respect, he insisted on besieging the town, but was defeated during a sortie and killed with several of his staff; other Egyptian notables were taken prisoner. Ka’it Bay could not wipe out this defeat and had to make peace, as he was threatened with a struggle with the new Ottoman sultan Bâyazîd [q.v.]. Apart from continual friction regarding the ownership of Albîstân, Bâyazîd felt himself threatened, because Ka’it Bay had given a friendly welcome to his brother Djem [q.v.], the pretender to the throne, and had even encouraged him to fight against Bâyazîd. An embassy sent to Bâyazîd to endeavour to maintain peace was unsuccessful. The Ottomans invaded Cilicia in 891/1485 and occupied Tarûs and Adana; other Ottoman troops besieged Malatya. The Egyptian forces operated with success against both armies especially as Ka’it Bay had won over ‘Alâ’ al-Dawla, prince of Albîstân. In 893/1488 the Ottomans were no more successful. An endeavour to land a considerable body of troops in the bay of Iskandarûn [q.v.] failed. In 895/1490 the Amûr of Kûbî of the Darîm, who made common cause with the Ottomans, inflicted a decisive defeat on the Ottomans at Kaysarî in Asia Minor, where several generals were captured. Ka’it Bay showed a wise moderation in maintaining his inclination for peace, recognizing the enormous resources of the Ottomans, and peace was concluded in 896/1491. The rest of the reign of Ka’it Bay was peaceful but the domestic situation did not improve. It is true that he succeeded by his authority alone in preventing a fight between the hostile Mamlûk factions, but he could not permanently restrain their outbursts and he did not succeed in introducing a sound financial system.

Ka’it Bay’s reign stood out above those of the other Circassian Mamlûks because of its duration but also because of his initiative and effectiveness. Ka’it Bay was well disposed towards the trading nations. While many of his predecessors, Barsbay in particular, had put obstacles in the way of the activities of Italian merchants, Ka’it Bay granted them new privileges and made no attempt to monopolize the spice trade. It is quite probable that trade between the sultan’s lands and Christian Europe did in fact make great strides during his reign; but Ka’it Bay also introduced measures to protect the interests of native merchants, taking appropriate action in relation to the governments of other states. His understanding of the economic interests of his country is also attested by the many inscriptions, which have recently been published, dealing with his abolition of certain taxes that weighed heavily on various branches of industry. Moreover, he spent considerable sums of money in construction work, such as the new buildings in the citadel of Cairo, his mausoleum, a Sûfî monastery (at Khânkhâh, near Cairo), the repair of the mosque of Medina and the aqueduct supplying water to the mosque at Jerusalem.

It was his military activities above all, however, which swallowed up his financial resources. According to Ibn Lyây, for the conduct of all his wars Ka’it Bay spent more than 7 million dinârûs (ashrafîs), discontinuing the gratuities he had to pay to his troops when they returned to Cairo, which was also an enormous sum. This information is borne out in the accounts of other writers. To this must be added his expenses connected with fortifications, such as the repair of the fortresses of Alexandria, Aleppo and other towns. Since the Mamlûk sultans had never succeeded in establishing a regular system of taxation, Ka’it Bay was obliged to exact arbitrary contributions, known as musâdara, from his subjects. When he was in need of money and the treasury was empty he levied contributions from leading citizens, from merchants, from the non-Muslim communities and even imposed new taxes on various branches of commerce and property in mortmain. Such measures reinforced the economic recession which had long marked industrial and commercial development in Egypt and Syria. In spite of the increase in international trade and the great efforts of the sultan, who embarked on tours of inspection in all the provinces (though not before his old age), the seemingly rich and powerful Mamlûk state under Ka’it Bay was heading for disaster. When he abdicated, one day before his death, the Mamlûk kingdom was so impoverished and enfeebled that it was no match for the Ottoman Turks.


SOBERNEHM—[E. ASHTOR]

Al-Ka’Kâ’î, Arabic term for a man whose foot-joints can be heard cracking when he walks, but often found as a proper name in the first days of Islam and particularly among the Tamînis; the last to bear this name seems to have been al-Ka’Kâ’î b. Dirâr al-Tamînlî, chief of police for ‘Isa b. Mûsâ [q.v.], governor of Kûfâ from 132/750 to 147/764 (Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskell, ii, 455; al-Tabarî, i, 131, 347). Among those who bore this name, apart from al-Ka’Kâ’î b. ‘Amr [see the following article] and the poets cited by al-Marzubânî (Ma’dîqam, 329-30), especially noteworthy was the Companion of the prophet al-Ka’Kâ’î b. ‘Abd Allîh b. Abî Hadrâd, who took part along with his father in the events at Wâdi Idfâm in 862/898 [see HAMO], after which was revealed the Kûr’ânic verse IV, 96/94, a warning and even a reprimand (Sîra, ii, 626-7; see also Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istî’âb, iii, 263; Ibn Hâdi’îr, Ijab, nos. 7126, 7342). Another Companion was al-Ka’Kâ’î b. Ma’bad b. Zûrûra al-Tamînlî, the nephew of Hâdîb b. Zûrûra [q.v.] and sayyîd of the Dîrîm, who made common cause with Sa’dâb [q.v.]; he is described here for his generosity and nicknamed Tayyâr al-Furât (see Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskell, ii, 455; al-Tabarî, i, 1913; al-Dîbâlî, Bayânû, iii, 88; idem, Hayawan, index; Nâbâî’d, 258, 771; Ibn Hîshâm, Sîra, ii, 621; Ibn Hâdi’îr, Muhabbar,
Also worthy of note are the names of al-Ka'ka' b. 'Atiyiya al-Bahlil, who lived in Khurram and was taken prisoner by the Khardidjites (Mubarrad, 996); and al-Ka'ka' b. Khulayd al-'Abdi, who was secretary to al-Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik between 86/705 and 96/715 (al-Dihajihayr, 47; al-Tabarî, ii, 357, 1300, 1312; Ibn al-Kalbi-Casqué, ii, 465; Ya'qubî, ii, 373). A'ibî b. Khulayd, whose generosity became proverbial, thanks to two verses in his praise, al-Ka'ka' b. Shwarz b. 'Iqbal al-Dhuhil, is cited among the associates of 'Ubayy Allâh b. Ziyâd (q.v.); he is numbered among the witnesses against Hujrî (q.v.) in 51/671 and among the officers who took part in the action against Muslim b. 'Abdi (q.v.) at Kufa in 60/680 and that against al-Muhtâr b. 'Abd 'Ubayd (q.v.) (al-Dajhis, Bayân, index; idem, Haâyân, vi, 327; idem, Tarbî, 85; Mubarrad, Kâmil, 152; al-Tabarî, ii, 133, 256-7, 272, 523; Ibn al-Kalbi-Casqué, ii 465; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, 'Ihd, iii, 311; al-Marzuqy, 330; Ibn Durayd 'Istibâk, 211; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'ârif, 99; Ibn Hağjar, Liṣân al-Mizân, iv, 474-5). Lastly, there is another belated ābât, al-Ka'ka' b. Hakîm al-Azdî, who settled in Baṣra and was a contemporary of al-Mahdi, (Ibn Khâbîr, Muhabbat, 407; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'ârif, 663; idem, Mawsûdî, Murûdî, vi, 257; al-Nawârî, Taḥâkî, 513-4). (Ed.)

AL-AMR B. MALIK AL-TAMîM! a warrior of the early Islamic period who, after the death of the Prophet, joined Sâdâbî (q.v.) for a time and became the lieutenant of Khâlid b. al-Walid (q.v.), taking part in the battle of Buzâkha (q.v.) as early as 11/632. After the capture of al-Ḥira, he commanded a detachment which won a victory over the Persians in the region of the Anbâr, probably in 12/633. In Râdbâb 13/August-September 635, he took part in the conquest of Damascus and the following year led a troop of cavalry at the battle of Yarmûk (q.v.). He fought with distinction at al-Kâdisîyya (q.v.), where his intervention was timely. He is cited among the brave warriors who captured al-Maddîn (q.v.) and he must have commanded the vanguard at the battle of Dijlîlî (16/653) (q.v.) and established a garrison at Hulwân (q.v.). He also took part in the capture of Nîâwân (21/641-2). Before the battle of the Camel [see al-Djamal] 'All sent him to Baṣra to negotiate with Ṭâlîb and al-Zubayr. Later he settled at Kufa. Al-Ka'ka', a much-loved heroic figure, was also known as a poet; a few of his verses celebrating his military exploits are extant.

Bibliography: Tabari, i, index; Mawsûdî, Murûdî, iv, 211-22, 217, 222 (ed. and tr. Pellat, §§ 1541-3, 1548, 1555); Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Is'tîhâl, iii, 263; Ibn al-Azhîr, ii, 294-5, 300, 303 ff., 316, 326, 367-8, 370 ff., 400 ff., iii, 7 ff., 186 ff., 195, 198, 200, 208 ff.; idem, Usd, iv, 207; Ibn Hağjar, Isbâa, no. 7127; Ya'qubî, ii, 362, 937, iii, 107, 280; Ağbânî, xv, 57, 58; Weil, Gesch, der Chalifen, i, 35-7, 82, 88, 203, 207-8; Wellhausen, Skizzen, vi, 14, 39, 45, 49, 85, 72, 77, 86, 105; Caetani, Annaîli, index. (K. V. Zettersten)
ruins in about 1890 in Humann und Puchstein, *Reise in Kleinasien*, 1890, 186. (CL. CAHEN)

KAKHTA — KAKUYIDS, or KAKWAYHS, a dynasty of Daylam origin which ruled over part of Dibbāl or west-central Persia during the first half of the 5th/11th century as virtually independent sovereigns, and thereafter for more than a century as local lords of Yazd, tributary to the Saljuqs. The rise of the Kakuyids is one aspect of the “Daylamite interlude” of Iranian history, during which hitherto submerged Daylam and Kurdish elements rose to prominence. Under the dynamic leadership of the greatest member of the dynasty, ‘Allā al-Dawla Muhammad, the Kakuyids played an important rôle in the politics of western Persia at a time when three great powers, the Buyids, the Ghaznavids and then the Saljuqs, were striving for power there.

1. Political and dynastic history.

The founder of the line, ‘Allā al-Dawla Abū Di‘āfar Muhammad b. Dughmanzīvar (thr in most of the literary sources: Kakuyid coins invariably have Dughmanzīvar, lit. “afflicting the enemy [through his military prowess]”, cf. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, 88), was the son of a Daylam officer, Rustam Dughmanzīvar, who was in the service of the Buyids of Rayy and Dibbāl. Muhammad often appears as “Ibn Kākūya” or “Pisar-i Kākū” in the historical texts. These sources generally explain kākūya as a hypercorist from Daylamī kākū “maternal uncle”, Dughmanzīvar being the uncle of the famous Sayyida, mother of the Buyid amir of Rayy, Majdī al-Dawla Rustam b. Fakhr al-Dawla (387–420/997–1029), cf. the modern Luri use of kākū “uncle” in a jocular, friendly sense. Sayyida was thus Muhammad’s first cousin, and Majdī al-Dawla dominated by his forceful mother, enabled Muhammad to constitute himself as the military defender of the Buyids. In 411/1020–1 we find him suppressing a revolt of Turkish soldiers in Hamadān for Madīd al-Dawla; in 414/1023–4 he seized Hamadān from the Daylamī garrison there and went on to attack the Kurdish Annazids [i.e.; in 417/1024 he put down unrest among the Kurds of Dibbāl or Gūrān; and in 418/1027 he repelled the concerted invasion of Dibbāl by the Bawandid Ispahbadh of Tabaristan and the Ziyārid Manzūr b. Kābūs, who had come to the aid of local Daylamī rebels. Whilst still acknowledging Buyid overlordship on his coins, Muhammad was now largely undisputed in his control of western Dibbāl and the adjacent parts of Kurdistan. There are extant coins of his from Isfahān, Hamadān, Asadadbād, Kirmān, al-Kaṣr, Burūjird, Djarbādkhān, Shābūr Khwāst, Dinawar, Karadī in the Rūdhrāvar district, Rayy and Yazd; their legends show how he gradually acquired an impressive string of altāb or honorific titles, comprising those of ‘Allā al-Dawla, ‘Aqṣū al-Din, Fakhr al-Millā and Tādd al-Umma.

When Māmūd of Ghazna occupied Rayy in 420/1029 and overthrew the Buyids there, ‘Allā al-Dawla Muhammad’s position was threatened by the efforts of Māmūd’s son Mas‘ūd to extend Ghaznavid control over north-western Persia, and shortly afterwards, the appearance of Oghuz raiding bands further complicated the situation. On more than one occasion, he lost Isfahān and Hamadān to the Ghaznavids, fleeing for refuge to the Buyids of Khūzsān or to the Annazids of Tarum. But the Ghaznavids always regarded Pisar-i Kākū as their implacable opponent, as Bayhaqi’s history shows. His statesmanship and pertinacity were such that he was always able to recover his position after reverses. On two occasions he even held Rayy, and it was probably in 421/1030 that he captured Yazd and minted coins there, the farthest outpost in the east of Kakuyid power. Possession of the rich towns of Dibbāl enabled him to hire mercenaries, Daylamī and Kurdish, for his army, and also to recruit Oghuz Türkmen fleeing westwards from the Ghaznavids in Khūrūsān. The historian of Isfahān, Ḩāfīr al-Rūmī, praises ‘Allā al-Dawla Muhammad for his care to maintain all fortresses in his territories, his ingenuity in planting spies in neighbouring regions, and his sense of realism, knowledge of when resistance was possible and when conciliation and yielding were wisest.

**Genealogical Table of the Kakuyids**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marzubān</th>
<th>Fulānā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rustam</td>
<td>Sayyida, mother of Madīd al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dughmanzīvar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Muhammad</td>
<td>Sayyida, mother of Madīd al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 433/1041-2)</td>
<td>(d. 419/1028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Farāmūr</td>
<td>Abū Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Garghsāp</td>
<td>Abū Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 443/1051-2)</td>
<td>Fulānā, mother of Ghazna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ‘Allī (d. 458/1069)</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Garghsāp</td>
<td>Fulānā (d. 536/1141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 536/1141)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulānā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulānā = Rūkūn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Din Sāmār, first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atabeg of Yazd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Allā al-Dawla Atā-Khan

With the collapse of Ghaznavid authority first in the west and then in Khūrūsān, ‘Allā al-Dawla Muhammad was for a brief period completely independent and acknowledged no suzerain on his coins. The increasing strength of the Saljuqs and the relentless extension of his power westwards by Tughrīl Beg were, however, bound to press on the Kakuyids. In 429/1037–8 ‘Allā al-Dawla Muhammad built a protective wall around Isfahān, but he died in 432/1041–2. His eldest son, Zahr al-Din Shams al-Mulūk Abū Mansūr Farāmūr had already discerned the trend of events; he was present with Tughrīl on the battlefield of Dandānkān in 431/1040, when the victorious Saljuq leader granted to him Rayy and Isfahān. When ‘Allā al-Dawla Muhammad died, there ensued a struggle amongst his sons over the Kakuyid inheritance. Farāmūr’s succession in Isfahān was contested by his brother Abū Ḥarḥ, who secured help from the Buyid amir of Fārs and Khūzsān, ‘Imād al-Din Abū Kālidār, but nevertheless failed to capture Isfahān. From 438/1047–8, when Tughrīl besieged him in Isfahān, till 433/1051, Farāmūr acknowledged on his coins Tughrīl as suzerain. In Muharram 433/May–June 1051 Tughrīl finally captured Isfahān after a year’s siege, razed its walls and moved his capital thither from Rayy. Farāmūr received in compensation the towns of Yazd and Abarḵū in northern Fārs, and ended his days as a faithful vassal of the Saljuqs; thus he was a member of the delegation led by
Kundur in 453/1061 to seek the hand of the caliph al-Kāfīm’s daughter for Togrīl, and of the sultan’s retinue when he went to Baghdad two years later to meet his wife.

A further brother of Farāmūrz, ʿAlāʾ al-Dawla Abū Kālidār Gardāsh, had been governor of Hamadān and Nihāwānd, i.e., the western part of the Kākūyid dominions, during his father’s lifetime, and had defended Hamadān against the so-called “ʾIrāqī” Turks when they besieged it in 420/1030. In 430/1038-9 the town was again attacked by the Qūghur, suffering a frightful sacking, but the Turks were soon afterwards repulsed by ʿAlāʾ al-Dawla Mūhammad himself. When the latter died, Gardāsh soon clashed with Togrīl Beg, and tried to get help from the Būyid Abū Kālidār; in exasperation, Togrīl in 437/1038-9 had defended Hamadān; the great scholar wrote his Persian encyclopedia of the sciences, the Dānṣik-nāma-yi ʿĀlī, for the Kākūyid amīr, and he died in 428/1037 whilst accompanying his patron from Ḳhurāsān to Hamadān. The Kākūyid governors of Yazd did much to beautify the town and make it a centre of intellectual life, and under them and their epigoni, the Atabegs, Yazd enjoyed one of its most prosperous periods. The local historian of Kirmān, ʿAdil al-Dīn Kirmānī, says in his ʿIḥār al-ʿulā that “ʿAlī al-Dawla ʿAllī b. Faraḥmūrz, who was the ruler of Yazd, continually sought to attract the eminent men of both Ḳhurāsān and ʿIrāq, encouraged them with all sorts of promises and expressions of favour, and brought them to Yazd” (ed. ʿAmīrī, Tehran 1321/1932, 102). ʿAllī was particularly noted as an early patron of the outstanding poet of the Saldjuks, Muʿizz al-Dīn, and several of the latter’s odes are dedicated to the Kākūyids. The Tarīkh-i Yazd and the other local histories deal at length with the many palaces, mosques, madrasas, caravanserais, libraries and mausoleums constructed in the town by the Kākūyid amīrs; of prime value in Yazd, situated on the local population, but in such troubled times the walls were regarded as a great benefit. One of ʿAlī al-Dawla Mūhammad’s special claims to fame is that he gave refuge to Ibn Ṣīnā (Aviceenna), after the latter had been in the service of the Būyid Ṣams al-Dawla of Hamadān; the great scholar wrote his Persian encyclopedia of the sciences, the Dānṣik-nāma-yi ʿĀlī, for the Kākūyid amīr, and he died in 428/1037 whilst accompanying his patron from Ḳhurāsān to Hamadān.

II. Cultural.

By the time of the Kākūyids’ rise to power, the Daylānī rulers of Persia had emerged from their pristine barbarism and grossness, and we find ʿAlī al-Dawla Mūhammad assuming the responsibilities of the paternalistic Islamic ruler in his principality. The cost of the walls which he built around Ḳɪsˤḥān, their circuit running to 15,000 paces not counting the defences of the outlying suburbs, was a burden on the local population, but in such troubled times the walls were regarded as a great benefit. One of ʿAlī al-Dawla Mūhammad’s special claims to fame is that he gave refuge to Ibn Ṣīnā (Aviceenna), after the latter had been in the service of the Būyid Ṣams al-Dawla of Hamadān; the great scholar wrote his Persian encyclopedia of the sciences, the Dānṣik-nāma-yi ʿĀlī, for the Kākūyid amīr, and he died in 428/1037 whilst accompanying his patron from Ḳhurāsān to Hamadān. The Kākūyid governors of Yazd did much to beautify the town and make it a centre of intellectual life, and under them and their epigoni, the Atabegs, Yazd enjoyed one of its most prosperous periods. The local historian of Kirmān, ʿAdil al-Dīn Kirmānī, says in his ʿIḥār al-ʿulā that “ʿAlī al-Dawla ʿAllī b. Faraḥmūrz, who was the ruler of Yazd, continually sought to attract the eminent men of both Ḳhurāsān and ʿIrāq, encouraged them with all sorts of promises and expressions of favour, and brought them to Yazd” (ed. ʿAmīrī, Tehran 1321/1932, 102). ʿAllī was particularly noted as an early patron of the outstanding poet of the Saldjuks, Muʿizz al-Dīn, and several of the latter’s odes are dedicated to the Kākūyids. The Tarīkh-i Yazd and the other local histories deal at length with the many palaces, mosques, madrasas, caravanserais, libraries and mausoleums constructed in the town by the Kākūyid amīrs; of prime value in Yazd, situated on the local population, but in such troubled times the walls were regarded as a great benefit. One of ʿAlī al-Dawla Mūhammad’s special claims to fame is that he gave refuge to Ibn Ṣīnā (Aviceenna), after the latter had been in the service of the Būyid Ṣams al-Dawla of Hamadān; the great scholar wrote his Persian encyclopedia of the sciences, the Dānṣik-nāma-yi ʿĀlī, for the Kākūyid amīr, and he died in 428/1037 whilst accompanying his patron from Ḳhurāsān to Hamadān.

II. Cultural.

By the time of the Kākūyids’ rise to power, the Daylānī rulers of Persia had emerged from their pristine barbarism and grossness, and we find ʿAlī al-Dawla Mūhammad assuming the responsibilities of the paternalistic Islamic ruler in his principality. The cost of the walls which he built around Ḳɪsˤḥān, their circuit running to 15,000 paces not counting the defences of the outlying suburbs, was a burden on the local population, but in such troubled times the walls were regarded as a great benefit. One of ʿAlī al-Dawla Mūhammad’s special claims to fame is that he gave refuge to Ibn Ṣīnā (Aviceenna), after the latter had been in the service of the Būyid Ṣams al-Dawla of Hamadān; the great scholar wrote his Persian encyclopedia of the sciences, the Dānṣik-nāma-yi ʿĀlī, for the Kākūyid amīr, and he died in 428/1037 whilst accompanying his patron from Ḳhurāsān to Hamadān.
ground to the rise of the Kakuyids, see V. Minor-
sky, art. DAYLAM, and idem, La domination des
Dailamites, Paris 1932, also in Iranica, twenty arti-
cles, Tehran-London 1964, 12-30; and for their place
in the general history of Persia, see C. E. Bosworth,
in Cambridge history of Iran, v, The Saljuq and
Mongol periods, Cambridge 1968, 37-40. On the chronology of the dynasty, see Zambaur, Manuel,
216-17, and Bosworth, The Islamic dynasties, 97-8.
A detailed history of the dynasty is given by Bos-
worth, Dailam in Iran: the Kakuyids of Jībāl and
Yazd, in Iran, Jnal. of the British Institute of

iii. Numismatics. The coinage of the Kakuy-
yids has been well covered. See Zambaur, Nouvelles
contributions à la numismatique orientale, in Wiener
numismatischen Zeitschrift, xlvii (1954), 142-7; G.
C. Miles, The coinage of the Kāhwāyihid dynasty, in
Iraq, v (1938), 89-104; idem, Notes on Kāhwāyihid
coins, in American Numismatic Society Museum
Notes, ix (1960), 231-6; idem, A hoard of Kāhwā-
yihid dirhems, in ANS Museum Notes, xii (1966),
165-93. (C. E. Bosworth)

AL-KAL'Ā [see KAL'AT BANI HAMMĀD].
KAL'A-1 SÆFiD [see KAL'É-1 SÆFiD].
KAL'Ä-I SULTĀNIYYA [see ČAKAR-ČAL'É
BOU HADJ].

KAL'A [see gagDIR, BURJU, HIŠĀR, HIŠN, KĀṢABA].
AL-KAL'Ā (ם), castle, fortress, a word which has passed into Spanish in the simple form Alcalá,
and as Cala—or Calat—in compounds, occurs as a place-name throughout the entire peninsula—e.g., Alcalá de Henares, Alcalá la Real (also named after Ibn Zayd), Alcalá de Guadaira, or Calahorra (castle of Hurra). Calatrua (Kal'Ta Rabah [g.v.] = 'All b. Rabah ?), Calatayud (Kal'At Ayyūb [g.v.]), Calatorao (from turāb = land, as in Madinat al-turāb = Valencia), Calatanao (Kal'at al-nusur, the site of the alleged defeat of al-Mansūr). The diminutive Alcolea (from the Arabic al-kulay'a) is also the name of vari-
ous places of less importance, such as Alcolea in the neighbourhood of Cordoba, Alcolea del Cinca, etc. The northern zone of Old Castile and the Alava 'land, as al-Kil'ā, 'the castles', a term comparable with the names Castilla and Cata-
luha = regions of castles.

Bibliography: Makārī, Analectes, i, 681; E.
Lévi-Provençal, HÉM, passim; Madoz, Diccionario
grográfico, i, 356-96. (A. Huici-Miranda)

AL-KALĀBĀDI, ABĪ BAKR MUḤAMMAD b.
ISHĀKH, author of one of the most celebrated manuals
on Sufism. In spite of the fame of his work, he himself
is practically unknown. He is believed to have died in
380/990 or 384/994; his nisba indicates that he lived in
Kalābād, a district of Bukhārā, according to
Yākūt [s.v.], and manuscript sources (see Arberry,
India Office Catalogue, no. 1218) confirm that he
died in Bukhara, where "his tomb is visited and
revered". Of the five or six works by al-Kalābādi,
two have come down to us, one of them unpublished
and without any great merit: Mašā'īn i-l-ābbār (for other titles of this work see Seghin, GAS, i, 669), a kind of brief ethical commentary on some of
the Prophet's hadiths. The other is Ta'arruf li-madīnah
ahli al-taṣawwuf, a basic work for the understanding
of Sufism in the first three centuries of Islam (tr.
1935). The work is divided into three parts. The first,
his book, section defines the meaning of the word
ṣūfī and gives a swift survey of the most important
figures of Sufism; the second part is apologetics,
going back to the articles of the creed al-Fikr al-
Akbar II to demonstrate the accord between the
doctrine of the Sufis and Ash'arī (see Arberry,
Sufism, 60); through using quotations from the
Sūfis and commenting on them, the third part sets
out the major stages on the mystic path. The author
frequently quotes al-Hallāj, indicating that he lived
in an environment favourable to mysticism but one
in which Sufism had begun to deteriorate. According
to the introduction, the book was written in response
to this decay and with the intention of delineating
true Sufism.

Bibliography: In the article. (P. NWYIA)

KALABAND (Ottoman) [see NAVY].

KALAH (KALAH, KĀLĀ, KĪLĀ, KILLAH), the
mediaeval Arab geographers' name for an island or
peninsula (djaizra) which played an important in-
termediary role in commercial and maritime relations
between Arabia, India and China. It was particularly
well-known for its tin mines, and the Arabic word
kalāihat [g.v.] for this metal derives from Kalah;
the place was also portrayed as the centre of trade in
camphor, bamboo, aloes, ivory etc. Its capital also
was named Kalah (cf. e.g., al-Dimashqī, Cosmo-
graphie, 152, 170; so too the sea which washed its
shores and was very difficult to navigate was called
the Bab Kalah (e.g., al-Dimashqī, op. cit., 152, 169).

The identification of Kalah, of no small importance
for the history of trade in the Indian Ocean, has
engendered a vast bibliography. Various clues, the
production of tin in particular, have suggested the
Malaccan peninsula; Walckenaer (Nouvelles Annales
des Voyages, Paris 1852, 19) was the first to identify
Kalah with a town whose name is written as Quedah
in the Portuguese sources, but is pronounced Kēdāh;
this town lies on the west bank of the Malacca
peninsula (6° Lat. N.). The province of Kēdāh,
watered by the Kalang River (see Ritter, Erdkunde,
v, 20-1), is still of importance in this region of Malacca
because of its brisk trade in tin; the town itself,
though a flourishing port in the past, has declined
considerably.

Walckenaer's identification was accepted by L. A.
van der Lith (ed. of K. 'Adid'ib al-Hind, index), De
goeje (in De Gids, Amsterdam 1889, iii, 165-93), and
tomaschek (Die topogr. des indischen Sesselspiegels
Mobīl, Vienna 1897, 86) and G. Le Strange (tr. of Hamd
Nuzhat al-frulub, Vienna 1897, 86) and G. Le Strange
(tr. of Hamd
Nuzhat al-frulub, Vienna 1897, 86) and G. Le Strange
(par. of Hand
Aliāl Mustawīfīs 'Nushāl al-kalābād, 194. Quatremerre
in Journal des Savants, 1846, 734) and Yule and
Burnell (Hobson-Jobson, 145) think it likely; the
latter believe that Kalan should also be identified
with Ptolemy's Kēlān, but this town seems to have
been situated elsewhere (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, art. Koli,
xi, 1973). J. Sauvaget (Relation de la Chine et de l'Inde,
Paris 1948, 43) favours this identification but points
out that Kēdāh, Kērah (Kra isthmus) or even Kēlāng,
north of the town of Malacca, are all possibilities.
Although the Malay d is pronounced in such a way
that an Arabic speaker might hear t, the Chinese
transcribed the name as Ko-lo and the vocalization
of the first syllable of Kēlah is in fact unknown (P.
Pelliot, Deux sinines de Chine en Inde à la fin
du VIIIe siècle, in Bull. de l'Ecole fr. d'Extreme-
Orient, iv (1904), 351 n. 6).

Moreover, it must be noted that G. Ferrand (in
JA, 2nd series, xiv (1919), 214-33) came to reject the
possibility of identifying Kēdāh with Kalah and to
conclude: "geographically, between Qara = Kra,
about 10° latitude North, and Kara, near Kēdāh, I
prefer the first of these ports as the site of Kalah
and its variants in the Arabic texts"; Ferrand's study
giving the reasons for his preferences has not been
published, and the claims of Kēdāh and Kēlah (Kra)
cannot be considered as settled. Other reasonable suggestions for the site of Kalah are: in Ceylon (the port of Gâlahi, Galle, Galle Point; e.g., Reinaud, Relations des voyages . . . Paris 1845, i, pp. lxxi-lxxi and Abu 'l-Fidâ', Geographie, i, cdxiv, cdxvii-cdxi; Dulaurier, in JA, 4th series, viii, 209), Malabar (Reinaudot, cf. Ouseley, Travels . . ., i, London 1819, 53 n.) and Coromandel (Gildeheimer, Script. Arab. de rebus Indicis loci, Bonn 1838, 57-8).

Alongside Kalah, Arab geographers use the compound word Kalâh-bâr (e.g., Rel. de l'Inde et de la Chine, § 15; al-Masûdî, Murâdî, i, 330, 340 = tr. Pellat, §§ 361, 374), where bâr is explained as deriving from the Sanskrit udâ, from which come ûdā and ûdâr, "district". However in Sanskrit and in Tamil pâram (= bâram in compounds) designates "the opposite coast" and is used by sailors from another country for the coast to which they usually travel; Relation (§ 15) gives two explanations ("kingdom" and "coast"), the second being the correct one, so al-Masûdî (i, 340-374) was wrong when he took bâr to mean "sea".


(M. Streck)

AL-KALÂ', Abu 'l-Râbî' Sulaymân b. Mûsâ b. Sâlim al-Himyari al-Balânsî, often known as Ibn al-Kahlâl, was the author of more than a score of works, but the only one which has been preserved is the Kitâb al-Ikhtîfâ', sometimes called the "Defensive Apologetics", or "the science of discourse" (on God); and 2) kalima [q.v.] which, in the expression kalimât Allâh, means "a" (single) divine utterance.

KALÂM, in the sense of kalâm Allâh the Word of God, must here be distinguished from 1) kalâm meaning "ilm al-kalâm" ("the science of the masâkid of the Prophet and of the first three caliphs only", is based on sources many of which are now lost. The volume published by H. Massî, the cover of the Prophet's mission, the conversion of Hamza b. 'Abd al-Mu'tassîl and the emigration to Abyssinia. Some quotations from it are to be found in al-Dîyârâbktîr's Ta'rîkh al-Abarmîs (Cairo 1283, 1302): Khurghîh Ahmad Fârîk has published in Delhi (Indian Institute of Islamic Studies, 1970) from a Ms. preserved in Dar al-kutub (Cairo), as Ta'rîkh al-riddâ, the passages in al-Ikhtîfâ' relating to the Ridda [q.v.].

Most biographers of al-Kalâlî agree on the list of his works; these reveal that this musâdîdî, celebrated for his erudition and fine handwriting, was particularly concerned with the Companions of the Prophet (notably Khâbîr Maydân al-sâhîkan, etc.; al-Musâdî 'l-dhârî man wâlîkat kunyat kunyat saudîq min Shahbât al-Musâfârî) and the transmission of hadîth (in particular, Ru'adî al-Bugdârî wa-akbârûnh, in 4 vols.; Arba'ân, etc.). Independently of his masters' Musâdî, he collected his poetical works in a diwân, as well as his correspondence and a few proverbs. Although it is difficult to form a judgment on the sole basis of titles which are not always explicit, it would appear that posterity did no injustice to al-Kalâlî in preserving from his voluminous output only the Ikhtîfâ', a work which deserves some attention.


(C. Pellat)
In the list of "the most beautiful (divine) names" (cf. AL-ASMA’ AL-HUSNA), neither kalām nor mutakallim is found. God speaks, but the Kur'ān does not "name" Him as "speaker". Kalām Allāh, "God’s spokesman", is the name of Moses. Yet in the treatises on "God, His existence and His attributes", God is described as mutakallim ("speaking"), since He possesses kalām.

Two groups of questions arise: 1) on the basis of the Kur'ānic texts, kalām, Word, is attributed to God and the "theologians" were quick to examine the question of kalām as a divine attribute (sifā); and 2) God having addressed His word to the prophets (II, 253), by antonomasia kalām Allāh designates the Kur'ān, which gave rise to the problem of the relationship between the Kur'ān and the Word as attribute. Throughout the centuries, this was to remain one of the most controversial questions.

I.—Kalām, a divine attribute. This problem is directly linked to reflections and debates on the nature of the Kur'ān (created or uncreated). Did such discussions come into being, as has been frequently stated (by C. H. Becker, for example), through the wish to reply to the Christian theologians of Damascus, who proclaimed that the Logos, the Word of God, was both uncreated and eternal?—e) Finally, the Ash'arite groups understood it to mean a divine, eternal Idea, a necessary emanation of the flux (fayd) which is bound to flow from the Prime Being, is received by the separate Intelligents, transmitted to men by the illumination of the single Active Intellect and is broken down into words on account of the structure of mankind's passive intellect (bi'l-fruwwa).—c) According to the Karrāmiyya, the Word of God is not strictly speaking eternal: God becomes the agent and speaker by producing within Himself (ihdāth fi 'l-ḥādī) the Act and the Word. It is therefore proper to speak of "an attribute of the Essence", but one which has "begun".—d) The "pious Forefathers" and the Hanbalite tradition affirm the absolute eternity of the Word, subsisting in God and revealing Him, the various schools interpreted this according to different principles, which are outlined above. Logically, therefore, the positions concerning the created or uncreated Kur'ān are an application of the teaching on attributes, but in fact the positions adopted on the subject of the Kur'ān took precedence and influenced developments relating to the attribute of the Word.

a) The Mu'tazilite theory of the created Kur'ān is based on the concept of word as speech, presuming articulation and movement, which would be incompatible with pure divine immutability. All prophetic utterances, above all the Kur'ān, may be called the "Word of God" in that they express what God wishes to communicate to mankind; but this Word is created on the lips of prophets or reciters, or on the pages where they are recorded. In the same way, when God spoke to Moses in the "burning bush", strictly speaking it was the bush which spoke, though sounds and words directly created in it by God.

b) It is not easy to define to its ultimate consequences the thinking of the "pious Forefathers", especially that of Ibn Hanbal. The affirmation that the Kur'ān is the uncreated Word of God is absolute. The definitive thinking of Ibn Hanbal is that the Kur'ān pertains not to the world of creation (khalī) but to the world of commandment (amr). Now, nothing appertaining to amr can perish. "The Kur'ān went out from God and will return to Him" (’Arba'a, v. 313; quoted by H. Lauoust, La profession de foi d'Ibn Batta, Damascus 1958, 84, n. 3); according to Ibn Batta, this applies to each word, each letter of the Book (ibid., 51/86). And anyone who asserts that the Kur'ān is created, or reserves any doubt on this subject, or simply refuses to make a pronouncement (wukhl), is impious (kāfir); so too is anyone who refuses to condemn such a man as an unbeliever (takfir). When God makes His Word appear in a body, said Ibn Taymiyya (Fatāwa v, Tis'īmiyya, Cairo 1329, 265), He does not create anything in that body; it is He Himself who speaks, as He did in the bush which revealed to Moses: "I am God and there are no other gods but Me." H. Lauoust has made an excellent summary of Ibn Taymiyya's thinking on this point, which is in itself an echo Hanball tradition (Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Tahdī-Dīn Ahmad B. Taimīya, Cairo 1939, 171 and ref.). The attribute of
the Word is subordinate to the attribute of the Will
(irdda). God speaks or (in opposition to the Salamiy-
ya) ceases to speak when and how He wishes. His Word is at the same time “an idea, sounds and letters organized
with an end in view (makhṣṣid)” (H. Laoust, ibid.). It may convey information (takhbīr) or ordain a command (ingāh). In this last case, it will either bring about a creation (takwīs: e.g., the five kūrānic kun) or formulate a law (taṣqīrī). The Word is therefore multiple in its formulation. It is also hierarchically graded: the best of the sūras is the Fāṭākh, followed by the sūrat al-Ikhlās; Kurān, Tawrāt and Indjil are indeed the Word of God, but the Kurān is superior to the Tawrāt, which itself is superior to the Indjil.

Are the pronunciation (laṣf) and reading (tildwā) of the Kurān by the faithful also uncreated? The professions of faith of Ibn Ħanbal declare that to assert that its pronunciation and reading are created, where the book is kalām Allāh, is the mark of the condemned sect of the Dāhiyimiya (ʿAbdīIa 1, 15, 12). Al-Barbahārī makes the same assertion, adding that it is also ḥāmi to opt for ṣubḥāf, a deferment of judgment, on this precise point.

But there is a Ḥanbalī tradition which tends to qualify—or at least make more exact—the position of Ibn Ḥanbal. It is said that he protested vigorously against those who averred that pronunciation and reading were created; but he never adds that they were definitely uncreated. Ibn Taimiyya came to the following conclusion: those who hold that the pronunciation and reading of the Kurān are uncreated are in fact similar to the Dāhiyimiya and thus to be condemned; but, also according to Ibn Ḥanbal, those who support the opposite view are guilty of “blame-worthy innovation” (bidā). It was Abū ʿAlī al-Makki, remarks H. Laoust (Essai... 152, n. 2), “who attributed to Ibn Ḥanbal the dogma that recitation of the Kurān is uncreated”. Was this in fact a position of reserve (tawaṣṣul) which Ibn Ḥanbal adopted for fear that such an uncreated recitation would lead to the acceptance of Ḥulāl, an “infusion” of divine substance in the reciter? Ibn Taimiyya avoided saying that the laṣf was uncreated and confined himself to formulating: “The Word (kalām) is the Word of God, and the voice (jawāt) is the voice of the reciter” (ibid., 172), and again: “When men recite the Kurān, or when they write it down on paper, the Kurān remains in reality (hābiṭaʾ) the Word of God. A word, in fact, can be attributed only to him who first formulated it and in no respect to him who transmits it or spreads it abroad” (tr. H. Laoust, Ibn Bajīa, 83, note referring to Wāṣīyiyya, 22).

c) The ʿAshʿarites and Ḥanafītes-Māturīdītes preferred a compromise to this prudent tawāṣṣul. Their solution was presented, especially by the earliest scholars, as the middle way between the Muʿtazilites and those whom they called Ḥaḍārīyya: according to the latter, the Kurān was uncreated, not only on the lips and in the hearts of the faithful but also in so far as it was reproduced in writing on paper; following a ḥakīm attributed to Ḥaḍīṣa, whatever lies between the two covers of the book is the Word of God (and thus uncreated).

The thesis of the Kurān as the Word of God, eternal and uncreated, was forcefully proclaimed in the professions of faith of al-ʿAshʿarī (Ibaina, ed. Cairo 1348, 10; Mahālīd al-Isāmiyyīn, ed. Cairo 1396/1950, 3, 321); and also in the Wāṣīyiyyat Abī Ḥanīfa (article 9) of the Fī Ḥikm Abī Ḥanīfa II (article 1); and II (article 16). Al-ʿAshʿarī cites the authority of Ibn Ḥanbal. Throughout the centuries, the schools remained faithful to this total affirmation.

But what part of the kalām Allāh is communicated by the prophets and recited or read by the faithful? Al-ʿAshʿarī’s profession of faith are silent on this point; yet on the other hand the problem is posed in basic Ḥanafī-Māturīdī texts. The Kurān, says the Wāṣīyiyyat Abī Ḥanīfa (article 9), the uncreated Word of God, inspired and revealed by Him, “is not He, nor other than He, but His real Attribute, written in the copies, recited by the tongues, preserved in the breasts, yet not residing there. The ink, the paper, the writing are created, for they are the work of men. The word of God on the other hand is uncreated, for the writing and the letters and the words and the verses are manifestations (dalāla) of the Kurān for the sake of human needs. The word of God on the other hand is self-existing in His Essence, and its meaning is understood by means of these things. Whoso sayeth that the word of God is created, he is an infidel (kafīr) regarding God... His speech being recited or written and retained in the heart, yet never dissociated from Him” (tr. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, 127). Fīḥk Abī Ḥanīfa II (article 3) goes further as far as this distinction is concerned: “Our pronouncing, writing and reciting the Kurān is created, whereas the Kurān itself is uncreated.”

What exact relationships can be established between the divine attribute of the Word and the Kurān, read, written or recited? A venerable tradition distinguishes between the heavenly Kurān, written for all eternity on the “protected table” (lawḥ mahfūz [q.v.]) and the earthly and created books. Burning one of these earthly Kurāns would not destroy the Word of God. Certain later writers, such as al-Fudālī, wondered if the words which “descended” on the Prophet were the very words of God (those of the lawḥ al-mahfūz) or the words spoken by the Angel. ʿAshʿarī answers were usually more elaborate. In an analysis reproduced by Ibn Hazm, al-Bākīllānī explains that the Kurān is the Word of God in the sense that it is an “expression” (tābīra) of it (see A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, Cambridge 1932, 151, and E1, D. B. Macdonald, tr. Kālām and refs.). He says further: “The kalām is an entity (maʿnī) subsisting within the soul (ḥāram bi ṣīnaf) which sometimes expresses itself in audible sounds” (Tamhid, ed. R. J. McCarthy, Baghdad-Beirut 1957, 251). This distinction led to the famous theory of the kalām al-naṣf or kalām nafsī, the internal word, which, as we have seen, was rejected by the Muʿtazilītes. Al-Djiwaynī stresses this point forcefully (Iṣrāḥ, 58-78/98-131; see also his Lūnāt). We have a brief and clear account of it in al-Ghazālī’s Iḥtiṣād (ed. Cairo, n.d., 80). It is not true that there can be no speech without letters and sounds. Internal speech, “the discourse of the soul”, kalām al-naṣf, is a reality. The attribute of the Word, subsisting in the divine Essence, is first and foremost this internal Word in God, which is eternal and uncreated, without future or past, without multiplication or division. It is in no way impossible that God makes it manifest ad extra by created sounds and letters. It is essentially in this that prophetic revelation resides. Contrary to the belief of the Muʿtazilītes, it is not a matter of words created in certain bodies. It is indeed God who speaks, but through sounds and letters belonging to the world of creation which manifest and express His single and immutable Word. Later ʿAshʿarī and Māturīdī manuals take up these points again with greater or lesser felicity (e.g., al-Badīūr,


Finally, it should be noted that if "the Word of God is one attribute without multiplicity" (al-Badjari, *thud*), its manifestation through verbal words allows us to make a distinction in the Kur'an between information and commandment as the Ancients insisted (cf. above, the Hanbali doctrine). In turn, commandment may be divided into prohibition, promise and threat; but these are "distinctions made by reason" (Abdom *Sibrkyya; *thud).

d) In the modern period, Mu'hammad 'Abduh emphasized the Ahl'arid distinctions to the extent of presenting an answer which seems an attempt at a synthesis between Agh'arism and Mu'tazilism (see Rida'at al-tawhid, Cairo 1353, 44 ff.): the Word is an eternal attribute of the essence; the Kur'an is the Word of God without any intermediary, but in as much as it is expressed in words that are uttered or written down, recited or read, it belongs to the world of creation. In this sense it can be said that God created the Kur'an, but without the intervention of any creature.

Bibliography: As well as references within the article, all manuals on usul al-din and *ilm al-kalam and all works in European languages devoted to these disciplines contain a chapter or some paragraphs on *kalam as an attribute of God.

(L. GarDET)

KALAM, theology [see *ilm al-kalam*].

KALAM (*kalka nour, reed*), the reed-pen used for writing in Arabic script. It is a tube of reed cut between two knots, sliced obliquely (or concave) at the thicker end and with the point slit, in similar fashion to the European quill and later the steel pen. The reed has to be very firm so that it does not wear away too quickly; the best kind comes from Wasi's and grows in the marshes (ba'diakh) of Irak, but those from the swamps of Egypt (al-Mukaddasi, *BA*, iii, 203, 1. 23) or from Fars were also recommended. Those from a rocky ground were called *sukhr/, those from the seashore *bahri* (Ibn 'Abd Rabbiihi, *Ikh i farid*, Bulak 1876, ii, 221, 1. 18 ff., al-Kalkashandi, *Subh al-a'sha*, ii, 441, 1. 7 ff.). It is allowed to steep like hemp and is kept in the water until its skin has taken on a beautiful dark brown colour. Its fibres should be quite straight so that the slit may also be even. After the nib of the kalam has been cut, it is laid on a long, flat piece of ivory or bone *mikafa/, which is specially used for this purpose; the point is then slit with a sharp transverse cut with a special very sharp knife with a long handle (penknife, Turkish kalametirik). The length of the reed-pen should be, according to Ibn Mula, 12-16 finger-breaths or a span, but could not exceed this by more than the length of the *djiya* (nib). The width should be that of the index and the little finger (al-Kalkashandi, *op. cit.*, ii, 444, 1. 14-16), but a medium thickness—not too long or short, not bent or curved—would be the best one (al-Kalkashandi, *op. cit.*, ii, 440, 1. 16-19). The intermediate should not be too long. The pen should also not be dry, although well-ripened; it should be browned by the sun, golden, shining like a pearl and silvery on the sides.

Each kind of script needed a special pen, and the cutting of the nib (*djiya*) was an art in itself. It was the prime necessity for good handwriting, and excellent cutting was considered as "half the script": it is worth noting that in the Fatimid period a kind of "fountain-pen" was invented in Egypt.

The part of the point to the left of the incision is called *insi*, "human", because it is turned towards the writer, and the right *waqfi", "savage". If the former is slightly softer than the latter so much the better. It became a rule that in the kinds of writing called *mashkh, thuluf* and *rikah* the *waqfi* side ought to be twice as broad as the *insi* side; in the kinds called *divini* and *birma*, it is the other way about. The *nasta'lik* is written with a pen slit exactly down the centre.

To protect the kalam from damage it is kept in a holder (*miklama*). These are of two kinds: 1) a metal box in the form of a long flat tube closed at one end by a lid with hinges and often adorned with arabesques. Attached to it is an inkwells (dawlat, popularly *dawla*). This kind of holder is peculiar to the Arabs. In Ottoman Turkish it is called *divel* (from Ar. *dawlat*); at an earlier period it was also called *subur* (strictly, plur. of *bahr* "grave") by the Ottoman Turks, a word which is found as early as Abü Yusuf, *Kitab al-Kalami* (Cairo 1302, p. 17), with the meaning of "holder"); *case*; 2) a paper,mache box adorned with lacquerwork. In it is a drawer which also holds an inkwell. This kind is used particularly in Persia and is called *kalamdar*, "pen-box".

Sura LXVIII of the Kur'an (Suraat Numin) is sometimes called *Suraat al-Kalam* from its opening: "N—By the pen and what they write...". According to the traditions quoted by al-Tabarî (Tabari, *Bulak* 1323-30, xxix, 107) the kalam was the first thing created by God so that He could write down events to come. Two explanations have been given of this kalam: 1) the implement used for writing, a divine gift like the latter; 2) a kalam of light, as long as the distance from heaven to earth, which wrote down all things that are to happen until the last judgment (cf. Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, *Majdiq al-Ghayb*, Cairo 1279, vi, 330; Mu'tahhar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, *Kitab al-bad* wa *'l-ta'rikh*, ed. Huart, i, text 161 ff., tr. 149).

The kalam is the emblem or symbol of the administrative services as opposed to the *sayf*, which marks the military officer. Ibn al-Wardi (d. 749/1349) wrote a *Mufakharat al-sayf wa 'l-kalam* and Ibn Nubata (d. 768/1366) a work with a similar title; al-Maliki (d. 1112) and Fakhr al-Din al-Mubarak (d. 997/1587), *Ali b. 'Abd al-'Aziz Umm al-Walad-zade (d. 920/1514) and Khallal-zade (d. 979/1572) each wrote a *Risala Kalamiyyaya* on the same subject (Brockelmann, ii, 140, 211, 430, 433).


(K. Huart—A. Grohmann)

KALAM. In Ottoman usage the word *kalam*, pronounced *kalam*, was used figuratively to designate the secretariat of an official department or service, and then came to be the normal term for an administrative office. This usage has survived in modern Turkish, and is also current in Arabic.

(Ed.)

KALAMDAN [see *kalam*, *kitab*].

KALAMKARI [from Persian *kalam*, "pen", and *kari*, "work"], the hand-painted and resistdyed cottons of India, also known as chintz (from the Western Indian vernacular word *chita*, "spotted
In true kalamkārī, printing-blocks are not employed. The design is sometimes drawn free-hand, but more commonly "pounced" (i.e., applied by rubbing powdered charcoal through a perforated paper stencil), after which the mordants (fixing-agents), some of the colours themselves, and the wax-resist which protects parts of the fabric during red and blue dyeing operations, are applied by hand, with kālamās made of reed or bamboo. The kālams incorporate a cotton wad or hair ball impregnated with the colour or with wax. Although India had understood the principles of mordant-dyeing for at least 2,000 years (there is some evidence that this was even practised in the Harappa civilization, c. 2000 B.C.) there are no surviving specimens of the work earlier than about 1000 A.D. The finest kalamkārī of that period were made in the hinterland of Masulipatam (Golconda), the craftsmen being Hindus who worked mainly under the patronage of Muslims and Europeans, although some were also produced as temple- hangings. Throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, large quantities were shipped to Europe by the Dutch, English and French East companies and had an important influence on the decorative arts of the West. Laws were introduced in France and England to forbid importation in the interests of home industry, but they were often defied. When the laws were relaxed in the second half of the 18th century, the fate of the trade was already sealed by advances in European technology, and in particular by the application of the copperplate process to fabric-printing. Henceforth the standard of the craft in India declined.


KALAMMAS, appellation bestowed on the man who, according to tradition, was the first nasi [q.v.] of the Arabs, Hudhayfa b. 'Abd b. Fukaym b. 'Adi, of the Banū Malik b. Kināna; al-Marzubān (Muhđjam, 250), however, echoes a tradition according to which al-Kalamass al-Akbar was 'Adi, great-grandfather of Hudhayfa, and al-Tabārī (Tafsīr, Būdī, x, 3) states that three men were the first to be designated nasi, but he does not mention Hudhayfa by name. However he does mention him in this respect in Annalen, i, 1134. According to al-Mas'ūdī (Mūrūđ, iii, 116 = § 965), the latter bore the kunya of Abu l-Kalammas, while biographers of al-Dībāšī [q.v.], a masūd of this family (see Mūsīn, s.v. and biblio.), attribute this kunya to a nasi by the name of 'Amr b. 'Abd, who does not appear in the current lists (much later it was borne by 'Uthmān b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar; see al-Ṭabarī, index; Abu l-Farādž, Mābdī, al-Tālibīyyin, 296).

It is probable that al-Mas'ūdī's Abu l-Kalammas derives from a confusion with the kunya of the last of the nasa'a, Abū Thumāmā, a contemporary of the Prophet. The function of nasi [q.v.] was handed down from father to son for several generations (Caussin, Essais, i, 244, who dates the institution from 412 A.D.) until the aforesaid Abū Thumāmā. The latter's genealogy differs according to the various writers: Ibn al-Kalbī-Caskel (Tab. 47) called him Dīnādā b. Umayya b. 'Awf b. 'Abd b. Hudhayfa, and in the Sira (i, 44) he appears as Dīnādā b. 'Awf b. Umayya b. 'Abd b. Kāla b. 'Abd b. Hudhayfa; Ibn Ḥabīb (Mubāhab, 157) and al-Būrūnī (Chronology, 13) add another Kāla, but they were often confused between Kāla and Kāla. On the other hand, however, Ibn Nūbahā (Sarh, 406) makes al-Kalammas a contemporary of Hind bint al-Quss [q.v.], who was thought to be responsible for introducing taboos relating to certain domestic animals which Allāh denies having introduced (Kūrān, v, 102/103).

The direct descendants of Hudhayfa were known collectively as al-Kālimīs, the plural of kālammas, the meaning of which is not clear; Arabic dictionaries give the meaning of the word as "sea, copious well" (cf. kālammas in LA, s.v.) and, by extension, "a generous, able man" etc. It may be related to kāmūs (kamwān) and perhaps also to kalendas, as A. Moberg has suggested (An-Nasi' in der islam. Tradition, Lund-Leipzig 1931, 44, 53-4).

Bibliography: in the article. [Ch. Pellat]

KALANDAR, name given to the members of a class of dervishes which existed formerly, especially in the 7th/13th century, in the Islamic world, within the area extending from Almalk in Turkestan in the east to Morocco in the west; they resembled, with some minor differences, the "hippies" of today, distinguishing themselves from other Muslims by adopting Malāmātiyya [q.v.] doctrines and by their unconventional dress, behaviour and way of life. The origin of the term has not yet been established: it is first encountered in a rubā'ī of Baba Tāhir (Uryān, 8th series, vi, 516) and in a short treatise entitled Kalandar-nāma (ed. Sultan Husayn-i Tabanda-i Gunbādī, 1939) by the well-known Sāfī 'Abd Allāh-i Anṣārī (d. 1482/1868-9).

It passed into Arabic in the form karamal (see Ṣafādī, al-Wāfi bi l-wa'fayāt, Berlin, Westdeutscher Bibliothek, Ms. orient, fol. 3145, f. 3a f.; Dozy, Suppl., ii, 340) and kalandar (al-Nu'aymī, Tanbih al-jālib wa irshad al-dāris, al-Ṭajni's Ms., f. 368b f.). The suggestions put forward that the word derives from Persian kalandar ("ugly and ungainly man"; "a whitened piece of wood put behind a door to stop it opening"); Burkhān-i kāstī, ed. M. Muftīn, Tehran 1342, ii, 1680a, Persian kalantar (from kalān, "large, great") (ibid.), or from Greek kalotēr, from the root kalo (Ivanov, Truth-workers, p. 60, note i) are still no more than hypotheses (cf. Burkhān-i kāstī, iii, 1540, editor's note 3). In Turkish, it came to mean "a dervish who has withdrawn from the world and who wanders about like a beggar; a man who has renounced all worldly things and who has seen the truth, a philosoper" (see Sāmī, Kāmis-i Türkī, Istanbul 1328, ii, 1081; cf. J. W. Redhouse, Turkish-English dictionary, Istanbul 1921, 1471).

There exists, especially in Turkish works, vivid and detailed information concerning the kalandar's outward appearance: they are depicted in the chapter on them in the Karšidān-i Dībān wa nafišā-i dīdān, by the 10th/16th-century Turkish writer Wāhīdī (Istanbul University Library, Ms. TY 9504, f. 31b), as clean-shaven, with shaven eyebrows and heads, wearing a conical hat of woven hair and a yellow or black shawl, and carrying a drum and a standard (sālam); to this should be added the information concerning the appearance of the dervishes connected with the Abdālān-i Rūm and the Şamshī groups (cf. Wāhīdī, ibid., ff. 20a-21b).

In an illustration to Nicolas de Nicolay's Les navigations... (Lyons 1567) and reproduced in Blaise de Vigenère's translation (Paris 1622) of Chalcondyles, the kalandar is wearing a coarse garment of horse-hair which reaches only to just below the hips; his hair and face are completely clean-shaven; on his head is a felt hat with a horse-hair brim of one hand's length and detailed information concerning the kalandars and the Haydarlı, Dījāmī and Bektāșī sects,
which differed to some extent in their appearance and dress but had adopted the same way of life. (Wit, ff. 43a, 57b ff., 60a ff.; cf. Türk halk edebiyatı ansiklopedisi, no. 1, p. 52b; Faşır, Ta'rifāf, Ist. Un. Lib., Ms. TY 3051, f. 13b.) In Old Ottoman texts, the words fgang and torlak are used as equivalents of kalander (Türk halk edebiyatı ansiklopedisi, p. 334).

In the Punjab, the word kalender usually means "a trainer of performing monkeys" (see Rose, Glossary of the tribes in Punjab and N. W. Frontier, iii, 257).

Bibliography: In the text. (TAHSIN YAZICI)

KALANDARIYYA, name of a Muslim tarīka and, earlier, name given to a (not strictly organized) movement, which probably began after the appearance of the Malâmatiyya (q.v.) (3rd/9th century) and whose adherents, holding in general to Malāmī doctrines, gave them a different interpretation; as manifested in the 7th/13th century, the movement was strongly under Buddhist influence (see M. Habib, Chishki mystīcs . . . , in Med. Ind. Qtly., i/2 (1950), n. 1). The existence of the movement in Kūrāsān in the 5th/11th century is clearly attested; its adherents then may have been Buddhist ascetics maintaining their Buddhist beliefs and way of life under a Muslim guise; alternatively, the (earlier) Malāmīs had been inspired by such Buddhist ascetics. Since the kalander looked with envy at the way of life of the Indian ascetics (see Khatīb-i Fārisī, Manāhī-i Camāl al-Dīn-i Sāvī, ed. T. Yazici, Ankara 1972, 12), the second alternative is more likely. The movement was at first confined to individuals and to the eastern Islamic world (Kūrāsān, Turkestan, etc.); it spread westward, in the early 7th/13th century, is due to the activities of Djamāl al-Dīn al-Sāwī (d. ca. 630/1232-3). Until his day the movement, like the Malmātīyya, possessed general basic principles, but remained no more than a corpus of ideas; al-Sāwī, systematizing and adding to this corpus, produced in effect a new movement—so new, that in some sources (e.g., Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Khatīb, Fustāf al-ṣadādā, ed. O. Turan, in Fuad Köprüöz, Armāğāns, Istanbul 1953, 555 ff.) he is represented as the founder not of the Kalandariyya but of the Djawlaškīyya branch of the Kalandariyya. The history of the movement must therefore be treated in two phases, before and after al-Sāwī.

In the first phase, the basic principles of the movement consisted of a kind of existentialism. Whereas the Malāmatīs, without boasting or ostentation, carried out scrupulously God's commands, the Kalandarīs sought to destroy all custom and tradition and to conceal their actions from public view (Dīāmī, Naftāhī, Turkish tr. by Lami, Istanbul 1289, 20; cf. al-Suhrawardi, Ṭawārfīf, Cairo 1358/1399, 56-7, partial Eng. tr. in J. S. Trimingham, The Sufi Orders in Islam, Oxford 1971, 267). Al-Suhrawardi's description is supported by the statements of kalandars in 'Abd Allāh-i Anārī's Kalandar-nāma (ed. Sulṭān Ḥusayn-i Tābānda-i Gunbāḥēdī, Tehran 1319 s., 87 ff.), which presents a system of thought advocating inner contentment, the unimportance of learning, the avoidance of all display, and contempt for the transient world and everything in it (op. cit., pp. 88 ff.).

In practically any society some individuals, naturally enough, will adopt such ideas; but their systematic adoption was probably due to the influence of Indian ascetics. In the 3rd/9th century there were to be found in Mesopotamia and adjacent regions wandering non-Muslim ascetics, practising poverty, seeking uprightness (ṣīdāf), purification and sanctity, traveling in pairs and never spending two nights in the same place (Dīābīs, Hayyūsūn, iv, 147; cf. J. Goldscheider, Le dogme et la loi de l'Islam, Paris 1920, p. 133). It is very possible that Muslim ascetics, impressed by these holy men, looked for, and found, in the Kurā (e.g., X, 112) and in ḥadīth the authority to imitate them.

Apart from Anārī's Kalandar-nāma, no work is known which treats of the movement before the beginning of the 7th/13th century, the time when it attracted the attention of the whole Muslim world, no doubt because of the appearance of Djamāl al-Dīn al-Sāwī, with his unusual style of dress, and his attraction of adherents. He and his followers shaved the beard, the moustache, the eye-brows and the head; they wore a hair-cloth garment; and they regarded any action as licit. Such distinctive behaviour provoked reaction in some, attracted others, and caused them to be mentioned in several literary works. Al-Sāwī probably died in about 630/1232 (the birthdate 382/992-3 given in his Manāhib (ed. T. Yazici, Ankara 1972, intr. p. iv, text p. 5; cf. M. F. Köprüöz, Andolu'da İslāmîyet, offprint from EFM, p. 52) is to be rejected). The name djawlaškīyya presumably arose from the founder's distinctive garb (Pers. djalawāla, "sack-cloth"). The Djawlaškīyya (under that name) had persisted in Anatolia in the first half of the 7th/13th century (see O. Turan, loc. cit. above; cf. Djalal al-Dīn al-Rūmī, Mathawārī, ed. Nicholson, i, 18). Convents of the movement were found principally in Anatolia and Egypt, but the movement itself spread as far as the Magrib and India (see Fakīr al-Dīn 'īrāfī, 'Uṣūl al-nāma, ed. and tr. A. J. Arberry, Oxford 1939, 2-26; cf. Djalalshāhī, pp. 213 f.; Dīmānī, Naftāhī, Turk. tr., p. 673). Kalandars were numerous in Syria and Egypt in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, and their unconventional behaviour occasionally produced a reaction from the authorities: thus in 761/1360 the Mamūlīl sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣīr obliged them to adopt normal dress. They were found in Anatolia in the first half of the 7th/13th century (cf. Afkārī, Manāhib al-ṣarīfīn, ed. T. Yazici, ii, 596; Fr. tr. Huart, ii, 100; cf. O. Turan, op. cit., p. 561), and in the Ottoman period (they were active until the 12th/18th century) are referred to also under other names: Abdālānī, Rūm, Shamsīyānī, etc. "Abdālā" are recorded from the early 8th/14th century (see, e.g., the Vīdyetnāme of Ḥājjīlīl Bektāšt, ed. A. Gölpınarlı, Istanbul 1958, 46). In the 10th/16th century, attacks on such dervish-groups began: a certain Wūbdīlī wrote his Maǧdīa-ī Dījkān wa Naḍībī-ī Dīnī (in the press, ed. T. Yazici) as a condemnation of the adherents of ten tarīkas of this type; and in the next century, when they were still active, Karakah-zāde 'Umar Ef. produced a modernized redaction of Wūbdīlī's work (Nūr al-hudā li-man ihtadā, Istanbul 1286). When later authors (e.g., Harīf-zāde Kemāl al-Dīn, Wānī al-haška fi bayān sa'dāsī al-tarābī, Ms Fathī 432 ff. 74 v. ff.) allege that the Kalandarīyya derives from the Mawlawīyya, they are misled by the fact that the dress of the Shamsīyānī, a branch of the Mawlawīyya, resembles that of the Kalandars. In Anatolia Kalandars are also called ışık and torlak.

In Iran the usual name was Kalandar (Türk halk edebiyatı ansiklopedisi, p. 34). In the Şafawīd period they were numerous, especially around Ardabīl (A. Okearīus, Vermerhete . . . Reisenbeschreibungen, n. p. 1656, 685).

The movement was firmly established in India as early as the reign of the Ilutmush (607/1210-633/1296) see M. Habib, in Med. Ind. Qtly., i/2 (1950), 3). In the 7th/13th century Kalandar-type dervishes came
to Delhi, and aroused curiosity by their odd behaviour (Diyâ 3 al-Din Barani, Ta'rikh-i Firuz-shâdi, Calcutta 1866-2, 202); especially in the Punjab and in Sind they influenced such personalities as Fâghr al-Dîn 'Irâqî (d. 686/1287-8), Amir 'Abâsînî (d. 718/1318-9) and Shâhâbâz Kalandar ('Uglîmân-i Marandî, d. 724/1324). They had convents in the neighbourhood of Delhi. They flourished particularly in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries (Barani, op. cit., p. 350), but were later absorbed into other orders (C. A. Storey, Persian literature, i, 1036).

Doctrines. Influenced by Hindu and Buddhist (especially Mahayana and Sangha) traditions, the Kalandariyya were distinguished from other Muslim orders by the following features: (1) The shaving of the head, eye-brows and face (especially after the time of al-Sâwi) in order fully to reveal the beauty of the face. (2) The wearing of a Khirfra- (cf. I^afiz Abru, Mandkib-i Carnal al-`ardb va afrshdm va farik-i Balu6, s. xvi/4, 421-2). His functions were primarily concerned with the assessment and collection of taxes. In the first three months of the year, he would appoint a tax collector (muqâsîl), assemble the heads of the craft guilds and the heads of the districts or wards of the city and send them, together with the minor officials, to the shah. Iskandar Beg, referring to the appointment of a certain Adham Beg as kalantar of Tabrîz in 1015/1606-7, states that this office was "among the most important affairs" (as muqâsîl-i ta*rikhi-i Iran, Dastur al-muluk, ed. Iradj Afshar, Tehran, 1971, 264-9).

As the head of a town or district the kalantar held a position of respect similar to that of the ra'îs in the Saldjûk period, though it must not be assumed that the kalantar necessarily carried out the same functions everywhere or that his status was always the same. He was, like the earlier ra'îs, the link between the government and the taxpayers and his main duty was to reconcile the interests of the two parties. In some cases he received his appointment from the ruler (cf. the appointment of a village kalantar by Timûr mentioned by J. Aubin, Un santon de l'époque Timuride, in REI (1967), 211). The analogy between the kalantar and the ra'îs, however, must not be pressed too far. Under the Şafawids, the kalantar was more fully integrated into the official hierarchy than had been the ra'îs in Saldjûk times. In the case of Isfahan and of the major towns, the kalantar received his appointment from the shah. Iskandar Beg, referring to the appointment of a certain Adham Beg as kalantar of Tabrîz in 1015/1606-7, states that this office was "among the most important affairs" (as muqâsîl-i ta*rikhi-i Iran, Dastur al-muluk, ed. Iradj Afshar, Tehran, 1971, 264-9).

KALANDARIYYA — KALANTAR

KALANDARIYYA — KALANTAR

KALANTAR (Pers. kalân, "big, great") is used in the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries to mean "leader" (cf. Hâfiz Abrû, Cinq opuscules de Hâfiz-i Abrû concernant l'histoire de l'Iran au temps de Tamerlan, ed. F. Tauer, Prague 1959, 7; Mu'ûn al-Dîn Natanji, Muntakkab al-tawârîkh-i mu'tini, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 257, 258, 261), and occurs especially with reference to the tribal or the city and the inhabitants of the different districts had, with the government of Khurasan and Transoxania (Asud va muhtâbâh-i ta'rikhi-i Iran, ed. 'Abd al-`Ussayn Navâ', Tehran 1962, 322), in which the phrase it il va wilâ va kalânârân va sar khâyân va a`šâb va a`khdâm va farik-i Balâd is found in a document dated 874/1470 issued by Uzun Hasan for the
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KALANTAR (Pers. kalân, "big, great") is used in the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries to mean "leader" (cf. Hâfiz Abrû, Cinq opuscules de Hâfiz-i Abrû concernant l'histoire de l'Iran au temps de Tamerlan, ed. F. Tauer, Prague 1959, 7; Mu'ûn al-Dîn Natanji, Muntakkab al-tawârîkh-i mu'tini, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 257, 258, 261), and occurs especially with reference to the tribal or the city and the inhabitants of the different districts had, with the government of Khurasan and Transoxania (Asud va muhtâbâh-i ta'rikhi-i Iran, ed. 'Abd al-`Ussayn Navâ', Tehran 1962, 322), in which the phrase it il va wilâ va kalânârân va sar khâyân va a`šâb va a`khdâm va farik-i Balâd is found in a document dated 874/1470 issued by Uzun Hasan for the
approval of the kadkhudās, allocated this among their members and the inhabitants of the districts respectively and the documents recording this had been signed by the nakhš, these would be brought to the kalāntar for his signature and would be registered by the muhasṣīs-i mamlakā, who kept a register of the break-down of the taxes among the individual taxpayers belonging to the guilds and districts. The muhasṣīs-i mamlakā was, in effect, the kalāntar’s clerk and appointed with his approval. The seal of the kalāntar was required on orders for the payment of drafts made on the taxes of the guild or districts.

It was also the duty of the kalāntar to investigate and decide any disputes which might occur between the guilds or the inhabitants of a district concerning their trade, business, or activities and to prevent them exercising tyranny or oppression against one another. A number of attendants belonging to the diaryān (mulāzsīn-dī diaryān) were allocated to him to act as his subordinates to perform the various tasks which were referred to him by the diaryān (Dastīr al-mulāh, xvi/4, 421-2, 427, xvii/5-6, 549; see also Taghāhir al-mulāh, tr. and explained by V. Minor- sky, GMS, 1943, Persian text, fol. 76a ff.). He received wages, allocated on the taxes, and dues which he collected annually from the guilds according to custom (Dastīr al-mulāh, xvi/4, 422). Dues levied for the kalāntar (Kalāntārī, rūstām-i kalāntārī, marṣām-i kalāntār) are also attested in Āl Koyunlū documents (see text of a sayyārghāl granted by Rustam Beg dated 902/1496 and a grant of immunities from Ahmad Beg dated 901/1497, given by J. Aubin in Arch. persanes commences 12, Note préliminaire sur les archives du Tabārī, Tehrān 1993, 51, and A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant, Oxford 1953, 103, for a document dated 904/1498-9 for a sayyārghāl from Amir Alwand Āl Koyunlū).

The kalāntar of Isfahan had certain functions in connection with the reception of foreign envoys, and was consulted by the mhāmānd-bārgāh and the wazīr over the designation of their lodgings (Dostūr al-mulāh, xvii/4, 427; cf. also a document dated 1370/1717 from Shāh Sulṭān Husayn, instructing the diyāndābegī, vizier, kalāntar, and officials of Isfahan to hand over to a certain Frenchman the house in which he was to live, H. Busse, Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiwesen, Cairo 1959, 229). When Ḥumāyūn, the Great Moghul, came to Kazwīn during the reign of Ṭāhmasp he lodged with the kalāntar Khādīja ʿAbd al-Qānnī Diālādātī (Iskandar Beg, ʿĀlāmārā-yi ʿAbbāsī, i, 98). Tavernier, when he arrived in Isfahan in 1664, was met by the kalāntar of the Armenians, who was ordered to provide him with men to transport the presents he had brought for inspection at the court (Voyages en Perse, Geneva 1970, 116).

The duties which the kalāntar performed on behalf of the government were only one aspect of his functions. He was also, in the words of the Dostūr al-mulāh, the representative of the people (wakīl-i raʿāyatī). As such, it was his responsibility to present their affairs to the shah and others in authority, to remove tyranny and oppression which might afflict them, and to see that the orders and regulations issued by the guilds concerning their business and work were carried out. Similarly, he was required to be present on occasions when measures were taken affecting the interests of the people, as, for example, when claims for a reduction of taxation after some natural calamity were examined by the rayyāc (surveyor), or when disputes over the use of the water of the Zāyandarūd were investigated (Dostūr al-mulāh, xvii/5-6, 557).

The population probably had greater influence on the appointment of the kalāntar in the provinces than in the capital. A document dated Rabīʿ I 1107/1695 for the dismissal of a certain Khādīja Muhammad Taḵī, the kalāntar of Gīlān-i Bīyā Pas (Rasht and its dependencies), and the appointment of Khādīja Muhammad Saʿīd as his successor, states that the wazīr, deputy wazīr and mustaʿfiṭī of Gīlān-i Bīyā Pas, the local šaykh al-islām and the wazīr of the buyūlt-i ḥāṣa had investigated the dissatisfaction of the kadkhudās, taxpayers (arbāb-i bunātā), and people of the province with Khādīja Muhammad Taḵī and their wish that Khādīja Muḥammad Saʿīd, the former kalāntar, should be reappointed. The document records that they had reported that only 469 persons had expressed their satisfaction with Khādīja Muhammad Taḵī, while 2,177 persons had signified their desire for the reappointment of Khādīja Muḥammad Saʿīd; of these 983 had complained against Khādīja Muhammad Taḵī, while the rest had merely stated their support for the appointment of Khādīja Muḥammad Saʿīd. In the light of this, the latter was reappointed kalāntar and the population of the province was instructed not to oppose him in anything which he would contrive to bring ease of the people or increase the revenue of the diaryān. The document states that the wazīr and mustaʿfiṭī were not to make allocations on the revenue or interfere without his knowledge or permission (or that of the officials he might appoint). It was his responsibility to make charges on the revenue in accordance with the details received from the diaryān and to send to the diwān (Tehrān) at the end of the year a statement of these charges and of the taxes and dues and their allocation among the individual taxpayers together with the relevant documents and receipts duly sealed. He was also given general oversight of the purchase of silk from Gīlān by the royal administration, and had a watching brief over matters connected with law and order: disputes between the people were to be decided by the dārḵīs in his presence or that of the officials he appointed (Barrashā-yi tārīḵī, Tehrān, ii/2, 80-2; also in Yak sad o pāndāh sanād-i tārīḵī, op. cit., 54). An undated farāmān issued by Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn in favour of Amīr Muḥammad Šāmān b. Amīr Muḥammad Ḥusayn, after establishing the hereditary claim of Amīr Muḥammad Šāmān to the office of kalāntar of some of the provinces (wālāyāt) of Sīstān and mentioning that the claim of his grandfather Mīr Muḥammad Muʿīn had been recognized in Rāmāḏān 1068/ June-July 1658, subject to two-thirds of those whose names were on the tax-roll (bunātā) being agreeable to holding the office of kalāntar, appoints him to that office, provided his appointment is also supported by two-thirds of the people. His duties were similar to those of the kalāntar of Gīlān-i Bīyā Pas, except that he did not have special duties in connection with the silk trade (Asnād-i khāndān-i Kalāntārī-i Sīstān in Barrashā-yi tārīḵī, Tehrān, iv/5-6, 12-14). Cf. also two diplomas for the office of kalāntar of Tabrīz issued by Kārim Khān Šand, dated 1764 and 1773 respectively, which show that the wishes of the inhabitants were considered in the appointment of the kalāntar, at least in theory. Nādīr Mīrzā, Tārīḵ-e pānkārā-yi dār al-salām-i Tabrīz, Tehrān lith., 1905, 297 ff.)

In the smaller towns also the kalāntar was the spokesman of the people and could sometimes make his voice heard. For example when the kalāntar of
Sava and the people of that region complained to Shah Abbas in 999/1590-1 of the tyranny and exactations of Shah Kuli Sulṭān, the Turkoman governor, he was replaced by Gandj Ali Khān (Kādī Ahmad Kummi, Kūlāsādī al-tawārīkh, ed. H. Muller, Wiesbaden 1964, Persian text, 90). Several European observers in the 17th century state that the kalāntar’s function was to defend the people against the injustice and extortion of the government (cf. Du Mans, État de la Perse en 1660, Paris 1890, 36; Tavernier, Voyages en Perse, 260; Cornelle le Brun, Voyages de Corneille le Brun par la Moscovie, en Perse, et aux Indes orientales, Amsterdam 1718, i, 209).

The kalāntar of the Armenians of New Djlufa outside Isfahān, where Shāh ‘Abbās established an Armenian colony, was an important and influential official in Safavid times. He was normally an Armenian. His functions were similar to those of the kalāntar in other towns or districts of towns (see further H. Busse, Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzelwesen, 138 ff.; J. Carswell, New Djlufa, Oxford 1968, 78). An official known as the kalāntar was also well-known in Georgia in the 17th and 18th centuries and his functions seem broadly to have corresponded to those of the kalāntar in Persian towns (cf. Joseph Karst, Le Code de Vakhtang VI, Commentaire historique analytique, in Corpus Juris Ibero-Caucasici, Strasbourg 1937, iii, 564).

Usually, the kalāntar was a local man, and as with many other local officials there was a strong hereditary tendency in his office. Occasionally the kalāntar of one city might be transferred to another, but this was rare. Sometimes the kalāntar held some other office as well (cf. the case of Muḥammad Šālīb Beg, a Tiflisī, who died in 1031/1621-2, after having been at one time usūr of Shīrwān and later usūr and kalāntar of Kumm; Iskandar Beg, ‘Ālamārā-yi ‘Abbāsī, i, 991).

The fact that the kalāntar, while acting as the spokesman of the people, was also integrated into the official hierarchy made it easy for him, as soon as the hand of the central government was removed, to use the power and influence which he held as a government official to assert his independence. In the 18th century the kalāntars and kadkhudās of the cities and towns often emerged as local leaders in times of crisis. One such was Ḥādījī Ḥāshim, whose father Ḥādījī Ḥāshim had been kadkhudābādī of the Haydarī quarters of Shīrāz under Nādir Shāh. He became kalāntar of Shīrāz after the death of ‘Alī Murād Khān Zand and continued to hold this office under Lutfi Ḥālī, and in 1205/1791, when the latter abdicated himself from Shīrāz in an abortive attempt to seize Isfahān, took possession of the city, to surrender it in due course to ʿĀdū Mūḥammad Khān Kādī-jār, whose sadrī aʿrām he later became. Amin al-Dawla, one of Fath ʿAlī Shāh’s first ministers, was also, at the beginning of his career, kadkhudā of one of the districts of Isfahān and later kalāntar of the city.

Sir John Malcolm, writing in the early 19th century, states that “the Kalantar, or chief magistrate of the city, and the Kut-khodas, or magistrates of the different wards, though nominated by the king, must be selected from the most respectable inhabitants. They hold the power and influence which they derive from personal consideration to aid the authority of the government.” (History of Persia, London 1829, ii, 324-5). James Morier, about the same time, states that a kalāntar besides “the real governor resides in every city, town and village and superintends the collection of the tribute”. His account shows that there was a marked continuity of practice in the office of kalāntar. He states, “The Kelountar is a man of consequence wherever he presides; he is an officer of the crown, and once a year appears before the Royal presence, an honour which is not permitted to the Ket Khoda. He also receives wages from the King’s treasury, which the Ket Khoda does not. The Kelountar is the medium through which the wishes and wants of the people are made known to the King: he is their chief and representative on all occasions, and brings forward the complaints of the Rayats, wherever they feel oppressed. He also knows the riches of every Rayat, and his means of rendering the annual tribute: he therefore regulates the quota that every man must pay; and if his seal is not affixed to the document which the Rayat brings forward in the time of the levy, the assessment is not valid, and the sun cannot be received” (A journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to Constantinople in the years 1808 and 1809, London 1812, 235-6).

From about the middle of the 19th century, as the central government extended its operations, the office of kalāntar lost its importance. Its functions were largely taken over by officials of the ministry of finance. The kalāntar continued, however, under the government, to have some responsibility for local affairs, the guilds, and, to some extent, public order, but his duties and influence varied from place to place (cf. E. Aubin, La Perse, Paris 1908, 37, 38, 51). With the grant of the constitution in 1906 and the adoption of modern forms of government, the office of kalāntar lapsed, its various surviving functions being taken over by municipal and police officials. During the reign of Riḍū Shāh, the term kalāntārī became the official designation of a policeman.
information: thus at Tlemcen he met al-Kasim b. Sacld al-cUkbani (d. 854/1450) and Muhammad b. Ahmad Ibn Zaghb (d. 849/1443), both of whom had a great influence on him and acquainted him with the methods of arithmetic and their application to the problems of the fara'id. In Egypt he attended the lectures of Ibn Radjjar al-Asflalani (in 852/1448). Having returned from his pilgrimage, al-Kalasadi settled in Granada, consecrating his life to teaching and editing his numerous works. Of his pupils, Abú 'Abd Allâh al-Mallâhî, Abû 'Abd Allâh al-Sanûsî, and Ahmad b. 'Ali al-Balawi may be mentioned. The political and military situation was, however, deteriorating: the united houses of Aragon and Castile decided to launch the final attack against the last Muslim stronghold in Spain. Courageously, al-Kalasadi exerted himself in trying to organize resistance, but he was soon forced to join the Andalusian hordes of refugees that were spreading over the Maghrib. He died in Ifrîkiya at Bedjaa, on 15 Dhû 'l-Hijjâd 892/10 December 1486.

Al-Kalasadi was a prolific author on widely varying topics, some of whose works enjoyed considerable renown both in East and West. He was certainly a compiler, but distinguished himself by the originality of his composition and the multiplicity of personal examples. In his mathematical works, one notices the first use of a symbolization which he uses quite extensively in the presentation and writing down of equations, sc. the use of the letter $x$ (abbreviation of $shayt$ to represent the unknown ($a$), of the letter $m$ (for $maâl$) $= x^2$, of $k$ (for $ka'b$) $= x^2$, of $l$ (for $la'd$) to represent the symbol $= $, of $d$ (for $da'd$) $= y$. Al-Kalasadi's commentary on Ibn al-Banna's *Mukhtasar* al-`Attdbiyya, a fairly advanced formula for finding the approximate square root. Finally, attention may be drawn to a rational classification of the fractions by him and an exhaustive study of arithmetical procedures [see Al-Kasî]. Here follows a list of his works:


(M. Souissi)

**KALÂT** [see BALOCÍSTÁN].

**KALÂT AYYûB** now Calatayud, a fortress town in the Upper March (al-`Thâqîr al-`atâ`d) to the south-west of Saragossa, built near the site of the ancient Bilbis (Labla in Yâfût); it took its name from the *tâbi`* Ayyûb b. Hâbbâ al-Lakhrâmi, a *wâlée* who succeeded `Abd al-`A`azîr b. Mûsâ b. Nušayr. Situated 25 miles from Tudela and 30 miles from Medinaicai and Saragossa, the town possessed fertile, well-watered lands with orchards of figs and many fruit trees, yielding a fairly wide variety of produce which was sold at moderate prices. According to al-Bakrî, the local mountains produced a gum-resin (murra) of good quality. A type of ceramic with a golden glaze was manufactured in the town and exported. Al-`Idrîsî included the *balad* of Kalât Ayyûb in the *ikîm* of Arnedo (Arnu), along with Daroca, Huesca, Saragossa and Tudela, but in al-Bakrî's opinion it must have come under the last-named place for administrative purposes; according to al-Maqqari, Mo- lina was its *madina*. The territory of Kalât Ayyûb suffered from incidents arising from the behaviour of two powerful families who were not always subject to Cordoba, the Banû Kast (mawâllitâd) and the
Banu 'l-Muhadjir or Tuglbis (Arab). According to al-Qadi, the amir Muhammad rebuilt Kal'at Ayyub in 248/862. Under the domination of the Tuglbis, it was compelled on several occasions to submit to Cordoba during the caliphate. In the 5th/11th century it was ruled by Sulaymân b. Hūd who, on his death, left the town to his son Muhammad, but the latter swiftly handed it over to his brother Ahmad, lord of Saragossa. It is reasonable to suppose that Kal'at Ayyub was under the control of the Almoravids at least from 503/1109, and it remained in their possession until 25 Rabi' I 114/12 June 1120, when it was captured by Alfonso I of Aragon. The Muslims who stayed on in Calatayud after the Christian conquest formed a community living alongside Christians and Jews; they must have been far superior in numbers. The Jalón valley, where Calatayud is situated, was one of the regions of Aragon where there was a strong concentration of Moriscos.


KAL'AT BANI 'ABBĀS, a town in Algeria in the Bôbân mountains, about 35 km. northwest of Bordj Bâ 'Arridj. Situated at an altitude of about 1050 m., the town stands on a strategic position on a plateau surrounded on three sides by sheer ravines. From about 800-900 m. in depth, its only link with the surrounding country being a narrow strip of land, Kal'a enjoyed the benefits of a real neutrality. The tomb of Sidi Ahmad, the son of 'Abd al-Rahmân and ancestor of the Ulûd Mu'âkrân, was an object of veneration in the 18th century. It was also in Kal'a that Mu'âkrân, the leader of the 1871 revolt, was buried.


KAL'AT BANI HAMMÂD, a medieval town in the Central Magrib, situated in the Ma'dîd mountains, capital of the Banû Hâmâd dynasty [see Hâmâdîs]. It is also known as Kal'at Abi Tawîl (al-Bakrî, Istibdâr, etc.). The site of the town, now a mass of ruins, is in the form of a vast amphitheatre opening out onto the plain of the Hodna which it dominates from a height of about 550 m. The average altitude of the old city is 900 m. above sea level. To the north of it rises the massive truncated cone of Ta' ārîb (1418 m.), an arid mountain whose contours are marked by projecting spurs where the folds of rock are inverted; to the west is the Gerein range, which can be transversed in the direction of Msila only by a pass at the foot of the peak, which rises to 1110 m. To the south, the Djebel Rahma largely bars the view, except over its eastern flank, which is cut by the narrow valley of the Oued Frâjî, running from north to south, a gap revealing in the distance the plain with the glittering Chott
Hodna. The same torrent, flowing down from the
mountain through narrow gorges with steep sides, runs past the eastern part of the town. Beyond its
deeply embanked course rise various mountains ranging from 1000-1400 m. in height.

Well protected against any possible attacks from the plain, which can easily be watched, and situated only a short distance from the most usual east-west routes, the site has doubtless been occupied from the earliest times. Ruins dating from antiquity—not yet investigated scientifically and including the remains of some baths—indicate Roman occupation, though it is impossible to estimate either its extent or its character. In 335/947-8, the place may have seen mains of some baths—indicate Roman occupation, routes, the site has doubtless been occupied from only a short distance from the most usual east-west the plain, which can easily be watched, and situated

the tragic end of Abu Yazid [q.v.], the "Man on the donkey", since Mount Kiyānā, still called the moun-
tain of the "Adīśa, seems to tally closely with the modern Takarbūst on whose summit some ruins are to be seen. There can be no doubt that the strategic value of the place was well known to the Sanhādja; the reasons motivating Hammād, son of Buluggin, son of Zīrī, in his partial abandonment of the ancient capital Ašhīr are thus apparent. By choosing the Ka'lā site, he secured for himself a second base that was strong and particularly well protected against the ambitions of the Zanjāt in the plain; but also and above all, by building a stronghold there, he made clear his desire for independence from Bādīs, the Zīrid of Kayrawān. Ka'lā was to appear as a spear-
head directed towards the East. Some years later (405/1015), Hammād raised "the standard of revolt" and "proclaimed the sovereignty of the 'Abbāsīd caliphs". A new dynasty was born, and Ka'lā became the capital of an independent state.

If Ibn Khaldūn is correct, the town was built and populated by the forced transfer of the inhabitants of Msila and Sūk Hamza (Boura); other elements of the population, particularly the Djarawa, settled there themselves. Hammād’s first care was the building of strong ramparts, a palace, "several mosques, caravanserais and other public buildings". It is hard to believe, however, that as early as 401/1010, Ka'lā "attained a high degree of prosperity" and that "artisans as well as students flocked there from the remotest regions and the furthest points of the empire". In fact, at this period Hammād still seems to have been closely attached to Ašhīr, regarding Ka'lā as merely a secondary town. Bādīs, who had re-
acted vigorously against his uncle’s initiatives, attacked Ka'lā in 406/1015; it seemed that the town could not resist his assault, when the Zīrid suddenly died.

The very short-lived apoge of the town came during the reign of al-Nāṣir, son of ‘Alānmās (454/ 1062-481/1089) and his son and successor al-Mansūr (481/1089-496/1050). The sudden prosperity of Ka'lā is due to the misfortunes of Iṣrīkiya when it was in-
vaded by the Arab nomads; but also and above all, by building a stronghold there, he made clear his desire for independence from Bādīs, the Zīrid of Kayrawān, in particular, were depopulated, while Ka'lā, according to al-Bakri, became the metropolis after the ruin of Kayrawān: “the inhabitants of Iṣrīkiya flocked there to settle... the town is a trading centre which attracts caravans from ‘Irāk, the Hīdjas, Egypt, Syria and all parts of the Ma-
thrib”. However, from the beginning of his reign al-
Nāṣir bought an emergency outlet to the sea; he had the little port of Bougie put into order, and there his son built al-Mansūriya, where he later took refuge. The Hilāllīs [see HILLAI] held the whole Hodna plain as well as that of Sétif, as far as the Iron Gates; despite a treaty, the Aḥbādī made the city’s existence more and more difficult, subjecting it to a terrible blockade. In the 6th/12th century, the power of Ka'lā declined continuously, to the advantage of Bougie, and in 543/1148-9 Yabāy the son of al-'Azzī removed all articles of value and transported them to Bougie. Shortly after 547/1152, Ka'lā was taken by storm by the Almohads, who "destroyed it utterly". However, the armies of 'Abd al-Mu'min installed themselves there and formed a garrison, restoring various ruined buildings and reconstructing a small oratory in the remains of the Great Mosque. The Banū Qanīyya occupied the town for a time, but they were dislodged by the Almohads after a three month’s siege (1185). After this date, noth-
ing more was heard of the former capital of the Hammādīs.

The population consisted firstly of the Sanhādja, kinsmen of Hammād who probably constituted a privileged class, secondly of the citizens of Msila and Sūk Hamza, whose origin was complex, and finally of the Djarawa, whose quarter, to the east of the town, seems to have been walled off from the other quarters of the town. There stood the Kasr al-Manār and its keep, the top of which commanded a view over the whole city and its environs. This situation corresponds so very closely to the text of Peter the Deacon that it is tempting to see in the Djarawa the famous Christians cited in the Chronique du Mont Cassin who were said to have had a church dedicated to the Virgin. Towards the end of the 5th/11th century, the population was augmented by new arrivals from Kayrawān, heterogeneous ethnic elements who included some Jews (there is in fact a record of the presence in Ka’la of the Jewish scholar Isaac Alfāsī, who apparently left for Spain at the end of the 11th century).

The topography of the town reveals an almost rectangular enceinte facing the south (approximately 950 by 500 m.), enclosing on three sides the town which is built on the last ridges of Takarbūst; despite the natural defence afforded by the precipi-
tous flanks of this massif, to the north of the town, the wall climbs high up the mountain, runs across its peak and comes down on the east to rejoin the quarter of the Djarawa. Similarly, on the west it follows the summit ridge of Gorein and climbs up to the peak, descending sharply to the bed of the oued, beyond which is the gate known as Bāb al-Dīrāwā, leading to Msila. An almost rectilinear axis connects this gate with Bāb al-Awkās, leading to Burdij Redir, to the north-east of the city, at the edge of the Djarā-
wa quarter; a third gate, to the south-east, Bāb al-
Djarawa, opens towards the Hodna valley. To the south of the east-west axis stand the ruins of the Great Mosque whose minaret still rises to a height of more than twenty metres. To the north of the same axis, on ridges fairly well isolated from one another, towards the west, can be seen the ruins of the Kasr al-Salām and then, further to the east, the Kasr al-
Kawkab and the Kasr al-Mulk, better known as Kasr al-Bahr because of the large sheet of water lying to its south, upon which nautical jousting (istibdar) probably took place. Finally, towards the east, in the Djarawa quarter can be seen the ruins of the Manār keep and those of the palace of the same name.

Identified by Méquesse in 1886, the old Hammādī city was investigated by P. Blanchet and A. Robert in subsequent years. Excavations on a quite considerable scale were undertaken by General de Béyfis; they concentrated upon the Manār keep, the Kasr al-Bahr and the mosque. From 1951 to 1962, new excavations were conducted by L. Golvin, particularly on the
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Kasr al-Manar and the Kasr al-Salam; numerous silos were discovered in the latter group of buildings, appearing to confirm al-Idrīsī’s statement: “There were... stores of such excellence that it (corn) could be kept for one and even two years, without fear of the least deterioration”. Still more recent excavations, which are being undertaken at the present time under the direction of R. Bourouiba, have succeeded in isolating the Kasr al-Manar completely; it is in enabling the excavators to draw up a more convincing plan of the mosque than that given by Beylîé to be drawn up.

The art of Kal'a reveals some originality, particularly in the deeply cut vertical niches in the façades of the Manār, and above all in its system of square, superimposed rooms, forming a central hall around which ramps are placed, roofed over with cradle vaulting, a foreshadowing of the great Almohad minarets at the end of the 6th/12th century (Kutubiyya, the Hassan Tower, the Girālda). The minaret of the mosque, square in shape, is much closer to those in Muslim Spain than to those in Ifriqiyya; on its south face it is ornamented with a rich decoration of deeply cut recesses set with polychrome tiles, the antecedents and continuation of which are little understood, while lobed interlaced arches, sometimes bordering shell-shaped or saucer-shaped semi-domes, call to mind Fāṭimīd Egypt. To Egypt should be attributed the hanging honeycomb vaulting (Mukarnās), probably the earliest in the Muslim West. Elsewhere, decorations of carved plaster may be compared with those in Sāmarrā, but here also is a reminder of Egyptian craftsmanship; and very beautiful enameled or painted decoration, polychrome tiles, hangings, honeycomb vaulting, a foreshadowing of the great Almohad minarets, are displayed.

Several painted frescoes, numerous ceramic fragments of carved plaster may be compared with those of the Manār, and above all in its system of square, superimposed rooms, forming a central hall around which ramps are placed, roofed over with cradle vaulting, to which ramps are placed, roofed over with cradle vaulting, a foreshadowing of the great Almohad minarets, are displayed.
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1. General view of the Takarbûst and the mosque.
2. View of the Takarthist and the Gorge.
3. Minaret of the mosque.
4. The keep of Ḥar al-Munaḥ.
KA'LAT HUWWARA — KA'LAT AL-SHAKIF

KA'LAT NADJM, a fortress in northern Syria, situated on the right bank of the Euphrates, which in the medieval period commanded the route from Halab to Harrän, in Upper Mesopotamia, via Manbijdi. This fortress stood at a point where the Euphrates was relatively easy to cross, owing to the existence of two small islands which facilitated the construction of pontoon bridges. It is thought that the fortress stands on a Classical site, but the identification of this presents some problems: the most tenable hypothesis appears to be the identification of the site with the Caeciliana of Roman itineraries.

In the oldest Arab texts, the locality is called Djdhr Manbijdi, and these add that the bridge over the Euphrates, which had formerly existed, was constructed at the order of the Caliph 'Uthmân. The name of Ka'lat Nadjm was rarely mentioned before the 6th/12th century; it seems to derive from a certain ghulâm called Nadjm who, in 300/912, re-founded the town. Certain maps and even texts are therefore mistaken when they give the name as Kal'at al-Nadjm. However, it seems that this name was deliberately adopted by these authors as more poetic, dubbing the fortress "the castle of stars".

The bridge of Ka'lat Nadjm played an important role from the earliest years of Islam. The region was conquered in 18/639 and the bridge is mentioned in accounts of the struggle between `All and Mu'âwiya. By this route the Umayyad armies won Mesopotamia. Subsequently, Ka'lat Nadjm was part of the Hamdânid [q.v.] domain, then that of the Mirdâsids [q.v.], and the Banû Numayr [q.v.], before falling into the hands of Zankî, of Nur al-Din [q.v.], and then of the Ayyûbîds [q.v.]. Nûr al-Dîn restored the fortress (which twenty years later Ibn Džubayr called a "new castle"), placing an important garrison there.

Later, probably in 68/1280, Hülâgû had to give battle to secure the fortresses which commanded the Euphrates crossings; at that time Barhebraeus, bishop of Aleppo, made his way to the conqueror to seek mercy for the Christians and was imprisoned at Ka'lat Nadjm.

The fortress of Ka'lat Nadjm, which was described by many travellers of the 10th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, stands isolated on a rocky eminence at a height of about 50 metres. The castle itself comprised two storeys and certain parts were damaged when the castle, where a rebel Arab had taken refuge, was captured by the Ottomans in 1820. Three Arabic inscriptions mention works undertaken at the orders of the Ayyûbid al-Malik al-Zâhir, son of Salâb al-Dîn, between 605/1208 and 612/1215. Of the little town which, according to the Arab geographers, lay along the bank of the river and at the foot of the fortress, no identifiable vestiges remain. The ancient bridge has also disappeared.


(D. SOURDEL)

KA'LAT RABĀH, Sp. Calatrava, town of Muslim Spain, of which the ruins are to be seen at Calatrava la Vieja on the left bank of the R. Guadiana about 15 km. north-north-east of Ciudad Real. According to the Râwâd al-mîjâr the town was founded in Umayyad times and peopled by the inhabitants of decaying Urtl (Oreto), about 40 km. to the south. The eponymous Rabâb is unidentified; the common belief that the place was named after the tâbi' 'All (or 'Ubayy) b. Rabâb seems to be an unfounded conjecture. It was the capital of an extensive region divided into dâ'is, which word in Andalusian usage (says Yâkût) was the equivalent of dinâm. The adîs of Bakr, Lakhm and Djudham are recorded. The marshy region to the north-east of Ka'lat Rabâh was well known to topographical writers as the place where the upper Guadiana (under which name they confused several rivers, e.g., Gigueta, Rânasares) disappeared underground and reappeared several times before emerging finally at Ka'lat Rabâb [see Wâdî vâla]. Dimâşkhî (q.v.) says that red arsenic or realgar (rabâdî l-zâhâ) is found there.

Standing in Toledan territory on the main highway between Córdoba and Toledo not far from Christian lands, Ka'lat Rabâb had an eventful history and is frequently mentioned in the literature, though without details. It fell into Christian hands for the first time in 478/1085 when Alfonso VI annexed Toledo, but this occupation came to an end with the arrival of the Almoravids (Battle of Zallâkâ [q.v.], 479/1086) though Toledo itself was not taken and never again came under Muslim rule. With the erosion of Almoravid power Ka'lat Rabâb was once more under Christian rule by 541/Jan. 1147 and remained so until the Muslims, in the shape of the Almohads, again reasserted their authority for a few years in 592/1196. (Alarcos, the scene of the celebrated Almohad victory in the previous year, is a short distance downstream from Ka'lat Rabâb [see AL-ARAK]). It finally surrendered to Alfonso VIII in 609/1212 immediately before the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa [see AL-TIKAR]. It did not recover any measure of prosperity and in 1252 the capital of the region became Villa Real, newly founded by Alfonso the Wise. It was renamed Ciudat Real in 1429.

The religious order of the Knights of Calatrava was founded in 1158 during the second Christian occupation with the purpose of fighting the Moors. The name Calatrava still exists as an element in numerous toponyms of the region.

Bibliography: Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Hîmyar Al-râud al-mîjâr, s.v.; Yâkût, s.v. Rabâb; Dimâșkhî, Nûakhtî al-dâhî, 424. (J. P. F. HOPKINS)

KA'LAT AL-ROM [see RÔM KA'LEST]

KA'LAT AL-SHAKIF (the "Citadel of the Rock") is the Crusaders' castle of Beaufort. It is also known by the name of Shaki' Arûn. On the testimony of the Arab authors, Yâkût among others, it was long believed that 'Arûn was the Arabic transcription of the name Arûn, a Frank said to have been lord of the region. In fact, it is a toponym which occurs even in the Bible (Joshua, XII, 11); its position to the west of the Jordan indicates that it corresponds to the present village of 'Arun which, in former times, marked the frontier of the land of Moab. From the earliest remains it may be supposed that a
military settlement existed on the site during the Roman period, beside the Leuctrum.

The castle, which was considered impregnable, is situated at an altitude of 670 m., high on a rocky crest, at the extreme southern end of the mountain range of Lebanon. To the east, standing above a sheer drop of 300 m., it dominates the deep and narrow valley of the Nahr al-Kasimiyya, forming the dividing line between the mountains of Lebanon and the plateau of Galilee.

Kal'at al-Shakif stands in an important strategic position, for it effectively controls a two-arched bridge over the Litâni, the Dijâzn and Saydâ, as well as several roads which meet at the bottom of the valley, including the roads from Bânyas to Saydâ via Nabâtîyâ and from Bânyas to Beirut via Dijâzn and Dâyr al-Kamar, and the road from Şûr (Tyre) to Damascus. The castle commands the entrance to Palestine; it guards the southern passage from the Bûk'ân, access to Syria from the south, and access from the coastal region of Şûr and from Saydâ. It is linked with several other fortresses, including Subayba to the south-east, Hûnûn to the south, Tîbnîn to the south-south-west, Kal'at Mârûn to the south-west and Saydâ to the north-west.

The whole complex of buildings, constructed on two levels, follows the configuration of the ground and takes the form of an elongated triangle about 140 m. long, with its base (about 38 m. wide) at the southern end. A ditch 15 to 36 m. wide, cut out of the rock on the north, west and south sides, forms a barrier between the plateau and the site of the fortress, which is inaccessible from the east. Opposite the entrance, two piers about 4.30 m. apart made it possible to cross the ditch by means of a bridge which could be destroyed in the event of an attack, and to reach a small artificially levelled area on the south side of the crest. Today Kal'at al-Shakif is in a very ruined condition. It is divided into various sections surrounded by two enceintes constructed of courses of large blocks of stone, the surface of the stone-work being left rough: to the east, above the ravine, is a group of buildings in the lower courtyard defended by four round towers linked together by curtain walls, and to the west is the upper part, which forms a redoubt accessible by means of an interior ramp. Such is the fortress itself, which includes several sections built at different periods. For the mediaeval period we can distinguish five separate programmes of alterations and construction: 1119 to 1119 (Crusaders), 1190 to 1220 (Franks of Saydâ), 1220 to 1268 (Temporals), 1268 onwards (Mamlûk). When the Crusaders arrived, Kal'at al-Shakif formed part of the province of Damascus. In 1133/113, the atabeg Shihâb ad-Dîn ceded the fortress to Fulk, king of Jerusalem, who entrusted it to Reynald, lord of Saydâ, since it controlled access to his territory. The irregularly shaped keep standing in the middle of the west front and typical of the Crusaders' earliest constructions dates from this period; it consists of two storeys and a terrace, the old curtain wall of the enceinte leaving it projecting; the rough surface of the stone-work is a characteristic feature of the period. After the battle of Hattin (q.v.), the Frankish castles still retained their garrisons, but through lack of man-power they no longer received any reinforcements or relief troops, and one after another they fell into the hands of the Muslims. Salah ad-Dîn (q.v.) prepared to lay siege to Kal'at al-Shakif on 17 Rabî' I 585/12 May 1189. Reynald of Sagette obtained a three months' truce, and took advantage of it to improve the castle's defences: the curtain walls were strengthened, and living-quarters were constructed in the courtyard. Stone-work with a more finished surface and stirrup-shaped arrow loops characterize this second period. In Rabî' II/August, the siege was resumed; in the end the fortress was starved out and surrendered on 15 Rabî' I 586/12 April 1190. Then began half a century of Muslim occupation (586-637/1190-1240). The Ayyûbîd al-Malik ad-Adil (q.v.) undertook various building operations, including some alterations to the first enceinte on the south side; he also constructed a new section of wall flanked by massive cylindrical towers with an entrance, to the east, giving access to an oblong armoury leading to the terreplein of the castle.

In 637/1240 al-Salih Ismâ'îl, prince of Damascus, was in conflict with his nephew al-Salih Ayyûb, the ruler of Egypt; to win the support of the Franks and Templars, he offered to restore to them the region of Saydâ, Kal'at al-Shakif, Tiberias and Şafad. The garrison of al-Shakif refused to surrender the fortress, and Ismâ'îl was compelled to besiege it in order to gain possession and to hand it over to the people of Sagette, the son of Reynald and a member of the Ibelin family. The castle was almost immediately, and his son Julian inherited the fortress, which he held until 1260. Crippled by debts and unable to strengthen the fortress to meet the threat from the troops of Baybars (q.v.), he sold it to the Templars and joined their ranks. The Templars improved its defences: on the east side, opposite the keep, they built a large hall with two vaulted bays over ogival windows and, about 245 m. to the south, the new castle, a small outwork destined to be destroyed eight years later. On 19 Rabî' II/April 1266, the sultan Baybars appeared before al-Shakif and bombarded the fortress with 26 sieve-engines for ten days. The garrison of Templars surrendered, the women and children were sent to Şûr, and the garrison itself, consisting of 480 men and 22 knights, was sent into captivity. The sultan appointed the amir Şârid ad-Dîn Kaymaz Kâfûr as governor and the amir Sayf ad-Dîn Balâbân Zaynî as superintendent of works; the latter restored the fortress and placed on the walls the heraldic device of Baybars, a feline passant. In the Mamlûk period, Kal'at al-Shakif was the centre of one of the eleven districts of the miyâba of Şafad.

At the beginning of the 11th/12th century, when the amir Fâkhr ad-Dîn Ma'n (q.v.) revolted against the Ottomans, he drove out the Ottoman garrison and tried to repair the citadel's defences, to withstand the troops sent by Eftâh' Ahmad Pâshâ from Damascus in 1022/1613. The fortress had stocks of water, oil and provisions for 500 men. Al-Shakif possessed three cannons for defence, while the attacking forces had only one which exploded at the second shot; the only damage suffered by the fortress was the destruction of an outer tower caused by the accidental explosion of a powder store. Eventually the troops from Damascus withdrew, after a siege lasting for 84 days. Fâkhr ad-Dîn entrusted the fortress to a Sukmân chief, Husayn Ţawîl, with stocks of food for three years. Shortly after the arrival of the Sukmâns, the latter betrayed the Ma'n and joined the Harîflâh. Sappers sent from Damascus then dismantled the fortresses of Bânyas and al-Shakif in 40 days.

At the beginning of the 18th century, al-Shakif
became the centre of one of the three districts of DJabal 'Amila, a region inhabited by the Mutawali, whose chiefs at that time belonged to the Yemeni section of the Shīṭite tribe of the Banū Sa'b. At the end of the 18th century, the fortress was included in the territories of the Druze and came under the pashalik of Sa'yada, while all around it, according to Volney, the best tobacco in Syria was grown. At the beginning of the 20th century al-Shakif formed part of the district of Sa'yada, on the borders of the districts of Şür and Mu'assasat Şeyh. In 1970 the castle was under the kadā' of Nabatiyya.

**Bibliography:** Yâkût, Muğṣūm al-Salih al-Nadim al-Adil (1000–1070), The Life of Sultan Salamish reigned for only three months, during which time his atabak Kalawun was the real ruler. Kalawun's name was mentioned in the Friday Khalt al-Shakif - Kalawan

The Mamluks then asked Kalawun to accept the post of commander of a thousand Mamluks, becoming one of their leading figures. In 627/1229 he fled with other Mamluk leaders such as Baybars, Sunqur, and Baysara to Syria in order to escape the likely revenge of Aybak, whom they had tried to depose. He spent about three years in Syria in the service of the Mamluk al-Nasir II al-Salih al-Din Yusuf (648/1250-650). In 653/1257 Kalawan and his fellow Bahtū Mamlūkīs fell foul of al-Nasir and were forced to leave him. They thereupon entered the service of the Mamluk al-Mughīth Fakhr al-Din 'Umar in Karak. The amīr Kutuz, the deputy of the Mamluk Sultan Nur al-Din 'Ali b. Aybak, sent an army to meet the fugitive Bahtū Mamlūkīs on their way to Karak. The Mamlūkīs were defeated and Kalawan was taken prisoner to Egypt. He did not stay long in Cairo but disappeared and fled to Karak in the same year (655/1257).

Kalawan remained in Karak for about two years, until 679/1280, when he returned to Egypt accompanied by other exiled Mamlūkīs. They were welcomed by the new Sultan Kūṭūṭ, at that time preparing to meet the invading Mongols, who were defeated near Nābulus in 658/1260. Kalawan was among the Mamlūkīs who helped Baybars I in his attempt to kill Sultan Kūṭūṭ and seize the throne in the same year. Baybars trusted Kalawan and promoted him to the position of commander of a thousand amīrs (amīr al-af). In 671/1272 Kalawan accompanied Sultan Baybars in a campaign against the Mongols. He distinguished himself as the first amīr to cross the Euphrates, thus gaining an advantage over the enemy. During the reign of Baybars, he became very close to the sultan, and in 675/1276 gave his daughter in marriage to Baybars' son, al-Malik al-Sa'di Baraka Khan. Baybars celebrated the event with great festivity.

In 676/1277 Baybars died, and was succeeded by his son. Kalawan, as father-in-law of the sultan, became the most eminent and important of the amīrs. In 676/1277 Sultan Baraka Khan sent Kalawan on a campaign against the Armenians. During this campaign, Kalawan rose to a higher position among the Mamlūkīs, becoming one of their leading figures. In 627/1229 he fled with other Mamluk leaders such as Baybars, Sunqur, and Baysara to Syria in order to escape the likely revenge of Aybak, whom they had tried to depose. He spent about three years in Syria in the service of the Mamluk al-Nasir II al-Salih al-Din Yusuf (648/1250-650). In 653/1257 Kalawan and his fellow Bahtū Mamlūkīs fell foul of al-Nasir and were forced to leave him. They thereupon entered the service of the Mamluk al-Mughīth Fakhr al-Din 'Umar in Karak. The amīr Kutuz, the deputy of the Mamluk Sultan Nur al-Din 'Ali b. Aybak, sent an army to meet the fugitive Bahtū Mamlūkīs on their way to Karak. The Mamlūkīs were defeated and Kalawan was taken prisoner to Egypt. He did not stay long in Cairo but disappeared and fled to Karak in the same year (655/1257).

Kalawan remained in Karak for about two years, until 679/1280, when he returned to Egypt accompanied by other exiled Mamlūkīs. They were welcomed by the new Sultan Kūṭūṭ, at that time preparing to meet the invading Mongols, who were defeated near Nābulus in 658/1260. Kalawan was among the Mamlūkīs who helped Baybars I in his attempt to kill Sultan Kūṭūṭ and seize the throne in the same year. Baybars trusted Kalawan and promoted him to the position of commander of a thousand amīrs (amīr al-af). In 671/1272 Kalawan accompanied Sultan Baybars in a campaign against the Mongols. He distinguished himself as the first amīr to cross the Euphrates, thus gaining an advantage over the enemy. During the reign of Baybars, he became very close to the sultan, and in 675/1276 gave his daughter in marriage to Baybars' son, al-Malik al-Sa'di Baraka Khan. Baybars celebrated the event with great festivity.
prayer and struck on the coins along with that of Salamish. At last in 678/1279 Salamish was deposed, and Kalawün was saluted as sultan, taking the title al-Malik al-Manṣūr.

As soon as he was acknowledged as sultan, Kalawün arrested a group of Zāhirī amirs, that is to say, amirs belonging to the late Sultan al-Zāhir Baybars. Prompted by purely political motives, Kalawün abolished certain taxes such as a war-tax which was collected whenever the sultan made preparations for a campaign. During the first year of his sultanate, Kalawün faced opposition from several of Baybars’ amirs who had their own claims to the sultanate. One of them, the amir Sunqur al-Aṣghar (“the ruddy”) proclaimed himself sultan in Syria with the name al-Malik al-Kāmil. Sunqur gained the support of Baybars’ Mamũks, the Bedouin tribes of Syria and the Ayyūbid amir of Hamah. Kalawün sent against him a strong army headed by the amir Badr al-Dīn Bakītāsh al-Fakhīr. The two armies met at al-Diṣṣūra near Damascus in 679/1280. Sunqur was defeated and fled to the Bedouin Arabs, asking the Mongols for assistance. In the following year, when both sides learned about the advent of the Mongols, Sunqur made peace with Kalawün.

Like Baybars I, Kalawün was successful in defending Syria against the Mongols, who had now taken advantage of the confusion in Syria resulting from Sunqur’s revolt. Led by Mangūṭīmūrī, a brother of the Ilkhan Abākā, the Mongols, together with their Georgian, Frankish and Armenian allies, had managed to cross the Euphrates and invade Syria. Kalawün came to Syria with his army, which was augmented by additional troops from various parts of Syria. The two armies met in 680/1281. The Mongols were severely defeated and forced to withdraw from Syria. Both Mangūṭīmūrī and Abākā died in the same year. Abākā’s successor, Abmad Tegūder (Takūdār), was a convert to Islam. He tried to establish good relations with Kalawün, exchanging letters and embassies with him. In 683/1284, Abmad Tegūder was murdered and his brother Arghūn succeeded him. Arghūn, who remained a pagan and was very hostile toward the Muslims, attempted, unsuccessfully, to persuade the pope and the king of France to help him in a Crusade against the Mamũkhs.

As for the Crusaders, Kalawün followed the example of Baybars I in pursuing the holy war against them in Syria. During the struggles with Sunqur and the Mongols, Kalawün had made a truce with the Crusaders, which led to a temporary cessation of hostilities. Having brought these struggles to a successful conclusion, he broke the truce and conducted a series of raids into Crusader territory. In 684/1285 he attacked the fortress of the Knights Hospitalers at Marḵāb and, after a siege of 38 days, succeeded in capturing it. The historian Abu ʿl-Fīdā (d. 733/1333), who was at that time 16 years old—participated with his father and cousin in this battle. He reports that after the capture of Tripoli he crossed over to an island outside the port where he was oppressed by the foul smell of decaying corpses lying there. In the following year (689/1290) the people of ‘Akkā (Acre) broke the truce by robbing and killing some Muslim merchants. Kalawün proclaimed a holy war, but as he was about to attack Acre, he died in his tent on the outskirts of Cairo.

This task was therefore left to his son and successor al-Malik al-ʿAṣḥaf al-Khālīl, who captured the city in 690/1291.

Kalawün also took the offensive against the Christian Armenians. The Kingdom of Little Armenia was raided in 682/1283. After two years the Armenians were forced to conclude a truce for ten years. They agreed to pay an annual tribute consisting of a large quantity of Armenian silver coins, and to release all Muslim prisoners.

In order to extend Mamũk rule in the south, Kalawün waged war against Nubia in 686/1288 and 688/1289. He sent two expeditions, headed by some of the ablest amirs, to punish Shāmāmūn of Nubia. Shāmāmūn had been playing a kind of “hide and seek” with the Mamũk army. At last he sent a delegation, bearing a gift and the normal tribute, bahīf (g.n.), to Egypt and begged forgiveness. These offerings were accepted and the delegation was kindly received. Nubia remained subordinate to the Mamũk sultanate.

Kalawün preserved and strengthened the good diplomatic and trade relations established by Baybars I with foreign powers. He also maintained good relations with the Mongols of the Golden Horde, Andronikos II Palaeologus of the Byzantine Empire, King Alfonso of Castile, James of Sicily and Rudolf I of Habsburg. He concluded, further, a commercial treaty with the republic of Genoa. Hoping to attract merchants to Egypt as a means of encouraging Egyptian trade, Kalawün issued a charter of safe conduct (amān [q.v.]) to foreign merchants coming from China, India, Yemen and others countries which is preserved in Kalkashandī’s Subh al-ʿAṣṣāhī. As an encouragement to internal trade Kalawün abolished a sub-category of the sakāt tax, called sakāt al-dawlabā, which was payable by Muslim shopkeepers on their merchandise, realizing that it tended to impoverish the merchants.

Kalawün bequeathed the most important monuments of the Mamũk period. He restored the citadels of Aleppo, Baalbek and Damascus. In Cairo, he erected a hospital (al-bimāristān al-Manṣūrī), which is perhaps the most remarkable building of the Mamũk era. It consists of many wards for various diseases, a lecture room, laboratories, a dispensary, baths, kitchens and store-rooms. This hospital was open to men and women, rich and poor, residents and transients from all countries and provinces, without distinction of origin or rank. Every patient leaving the hospital received a gift of money and clothing. The hospital was connected with a school mosque and a mausoleum which is decorated with remarkable arabesque tracery and fine marble mosaic. The school mosque, which was designed for the education of approximately 60 orphans, was equipped with a library containing a fine collection of medical, theological and legal books. Nuwayri, who was the nāṣir of Kalawün’s hospital and its wakīf, provides in his book Nikāyat al-arab valuable data about the properties, shops, public baths, and farms which constituted the wakīf assigned by Kalawün for the maintenance of his tomb, school and hospital.
Kalawun died on Saturday 7 Dhu 'l-Kacda 689/11 November 1290. He had proved to be brave, patient, generous, just and mild. It is said that he could express himself in Arabic only with great difficulty. He was the only Mamluk sultan who succeeded in founding a dynasty capable of holding the sultanate for several generations. All the Mamluk sultans from 689/1290 until 784/1382 were his descendants, except those who were his Mamluks; i.e., Kitbugha, Lajjin, and Baybars II al-Djafrakil. Kalawun established the Burdj or Cassian Mamluks, the second line of the Mamluk sultans, ruled Egypt and Syria from 784/1382 until the end of the Mamluk sultanate in 922/1517.


Hassanein Rabi

KALB pl. ṣulub (A.), "heart".

I. MYSTICISM

In Sūfī terminology the "heart" plays a large part, for it is viewed both as the source of man's good and evil aspirations and as the seat of learning or religious apprehension and of divine visitations. The 'ilm al-ḥulub wa-l- ḥulaf, "science of hearts and movements of the soul", owes its origin to al-Hasan al-Baṣrī, one of the earliest writers on tāṣawwuf (cf. L. Massignon, La passion d'al-Hallâdî, Paris 1922, 468).

The role allotted to "heart" in the personality and understanding of man is in strict conformity with Semitic tradition, and the Sūfī "science of hearts" is firmly based on the Kur'ān. While 'aql, "intellect", has no place in the vocabulary of the Kur'ān, kalb is repeatedly employed. It is with his heart that man "understands", just as he sees with his eyes and hears with his ears (e.g., Kur'ān, VII, 179, XXII, 46). Of those who neither understand nor hear the Word of God it is said, "it is not their eyes that are blind, but the hearts in their breasts" (XXII, 46). Such blindness of the heart is a denial, the origin of ignorance. Thus God "seals the hearts" of "those who do not know" and does not guide them in the true way (VII, 101, X, 74, XXX, 59, etc.). God "sets a seal on the heart of every haughty tyrant" (XL, 35). In tafsīr and 'ilm al-kalām, the "seal affixed to the heart" was to become one of the most controversial questions in the consideration of man's freedom of action (e.g., Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Ma-fāth al-qāyub, on Kur'ān, XVII, 23).

So it is from his heart that man's awareness or ignorance of God originates. But far from being merely an intellectual apprehension, this is a knowledge which demands the whole of one's life. So that the heart may be truly the seat of divine knowledge, it must be "assuaged by a remembrance of God" (XIII, 28), be pure (XXVI, 69; XXXVI, 84) and contrite (L, 33); it must be filled with takrūr, referential awe of the Lord (XXII, 32). It is one of the main sciences; it is also the home of that mercy, that "faith above faith" which is the divine dwelling-place: God Himself "causes His Presence to be marked out for severe punishment on the Day of Judgement, and the hearts of those who do not believe (sakina) to descend to the hearts of Believers so that they may add faith to their faith" (XLVIII, 4). The hearts of those who are guilty, however (XV, 12; XXVI, 200), which are "marked out for severe punishment", and the hearts of "those who do not believe in the Hereafter" (XXXIX, 45), "shudder" (ibid.); terror will strike the hearts of the impious (kuffār, III, 151, VIII, 12).

Closely related to these texts is L. Massignon's comment (op. cit., 489): "In sum, the Kur'ān made the heart the source of the knowledge and conscience; since he can in no way "hold back" the irreparable dispersion of his resources (in movements and feelings), man can regain possession of himself only within his own self, in his takrīb, in his heart". This he does "against the grain of the countermanding fleshly lusts, which all Muslim writers locate in the liver and bile" (ibid., n. 7).

Consequently, the deepening experience of faith and the search for understanding God, which was the first and constant aims of tāṣawwuf, become linked with the study of the "science of hearts", the 'ilm al-ḥulub to use al-Hasan al-Baṣrī's expression. The following distinctions were formulated: the seat of thought and awareness of self lay not in the brain but in the heart, a bodily organ (qism), a morsel of flesh (madīqa, madīq), situated in the hollow of the breast whose beats both gave life and indicated the presence of life. There in the heart lies the "secret and hidden (sirr) home of the conscience, whose secrets (nafs) will be revealed on Judgement Day" (L. Massignon, op. cit., 478). The role of the spiritual master (ghayb) regarding the novice (murād) is to teach him this "science of desires, thoughts and inner impulses, to teach him to recognize and overcome those aspirations which come from the physical soul" (nafs), and to gather up and protect the inspirations from the "heavenly spiritual breath" (ruh) through which God reveals Himself to man. Everything that enables man to battle against cupidity and the passions, all that can strengthen his faith (imān) and foster his surrender to God (islām), becomes part of "the science of hearts". Thus the celebrated Sūfī treatise by Abū Tašīl al-Makki (4th/10th century), which covers the final steps in the path to divine union, is called Kūt al-ḥulūb ("Food for Hearts", numerous eds., especially Cairo 1351/1932). In a closely related sense, Babya
ibn Pakūda, an Andalusian Jew who wrote in Arabic in the 5th/6th century and was strongly influenced by Sufi ideas, entitled his spiritual treatise ‘Introduction to the Duties of the Heart’, *Hidāya ila ḥaraqāt al-kalb*.

This stress placed on the ‘heart’, the organ of conscience and seat of religious knowledge and of life in the presence of God, is in no respect an emotionalization of religious values. It stems from an experimentally based anthropology in which understanding and will are united in an existential mode of behaviour which binds man and his destiny. It remains in complete harmony with one of the most dominant notes in the Sufi teaching. Here, *kalb* comes close to the Sūfī idea of *maʿrifa*, the direct awareness of the ‘initiate’ (*drīf*).

A great many works of *taṣawwuf* deal with the ‘science of hearts’, but here we will restrict our enquiry to one of the most characteristic examples. One of the best, and most famous, expositions is that of Abū Hāmid al-Ghazālī, notably in his *Ihya* *uluḥm al-dīn*, which follows in the same tradition as Abū Tālib al-Makki and in fact reproduces whole passages from the *Kūt al-kulub*. However, the influence of Hellenic philosophy led al-Ghazālī to set out clearly the problem of the heart as one of the foundations of the human personality. While it may be legitimate to stress the ethical end of the ‘science of hearts’, as does al-Ghazālī, for example, in *Bidāyat al-Hidāya* (cf. W. Montgomery Watt, *The Faith and Practice of al-Ghazālī*, London 1953), the close intertwining of knowledge and the moral life which is also affirmed there should not be forgotten. These are its presuppositions:

The first book of the third part of the *Ihya* *uluḥm is called *Shahr ʿadīd* al-*kalb*, “A commentary on the wonder of the heart”. The preliminary definitions where al-Ghazālī analyses the four concepts *kalb*, rūḥ, nafs and *ʿakl* are well known. For each concept al-Ghazālī distinguishes a ‘physical’ and a spiritual meaning. In the first sense *kalb* is a bodily organ: rūḥ the “vital spirits” in the blood (cf. contemporaneous ideas of physiology); nafs is the sum of man’s passions, the root of his “blameworthy qualities”; and *ʿakl* the faculty of knowing, which “has its seat in the *kalb*”. In the second sense *kalb* is a “subtle, divine and spiritual” principle which is “the reality of man” (*hākīkat al-insān*); rūḥ is that spiritual substance in man that acts and understands; and *ʿakl* the faculty of knowing, which “has its seat in the *kalb*”. The *kalb* in the second sense is “subtle, divine and spiritual” principle which is “the reality of man” (*hākīkat al-insān*); rūḥ is that spiritual substance in man that acts and understands; and *ʿakl* the faculty of knowing, which “has its seat in the *kalb*”. In the second sense *kalb* is a “subtle, divine and spiritual” principle which is “the reality of man” (*hākīkat al-insān*); rūḥ is that spiritual substance in man that acts and understands; and *ʿakl* the faculty of knowing, which “has its seat in the *kalb*”. The second sense is “the faculty of knowing, which “has its seat in the *kalb*”.

In Sufism the analysis of the cardinal virtue of *dhikr* is one of the most characteristic and profound examples of the problem of the heart as one of the foundations of the human personality. It is a problem which is raised in the Sufi tradition as a whole, the bodily organ of the heart and its spiritual function being of central importance. The Ghazalian text *Risāla lādāmiyya* (in *Dhawāshir al-shawāhidi*, Cairo 1353/1934, 23-7) lays greater stress on the synonymy of the terms: “By the ‘rational soul’ I mean that matter to which all schools give a special name. Philosophers call it the ‘rational soul’; the Khurān calls it the ‘soul at peace’ and the spirit which descends from the Word of God” (cf. *XVII, 87*); the Sūfis call it ‘the heart’. These are simply differences in terminology, but they cover a single concept (*maʿrāt wūḥūd*): there are no conceptual differences. The heart, the spirit and the soul at peace are all names for the rational soul, which is a substance endowed with life, action and perception. Wherever we speak of the ‘spirit’ in absolute terms, or of the ‘heart’, it is this substance we are discussing”.

Thus it would be a mistake to take al-Ghazālī’s stress on the heart as indicating his “subjectivity” in the western sense of the term (cf. J. Oberman, *Der philosophische und religiöse Subjektivismus Gha- zalīs*, Vienna 1921). If, as A. J. Wensinck observes (*La Pensée de Ghażalī*, Paris 1940, 64), “the heart comprises reason and will”, then rather than perceiving an emotionalization of rational values (see above), we should be aware of a total apprehension of what is distinctive of man according to an existential psychology common to biblical and Sufi traditions: “the heart in a Pascalian sense” indeed, but only to the extent that Pascal’s statements are themselves inspired by the Bible. “The heart has two gates”, said al-Ghazālī in the *Ihya* (cf. Wensinck, op. cit., 66-7), one opening on to the external world, the impressions of the senses, passions and desires and thus open to devilish whispers, and the other opening on to the “internal Kingdom”. This second gate is “that of inspiration, of the breath of awe of God, and of revelation”. Though the terminology is different, this is very close to the “two faces of the soul” found in St. Augustine and mediaeval Latin writers.

In the experience of *dhikr* (*q.v.*), increasingly intensified repetition of the Holy Name passes from the tongue to the heart (cf. *Ihya* ii, 17): the formula uttered, and thus the Object it evokes, are impressed first on the very organ of the heart (and thus the circulatory system) and then, by this means, on the spiritual heart, that is in the very depths of being. (N.B.: the “heart” plays a very similar role in Sūfī *dhikr* and in the hesychasm of Mount Athos or in the *Ac- count* by a *Russian Pilgrim*). Al-Ghazālī appears to distinguish only two stages, “*dhikr* of the tongue” and “*dhikr* of the heart”; others add a third, “*dhikr* of the inmost heart of hearts (*sirr*)”, which takes possession of the whole being of the man or prayer (cf. Ibn ʿAtaʾ Allāh of Alexandria, *Miftāḥ al-salāf wa l-mashāb*, Cairo, n.d., 4-6).

To sum up: we have seen that for al-Ghazālī and Sūfī tradition as a whole, the bodily organ of the heart (and not the brain) is the seat of *ʿakl, the faculty of knowledge. *ʿakl*, in the meaning of “the understanding of knowledge”, is “in short the heart itself”, and the heart is the home and source of *maʿrāt*. Now the “spiritual heart” is the province of the moralist (in man as in animals the “bodily heart” belongs to medicine). Thus while *ʿakl* may be identified with *kalb*, the reverse does not hold. *Kalb* is not only the faculty of knowing, it is also the seat of all moral impulses, both evil desires and instincts and the struggle to be free of them and attentive to divine teaching (cf. the analysis of texts of the *Ihya* by H. Laoust in *La Politique de Ghażalī*, Paris 1970, 218-21). Salvation comes only from the heart’s purified knowledge in its dual and inseparable aspects, speculative and actual. Thus it is a complete education of the “heart” that spiritual teachers must constantly develop and enrich in themselves and their disciples.

In Sūfism the analysis of the cardinal virtue of *ṣūdah* (*q.v.*), “sincerity” or “truthfulness”, is wholly dependent on the “science of hearts” (here *kalb* is *ṣūdah* of al-Kharrāz (ed. and tr. A. J. Arberry, Oxford 1937). On Judgement Day the answer to the *swād al-ṣūdah*, “the question of sincerity”, will be revealed in two fashions by those prophets who are
also saints (wajh): it will be stamped on the tongue, visible to the hearers, and on the heart, the seat of divine inspiration.

Al-Hallâjî, al-Tirmîdî and Ibn 'Arabî comment in this manner on Jesus' answer to the su'ûd al-sîdîk (cf. L. Massignon, op. cit., 686 and ref.).

**Bibliography:** in the article. (L. Gardet)

### II. — POETRY

Although accorded from the outset an important place in the nasîb of the kaṣîda (g.v.), the word “heart” is emphasized only rarely in the ancient literature of Arabia. This situation conditioned the evolution of the word in all subsequent poetic literature. It was rediscovered and re-assessed as the progressive development of feeling caused the word to be employed more and more freely in the traditional context of Arab poetry. It would appear that this represented the righting of a deliberate omission, the precise reasons for which have yet to be determined.

In fact, the old Arab nasîb contains hardly any mention of the heart as the seat of the passions, at least in the collections generally held to be the most Bedouin (one example in Zuhab, two in the Muṣafād al-sîdîk, 13 in Dîarih, who was influenced by the poetry of the cities). It is permissible to suppose that the rarity of the word “heart” in the works of the founders of the Arab lyric is related to the nature of love which was celebrated in their nasîb, though it is true that the few examples found in their verse show that they did not neglect the affective meaning of the term. But for them “matters of the heart” had a social, even sociological, importance. In fact the nasîb reveals many of the features of the “Rites de passage” (V. Gennep, Paris 1909). The poet is searching for a protector, a stronger or older “neighbour” whose intervention entails a new tribal affiliation, nasîb (cf. al-Buṭûrî, al-mawlâ 'l-sârîb-nasibû); the hâmâ, or “abandoned encampment”, appears to be the place where the “binding” rites took place, in the ceremony perhaps called ašâba (Robertson Smith, Kinship and marriage in early Arabia, 152); the poet becomes the bondsman of a new clan, the clan of the Lady who is presumed to have sprung up in capâs (sâhî}); he becomes a “hostage” (râkîm) of the Lady’s clan (used in the sense of captive in Futûh al-bulûd, 402; cf. al-Sârâjî, al-Maṣâri, 177, verse by Hilâl b. al-‘Alâ?). He is a captive (aṣîr) of the Lady’s clan like the devotee of a god dwelling in the midst a sanctuary in classical antiquity. Furthermore, for the Lîsân, each child is called râhîna, pledge or captive in respect of the ašâbka he has undergone; the same root implies the idea of kâdîb, the sacred sport of arrows, which is compared with the “arrows of the Lady”. The same is true of the poet’s she-camel; we know that in Arabic folklore (e.g., in al-Sârâjî, Maṣâri, 101) the lover is in search of (nîshâd) a stray she-camel, perhaps also jabl al-hâjja, the visit of the Lady being a sign that the poet’s quest is crowned with success.

Like the ašâba, the nîshâd is an old pagan rite (cf. ḍadîb on the prohibition on gleaning in the haram of Mecca, the former hâmâ). The munṣâhîd, the pilgrim of the hâmâ and acolyte of the “visit”, is searching for “signs”, as the meaning of the root indicates. These signs are those provided by the sâdîr: these become commonplace in the classical nasîb. Sometimes the munṣâhîd’s quest is ended by the ‘aṣâr, a term with clear sociological and religious overtones (the descent affiliation being connote by the 5th and 7th forms of the root). The visit to the Lady or pilgrimage of the hâmâ (‘l-sârîb) seems to be linked to the season, the spring equinox, raḍījâb, for the first encounters (the ideal month of the ‘umra or the ‘Irâj), after a visit had been made to the sanctuary of the Lady; it is possible, on the evidence of the Kurân, that wâ’d and iḥlîbî were related to the vicissitudes of this quest of the Arab lover, which in later literature became that of the “heart” as such.

From these fleeting but converging indications, we can speculate with some probability that “Arab love” corresponded to a “passage ritual”, related, at least in the composition of its vocabulary, to the presence of a lady from another tribe who mysteriously bound the lover by a tie, the duration and exact nature of which remained imprecise because of the same “tabu” which affected “matters of the heart”.

This “tabu” no longer operated where the Bedouin significance of the love poem had been completely obliterated, and when it had succumbed to the joint influence of the poetry of the cities, music and religious terminology. After the breakdown of tribal ties, those poets who preferred to turn to the past rather than to the future, with the exception of ‘Umar b. Abl Ribâ’sa, transferred the main import of Bedouin love to the heart, but weakened it into mere metaphor. The following ideas were retained: 1) Now it is the heart of the poet which, always in straitened circumstances or abroad, “searches” for the Lady. 2) Having become the seat of passion, that is of the Memory and the Secret, the heart is for that very reason an indispensable part of courtly dialectic, at the same time confidant and actor. Naturally the latter is the element which we shall see emphasized when we turn from the poetry of Hîlâjî to that of ‘Irâj (1909).

The heart is on a never-ending quest, journeying after the caravan in which his beloved rides (Hâmassa of al-Marzûkhî, i, 51; al-Sârâjî, Maṣâri, al-bûb man tasyâmû, 141; Dîarih’s Dîawûn, ed. Nâssâr, 118; al-‘Abbâs, 232). This heart is called mûrtakîn (‘Umar, 179 and 295), for it is no longer clear where it dwells and the uncertainty condemns the poet to perpetual wandering. Dissociated from the person of the poet and his group, it is free. (See ‘aṣîra, or even: it flies through space, in the grip of such an intense emotion that it cannot recognize its true country (mâri), 185), a metaphor later employed by the mystic Dînâyî (al-Dâlayâmî, ‘Aţîf, 32).

Such an instability, arising from uncertainty about its home and where it really belongs, turns the heart into a nomad with no clearly defined pastureland, doomed to follow the whims of the seasons (mîshâ’ al-wâsân, ‘Umar, 279). Strictly speaking, this situation is tasyâmû, slavery in exile (‘Umar, 192; cf. al-Dâlayâmî for an analysis of the equivalent notion of Huyâm, 23). It is also the ‘ibû, the call of passion (coming after the signs given to the munṣâhîd), flashes of lightning, the language of birds which set the heart on the right road. Vagabond and wanderer, the heart is at the same time imprisoned in the net of love which condemns it to strive unceasingly for the wâsîl or wîsîl (the Lady’s favour, originally integration within the Lady’s group; ‘Umar, 295, a synonym: mawadda, Abû Nuwâs, 704; cf. ‘Umar, 222 and 326). During this tabâ, this quest, the heart is truly the quarry (a gazelle of the sacred enclosure) hunted by the Lady and eventually tracked down by her and pierced by her arrows, perhaps like the animals that are no longer kept by the prohibition of the hâmâ (‘Umar 316: mawadda coupled with tasyâmû, ibid., 360; the Lady hunts the heart though she herself has the appearance of a gazelle).
The heart which has been subjected to such harsh blows (musdūb) is lovesmitten and dependent upon the Lady’s pleasure (mu’alāk, musu’ūkāl, 362). These metaphors are interchangeable between the lover, represented by his heart, and the Lady; the victim is endowed with the traits and attributes of his tormentor, and vice versa. Thus the poet is led to declare that the Lady occupies his heart (ibid., 355), the heart itself having become the sacred enclosure where the Lady’s whims are given free rein. The Lady occupies the best seat in the poet’s heart, the “highest place” (‘Umur, 190: muhasilān, rafi‘ān). There she can do exactly as she pleases, knowing herself to be in a vanished land (abbaṣat Umm Ḥazra min ḫalād, Djarīr, 65; cf. al-‘Abbas, 39, 191, and ʿAbū Nuwas, 497). At the end of love’s “quest”, the heart can be possessed by the Lady through a variety of means (magic, the hunt, capture, captivity, chains, bonds, cords, nets, pledge, loan, deposit with every kind of alienation, the result of the departure for strange lands which is the “quest” inherent in the Arab concept of love).

Yet in still deeper fashion, by means of a psychology which endows the heart with many ‘membranes’ (al-Hamādhānī, al-‘Alīs al-haddīsyya, hāb yāmīn al-‘abbās; cf. Daylāmi, ‘Afīf, 16 and al-Šarīf al-Murtada, 1, 861), it can be considered that the heart contains the Lady or her image (a trace of the encampment) in whole or in part. Thus it is with a love which is more internal, more courtly or more normative that the poet from the cities of ʿIrāq (e.g., al-ʿAbbas b. al-ʿAbnāf; fifty examples in the Khazraḍī edition; the pseudo-dīwān of the romantic heroes) must come to terms when he endeavors to look into his heart.

The heart is the seat of the Memory of Love (al-ʿAbbās, 182). This Memory is identical with Love (281: “I am astonished that a heart can love you”). To compare the lover to the Lady is to compare the respective state of their hearts (ibid., 53: “if my heart were like yours”). The heart experiences the fires (nirān) of passion (ḥād abrabāt nirānahu ḫalī). The Lady rules the heart of the lover as absolute monarch (ibid., 16). Little distinction is made between Memory and the image of the Lady which resides in a heart that can contain no other object (ibid., 19).

On the other hand, there is less insistence on the breaking or cracking of the heart (ṣuṣdāt, fufur), that symbol of the restless life of the lover and his separation from his tribe.

Arab poetry henceforth invested the heart with an importance which remained characteristic of the courtly spirit. But the heart also had conflicts and problems which occupied theorists as well as poets. In the first place, since the heart seemed to be the principle of love, the question arose whether it shared this role with the eyes, whose act of looking had wounded the poet. This question brought to the fore the related question of the “licentiousness of the glance” (natal al-kulub) cast at the beloved object, which is the main object of courtly ethics. To recognize the priority of the glance is to uphold the imperative of a strict morality which condemns the lover and perhaps the Lady or her image (a trace of the encampment) in a heart that can contain no other object.

Thus the heart begins by referring to a Bedouin love about which little is known except that it involved a change of status where the sacred element had already infiltrated tribal customs. In the cities, the heart eventually seems to be the focus of poetic modes of expression; later, under other and still more complex influences, the heart becomes the authorized seat of the Memory of Love and the Vision of the Lady. To determine to what extent this “vision of the heart”, the offspring of a highly elaborated civilization, remained faithful to the ideas of primitive Arab culture, is not one of the least of the problems posed by the appearance in the Arab language of a literature composed in a clearly courtly spirit.

Bibliography: Examples of the use of the word kāb: Mufaddaliyyāt, ed. Ahmad Shākir, 93, 301; Zuhayr, ed. Ahlwardt, 91; Djarīr, ed. al-Sawi, 65, 91, 100, 147, 158, 159, 181, 210, 227, 240, 257, 300, 301; ‘Umur b. ʿAbī Rabi‘a, ed. ʿAbī al-Ḥamīd, 67, 84, 105, 106, 160, 176, 179, 185, 190, 192, 195, 201, 203, 217, 219, 222, 225, 227, 229, 279, 295, 319, 323, 326, 355, 360, 362. For the relationship which may have existed between the condition of the poet and the heart’s “captivity”, see J. C. Vadet, L’esprit courtisant en Orient dans les cinq premiers siècles de l’Hégire, Paris 1968, 61. For the role of the heart in “courtliness”, see Vadet, op. cit. and Ibn al-Ḍawwūr; Ḥīlāl al-Ṣawād, Ms. Bursa 1535 and especially Ibn Kayyim al-Daghawīyya, Rawdat al-muḥšihin, ed. Ubayd, 104 (mundšara between the heart and the eyes). For the original meaning of munḥīd and insād, see the romance of ‘Umur b. ʿAbī Rabi‘a in Azkāni, i, 199, Daylāmi, ‘Afīf, 88, the legal treatises on the relationship between yāmīn and mundšadā. (J. C. Vadet)
in numerous proverbial sayings. In addition, throughout Asia and the Near East, and particularly in Arabic sayings in all countries at all periods. It is also obvious why the Prophet, faced with the problem of a plague of stray dogs in Medina in his day, at first took the implacable decision to exterminate “all dogs” (according to the hadiths) and then, mitigating his decree because the canine race were a race of Allah’s creatures (inna-hā umma min al-umam) and because man needed certain categories of dog, decided to exterminate the black-coated strays and particularly those with light patches (sabatādnī) on each eyebrow, the undisputable mark of the devil in the eyes of all Arabs. It should be noted that this physical trait occurs frequently among black-herd and sheep-dogs of many occidental breeds and could be regarded by cynologists as an identifying mark of oriental pariahs. Freed from the Prophet’s condemnation were all useful dogs who obeyed a master, i.e., trained hunting dogs (kalb al-sayd, dārī, pl. dāzdari) and watchdogs, whether they guarded houses (kalb al-dār), alleys (kalb al-darb), flocks (kalb al-darʿ), kalb al-khanām, or crops and vineyards (kalb al-tarʿ). In the general opinion of the doctors of law and jurisconsults it was permitted to possess, maintain (khudnā), buy, sell and bequeath such dogs, even black ones so long as their use could be justified. In addition, one who killed one of these dogs had to compensate the owner (kālib) at the rate of forty dirhams for a hunting dog, one ewe for a sheep-dog, one farāk (= 16 raḥis) of wheat for a crop-guarding dog and one farāk of good earth for a house watchdog. Though socially useful dogs are tolerated, the animal remains unclean with respect to religious practices. Everything a dog touches or licks is rendered impure and the place where it has lain must be purified with water, following the practice of the Prophet on one occasion. A dog prowling close to a house is, according to the individual writers); they are likewise noticed for him to be given a proper name which had no connection with his external appearance, like Saʿd, Masʿūd, Anś, Murdgān or Samba, and the chroniclers recount a number of anecdotes illustrating the compassion shown to dogs. The Prophet himself promised a divine reward to an old woman for her act of charity to a thirsty dog. S. H. Leeder (in Tieded Mysteriels of Egypt, 1912) twice mentions wills or wakfs made in favour of dogs (cf. G. H. Bouquet, Des Animaux et de leur traitement selon le Judaïsme, le Christianisme et l’Islam, in L. Ist. ix (1938), 37-48). Nor does the Muslim forget the edifying and touching story of Kitīmīr, the dog belonging to the Seven Sleepers (Kur’an, XVIII, 17), the symbol of fidelity [see AṣHAB AL-KAHF]; he will be the only dog allowed to enter Paradise. In the opinion of al-Bayḍawlī (Anwār al-tansī, Leipzig 1848, i, 557), Allah gave this dog the gift of speech, while al-Ṭabarī (Tafsīr, xv, 141) believed him to be the incarnation of a human being, a view that tallies with the Ismāʿīlī belief that Kitīmīr’s doglike exterior hid the huntsman (mukhallīb) Salmān (see al-Dībājī, Hayagunakan, ii, 189, iii, 44; al-Damrī, s.v. kalb, ii, 278-312; Massignon, Les Sept Dormants d’Éphèse en Islam et en Chrétienté, in REI, xxii-xxxi (1954-62). It was al-Dībājī who restored the dog to its just place in Muslim society in his remarkable treatise On Animals” (Hayagunakan, i and ii). Pleading the case for the defence of the dog in a disputation between the supporter of the dog (ṣāhib al-kalb) and the supporter of the cock (ṣāhib al-dīkh), he gathers together the Greek scientific data alongside Aristotle, whom he can, when necessary, refute, Arabic sayings in
prose and verse, travellers' tales and contemporary information, with the addition of his own observations on canine ecology and ethology. All this he examines critically in the light of a logic which in his case may owe more to an innate feeling for method than to his penchant towards the rationalist tendency of the Mutʿazilites. In any case, we may be grateful to al-Djahiz for not having contented himself with an apology for one type of hound, the "Sahri" (kalb al-sahri) (see Agāh, 1969), which was all that poets and writers on the hunt before and after al-Djahiz could do. Thanks to him, although we cannot speak of breeds, we are nevertheless able to distinguish the most common dogs of his day. Apart from the Saluki, there were the Kurdish sheep-dog (kurdāl), a large animal introduced into Turkey in the 6th–7th century by the Kurds, probably the fore-runner of the Hungarian herd-dog, the Kuwatz. Since it had a keen sense of smell, the Kurdish sheep-dog was also used to track game and, when mated with a Saluki, produced a "cross" (bhi-
lāsī) with the qualities of both its parents. This, the first hound to hunt by smell and not by sight, was described succinctly by the poet 'All b. al-Diāhm al-Sāmī (d. 249/863), the favourite of the caliph al-
Muqawwāl b. al-Muqtawwāl (see Agāh, 1969). A century later, this verse portrait was summarized by Ibn al-Muṭazz in two of his tādīyyas [q.v.] (see Dīwān, Istanbul 1945, 26, no. 30; Damascus 1952, 297; Beirut 1961, 282-3), where this great hunting dog is described as nāyraḍīn masaradī, "a tireless tracker". The many subsequent crosses of this strain, which falcons used as "bird dogs" to flush small furred and feathered game for their birds of prey, led to a great many varieties of "master hunters" or mongrels (kādīrān) and in the Maqārr bālūsī, barbāshī). The pointer known as sāgārī/suṣurī (pl. --iyān) is, from its old High German name, seigari, "pointer", appeared in the 6th/7th century with the Crusades. It was imported into Islamic countries at great cost for use as a bird dog; quieter than the bhi-
lāsī, it was described as kalb al-ḥadī, "the bush dog". Because of its origins and its clear and light-coloured coat, the sāgārī pointer greatly resembles the present-day Italian pointer and Hungarian Vizsla, who are assumed to be the ancestors of all other breeds of pointer. From its pale beige coat, the sāgārī pointer was given the nickname sabībī (dry grape colour); thus named, it is listed among the presents set by the Bulgarian emperor Michael VI Stratitokos to the Fātimid caliph al-Mustanṣir bīlāhī in 444/1052 (see M. Hamidullah, L'Europe et l'Orient musulman, in Arabica, vii (1960), 289).

Among the smaller breeds, al-Djahiz mentions a baskett sheep-dog, the tīmisī, which is reminiscent of the Hungarian Puli and Pumi. He also mentions the kalālī, the "stocky dog", which seems to belong to the same type as the Poon, and the simī, the "Chinese", which corresponds to the pud or Pekinese. This dog was easily trained to perform tricks for ladies such as holding a lamp on its muzzle without moving or running errands in the market place with a basket round its neck (Hashardt). Mountebanks and travelling showmen made wide use of its skills as a performing dog (mulatālākīn), putting it to work with monkeys in public performances.

Following the Greeks, the Muslims were not aware of any breeds of wild dog, believing the painted hyena or cynhyena (simī) and the aardwolf (tīshār) to be hybrids resulting from a cross between domestic dogs and wolves or hyenas. Al-Djahīs was the first to refute these errors (Hashardt, i, 183-5).

Rabies (dād al-halq) was widespread in Arab countries from the earliest days because of the hordes of pariah packs transmitting the virus. For a long time, a man smitten with the disease (kalāb, makāb) was considered as one possessed by diyān and treated accordingly by methods designed more for exorcism than therapy; drinking the blood of a king was held to be the supreme remedy and empirical treatments, which were kept secret, were passed on from father to son in some families. Driven by the urgent need to act against the growing scourge, Ziyād b. Abī Sufyān, governor of Baṣra (45/665-6), made public a form of treatment by having it posted up on the wall of the Great Mosque which he had restored (Hayaṣāwān, ii, 10-2); unfortunately we do not know the nature of this treatment, which appears to have produced good results. The clinical symptoms of rabies, especially hydrophobia, were known precisely; al-Djahīs describes them and, after him, so Kūshā-
dīm (Maṣāyīd, Bagdad 1934, 138-9), al-Kawzānī and al-Damrī (s.vv. kalb).

On the analogy of shape, the Arabs gave the name kalb to other animals; thus kalb al-māwī (fresh-water dog) is the name for the otter, and in the western Islamic world for the beaver. Greed was the analogy which led to the name kalb al-bahr (dog of the sea) being given to the little shark which we too call the dog-fish and which Arab naturalists also call the kaw-
saḍī or ḥālīm. It is from this "little shark" (barayyā) that Muḥammad's tribe probably took its name, apparently through totemism. Finally, in the world of the invertebrates (bāštārdā), we find the kalb al-maṣṣā, the mole-cricket (gyllolatpa vulgaris), also called bāštārdā and kaw-saḍī by horticulturists, while arbori-
culturalists call all wood-eating worms kalb. By a similar process of analogy, the word kalb and its derivatives were given to a large number of objects, instruments and tools, whose contours or functions were to a greater or lesser degree reminiscent of the animal (see Dozy, Supplément, s.v.).
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The dog in astronomy. The ancient astron-
omers gave the name "dog" (kwuṣūn, canis) to a number of constellations and stars because of the allegorical figures which they believed they would perceive in
their dispositions in the sky. After the rise of Islam, the Muslims adopted the same principle and, translating the Greek and Latin terms, gave the name kalb to the following two stars: a) al Kalb al-akbar, the Great Dog—also known as Kalb al-джаббар, “the dog of the giant” (i.e., of Orion)—is a sub-zodiacal constellation lying to the east of the Hare, beneath and to the left of Orion, on the edge of the Milky Way. In the European Middle Ages it was called the quell alagbar and quell elbar. There are seven stars in the constellation and one of these, Sirius the Dog (α Canis majoris, magnitude 1.58) or al-Shir'ā al-yamaniyya (Elschere alieni), rises soon after the summer solstice. b) al-Kalb al-asghar, “the Little Dog”—also called mulhadam al-kalb, “the forerunner dog”—is a sub-zodiacal constellation lying under Gemini between Hydra and Orion. Quell al-ṣaqar embraces two stars: Procyon (α Canis minoris, mag. 0.48) or al-Ghumayṣāl algomāla (rheumy-eyed, a corruption of al-dumayṣā, the sycamore)—which is also known as al-Shir‘āl-dhimiyā, “Sirius of Syria”—and al-Shir‘ā al-‘abār/al-khabur, “Sirius which has crossed” (the Milky Way). They rise in mid-July. c) al-Kalb, “the Two Dogs” (of Abdebaran), in the zodiacal constellation of Taurus are two stars situated between the Hyades and the Pleiades, corresponding to η Tauri, mag. 4.5, and x Tauri, mag. 4.6. d) Kalb al-rā‘il/قلب، “the Shepherd's Dog”, is a corruption of Kitf al-rā‘i, “the Shepherd’s Shoulder” (Aruteus) and corresponds to β Ophiuchi, mag. 2.9, in the Serpentarius constellation. e) Kalb al-dhihrā‘, “the Dogs of Winter”, designates the four mansions of al-dhihrā‘ (Castor and Pollux, α, β Gemini), al-Nathra (γ, δ, ε Cancer), al-Tarif (ζ, η, θ Leo), and al-Leonis) whose heliacal rising occurs successively from the end of June to mid-August and acronychal setting from the beginning of January to mid-February. Sirius (α Canis majoris) rises at the same time as al-dhihrā‘. This long period covers the time of the Dog (al-kalb) or "Dog Days" (cf. Fr. jours caniculaires, Ger. Hundstage), which are characterized by heatwaves (sahhedīr) and sandstorms (samāt) and also the time of the dry-frost (kuiba, kalab al-dhihrā‘), with its "black nights" (al-layāl al-sūd). In antiquity this whole period was regarded as ill-omened and thus held in dread. At the time of the rise of Sirius the Romans sought to placate him by sacrificing a red dog. The maxims of the nomadic Arabs concern the kalb, the animal, see, e.g., Aghānī, vii, 109, l. 4) were in the steppe between Syria and Irāk (see map in vol. i, §91) called samawal Kalb (Yākūt, iii, 152 et al.; here their centres were the oases in the low-lying valley (al-kibha) formed by the Djawf and the Wādlī Sīrān (g.v.) which opened to them the way to Syria long before the Muslims conquered it (see the verses in Hamāda, Freytag, p. 659 and Wellhausen, Das arabis. Reich, ii, 2 ff.). Thus, they had settled in Salamiyya, Palmyra, Damascus (especially in the Ghūṭa and al-Mizāb), in Djawlān, al-Suwāyda‘, and in the region of Harrān; there were small numbers of them in Hims, Aleppo, Hamāt and Manbūq. They had also settled in Fadak, Dōmat al-Djadjal, Taymā‘, and al-Hira, and, according to al-Kalkashandi (Kal‘id al-qūmān, 47) and Ibn Khaldūn (Ibar, ii, 521), there were many of them in “the Gulf of Constantiople” (al-malādī al-kustānīfīn), as well as in Şhrāz in Persia, and in Manfalūt in Egypt. In Syria the Byzantines had placed them under the command of the Ghassānids (g.v.), their phylarchs, to defend the Syrian Limes against the Sasanids and al-Hira. In this way the Kalb became accustomed to military discipline and to law and order. Like the Ghassānids they became converted to Christianity in its Monophysite form.

The Kalb clashed with the Muslims for the first time when Muhammad sent, c. 6/627, an expedition against Dōmat al-Djadjal (g.v.) which led to the conversion of al-Asbagh b. ‘Amr and a treaty (Ibn Sa’d, i, 36; see J. Sperber in MSOS As., xi (1910)). There were already some converted Kalb in Mecca, e.g. Muhammad’s step-son Ẓayd b. Ḥārīja (g.v.) and Dihyā (g.v.). In 8/639 the Kalb sent a deputation to Muhammad to announce their conversion; it seems however that the majority stood aside, taking no part in the conquest of Syria.

Bibliography: in the article; in addition see the indexes to Tabārī, Ya’qūbī, Mas‘ūdī, Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn Durayd, al-Fakhrī, the Aghānī (Tables), Ibn ‘Abd Ṭabīb, al-Iṣkāf al-jārīd (Indices by M. Shafî‘), Hamdānī, D. H. Müller (BGA, iv), al-
The relations between Kalb and the Umayyads go back to the time of the caliph 'Ugmn b. 'Affân (see above). Owing to their importance and strength in Syria, Muṣ̄wiya, who had married Maysun [q.v.], whose father, Unayf [q.v.], belonged to the Kalb aristocracy, chose to rely on the Kalb in order both to secure his position at home, and to prepare himself to face Ṛbl b. Abī Ṭalib in war. Thus the Yamounites in general and the Kalb in particular became the most influential of the tribes in Syria during the reigns of Muṣ̄wiya and his son, Yazīd, who also had married a wife from the Kalb, and during that of Muṣ̄wiya II [q.v.].

Conflicting interests led Kalb and Kays [q.v.] to support opposing political groups. In the period of political trouble that followed the death of Ṛbl, the support given by Kalb to the Umayyads was due to the favourable economic and political position which they had enjoyed under them. On the other hand, Kays gave their full support to Ibn al-Zubayr [q.v.], less because of their attachment to his cause, than because of their hatred for the Kalb and the Umayyads who supported them. Masuṭḍ reports (Mụṣ̄alāt, v, 200) that al-Yaman, headed by the Kalb, Ḥassān b. Mālik b. Bahdal, stipulated before giving their full support to Marwān [q.v.] that they should be given the same concessions as they had enjoyed under Muṣ̄wiya I, Yazīd I and Muṣ̄wiya II. These were that two thousand of them should receive two thousand dirhams for their support each year, and, if a recipient died, his son or cousin should receive the payment. Kalb should take precedence at court, for their support each year, and, thus had a response among some of the Kalb and Kays in the Ḍažlra had stirred up the Band Fazara [q.v.] in Ḳīrak, who complained to the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik. This led to another series of raids, the most celebrated of which was that of Banāt Kayn, in which the Kays was victorious. As a result of the wise measures taken by ʿAbd al-Malik, the raiding ceased, and the day of Banāt Kayn was the last of the famous “days” between Kalb and Kays.

During the military struggle between the Umayyads and the ʿAbbāsids (152/770), 2,000 Kalb originally sent to help Salm b. Ḳutayba—the Umayyad governor of Baṣra—defected and took the side of the ʿAbbāsids. This may have been due to the fact that Marwān II relied almost exclusively on Kays; or the Kalb may have realized that this time the Umayyad cause was lost and therefore have tried to win favour with the new regime. However, in the same year the Kalb, with others of Yemen, took part in the revolt of Abu ʿ1-Ward against the ʿAbbāsids army led by ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās of ʿIrāq. This may have been a result of their disappointment with the new regime.

Under Ḥārūn al-Raṣḥīd [q.v.], Damascus was the scene of a tribal feud between the two factions of Yemen and Muḍar. It lasted with short intervals from 174/790 to 180/796. The chief reason for this feud was the Syrian Arab tribes' sympathy for the Umayyads, and it was fostered by the policies of the ʿAbbāsids governors, who supported one faction against the other. This feud emerged once more under al-Maʾmūn [q.v.] (213/828) in connection with the Yaman in Egypt.

In the later ʿAbbāsids period, the history of the Kalb was of less importance and took the form of Bedouin (aʾrāb) attacks on the central authorities. The following are the main events. The Kalb under ʿUṯayf b. Niʿma took part in the revolt of Ḥiṃṣ against the governor al-Faḍl b. Kārīn and killed him in 250/864. But al-Muṣṭaʿīn's general, Mūsā b. Bughā b. al-Kabīr, was able to defeat the rebels and capture Ḥiṃṣ. In the year 294/906, the aʾrāb of Kalb, together with al-Nimr b. Kāṣīt [q.v.] and Asad, defeated al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥamḍān, the governor of Muṣṭaʿīn, and pursued him to the gates of Aleppo. In the same year al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥamḍān succeeded in defeating the aʾrāb of Kalb and Ṭayy [q.v.], but he was eventually captured. Under al-Muṣṭarṣīd, the Kalb took part in the dispute between the ruler of Damascus and the slave bodyguards, the ruler of Aleppo [see Mawṣīda], by betraying the latter, who took refuge with them, to the former.

It is interesting to note that Carmathian propagandists found a response among some of the Kalb and especially the Banu ʿ1-Ulaṣ b. ʿUṣāna and their maidūl, who were living in the Samawa desert. In 289/901 they paid homage to Yahyā b. Zakrawayh, the Carmathian propagandist, calling him ʿsk̄ayy. Banu ʿ1-Asbaḥ—another branch of Kalb—also joined Ibn Zakrawayh, and seem to have believed so sincerely in his mission that they called themselves “Fātimids”. Taking by surprise al-Muṭaqiḍ's army, which was pursuing them, they managed to kill its leader, Sabūk b. ʿUṣāna. Then they pushed on to Damascus, burning the mosque of al-Rūṣafā and surprising all the villages they passed through. Ibn Zakrawayh and his followers harassed Ṭubghā b. Ḥijj b. Ṭū[f. q.v.], the ruler of Damascus, and imprisoned
him within his city. It was not until the Egyptians sent an army under Badr al-Kalb, Ibn Tabb's slave, that the Carmathians were defeated and their leader Ibn Zakrawayh was killed. It is significant that one reason suggested for his death was the egalitarian policy he adopted towards his masuli followers.

The death of Yabäb led Banu 'l-'Ulayas and Banu 'l-'Asbagh to follow his brother al-Hasan b. Zakrawayh. The latter was able to defeat the Egyptian force and the troops of Himas and of other Syrian provinces sent against him. He also made his authority felt to such an extent that he was recognized as Amr al-Mu'min in the Friday khutba all over Syria in 289/901-2. However, the caliph al-Muktafi was able to have him seized and put to death in 291/903.

Following the death of al-Hasan b. Zakrawayh, the Banu 'l-'Ulayas, Banu 'l-'Asbagh and Banu Ziyad (all from Kalb) joined another Carmathian dâbi, Abu Ghânim Naṣr. They made several attacks on Buṣra, Ṭabariyya, Damascus and Tabariyya. j

III.—In Muslim Spain

The army of Māsûb b. Nuṣayr [q.v.] included Kalb and Kaysi elements, among whom the memory of Mardî Râḥîṣ aroused an antagonism which showed itself in North Africa and particularly in Spain throughout most of the 2nd/8th century. The troops sent by Highâm b. 'Abd al-Malik to suppress the Berber revolt launched by Maysara [q.v.] were composed of Syrians; Baldj [q.v.], commander of their van, who was a member of the Kaysi aristocracy, took refuge at Ceuta, appealing for assistance to the governor of Spain, 'Abd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-Rahmân b. ʿAbd al-Ragman I [q.v.], who adopted a policy which favoured his fellow-tribesman. His partiality earned him the hostility of a Kaysi chieftain, al-Sumayl b. ʿAbbâs [q.v.].

The revolt launched in 127/745 was successful; Abu ʿl-Khaṭṭār, defeated and taken prisoner, was replaced by Ṭahâbâ b. Salama al-Djûdhamî, who died in 129/746. Yusuf b. 'Abd al-Ragman al-Fihri [q.v.] was then chosen as governor of Spain. The Kalb supported Abu ʿl-Khaṭṭār, who had fled, were defeated at Secunda (Shakunda) in 130/747 by the Caliphate, its Fall, Calcutta 1927, 70-1, 132-3, 178, 182, 201-6; W. Caskel, Gomharat an-nasab: das Genealogische Werk des Ḥisām al-Djâibî, Leiden 1966, 279, 288, 359; A. A. Dixon, The Umayyads Caliphate, London 1970, 83-120. [A. A. Dixon]

The revolt in 127/745 was successful; Abu ʿl-Khaṭṭār, defeated and taken prisoner, was replaced by Ṭahâbâ b. Salama al-Djûdhamî, who died in 129/746. Yusuf b. 'Abd al-Ragman al-Fihri [q.v.] was then chosen as governor of Spain. The Kalb supported Abu ʿl-Khaṭṭār, who had fled, were defeated at Secunda (Shakunda) in 130/747 by the Caliphate, its Fall, Calcutta 1927, 70-1, 132-3, 178, 182, 201-6; W. Caskel, Gomharat an-nasab: das Genealogische Werk des Ḥisām al-Djâibî, Leiden 1966, 279, 288, 359; A. A. Dixon, The Umayyads Caliphate, London 1970, 83-120. [A. A. Dixon]
ranks of the Kufans, was slain beside him at Dayr al-Diathalik in 71/690 by Warka' al-Nakha'i b. al-Sa'ib (and not b. Malik as in the Fihrist, ed. G. Flügel, 95) played an active part in the revolt of 'Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad b. al-Ash'ath [see Ibn al-Ash'ath] and fought in his ranks at Dayr al-Diamjādir [q.v.] (82/701); he left a partial account of this battle in which he recounts, inter alia, his honourable, even triumphant, return to his family in Kufa in one single day without having had to abandon one of his weapons (al-Tabari, vi, 349-50, 364).

To swordsmanship, the family added another claim to fame: learning; in fact it is rare to consult an early Arab book without finding some reference to an al-Kalbi. These references, brief or more detailed, concern three different persons, who were already difficult to distinguish in early days.

I.—Muḥammad b. al-Sā'ib al-Kalbi (Abu 'l-Nadr) died in Kufa at the age of at least 80 in 146/763. He was interested in all contemporary branches of learning: universal history; the history of religions, pre-Islamic (al-Šahrastānī, Misā'il, Cairo 1947, 1220-64), Jewish (Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, Ḥabid, Cairo 1948, i, 157) and Christian; poetry (Ibn Khalikān, Cairo 1948, iii, 436), literature and philology; genealogy, tradition and ancient legends. He employed his wide knowledge in a commentary on the Kur'ān (Tafṣīr), the longest ever composed (al-Ǧabab, Ḫabar, Kufa 1930, i, 106). Stagira, the sphere that Sulaymān b. 'Alli, perhaps during his governorship of Ṣaḥra (133-9), brought him to that city to teach ūrānic exegesis. With the support of Sulaymān b. 'Alli, Muḥammad al-Kalbi put forward, despite the opposition of his hearers, an interpretation of the Kur'ān which went contrary to received opinion; it is probable that he expressed pre-ʾAlid views. His courses were written down (Ibn al-Kalbi, Tafṣīr, Cairo 1374, i, 76, 91, 216-7, etc.). He was sometimes accused of heresy, of rijaḍ of sabaʿīsm, of irijaḍ and so on, and sometimes of forgery and falsehood. Even in the 10th century he has impassioned opponents among the scholars of al-ʾAzhar (Abmad Ṣakhir in his edition of the Tahdhib 'al-ʾAdhāb, Cairo 1935, 134-5, n. 5). Yet he has remained an authority, and even his detractors draw on him as a source.

II.—Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Sā'ib al-Kalbi, Abu 'l-Mundhir, generally called Ibn al-Kalbi, was probably born in Kufa around 120/737 and educated in that town; he died there in 204/819 or 206/821, in the caliphate of al-Maʾmūn. His death was greatly regretted by the caliph (al-ʾAbbāṣīd al-Mahdī d. 169/785) made use of Ibn al-Kalbi's knowledge when counteracting the Umayyad attack in Spain (al-Tabari, viii, 172-3). It was probably during this caliph's rule that Ibn al-Kalbi stayed in Baghdād. Like his father, he was interested in all branches of knowledge of his time and he wrote a good number of works, more than 150 according to the Fihrist. This immense oeuvre was incorporated, to a great extent, in the works of his direct and indirect disciples: Muḥammad b. Ḥabbīb, Ibn Durayd, al-ʾTabari, Abu 'l-Faradī al-ʾIrṣāḥān and many others who borrowed a great deal from him without much concern for acknowledgement and often with vague references to the master's work. A few titles, however, have been recovered from this anonymous mass by Ibn al-Kalbi's fame.---1. Dīmgharats al-Nasab: W. Caskel and G. Strenzick have published two imposing volumes, one a study on everything closely or remotely connected with Arab genealogy and with Ibn al-Kalbi in particular, and the other genealogical tables culled from the work of Ibn al-Kalbi (Dīmgharat an-Nasab des Ibn al-Kalbi, Leiden 1966). Ibn al-Kalbi was the uncontested master of Arab genealogy, and in his Dīmghara Ibn Ḥazm did no more than give currency to the work of his eminent predecessor, without acknowledging it to a great extent. In his lifetime Ibn al-Kalbi was the source, arbiter and sometimes amused dispenser of titles of nobility.---2. Al-ʾApnām, published for the first time in Arabic by Usamah b. Zaki, has been translated into German (by Rosa K. Rosenberger, Leipzig 1941), into English (by N. A. Faris, Princeton 1952), and into French (by M. S. Marmardji, in Revue Biblique, xxxv (1926), 397-420; a fragmentary translation; more recently, W. Atallah has published a new ed. of the text together with an annotated French translation (Paris 1969)). As on genealogy, Ibn al-Kalbi remains an authority on the history of Arab paganism; Ibn Durayd, al-ʾTabari, and al-Baghdādī and others consulted his work, summarized it, and always cited him as a reference.---3. Anṣāb al-ʾKhayl, in which the author set forth genealogical accounts illustrated by short poetic pieces celebrating the most famous chargers of history (ed. Levi Della Vida, Leiden 1928; a copiously annotated edition by Ahmad Šakīr appeared posthumously in Cairo in 1946-7). A few fragments of various length have been preserved, vestiges of lost works such as K. al-Kalb, K. al-Lubāb, Šaʿr Ḥāʾīm al-Ṭāʾī, etc.

To some extent Ibn al-Kalbi's work has been mingled with that of his father, but only partially; in the narrative of the battle of Dayr al-Dīmgharats, for example, he naturally cites his father, who had taken part in the combat, but he also had recourse to other witnesses (al-Tabari, vi, 342-50). He is so scrupulous in his pursuit of exactitude that he even quotes his own father through the medium of other narrators (ibid., ii, 272, vi, 360). Apart from oral sources, Ibn al-Kalbi cited specialists who had access to biblical and Palmyran sources (ibid., ii, 273); he was kept informed of the genealogical accounts illustrated by short poetic pieces in the Yemen (Ibn Durayd, Ṣahkan, ed. Harūn, Cairo 1958, 524); he seems to have had a secretary called Djabala who provided him with translations from Pahlavi (Fihrist, 244) and he himself consulted the archives and tablets of the Christian communities of al-Hira (al-Tabari, i, 628). Equipped with modern methodological criteria, it is easy to point to lacunae in Ibn al-Kalbi's knowledge and to criticize some of his opinions on the basis of modern languages or some of his narratives, which are more legendary than historical. In his universal history he often had to fall back on oral sources alone, and he should be given credit for having written these down. All in all, his work is not inferior to that of other historians of
oriental or classical antiquity. Some Arab writers were fiercely critical of him, but such criticisms, sometimes based on scholarly rivalry, were often sectarian or motivated by religious fervour, for, like his father, Ibn al-Kalbi fell foul of Sunnī orthodoxy. On the other hand, he did have ardent supporters (Yākūt, Beirut 1956, ii, 187-8, 219, 504), and detractors and admirers alike were frequently largely dependent on his work. Among modern scholars, I. Goldziher has criticized Ibn al-Kalbi (Muḥ. Stud., i, 185-7) by taking literally the early criticisms directed against him; he bases his arguments on the false, self-glorying genealogies which Ibn al-Kalbi recounts with humour, and on his pro-Abbāsid views (al-Tabari, viii, 172-3), using these to throw doubt on his scientific worth. Th. Nöldeke (Gesch. der Araber und Perser, Leiden 1879, xxvii and index) restored the balance, and since then criticisms of Ibn al-Kalbi have been reduced to their proper dimensions: even so, neither ancients nor moderns have evaluated him at his true worth. Present-day research is confirming Ibn al-Kalbi's eminent role in the history of Arab literature.

III.—Abūbās b. Ḥishām, Ḥishām's son and not his brother as al-Kūtī states (Fihrist, 95). Al-Ḵāṭīb al-Baḡdādī (xvi, 46) speaks of an Ibn al-Kalbi who must be the grandson of Muhammad al-Kalbi. Al-ʿAbbās transmitted his recollections of his father, Ḥishām, passing on some of his learning to philologists like Ibn Durayd (Iṣḥāḥī, passim) and to historians like al-Balāḍīrī and al-Ṭabarī. Nothing further is known about him.
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(W. ATALLAH)

KALBIDS, a family stemming from the tribe of the Kalb b. Wabara [q.v.], which Arab sources relating to the Maghrib call Banū Abī Ḥusayn (or al-Ḥasan).

In the Maghribi chronicles, governors and senior officials of the Umayyad administration in Ifrikiyya who were of Kalbite origin appear frequently, as do others belonging to the rival Kayū tribe. While the more astute of the caliphs in Damascus sometimes managed to steer an even course between these two adversaries, their representatives in the Maghrib, in Spain and in Sicily often leaned to one side or the other, guided either by their personal sympathies or by the circumstances obtaining at any particular time. Thus the disputes and often bloody battles provoked by the traditional antagonism of the two tribes intensified the chaos in a situation where a Kalbite waṣṭī frequently followed aKayyite one and vice versa.

Under the Aḥlabids, who relied largely on Muḥarrīte elements, the Kalbites began to decline, but they were the main prop and stay of Fāṭimid political and religious policy; they therefore swiftly found in the new milieu a fresh role to their rise, so that by the middle of the 4th/10th century they were the governing element of Muslim Sicily. At this period Kalbite elements were probably already allied with the Kutāma Berbers.

For services rendered particularly to the first imams of Ifrikiyya, the Kalbites were speedily rewarded by the Mahdī and his descendants; in al-Kāʾīm's day, All b. Abī Ḥusayn al-Kalbi (one of the first dynasts of this family and son-in-law of Sālim b. Abī Rāḍīḥ, the Fāṭimid governor of Sicily from 305/917 to 325/936) died at the siege of Agrigento (326/938) in the midst of the struggle pursued by Sicilian Fāṭimid supporters against those who had remained faithful to the caliphate in Baḡdād. His son al-Ḥasan b. All, who had distinguished himself in Ifrikiyya in the campaigns waged by al-Kāʾīm and al-Ḥansūr against the Khaḍījīt Abū Yazīd [q.v.], was the first of a succession of Kalbite governors in Sicily, a kind of hereditary emirate (cf. Kūḥā b. Amāl al-aʿlām [see Bibl.]), which lasted until the mid-5th/11th century.

Confronted by that chaotic situation caused by the rebellions in Palermo and Agrigento against the Fāṭimid representatives, the Caliph al-Ḥansūr deemed it logical and sensible to entrust Sicily's management to those whose fidelity was proven beyond doubt and who, moreover, could maintain a neutral stand between the rebels and the imams of Ifrikiyya. Only a few years after his arrival in Sicily, al-Ḥasan had two victorious encounters with the Byzantine forces in Calabria and Alabardara, and took the opportunity to build a mosque at Reggio, but it was destroyed a few years later. On al-Ḥansūr's death (Dhu 'l-Qadā' 341/March 953), al-Ḥasan returned to Ifrikiyya, leaving the government of the island in the hands of his son Ahmad, but without definitively abandoning his role as military commander in Sicily and Calabria. He was later recalled to the area by his brother ʿAmmar, who was hard-pressed, and was later recalled to the area by his brother ʿAmmar, who was hard-pressed, while Ahmad was hard-pressed, and was later recalled to the area by his brother ʿAmmar, who was hard-pressed, while Ahmad was hard-pressed, and was later recalled to the area by his brother ʿAmmar, who was hard-pressed, while Ahmad was hard-pressed, and was later recalled to the area by his brother ʿAmmar, who was hard-pressed, while Ahmad was hard-pressed, and was later recalled to the area by his brother ʿAmmar, who was hard-pressed, while Ahmad was hard-pressed, and was later recalled to the area by his brother ʿAmmar, who was hard-pressed, while Ahmad was hard-pressed, and was later recalled to the area by his brother ʿAmmar, who was hard-pressed, while Ahmad was hard-pressed.

In the succeeding years the different Kalbid governors pursued sporadically their conflict with the Byzantines, but military offensives were rarely large-scale: Byzantium had now admitted the need to enter into peace negotiations with the Fāṭimids, especially since the ambitions of the Emperor Otto I regarding southern Italy had become known. These ambitions also fired his son, Otto II, who, when he ventured into Calabria, found himself faced with a coalition of Muslims and Byzantines, the latter driven by necessity to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Kalbid troops, the former providentially assisted by the rivalry of the two Christian empires. The clash between Otto II's troops and those of the Kalbid waṣāṭ, All b. al-Ḥasan, son of the first Kalbid governor of Sicily, took place in Mubarram 372/July 982 at Cape Crotone in Calabria. At first the Muslims seemed overwhelmed but the battle quickly turned in their favour. This was perhaps the last great Muslim victory against the Christians in Sicily, aside from a few offensives of little importance such as the forays of 376/986 into Calabria, the battle of the straits, which is celebrated in a long letter to Ibn Ḥānāʾī (Daʿud, ed. Zāḥid All, 1358/1934, no. 40, 540-59).

In Egypt too the Fāṭimids employed the services of leading members of the Kalbid family, some of
whom were sent to Sicily by the imams of Cairo to act as governors. This was true of, for example, 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad, in Egypt counsellor to al-'Aziz bi-llâh (al-Mu'izz's successor in 354/975), who governed the island for two years (372/983-374/985). This period saw the apogee of Kalbid prestige: in Egypt, when al-Hakim bi-amr Allâh [q.v.] was proclaimed caliph, the Kutama Berbers, Fâtimid supporters, demanded that control of affairs be entrusted to al-Hakim b. al-Hammar, the victor of Rametta and nephew of al-Hasan b. 'Ali b. Abî 'l-Husayn; in Sicily, the Kalbid Abu 'l-Futûb Yûsuf b. 'Abd Allâh (379/989-388/998) governed the island with great wisdom for eight years. The former was granted the title of Amîn al-Dawla and the latter that of Thikat al-Dawla.

The fortunes of the Banû Abî 'l-Husayn family soon declined from this peak: in Egypt there was a conspiracy against al-Hasan, while Sicily sank into chaos under Dja'far (388/998-410/1010), son of Yûsuf. Although the steadily increasing autonomy enjoyed by Sicily from the outset of Fâtimid rule in Egypt coincided with the greatest splendour of the amirs' court in Palermo, it proved detrimental to the political realities of the moment, in the face of which the Kalbid rulers should have shown greater administrative prudence and zeal. Instead, they preferred to relaxing in the mansions of Palermo, numerous at this period, to the efforts of military undertakings or the cares of political responsibility. Indeed Dja'far, amîr of the island for twenty years, seems to have been the founder of Castello di Maredolci in Palermo. The effects of this decline were apparent in all fields, but they were especially marked in military matters: the Muslims suffered their first setback in Bari in 394/1004 at the hands of the Byzantines and the latter then withdrew to Calabria, leaving the Kalbid era was one of the most prosperous. As their autonomy, promoted the marked development of western Sicily. Palermo and some other urban centres prospered once more, thanks to the new impetus given to municipal enterprises, to public works and to cultural matters. In the capital especially, the study of the traditional sciences had already been inaugurated in the preceding period, and some of the most enlightened Kalbid amirs, themselves often enthusiastic versifiers, encouraged an exceptional development of poetry, as may be seen from the few extant extracts of the vanished anthology compiled by Ibn al-Katå'â al-Sikîlî [q.v.].

Bibliography: The historical, geographical and literary texts dealing with the Kalbids of Sicily have been collected by M. Amari in Biblioteca arabo-sicula, Leipzig 1857, appendix, Leipzig 1875 (Italian tr., i, Turin-Rome 1886; ii, 1887; appendix 1889); the historical data on this family have been studied by this same historian in Storia dei Musul-mani di Sicilia, ed. C. A. Nallino, Catania 1933-39.


In the Kitâb amâr-al-âdâm of Lîsân al-Dîn b. al-Khâṭîb, one chapter is devoted to the Banû Abî 'l-Husayn family; cf. the edition by Ahmad Mukhtâr al-`Abbâdî and Mûb. Îbrâhîm al-Kîttîânî, Casablanca 1964, 122-36 (Sp. tr. by R. Castrillo Marquez, Madrid 1958).

(U. RIZZITANO)

KAL'Â [see KAL'Â]

KAL'È-I SEFÎD [see KAL'ÈI]

KAL'È-I SEFÎD, a fortress in Fârs, in 30° 10' N. Lat. and 51° 30' E. Long. (Greenwich). It is built on a mountain with a flat top, in the eastern part of the valley of Kohra, which falls steeply down on all sides. On its summit, which can only be reached by cliff-paths, lies an extensive well-wooded plateau watered by numerous springs. A strong garrison is necessary for its defence, as is noted in Fârsnâmâ. Descriptions of the fortress and the country round it are given, among Oriental writers for the pertinent passage is copied by Mustawfi, Nuhtal al-Külûb, 'Ali Yazdi and Mirghi`ând (see Bibli.). Of descriptions by European travellers in the 19th century, that of Stolze deserves special mention; along with Andreas Khatib, one chapter is devoted to the Banû Abî 'l-Husayn family; cf. the edition by Ahmad Mukhtâr al-`Abbâdî and Mûb. Îbrâhîm al-Kîttîânî, Casablanca 1964, 122-36 (Sp. tr. by R. Castrillo Marquez, Madrid 1958).

(U. RIZZITANO)
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briga di Cefalù. A fortezza situata sul promontorio di Cefalù, la cui storia è strettamente legata alla storia della Sicilia. La sua importanza geopolitica nei secoli successivi ha permesso di conservare al posto di frontiera i resti di una struttura militare di notevole rilievo arabo-siciliano.
very probably originate in the dazzling white colour of the building-stone used. The name Kal’c-i Gul (citadel of the rose and rose-water), borne by Kal’c-i Sefid in al-Bundār (Houtsma, Recueil, ii, 183, 13) is remarkable.

Kal’c-i Sefid is the most noteworthy point on the mountain road which leads from Behbahān to Shīrāz and furnishes communication between Khūzistan and Fārs. It may be regarded as certain that a commanding place like this was very early fortified. The “Persian passes,” through which Alexander the Great tried to enter the ancestral home of the Achaemenids and which were defended by the Satrap of Persis, Ariobarzanes, with his strong forces, have often been sought in the valley of Kal’c-i Sefid; e.g., by Vincent, Mützel, Droyseyn, Forbiger. Ritter (Erdkunde, ix, 138), in differing from these, considers Kal’c-i Sefid to be the stronghold of the Uxians and places the “Persian Gates” farther east. Ritter’s view has been attacked particularly by Mützel in his edition of Curtius (Berlin 1841, p. 414 f. and by Stolze (op. cit., 262 f.; see bibl.). That the region of Kal’c-i Sefid does not correspond to the situation of the “Persian Gates” of the historians of Alexander and that the latter should be located elsewhere has been fairly convincingly proved by Stolze, op. cit.

Kal’c-i Sefid is not mentioned by the Arab geographers of the Middle Ages. Like the adjoining town of Nawbandān (Nawbandadjan) it must have been allotted to the Persian province of Sābūr in the Caliphate period. From the 4th/10th century on we find cropping up in the Oriental sources a nomenclature of which the Shūl, after whom the whole area, inhabited by them from the west of Shīrāz to the frontiers of Fārs and Khūzistan was called Shūllistān. There is definite evidence to show that Kal’c-i Sefid belonged to Shūllistān. On the Shūl and the land of Shūllistān cf. the references in Quatremère, Hist. des Mongols, 380 f. (see bibl.) and also Mustawfi, Tāʿrīḵ-i Gusāda (ed. Browne, GMS xiv), 538, 638, 660, 696, 726.

Kal’c-i Sefid is frequently mentioned by Persian poets and chroniclers. It is first found in Firdawsw’s Shāhkama (ed. Mohi, ii, 92, 245 f.); here the conquest of the stronghold is related as one of the noteworthy deeds of the hero Rustam. As the Fārsnāma (written about 500/1106) reports, the fortress of Kal’c-i Sefid had lain in ruins for many years until it was rebuilt by a certain Abū Naṣr from Tir Mūrdān (a district of the province of Sābūr) during the tumults of the last decades of Bāyūl rule, that is in the first half of the 5th/11th century. The mountain, difficult of access, served not infrequently in wartime as a secure hiding-place. For example in 534/1139 Buṣāba, governor of Fārs, retired here before Karā ʿṢonḵor, atabeg of the Ṣaḥīḫ Ṣutan Masʿūd, cf. the article būz-ābān. The Salghūrīd Abū Bakr (g.v.), atabeg of Fārs from 623 to 658 (1226-1260) (on him see Salghūrīd) transported his treasures to Kal’c-i Sefid and placed a garrison in the citadel in order to have a place of refuge here in case of a catastrophe. The last atabeg of Fārs of the Salghūrīd dynasty, Salghūrakh, met his death at the foot of Mount Kal’c-i Sefid in battle with one of Hūlāqū’s generals in 663/1264; see J. v. Hammer, Gesch. der Ilkhān, Darmstadt 1842, i, 243 and cf. also Mustawfi, Tāʿrīḵ-i Gusāda, 509. Mustawfi (ed. Houtsma) issued an order to destroy all the fortresses in the lands conquered by him, an exception was made of Kal’c-i Sefid, as is expressly mentioned; cf. the passage in the Tāʿrīḵ-i Wāṣṣāf in Quatemère, op. cit., 382. The citadel could therefore continue to serve as a place of refuge, and was also on several occasions a station for political opponents. Thus for example Masʿūd Shāh of the Indjū dynasty, who ruled as governor of Fārs from 736/1335, imprisoned his brother Muḥammad in Kal’c-i Sefid [see INQŪ]; when later Abū Isḥāḵ, a younger brother of the Masʿūd Shāh just mentioned, came into conflict with the Muzaffarīd Muḥārīz al-Dīn and had to flee before the capture of his capital Shīrāz in 735, he went to Kal’c-i Sefid (see Mirḵābd’s account in Quatremère, op. cit., 382; Mustawfi, Tāʿrīḵ-i Gusāda, 658, 15 f.). A few years later the sons of Muḥārīz al-Dīn, Shāh Ṣultān and Shāh Shuḏjā, rebelled against their father, blinded him and imprisoned him in Kal’c-i Sefid in 759/1358; see Mustawfi, Tāʿrīḵ-i Gusāda, 681; Defrémery in JA, 1864, ii, 112. In 785/1383 Shāh Shuḏjā had his son Sūltān Shuḥbīl sent to Kal’c-i Sefid as an alleged rebel (see Mustawfi, op. cit., 743; Quatremère, op. cit., 382; Defrémery, op. cit. (1845), i, 437).

Kal’c-i Sefid has attained special fame through its capture by Timūr. The latter on his second campaign in Fārs in 795/1393 passed by the road from Behbahān to Shīrāz, besieged this barrier fortress, considered impregnable, and stormed it on the third day. All the members of the Muzaffarīd dynasty who were captured and put to death (cf. Šaraf al-Dīn ʿAlī Yāzdī, Šarfānrāma, Calcutta 1887, i, 600 f.; Mustawfi, op. cit., 751).

We read of the capture of Kal’c-i Sefid by Hamza-Bey several centuries later, in the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās I; see Quatemère, op. cit., 384. The Mamasānī have now settled in a large part of what was once called Shūllistān; they are a robber tribe, who centre round Kal’c-i Sefid. On them see Layard in the JR Geogr. Soc., xv, 28; Ritter, Erdkunde, viii, 390, ix, 137; C. de Bode, Travels in Luristan and Arabistan, London 1845, i, 210, 219 f., 262 f. When the Mamasānī in the latter part of the reign of Fath ʿAlī Shāh (1797-1834) were in constant rebellion under a robber chief named Wāl Khan Bakākh, an army of ʿĀdhar-baydjam troops was sent against them, who besieged Kal’c-i Sefid and forced the stubborn defenders of the citadel to yield (cf. Curzon, op. cit.).

It should further be mentioned that below the fortress on the mountain there was at one time a second smaller castle, the name of which is variously given as Astāk (Fārsnāma, 158, 17) or Nūzhān (Mustawfi, Nūzhā, 127); further variants of the name are given here in note 1).

The little village of Tell Espid should not be confused with this; it lies northwest of Kal’c-i Sefid in the adjacent plain on a hill some 2400 feet high; cf. Wells in the Proc. of the Roy. Geogr. Soc., 1883, v, 161 and Herzfeld, op. cit., 85.


(Streck)

KAL'EE-I SULTANİYE [see CANAR-KAL'E BOGHAY].

KALENDER [see KALANDAR].

KALENDERGHOLİ MEHMED (d. 1018/1600), leader of the Djeilaî [q.v. in Supp.] rebels of Anatolia, was born in the village of Yassilvårın, in the sandjak of Ankara. He managed to obtain a timar in this sandjak and was promoted to cavuş when Lala Mehmeth Paşa [q.v.] was beglerbegi of Anatolia. As one of the “deserters” (fördir) who fled at the critical moment in the battle of Mezö-Keresztes (q.v., 1005/1596), he was deprived of his timar; when he appealed, his dismissal was confirmed and he was threatened with further punishment, whereupon he, like so many others who had been proscribed as “deserters”, joined the Djeilaî movement under Karayazgil, then the virtual ruler of Anatolia. Karayazgil died in 1010/1601, and was succeeded as leader by his brother Deli Hasan. In 1015/1603, Deli Hasan came to terms with the government in Istanbul and crossed into Rûmeli to serve as beglerbegi of Bosna, but Kalendergholî, together with such other leaders as Karakush Ahmed and Kara Sa'îld, stayed in Anatolia and maintained their resistance in the area of Ankara—Akshehir—Kütahya. He came to the fore as one of the officers of Tawll Khalî, who surprised the army of the vizier Nasûb Paşa near Bolvadin (1014/1605), so that when the sultan (Abmed I) attempted to come to terms with the Djeilaî leaders Kalendergholî was appointed beglerbegi of Karaman (and thus obtained the title of pasha). However, he did not assume the duties of this post but was granted Ankara as arşapîl [q.v.]. His position became precarious with the death of Lala Mehmeth Paşa, who had been his protector, and the appointment of Müredd Paşa (“The eggplant”) [q.v., 1015/1606] as grand vizier. Moreover, the people of Ankara had refused to permit him to enter the city; he was obliged to leave one of his officers to deputize for him and to withdraw eastwards.

Meanwhile, Murâd Paşa had marched against the rebels and summoned Kalendergholî to join him in the campaign against Djanpulatoghî Ali Pasha at Aleppo. Suspecting a trap, Kalendergholî disobeyed this order, thus revealing himself as a rebel. When Murâd Paşa moved towards Aleippo, Kalendergholî, at the head of a numerous host of segbâns [q.v.], moved westwards, occupying the Aegean coastlands and the Bursa district, so as to threaten Istanbul itself. He defeated the government forces sent against him and even laid siege to Bursa; he failed to take the city but fired the suburbs. Greatly disturbed by Murâd Paşa's decisive defeat of Djanpulatoghî in 1016/1607, Kalendergholî summoned all the Djeilaî leaders to join him; nearly all obeyed, with the exception of Muslu Cavuş, who was operating around Silifke, and Djanpulatoghî himself, who was attempting to take refuge in Istanbul. Kalendergholî's proposal to offer battle in the region of Marâş - Aleppo was accepted, with few assessents. The army of over 70,000 segbâns was defeated in the yayla of Gökşün [q.v.] by Murâd Paşa's troops, composed entirely of kapidu kullari and reliable tribal levies from south-east Anatolia and the Arab lands (22 Rabî' II 1017/5 August 1608). Kalendergholî and his companions fled, hoping to reach safety in Persia. Holly pursuing, he ended on the 10. took refuge with Şâh 'Abbâs, but since he would not abandon his turbulent ways he was put to death.

Bibliography: M. Akdağ, Cildî isyanlarandan Buyluk Kağanlıgû (1603-1606), i, in Tarikh Arabshîî malarî Dergisi, ii/2-3 (Ankara 1964), 1-49; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Tarihi, iii/1 (Ankara 1957), 102-17; Na'tîm, Istanbul 1280, ii, 4-10; Pevece, Istanbul 1283, ii, 270; Tarih-i Cevâhil-i Halim Giray. (q.v.)

(Streck)

KALGHAY, KALGHAY, KAGILKAY, a title best known as indicating the “deputy” or “heir apparent” of the khans of the Crimean Khânate [see KİRM]. The term has been subjected to a variety of linguistic, sociological and political analyses, the most important of which are summarized here.

Linguistically, the title has been connected with the Tatar word kalghay, “he will remain” or “let him remain”, on the basis of an anecdote given by Halîm Giray (Gülbûn-i Khânân, Istanbul 1287, 11 f.). This popular etymology, followed by Hammer (Geschichte der Chane der Krîm . . ., Vienna 1856, 10), Howorth (ii/1, 60) and Ahmed Djeewed (Ta'rikh, i, 73), is untenable. A Mongol origin (Pelliot, Inalcik) is unlikely, since the term is not encountered before 1475. For a full discussion of the problem, see Doerfer, iii, p. 499, and J. Matus, Qalqa, in Turcica, ii (1970), 101-29.

In a sociological or institutional sense, there were ample precedents for the office of kalghay. The Khânate of the Golden Horde and its successor state, the Crimean Khânate, like other stable governments, required a trusted official who could make decisions in the absence of the khân. The kalghay, as deputy and heir apparent, was invariably a brother or a son of the khân (M. de Peyssonnel, Traité sur le commerce de la Mer noire, ii, Paris 1877, 252). As direct descendants of Cingiz-Khân [q.v.], the khâns of the Golden Horde and of the Crimea followed closely many Mongol or inner Asian traditions. In fact, the office of kalghay corresponds rather closely to the Mongol prince known as the olcîgîn-âjan or “master of the hearth and the home yurt or patrimony” (cf. B. Vladimirtsov, Le Régime social des Mongols, Paris 1948, 67 and 126). According to Mongol tradition, the home yurt was entrusted to the care of the khân's youngest son. He would appear significant that most kalghâys were chosen from among the younger brothers of the khân until the end of the 13th century, a time when Islamic-Ottoman practices became more influential in the Crimea (see OTAY and the accompanying genealogical table). Inalcik reports (loc. cit.) that slightly more than half of the khâns had previously served as kalghay, which emphasizes the role of deputy over that of their apparent. Clearly the Ottoman sultan (after 883/1478) and the tribal aristocracy could always impose their will, and often did, to disrupt an orderly succession and to weaken an able or over ambitious Giray dynastic line. A convolution of the tribal dignitaries, termed a kuriltay [q.v.], also represented a weakened version of an inner Asian institution; the original kuriltay
apparently consisted only of family members of a ruling dynasty. In the Crimean Khanate, the privilege was extended to the tribal mirsads [q.v.], thus weakening the authority of the ruling family (cf. B. Grekov and A. Iakoubovski, *La Horde d'Or*, Paris 1939, 121-3).

In accordance with the inner Asian practice of conferring an injeqd or fief upon princes and holders of high office, the kalghay maintained his seat of power in Akmesdjid, exercising from there complete administrative and judicial authority over the inner Crimean territory from Akmesdjid to the Ottoman enclave of Kaffa (Kaffa). He held his own daily divdin [q.v.] and was attended by officials with ranks corresponding to those of the khans divdin in Baghche-saray. It was in the composition of the court and in the powers given to kadids that one may observe Islamic political influences among the Krim Tatar elite. The divdin of the kalghay could recommend the death penalty for criminals within the kalghay's territory, but this penalty was subject to the review of the khans and his mujid and badi-saker [q.v.]. The appointment of a nur al-din [q.v.], a second deputy and heir apparent to the khans, after 992/1584, may indicate an Ottoman influence. Henceforth the tendency was to appoint a brother of the khans, younger or older, to the right wing of kalghay, while the position of nur al-din was reserved for his favourite son. Thus, a certain preference was given to seniority of line, as in the case of the later Ottoman sultans, rather than seniority in a given Giray family.

In the 12th/18th century the revenues of the kalghay included 10,000 piastres from the customs dues of Karasubazar [q.v.], 5,000 p. from the salt works of Kaffa, 3,000 p. from the khan's own dairies, and a tribute of 2,500 p. from the honey tax of Moldavia and 1,000 p. of the same from Wallachia. He also received the capititation tax (jizya, [q.v.]) from certain Christian villages, a revenue which he often turned over to officers of the court, and he inherited the property of mirsads in his district who died without suitable heirs (Peyssonel, ii, 254).

The kalghay could be called upon by the khans to lead Tatar contingents to war (usually in support of the Ottoman army, at which time special subsidies were forthcoming) or on Tatar raids into the territories of Poland-Lithuania, Muscovy or Circassia; on these occasions the kalghay had full powers and received one tenth of all booty in keeping with Mongol custom. When the khans led the army, the kalghay often remained behind to guard the Crimea from Cossack or other attack. If he accompanied the khans, he was placed in command of the right wing of the army (Ewliya Celebi, *Seyahatname*, x, 47-8). The kalghay generally could be expected to support the prerogatives of the dynasty against encroachment by the sultan or the mirsads.

In the sphere of foreign affairs, the kalghay could send his own envoys together with those of the khans and could negotiate independently of the khans under certain circumstances. A proportional amount of all tribute (fisah) payments from Muscovy, for example, had to be specifically allotted to the kalghay. (Note the lists of articles sent to the Crimea in H. Feyizhan and V. Velyaminov-Zernov, *Materiiali po istorii Krimskago Khansata*, St. Petersburg 1864, passim.)

The palace of the kalghay, situated on high ground on the left bank of the Salt river in Akmesdjid, was demolished after the Russian conquest of 1783. Close to the old town, the Russians built the new enclave of Simferopol, which became the seat of power for the Russian governor of the Crimea. The office of kalghay typified the combination of inner Asian and Islamic institutions, a feature common to the institutions of the Turco-Tatar peoples of western Asia.

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text, see the bibliography to the article gin/ in *IA* (Hali Inalcik); H. Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, London 1876-1929, especially vol. ii/2; V. D. Smirnov, *Krimskoye Khans'tvo pod vtorovenskom Ottomanskoj Porti do Nacala xvi v.,* St. Petersburg 1887; and C. M. Kortepeter, *Ottoman Imperialism during the Reformation: Europe and the Caucasus*, New York 1972.

(C. M. Kortepeter)
KALHAT — AL-KALI
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KĀLĪ, KALĀT, the name used by the Arabs for tin (or for an especially good quality of tin), which is sometimes also called raṣāṣ al-kašī and raṣāṣ al-abyād, that is, "kašī lead" or "white lead" (see LA, s.v.; Dozy, Supplément, s.v.; Vullers, Lex. pers.-lat., s.v.; E. Ribdf Dhi 'l-Kifl, Paris 1913-4, 814, 45). The word probably comes from the Far East, whence the Arabs could have borrowed it directly, without the intermediary of modern Persian (although this is also possible) as al-Jāwālišī believed (ed. Socin) no. 3, speaks of the "pearls of Kalāšt" (kalāšt). It is clear that the Arab word kalāšt is derived from the district of Kalāšt, which was celebrated for its tin mines, gave rise to kalāšt and kalāšt. Sometimes the Syro-Arab desert (the Badiya), or the Yemen (al-Flruzabadi, ed. Le Strange, 203), is often mentioned, especially in early Arabic poetry (cf., for example, Ṣīdīqī, al-Kāfī, ed. Le Strange, 203). The word is also—already certainly erroneously—connected with an (alleged) source of tin called al-Kalabī (kalabī) in Ceylon (Yākūṭ, iv, 21, iv, 162), in Spain (Yākūṭ, iv, 162; Ṣīdīqī, al-Kāfī, ed. Le Strange, 203) and in the Yemen (al-Fīruzabādī, op. cit.).

The usual word for tin in present-day Malay appears to be tinak. Also found with this meaning are kalang, kalang—not kalag as Langles, Quatremère, Dozy-Engelmann, Yule-Burnell and others write it—which, according to the dictionaries, means primarily tin-plate or tinned iron-plate (though the meaning tin may be an older one). It is clear that the Arab word kalāšt is derived from Kalāšt (= Kalabī), but from this Malayan word. Quatremère firmly supports this etymology but Dozy-Engelmann and Yule-Burnell do not commit themselves. It is difficult to credit that the Malayan kalang is a corruption of kalāšt. The possibility has also been considered that the name of the district of Kalah, from the Malayan kalang, means simply "land of tin"; this view was expressed as long age as Langlès in his edition of the Voyages of Sinbad the Sailor in Grammaire de la langue arabe by Savary (Paris 1813, 499 = offprint, Paris 1814, 63). Yule and Burnell quote as an analogy the fact that the little state of Salangor (north of the city of Malacca) was formerly known as Nagri Kalāšt, "the land of tin". Furthermore, according to Wilkinson, Malay-Eng. Dict., 526, Kēlāng, Klang properly only name the district of Salangor and a small urban town within that district, is also often extended to include the whole state of Salangor. Perhaps the origin of kalāšt is to be found in this Kelāng.

Kāli, kalašt is also used for a type of sword which is often mentioned, especially in early Arabic poetry (cf., for example, Aww b. Ḥāḍjar, ed. Geyer, 33; Ruβa b. al-ʿAḍijadāšt, ed. Ahlwardt, 49, l. 43; scholia to ʾAṭara, Muʿallaka (apud Arnold, Septem Moalakat, Leipzig 1850, 61). On al-Ṭāʿalīb, Kalāšt, 102, 130 (cited by Dozy, Supplément, ii, 358), see Fleischer in Sitz.-Ber. d. Sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss., (1886), 45. Cf. also Ibn Saʿd, Tabābādī, l. 30). This kind of sword is generally considered to be of Indian origin (cf., e.g., al-Fīruzabādī, al-Kāfī, and, indeed, modern Indian swords were famous from early times among the Arabs and were celebrated by the poets (cf. Schwarzlose, Die Waffen der alten Araber, Leipzig 1886, 127-8 and A. Siddiqi, Studien über die persischen Fremdwörter im klassischen Arabisch, Göttingen 1919, 88-9). As a more definite place of origin Arab geographers and lexicographers usually give al-Kalāšt, where the tin of the same name comes from (e.g., Yākūṭ, s.v.). Sometimes the Syro-Arab desert (the Bādiya), or the district of Hūlwān in ʾUrāk (cf. LA and Kāmūs, s.v.) is given as the place of origin. The Yemen, which produced the finest swords after India, is sometimes given as the place where the sayf kalāšt came from; as in the glossary of ʾAṭara's Muʿallaka cited above. Jacob, All-arab. Beduinen-lexen (Berlin 1889, 149) would like to opt for the Yemen, more, according to Wilkinson, specifically the "fortress" (kalāšt) of Aden; in support of this hypothesis is the fact that a poem by ʿAlīkama (ed. Socin) no. 3, speaks of the "earls of Kalāšt" (kalāšt). Yet the derivations of the Arab word from an East Indian place called al-Kalāšt (= the Kalah of Malacca (q.v.)) seems more likely. The distinction between the two kinds of sword, kalāšt and kalāšt (cf. Freytag, Lex. Arab.-Lat., s.v. kalāšt and kalūst), is in any case invalid (contra Schwarzlose, op. cit., 130).

KALĪF, also KAYLIF, a town on the Amū-Daryā (al-Masʿūdī, viii, 64 calls the latter "Kālīf River"), west-north-west of Tirmašt. The main part of the town with the fortress Ribāšt Dhi-i-Kārmaš lay to the south of the river; there was a castle nearby. On the outskirts on the northern bank lay the fortress called Ribāšt Dhi-i-Kālīf (cf. Būkht). In 1220 the Khwārizmshāh Muḥammad II marched on the town to prevent the Mongols from crossing the Amū-Daryā. According to Mustawfī, Nuzhat al-Kalāšt, 135 (translation 153), Kālīf was famous in the 9th/10th century for its fruit and had some importance as trading-post on the road from Bāltik to Nakhchīvan (Nasaf) (q.v.) in Sogd. The town still exists (Russian Ribči) but is now situated not on the northern bank of the river only. The ford in the Amū-Daryā is still of importance on the route to Afghanistan.

Bibliography: Muḥaddasi, 291, 343; Yākūṭ/
Wüstenfeld iv, 229 = Ed. Beirut iv, 432 = Barbier de Meynard, Dict. 474; Le Strange, Eastern Caliphate 442; Barthold, 2 parts, index; Encyclop. isheq Slever Brockhaus-Efron xxviii (1893), 902.

(B. Spuler)

KALIFA [see ERZURUM].

KALIFAT [see CACUTTA].

KALILA WA-DIMNA, title of an Indian mirror for princes, formed by the corruption of the Sanskrit names of the two principal characters, two jackals, Karāṭaṇka and Damānaka (in the old Syriac translation the forms are still Kaallag and Damnag). It was translated from Sanskrit into Pahlavi and thence into Arabic, and became widely known in Muslim as well as Christian literatures.

1. The original work. The Indian original was composed by an unknown Vignhunite Brahman, according to Hertel probably about the year 300 A.D. in Kashmir; the main argument for this, the translation of denarius by dinəra is, however, not conclusive, as the pronunciation of the ɣ as i is older than Hertel supposes (see also A. Berriedale Keith in JRAS, 1915, 505). It consisted of an introduction and five books, each of which bore the name tantra, i.e., "occasion of good sense". The book was intended to instruct princes in the art of polity by means of animal-fables composed in perfect Sanskrit. The oldest descendant of the original work is the Tantrākhyāyika, rediscovered by J. Hertel (see Tantrākhyāyika, die älteste Fassung des Pañcatantra, tr. from the Sanskrit with intro. and notes by J. Hertel, 2 parts, Leipzig-Berlin 1909). A second recension of the original work is called the Añcatantra. J. G. Kosegarten published an uncritical mixed text (Bonn 1848) on this. Benfey based his translation, Pañcatantra, fünf Bücher indischer Fabeln, Märchen und Erzählungen, tr. from the Sanskrit with intro. and notes, 2 vols., Leipzig 1859. In the introduction to this work the history of the spread of Indian literary themes to Europe was first exhaustively investigated.

2. The Pahlavi translation. A rather early recension of the Pañcatantra was translated from Sanskrit into Pahlavi by order of the Sasanian king Khusrav Anāšāhvān (532-579) by his physician Burzōe, whom he had sent to India for this purpose, and expanded by the addition of an appendix of fables from other Indian sources; of these the three first (chap. 1-13 in de Sacy) are taken from the twelfth book of the Mahābhārata (ibid., chap. 138, 139, 111); the other five (de Sacy's chap. 14, 15, 16, 18, 19 and the story of the king of the mice, see below, not given in de Sacy) have so far not been found in Indian literature, although there is no reason to doubt their Indian origin. Burzōe prefaced his translation with an autobiographical introduction which the vizier Buzurdjmír, it appears, signed with his own name (see Burzōe's Einleitung zu dem Buch Kalila wa-Dimna, tr. and annot. by Th. Nöldece, Schriften der wissensch. Gesellsch. in Strassburg, fasc. 12, Strasbourg 1912).

3. The old Syriac translation. Burzōe's Pahlavi translation itself is lost; but by about 570 A.D. it had already been translated by the Periodiut Būd into Syriac. This translation only survives in one manuscript, which was formerly preserved in the monastery at Mārdin, then in the library of the Patriarch of Mōsul and afterwards came into the possession of Mgr. Graffin in Paris. From a defective copy of this, which Socin had brought with him, Bickell prepared the first edition (Kalila et Dimna, ou Fables de Bidpai, Paris 1816) is based on an inferior manuscript and is arbitrarily emended from other manuscripts (see Nöldeke, in the Göttinger Gelehrte Ans., 1854, 676). In de Sacy's text, Ibn al-Mukaffa's preface is preceded by a new preface by an otherwise unknown Bahnhīd b. Sābwa' or 'All b. al-Shāh al-خارش, in which he gives an account of the history of the book in India, as well as a report said to have been written by Buzurdjmīr regarding Burzōe's mission to India with the commission to bring back the book; in several manuscripts this is followed by another story of Burzōe's being sent for a miraculous plant. Some manuscripts (see J. Derenbourg, Directories vitae humanae, 323) add at the end two more fables, of the heron and the duck and of the dove, the fox and the heron from other, as yet unknown sources. This latter story is also inserted in the oldest Oriental reprint of de Sacy's edition, Bōlāk 1249 (according to Chauvin, op. cit., p. 13); from this it has passed into the more recent editions printed at Cairo, Mōsul and Beirut, the list of which in Chauvin, p. 13 ff., according to Cheikho, p. 6, is not yet complete. Valuable contributions to the criticism of de Sacy's text from Italian manuscripts are given by I. Guidi, Studi sul testo arabo del Libro di Calila e Dimna, Rome 1873. The story of the king of the mice and his ministers, not given in de Sacy, which is shown by the Syriac text to belong to the Pahlavi work, was published by Nöldeke in text and translation in the Abhandl. der Königl. Gesell. der Wissenschaft. zu Göttingen, xxv/4 (1879). The complete material from 16 Paris manuscripts for the story of the ascetic and the broken jug was given by Zotenberg in the JA Ser. 8, vii (1886), 116-23.

While the numerous printed editions of the East (Bōlāk 1249/1817; Cairo 1297/1835; Bayt al-dīn 1869; Mōsul 1874, 1876; Beirut 1880, 1884) in the main reproduce the texts of the Sacy and Guide, A. N. Tabbara (Kalila et Dimna, trad. arabe copiée d'après un ancien manuscrit trouvè à Damas, avec notes, Beirut 1904) claimed to have discovered a new source for textual criticism; but his work (1904-1925) is too modern to afford new material and his edition is, besides, bowdlerized. On the other hand I. Cheikho found in the Lebanon monastery of Dayr...
al-Shir a valuable manuscript of the year 719/1320, and made it accessible in an excellent edition: The version arabe de Kalilah et Dimnah d'après le plus ancien manuscrit arabe daté, Beirut 1905 (many later eds.). A new edition by Khalil al-Ya'qubi (ibid., 1908) was followed by that of Salim Ibrāhīm Shādir and Shāhīn Ṭāṭīa (ibid., 1910), intended for school use. The latest of note is that of T. Husayn and Ḥabīb al-Wahāb Azzām (Cairo 1947), based on a Ms. from Aṣyā Sodīya dated 619/1224 and therefore earlier than that of Cheikho. The modern European translations from de Sacy’s text are given by Hertel (op. cit., 393); to these may be added M. Moreno, La versione araba di Kalila e Dimna, tr. into Italian, San Remo 1910 (see RSO, vi, 201, in his Kalila et Dimna, fables de Bidpāi (Paris 1957); A. Miguel follows the ‘Azzām’s edition with the addition of chapters from fragments of Marāfī (4th ed., Cairo 1935) and Derencour’s Directorium.

5. Arabic versifications. The translation by Ibn al-Mukaffa’s has been three times put into Arabic verse. The first version was made by his younger contemporary Abūn al-Lābīkī [q.v.]; see also A. E. Krymski, Abūn al-Lahiqī, le Zindiq (environ 750-825), versificateur arabe des recueils des apories indo-persans. Essai sur sa vie et ses écrits, tiré de l'unique manuscrit de Souli,..., Bbl. Khd., N°., 594, and d'autres sources primitives. A. geproces. Brr,hm et bases...; b. Texte arabe intact d'al-Avrāq par Souli, éd. en collaboration avec Misra Abdoullah Ghaffarow (also in Russian with Turkish title) Moscow 1913; on the manuscript cf. Horovitz in the Mitt. des Seminars für Orient. Sprachen, Westas. Stud., x, 35. This version is lost; with the help of it, but on the basis of the text of Ibn al-Mukaffa’s, a version was prepared in 1190, Ibn al-Habbariya announces his intention of reproducing the work completely, including the aphorisms which seemed to him particularly valuable, with all the rhetorical adornment of artificial prose; he gives only Buzröe’s introduction in ordinary prose, as an artificial style does not suit its matter. The work was lithographed in Tehran in 1282/1865 (this dispenses with Chauvin’s doubts, p. 46/7), 1304 and 1305; cf. de Sacy in Not. et Extr. X, i, 96 ff.; E. G. Browne, A literary history of Persia, li, London 1906, 349.

A metrical version of the book was composed by Sultan ‘Īzz al-Dīn Kaykābūs (641-62/1244-63) by Ahmad b. Mahmaid al-Tūsī Kānī, a contemporary of Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī at Kumya, who had fled before the Mongols from his native city of Tūs; it was probably based on Naṣr Allāh’s translation, which, however, he now mentions (see Rieu, Cat. of the Pers. MSS. in the Brit. Mus., 582 ff.; E. G. Browne, A history of Pers. literature under Tar tail dominion, Cambridge 1920, 121).

This work was, however, put in the shade completely by the revision of Naṣr Allāh’s translation done by Husayn Wā’īs Kāshīfī (d. 910/1504) [see Xāqīgīr], the court-preacher of Ḥusayn Baykārā of Herāt [see Husayna [q.v.]] in honour of Husayn’s minister Ahmad Suhaylī he called his work Ame’ir-i Suhaylī. He professed to be making the rhetorical artificial prose of Naṣr Allāh easier to understand by giving it a new version but in reality he created an even more florid and verbose concoction, “full of absurd exaggerations, recondite words, vain epithets, far-fetched comparisons and tasteless bombast and represents to perfection the worst style of those florid writers who flourished under the patronage of the Timurids” (E. G. Browne, A literary history of Persia, n. 352). But as this style remained predominant in Persia and particularly in India down to the threshold of the modern period, the work had an unparalleled success and was printed in England (first complete edition London 1836), where it was used as a text book for the examination of English officials in India in Persian and repeatedly printed and lithographed in India and Persia, translated into several Indian dialects, into Pushtu, Georgian and all the principal languages of Europe (see Chauvin, 26-43). Husayn replaced the four prefaces of Ibn al-Mukaffa’s by a new introduction from a so far unidentified source; de Sacy supposes (Not. et Extr. XII, i, 59) that in it we have the older Dīkwān al-Kord, which al-Turtūshī was still able to use for his Sirādī al-Mulūk, Bulāk 1260, 97, 185. The Emperor of China, Humâyūnflā, is persuaded to give up the idea of abdicating his throne by his vizier, who tells him how the Indian king Dābhīlīn was directed by a dream to a cave in which an old man would give him a treasure. Of the latter Dābhīlīn keeps only the testament of Hoghang, king of Persia, which contains 14 pieces of advice for rulers, and with these he goes to Ceylon, where the Brahman Bidpāι and Pillāpī explain each of these precepts by stories which form the separate chapters of the book.

Dislike of the extravagant and luxurious style of the poet Rūdhīkī (d. 304/916) put the book into Persian verse of which, however, only 16 verses have survived in quotations in Asadī’s Lughāt-i Fors, ed. Horn, p. 18 sqq. Ibn al-Mukaffa’s work was translated into Persian prose probably after the year 530/1144 (see Rieu, Cat. of the Pers. MSS. in the Brit. Mus., 745-6) by Nizām al-Dīn Abu ‘l-Ma’ālī Naṣr Allāh b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, who dedicated his work to Bahrām Shāh of Ghazna (q.v.). Naṣr Allāh in a new preface announces his intention of reproducing the work completely, including the aphorisms which seemed to him particularly valuable, with all the rhetorical adornment of artificial prose; he gives only Buzröe’s introduction in ordinary prose, as an artificial style does not suit its matter. The work was lithographed in Tehran in 1282/1865 (this dispenses with Chauvin’s doubts, p. 46/7), 1304 and 1305; cf. de Sacy in Not. et Extr. X, i, 96 ff.; E. G. Browne, A literary history of Persia, li, London 1906, 349.

A metrical version of the book was composed for Sultan ‘Īzz al-Dīn Kaykābūs (641-62/1244-63) by Ahmad b. Mahmaid al-Tūsī Kānī, a contemporary of Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī at Kumya, who had fled before the Mongols from his native city of Tūs; it was probably based on Naṣr Allāh’s translation, which, however, he now mentions (see Rieu, Cat. of the Pers. MSS. in the Brit. Mus., 582 ff.; E. G. Browne, A history of Pers. literature under Tar tail dominion, Cambridge 1920, 121).

This work was, however, put in the shade completely by the revision of Naṣr Allāh’s translation done by Husayn Wā’īs Kāshīfī (d. 910/1504) [see Xāqīgīr], the court-preacher of Ḥusayn Baykārā of Herāt [see Husayna [q.v.]] in honour of Husayn’s minister Ahmad Suhaylī he called his work Ame’ir-i Suhaylī. He professed to be making the rhetorical artificial prose of Naṣr Allāh easier to understand by giving it a new version but in reality he created an even more florid and verbose concoction, “full of absurd exaggerations, recondite words, vain epithets, far-fetched comparisons and tasteless bombast and represents to perfection the worst style of those florid writers who flourished under the patronage of the Timurids” (E. G. Browne, A literary history of Persia, n. 352). But as this style remained predominant in Persia and particularly in India down to the threshold of the modern period, the work had an unparalleled success and was printed in England (first complete edition London 1836), where it was used as a text book for the examination of English officials in India in Persian and repeatedly printed and lithographed in India and Persia, translated into several Indian dialects, into Pushtu, Georgian and all the principal languages of Europe (see Chauvin, 26-43). Husayn replaced the four prefaces of Ibn al-Mukaffa’s by a new introduction from a so far unidentified source; de Sacy supposes (Not. et Extr. XII, i, 59) that in it we have the older Dīkwān al-Kord, which al-Turtūshī was still able to use for his Sirādī al-Mulūk, Bulāk 1260, 97, 185. The Emperor of China, Humâyūnflā, is persuaded to give up the idea of abdicating his throne by his vizier, who tells him how the Indian king Dābhīlīn was directed by a dream to a cave in which an old man would give him a treasure. Of the latter Dābhīlīn keeps only the testament of Hoghang, king of Persia, which contains 14 pieces of advice for rulers, and with these he goes to Ceylon, where the Brahman Bidpāι and Pillāpī explain each of these precepts by stories which form the separate chapters of the book.

Dislike of the extravagant and luxurious style of
the Amãr-i Suhâyli induced the Emperor Akbar (1556-1605) to commission his vizier Abu 'I-Fadl to prepare a new edition of the work. This bears the title 'Iydr-i Dâmiq and was completed in 966/1558. It retains the arrangement of its model but restores Ibn al-Mukaffa’s preface and Burzoe’s introduction. The work itself is still unpublished but a Hindustân translation by Hafi zuddîn, entitled Khâm ã Afrás, was published by Th. Roebuck (Calcutta 1815) and by Eastwick (Hertford 1857), London 1867 on account of its elegant diction.


Naṣr Allâh’s edition was translated into old Ottoman Turkish (not into Eastern Turkî, as Hertel, p. 407, says, relying on a somewhat misleading expression of Éthé’s, op. cit.) by Masûd for Umar Beg, prince of Aydîn (d. 748/1347) (a Ms. in the Bodleian, Marsh. 180). This prose text was put into verse by an unknown author who dedicated his work to Sultan Murâd I (761/1359-792/1399); only about half has survived in a copy manuscript (see Persîch, Ver. der âûr. Handschr. d. Her. Bibl., 168, 189). A modern Ottoman prose version, which must have been made before 955/1548, exists in the Bodleian Ms. Marsh. 61; cf. H. Éthé, On some hitherto unknown Turkish versions of Kalilah and Dimnah in the Actes du 6th Congr. internat. des Orientalistes, 2nd sect., i, 241 ff.

9. Ali b. Šâlîb, called ‘Ali Wâsi or ‘Ali Célébi, translated the Amãr-i Suhâyli into Ottoman rhymed prose and dedicated his work to Sultan Sülaymân I (1512-20) with the title Humâyûn-nâmâ; it has been several times printed in Bîlâk and Istanbul (see Chauvin, p. 50). Among the different European translations of the Humâyûn-nâmâ, the best known is the French of Galland, published after his death by Gueulette (Paris 1724); it was reprinted many times and "continued" in 1778 by D. Cardonne (see Abdel-Halim, Antoine Galland, Paris 1964, 180-8, 254-9). It was translated into German, Dutch, Hungarian and Swedish, and into Malay by Gonggrijp (Batavia 1866) and the latter version inspired a Javanese translation by Kramaprawira, which was put into Javanese verse by an anonymous poet. The luxuriousness of its language, in which the Humâyûn-nâmâ surpassed even its Persian original, induced the muftî ‘Abd Allâh Efendî and ʿUmrânâzîdê, who died in 1159/1746 as hâdzi in Cairo, to prepare extracts from it (see Éthé, op. cit., 242).

The Amãr-i Suhâyli was translated, apparently with the assistance of the Humâyûn-nâmâ by Faqîr Allâh b. ʿIsâ Taqīkandî, at the instigation of Muḥâm-mad Mûsâ Bay Bâkî into modern Eastern Turkî prose (to be more accurate, into the language of Tashkant and Farghânâ as the colophon says, or the language of Turkestan and Farghânâ as the title states). Muḥâm-mad then had the book lithographed by the calligrapher Mîrzâ Ḩâşim Khodîndî, according to the colophon in 1308/1888; according to the title, the book was published in 1893.

Ibn al-Mukaffa’s book was translated from the Arabic into Eastern Turkî by ‘Abd al-Allâh Fâysân Khân Oghlu and printed at Kazan in 1896 (University Press, Orient. Bibliographie, iii, 1421), in the same year at Wjatschak (ibid., iv, p. 3935) and in 1892 at Cîrkova (ibid., vi, 167, no. 3166). The introduction, however, was borrowed from the Amãr-i-Suhâyli. The Mongol translation which Malik Iltifâık al-Dîn Muḥâm-mad b. Abî Naṣr, a descendant of Muḥâm-mad Bakrî, prepared in Kazan has not survived (see Hand Allah Mustawfî, Taʾrikh-i Gûstâda, ed. Browne, Gibb Mem. xiv, 844-5, tr. 233; Browne, A history of Persian literature under Tartar dominion, 93, and correctly stated as early as Hammer-Purgstall in the JA, 3rd Ser., i, 580). This statement is confused in Hâddîl Fâtih, v, 239, who ascribes a translation into Turkish (jugal-tûrk) to the ancestor Muḥâm-mad Bakrî (see de Sacy, Not. et Extr. X, 175; Éthé, op. cit., 243, does not take notice of von Hammer’s cor-

correct statement). As Flügel wrongly translates in "language Taterorum", Hertel (p. 414) wrongly identifies this reported Tatar translation with the above mentioned Kazan Turkî (so-called Tatar) translation quoted in Chauvin, 78, n.

10. The Ethiopic version, which was certainly based on an Egyptian text of the Arabic of Ibn al-Mukaffa, is also lost: it is mentioned in a work composed in 1582 (see Wright, Cat. of the Ethiopic MSS. in the Brit. Mus., 816; see also Nöldeke, Gött. Gelehrte Anz. 1884, 676, n. 5).

11. The Hebrew and older European trans-

lations. At the beginning of the twelfth century a certain Rabbi Jôël translated Ibn al-Mukaffa’s work into Hebrew (see S. de Sacy, Notes et Extraits, ix (1823), 397-466) from a valuable manuscript which, however, already contained the false story of Burzoe’s mission and the two not genuine fables at the end of the heron and the duck and the fox, dove and heron. From the unique manuscript, exceedingly corrupt in the beginning, J. Derenbourg published his translation along with that of Jacob b. Eleazar of the 13th century (Deux versions hébraïques du Livre de Kalîlh et Dimnah in the Bibli. de l’École des Hautes Études, fasc. 49, Paris 1881). Jacob’s version while based on a similar text to that of Jôël is, however, very free, composed in elegant rhymed prose and full of biblical locutions. The version of Rabbi Jôël was then translated into Latin by the baptised Jew John of Capua for Cardinal Ursinus between 1263 and 1278 with the title Directorium vitae humanae (cf. Johannes de Capua, Directorium vitae humanae, publ. and annot. by J. Derenbourg in the Bibl. de l’École des Hautes Études, fasc. 72, Paris 1889). With the exception of an old Spanish version, which reproduces the same text as Rabbi Jôël much more faithfully than John of Capua does (see Clifford G. Allen, L’ancienne version espagnole de Kalîla et Digna, texte des mss. de l’Escorial, précédé d’un avant-propos et suivi d’un glossaire, thesis, Paris-Macon 1906), all later translations into Western European languages, with the exception of quite modern ones, are based on the Latin text of John of Capua (see Chauvin, 59-71; Hertel, 366-400). Most noteworthy are the Italian versions by Firenzuola (Discorsi degli animali ragionanti tra loro, Florence 1548) and Deni (La filosofia morale del Doni, Venice 1552), and the French adaptations by G. Pottier (Plaisants et factieux discours sur les animaux, Lyons 1566) and P. de la Rivey (Deux livres de philosophie fabuleuse, Lyons 1579). In 1664 G. Gualmiier published a translation from the Arabic text entitled Livres des lumieres. , . . , . attributing its elaborations to “David Sahod d’Isfahan”. A version of a Greek translation (see below) appeared in 1666, prepared by P. Pousianne. The last two works inspired La Fontaine (for the influence of Kalîla wa-Dimnah on the Roman de Renart and

12. The Greek translation. Towards the end of the 11th century, Symeon son of Seth translated Ibn al-Mukaffa's work fairly freely into Greek from a manuscript which was still free from later additions but contained the chapter on the king of the mice and his ministers. He called the book Στεφανίται και Ύγιελάται, because he recognised in Kalila the Arabic shhih and in Dimna the Arabic word for "trace". See Στεφανίται και Ύγιελάται, Quattro recensioni della versione greca del Kitāb Kalila wa-Dimna, pubbli. da Vittorio Puntoni, *Publibcazioni della Società Asiat. Ital.,* ii, (1889). This version was in turn translated into Latin and German as well as into several Slavonic languages.

13. The Persian translation of the Hitopadēṣa. The later Sanskrit version of the Pañcatantra, the Hitopadēṣa, was translated very freely into Persian, probably in the reign of Akbar, by a certain Tādji al-Din, under the title Musarrāt al-Kalilā va-dimnā (see above). The Indian Ethics, transl. from the Version of the celebrated 2nd Indian Ethics, ed. by his vizier Muhammad b. Ghādār al-Malāyān; his work, entitled Rawdat al-Ukhlā, exists in two manuscripts in Leiden and Paris. The *Marzubānnāma* of Sa'd al-Dīn-Warāwīnī, composed between 607/1210 and 622/1225, enjoyed greater popularity. It has been edited by Mīrzā Muhammad (Gibb Mem. Ser., vol. viii, 1932).

Warāwīnī's version was translated by an unknown author into Ottoman Turkish (a copy of 848/1444 in Berlin; see Pertsch, *Vers. der Türk. Hds.,* no. 444); this Turkish version was again translated anonymously into Arabic (Ms. Berlin, see Ahlwardt, Verz., no. 847). A second Arabic translation, which according to the Gotha Ms. (see Pertsch, *Die Arab. Hāss. der Pers. Bibl.,* no. 269), is also based on the Turkish, was made by Ibn 'Arābah (q.v.); there is another Ms. in Paris (de Slane, Cal., no. 3524) and it was lithographed in Cairo in 1278. The same author then rewrote his work in artificial prose in his *Fikhab al-Khalafā wa-Muṣaffār al-Ẓārafā*, and added several new stories.

The same recension, which had been translated into Ottoman Turkish and which is distinguished from Warāwīnī's vulgate as well as from the Rawdat al-Ukhlā by the tenth (concluding) chapter, thus came to be called iṣyādāt-i ʿumr wa-dawlat wa-zindagānī hardān bā dōst udāman, was translated into Kazan Sulaymān Bek, son of Muhammad Bek, and printed at Kazan in 1864 under the title Kitāb Destārī Shahī fi ḥikāyāt Dādivānī.

15. Imitations of Kalīla wa-Dīmnā. A handbook of Mohammedan missions was prepared by the prince of Tabaristan, Isḥāq ibn al-Kurashī, intended to produce a mirror for princes, *al-kulub fi ḥikāyāt al-dāima,* in which historic anecdotes are mingled with beast-fables for the edification of the reader, was composed about the end of the 10th/16th century by the prince of Tabaristan, Isḥāq ibn al-Kurashī, in the Persian dialect of his early youth, he visited India in Dāgānīr's reign, but returned to Persia in 1019/1609-10. Two years later, however, he migrated permanently to India. On his arrival, he sought his fortune in various
provinces, including Deccan, where he attached himself to Mir Aqsa Khan. Following Shahjahan's accession, Kalim entered the imperial court, and became poet laureate to the emperor. He was commissioned to write a verse account of Shahjahan's reign on the model of Firdawsi's *Shāh-nāma*. He died in Kashmir in 1651, and was buried there.

Kalim's poetic output is said to comprise approximately 24,000 couplets. He tried his hand at almost every traditional form, but his claim to renown rests chiefly upon his *ghazals*, which are characterized by a subtlety of themes. His consistent use of the artifice known as *miḥāliyya* (giving a statement in one line of the couplet and equating it with an appropriate illustration in the other) seems to have contributed to its popularity as an accepted poetic convention.

**Bibliography:**

(Munibur Rahman)

**KĀLIM ALLĀH**

KĀLIM ALLĀH AL-DJAHANABĀDI

KĀLIM ALLĀH AL-DJAHANABĀDI, b. NūR ALLĀH B. ĀHMAD AL-.MMĀR (mason/architect), al-S̄īndī, one of the leading Cīṣṭī saints of his time, who was responsible for the revival of this order in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent when Muslim society was in a state of utter disorder. He was born at Shāhjahanābād (Delhi), whence his nisba al-Djahanābādī, on 24 Djumādā II 1060/24 June 1650, eight years before Awrangzīb's accession to the throne. His ancestors, builders and masons by profession, originally hailed from Khojandā (q.v.). On his death, the mosque was made by his father, the ustād ʿUlī Nūr Allāh. He acquired his early education from local scholars, including Abū Ḵārid Mūḥammad, uncle of ʿUlī Wāfī Allāh al-Dihlawī (q.v.).

Later he left for the Hijāz to make the Ḥajj and Ziyāra and stayed there for a long time. He contrac-
ted his *bayā* in the Cīṣṭī order with Yābūyā b. Muh-
əmmād al-Gūrjānī (d. 1101/1690), who had migrated to Medina and settled there. During his stay in the Hijāz he was initiated into the Naḵkhbandi and Kādīrī orders by Miḥrābān and Shaḵykh Mūḥammad Ghiyāt (cf. *Nushāt al-Khawādīr*, vi, 240). On his return to Delhi he stayed in a mosque situated between the Red Fort and the Ḍāmī Masjīdī in the quarter known as the Khānim bā Ṭābārār. He established a madrasa there which attracted a large number of students from far and wide who enjoyed free board and lodging. No details of this madrasa are available. The Sūfī poet Mīrzā Maḥzār Ḍāmī-Ḍānānī once saw him teaching the Sābīḥ of al-Bu-
khārī to students in this madrasa, which probably formed part of the mosque in which he stayed.

According to Mīrzā Mūḥammad Aḥṣārī Gārgānī (*Tadž-
hīra-ī Auliya*; *Hind wa-Pākistān*, Lahore 1954 (7), ii, 272), the emperor Awrangzīb later ordered the construction of a khānkhānā for him, a complex of buildings comprising ʿibādat-khānā, Ṣafāi-khānā, Ṣanjār-khānā and private quarters. According to the same author the emperor Mūʿāzẓam Bahādūr Shāh I (q.v.) became his disciple in his fourth reignal year (1123/1711), while engaged in an expedi-
tion against the rebellious Šīkh under Banda Bāy-
rāgī. Kālīm Allāh led a life of austerity, which was mainly on the *fuṭūḥāt* (offering) received from dev-
tees and disciples. Learning of his poverty, Far-
rukhsīyār (q.v.), during his short but eventful reign, offered him financial assistance but he refused to ac-
cept it, perhaps fearing persecution at the hands of the *amīr al-ṣamāʿ* Ḥusayn ʿAlī Kāhān, one of the Sāyīdī king-makers known to Indian history.

As a rule he discouraged his disciples from coming close to the rulers and kings and even exhorted them not to approach or visit them. He also did not favour the samāʿ, as was in vogue in his days, although he himself enjoyed it. In one of his letters (no. 110) he vehemently condemns the imitation or sham Šīfīs whom he describes as *mulhīdā* who have given up the *gharfaʿa*. As against Abmad Sirhindī (q.v.), he was not keen of keeping good relations with the non-Mus-
lims so that they might be impressed with the teach-
ings of Islam. Similarly he did not shun the common people but rather liked their company. He discouraged the indiscriminate discussion of the knotty prob-
lem of ṣawdāt al-wudjud. All his life he struggled for the glory and spread of Islam but like Shāh Wāli Allah al-Dihlawī, his successor in the field, his efforts met with little success.

He died on 24 Rābīʿ I 1142/17 Oct. 1729 at an advanced age at Delhi and was buried in the com-
pound of his own khānkhānā, which also served as his residence. The year of his death has been variously given as 1140/1727, 1141/1728 (cf. *Nushāt al-Khawādīr*, vi, 241), 1142/1729 (appendix to Saudā al-Sādī, 139) and 1143/1730 as given by Ghūlām ʿAlī ʿĀzād Bilgārāmī (cf. *Maẓāḥkāda al-Khurās̄ānī*, 1, Haydarābād 1840, 42). The year 1142/1729 has been adopted as the most reliable one, as many authorities agree thereon. After the mutiny of 1857 the entire quarter wherein stood his khānkhānā was pulled down by the British but his grave was spared. It had remained in a state of neglect and disrepair for some decades when Ḥāfaẓ-Ṣāḥīb Ḥūšām Farīd, spiritual guide of the ruler of Bahāwālpūr (q.v.), contributed a large sum for its reconstruction. It was later repaired and renovated by one of his descendants, who set up a beautifully carved stone railing around his grave and paved the tomb floor with marble flags. The tomb still exists and is the lonely structure standing between the Red Fort and the Ḍāmī Masjīdī. An āʿpū is held every year at his tomb on the occasion of the anniversary of his death. It was regularly attended by the last Moghul emperor of Delhi, Bahādūr Shāh ʿZafar (q.v.), and other princes of the royal family.

His leading *khaliṣa* was Niẓām al-Dīn Awrangzībādī to whom he addressed a number of letters on the problems of ṭasaʿwūf. He left three sons and three daughters. His sons, however, were all minors at the time of his death.

He is credited with having written more than 20 books including: (1) Saudā al-Sādī (ed. Delhi 1343/ 1925), original in Arabic with Urdu tr., on various mystic problems; (2) *Irshaddī-ī Kalimi* (ed. Delhi 1346/1927), a selection of letters addressed to his principal *khaliṣa* Niẓām al-Dīn Awrangzībādī, with
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Urdu translation; (3) Kashkul (in Persian, Delhi n.d.), described as a pot-pourri of tasaawuf, composed in 1101/1690, when he was nearly 41 years of age; (4) Murakka (in Persian with Urdu tr., Delhi n.d.), comprising what the ḥikûts recite daily by way of dhikr, regarded as a supplement to No. 3; (5) Maktab (Delhi n.d.), 132 in number, addressed to his principal disciples, outstanding among whom was Nizâm al-Dîn Awrangbâdî, interspersed with personal and private affairs; (6) Tâhâri i gharas al-Kâmila, in Arabic (ed. Delhi with Urdu tr., n.d.), discusses ten problems of tasaawuf which he claims to have solved while in ištîkâq (q.v.) during Ramâdân; (7) Mâ lâ-budda fi l-tasaawuf, (ed. Delhi n.d., in Arabic with Urdu tr.), deals with the aims and objects of suâlî and tasaawuf; (8) Keeping up the tradition of his family he wrote a treatise on astrology styled Risâlât Tashkhi i Alâjî i 'Amîlî mubâhkhî bîl-fârsîyya (Ms. in the Naghñîrya Public Library, Delhi). He also wrote a commentary on the Kânûn of Avicenna of which a Ms. copy is preserved in the Raza (sic) Library, Rampur. A fine commentary on the Kur'ân, called Kur'ân al-Kur'ân, which was printed in the margin of a copy of the Kur'ân (ed. Meerut 1920), was also written by him. A certain Kibb al-radd (ṣalb) or Risâlât Radd i Rawdfid (ed. and Fr. tr. H. Laoust, Damascus 1957, 253) the Christians and the Mu'âtshîfîtes were confused once again. Thus in al-Bakillanî's Diet, of Technical Terms, "decree" is the self of the creative commands (kalimat Allah), which is related to the problem of the attribute of kalima which he claims to have solved during Ramadan; (7) i'tikâf [q.v.] and tasâwîf,...
formed beneath the Prime Intelligence” (ed. and tr. H. Corbin, Triologie ismaélienne, Tehran-Paris 1964, 30/32). “The Word of God”, says Corbin (ibid., 29, n. 44), “should be understood as the divine imperative (amr Allāh) by whose will the Prime Intelligence exists”. Further on (7092), al-Sidjistiţanī specifies: “Paradise is the kalimat Allāh by whose means He first founded those things which exist in Paradise”. Finally, the penultimate chapter of the book considers the “meaning (maw'ūd) of the Word (kalima) of the Prime Cause” (90/4/123-121). 

There kalima is analysed letter by letter (k-l-m-h) according to the principles of digfr [q.v.], with reference to the Isma'īlī hierarchies. To the extent that the Prime Intelligence is identified with kalām Allāh (91/119), kalimat Allāh becomes synonymous with the “First Cause, i.e., the Oneness” (90/118).

b) From an Ismā'īlī lexicon. In his Kitāb al-maghāfîr (ed. and tr. H. Corbin, Tehran-Paris 1342/1964) Mullā Sadrā Shirāzī (10th/16th-11th/17th c.) established the link between the Word of God and the Kurān. He deals with the kalām Allāh, but in specifying that the attribute of the Word (kalām) refers to the production of “perfect Words” (kalimatī tāmmī), whose chief example is the creation of Jesus in Mary’s womb (op. cit., 57/193). Mullā Sadrā is the chief exponent of kalimat Allāh. He was Ibn ‘Arabī, who took it as his main theme in Fuyūs al-bihām (ed. ‘Affīlī, Cairo 1365/1946). His meditations on the experience of each prophet are called “the divine Wisdom in the Word (kalima)” of Adam, Seth, Abraham, Isaac, etc. In the chapter on Jesus he stresses this (i, 139); while in the passages dealing with the experience of Moses (i, 197 ff.), he notes Kurān, X, 64 (“the words of God cannot be altered”) and adds (i, 211): “the words of God (kalimatī Allāh) are in fact the essence (a‘yān) of all things in existence; to them belongs eternity (kidām) by virtue of their immutability; to them belongs contingency (budībāh) because of their (concrete) existence and their burgeoning forth (within existence)”. Many other texts could be cited to show how kalima becomes the creative Logos of God, His Parole instauratrice, “instigating Word” (H. Corbin), the first and emanating Source of the production of all being which makes and is the essence of all things.

Bibliography: in the article. See also the main ta’ṣīrīs on the kurānic verses cited above.

(K. D. Macdonald—L. Gardey)

KALIMA [see vahdāt]

AL-KALKASHANDĪ, the nisha or gentilic of several Egyptian scholars of the Mamluk and early Ottoman periods, the most important of whom are as follows:

1. Shihāb al-Dīn Abū ’l-‘Abbās Ahmad b. ‘Ali (‘Abd Allāh?) b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Fazārī al-Shāfi‘ī, legal scholar and secretary in the Mamluk chancery, and author of several books. The main sources for his life are the fairly brief mentions of him in biographical and historical sources of the late Mamluk period by al-Aynī, al-Makrīzī, Ibn Taqrī- birdī, al-Shawkānī and Ibn al-‘Imād; some of his compositions are recorded by Ḥādīdī Khalfā; but it is above all from his own works that we gain most information. It is remarkable how little notice was taken of al-Kalkashandi by contemporaries or near-contemporaries. Al-Shawkānī (d. 902/1497) even states in his al-Daw‘ al-‘alimi that al-Kalkashandi’s Šubh comprises four volumes only, instead of the seven of reality, and he had obviously not seen an actual copy. Nor does he seem to have seen a copy of al-Kalkashandi’s Kitāb al-‘aflat, for he states in his defence of the study of history, al-‘āfāl bi’l-tawbik li-man dhimmu ahl al-tawrīk, tr. in F. Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, 2, Leiden 1968, 434, that it was dedicated to the Ustadar Djamāl al-Dīn, when the dedicatee in the Nihāya itself is another person altogether (see below). Hence we do not know much about al-Kalkashandi’s legal and professional life beyond the salient points and dates of his official career, let alone about his early years, education and private life.

He was born in 756/1355 at Kalkashanda (the form Kalkashanda in Yakūt, Buldān, must be based on a mispronunciation or a dialectal variant pronunciation), a small town south of Tūkhī and north of Cairo in the modern muḍabitiyāt of Kalyūb [q.v.], into a family of scholars. In his nasab or genealogy, al-Kalkashandi attached himself to the Bānū Badr of the North Arab tribal group of Fazārā of Ghatafān [q.v.], see Šubh, i, 345, which had settled in this part of Lower Egypt after the Muslim conquest. In the course of his education at Alexandria, he concentrated on literature, tradition and law, with the aim of becoming a kāfīl of the Shāfi‘ī law school, and his earliest compositions were in this sphere (see below). In 778/1376-7 he received his idgāhī fakhrī or licence to lecture (al-fuyūs wa’l-tadrīs) on Shāfi‘ī law and on the classic collections of traditions from the well-known scholar Shaykh Sirājī al-Dīn Abū Ḥaṣṣ ‘Umar b. ‘Ali, called Ibn al-Mulakātin (d. 804/1401).

However, after a period of teaching, in 791/1389 al-Kalkashandi became a secretary in the chancery under Mīrām b. ‘Ummār al-Makrīzī of the Mamluk administration in Cairo, as a kāfīl al-dāst, one of the secretaries who accompanied the chief secretary (kādī al-sirr) when the latter sat with the sultan for the dispensation of justice [see nīwān, i Egypt]. The background to this appointment of his under the kādī al-sirr Badr al-Dīn Muhammad b. ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn ‘Ali b. Fāḍl Allāh al-‘Umarī, of the famous secretarial family of the Bānū Fāḍl Allāh [q.v.], is indicated in the makāmā in praise of the secretarial art and of his master which al-Kalkashandi inserts in Šubh, xiv, 122-28 (see on this Bosworth, in BSOAS, xxvii (1964), 291-8).

He died on 10 Dijmādāl II 821/16 July 1428 aged 65; it is not known whether he was still employed in the disān at that date. His son Nadīm al-Dīn Mūhammad, called Ibn Abī Ghudda (791/1395-876/1471), also achieved some fame as a legal scholar, a traditionist and a littérateur (Shahkawā, Dāw‘, ed. Cairo 1353-5, 1934-5, vi, 322-3; Makrīzī, Sulhā, ed. Cairo 1353-6, 1934-6, iii, 821; cf. Brockelmann, II, 167, S II, 165).

Al-Kalkashandi’s compositions fall into three groups: (a) law, (b) adab, (c) kīhāb, the secretarial art, together with its genealogical and historical ancillary disciplines.

In the legal sphere, he composed commentaries on the works of two earlier scholars. Firstly, on the Dīwān al-muḥāṣṣarat al-furū‘ī al-ṣafī‘iyā of the Shāfi‘ī scholar Kumāl al-Dīn Abū ‘Umar al-Nasā‘ī al-Madlīlī (691/1292-727/1325), see Brockelmann, II, 224, S II, 271; Guadet-Demobynés, La Syrie à l’époque des Mamelouks, VIII, gives this commentary the title al-Sawāik al-kawāsim, without, however, specifying his source; and secondly, on the treatise al-Hikāt al-ṣagīr fi ‘l-furū‘ī of the Šufi Shaykh Nadīm al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ghaṭafār al-Kawāzin (d. 665/1266, see Brockelmann, II, 494-5, S I, 679). These two works are mentioned by Ḥādīdī Khalfā and
Sakhawl respectively, but do not now seem to be extant.

In the realm of adab, al-Kalkashandi wrote a short work, the Ḥiyāy al-fādil wa-nīzāt al-karam fi 'l-muṣafāḥa bayn al-sayf wa'l-balam, for the bearer of the royal inkstand or davāddār [q.v.], Zayn al-Dīn Abu ʿl-Ẓāhirī, when Sulṭān al-Ẓāhirī Barūḵī appointed him to this high post in 794/1392; the text of this exists in independent manuscripts and is also inserted into the Majālis of Maḥmūd b. Shams al-Dīn. The Subh was completed in 819/1416. This may well have been al-Kalkashandi’s last work; it has been edited by Abyārī (Cairo 1959).

The study of genealogies, important to the secretary for identifying and correctly addressing the recipients of official documents, is dealt with in Subh, i, 306-71, but al-Kalkashandi devoted two works specially to the science of genealogy. The chief one is the Nihdya al-arab fi 'l-tarīf, written after the Subh and before the Dawā, and dedicated to the Amir Abu ʿl-Māḥāsīn Yūsūf al-Umawī al-Kurāṣī. As well as giving a very detailed account of the science of genealogy in general, it deals with early Arabic history, the Asyam al-arab, etc.; but the core of the book is an alphabetically-arranged dictionary of Arab tribal names. The book was printed at Baghdad in 1331/1714 from an unspecified manuscript, and properly edited (with a very biographical introduction, summarized by G. C. Anawati in MIDEO, vi (1959-61), 274-6) by İbrahim al-Abyārī (Cairo 1959).

One question discussed by Abyārī relates to the ascription by Hādīdī Khālīfā, iv, no. 9556, cf. vi, no. 14070, of a work also entitled Nihdya al-arab to al-Kalkashandi’s son Muhammad (see above), this book being written for Zayn al-Dīn Abu ʿl-Dīn Rāghīd, “Amir of the Bedouins of the Eastern and Western Regions”, sc. of Lower Egypt; Brockelmann, ii, 167, 52, 16, attributed this work to the son Muhammad and repeats this dedication to Abu ʿl-Dīn. Abyārī, on the other hand, thinks it improbable that father and son should both write a work on the same subject and with the same title, and convincingly suggests that Muhammad transcribed the original manuscript of his father’s Nihdya in 874/1469-70 and presented this copy to Abu ʿl-Dīn (Nihdya, ed. Cairo, intro., hdn-thd). Al-Kalkashandi’s other genealogical work, described as a supplement (istīdār) to the Nihdya, is the Kālidī al-dījmān fi 'l-tarīf bi-kabāʾil al-arab al-sāmān, dedicated to Abu ʿl-Māḥāsīn Muhammad al-Dīnān al-Muʿayyadī, and completed in 839/1436. This may well have been al-Kalkashandi’s last work; it has been edited by Abyārī (Cairo 1964).

Finally, we have al-Kalkashandi’s remaining work, the Maʾḏāhir al-infāf fi maʾṣālim al-khillāf. This is a treatise on the constitutional position of the Caliphate, the qualities necessary for office, the duties of the caliphs, the documents issued by them (of which many texts are quoted), together with a history of the caliphs and some of the latter sultans. The whole work is dedicated to the ʿAbbāsid caliph in Cairo, al-Muʿtaṣidī b. al-Muṭawakkil (816/1414-845/1447), which places the composition of the work after that of the Subh and in the last years of al-Kalkashandi’s life; the non-historical part of the Maʾḏāhir is clearly dependent on the Subh. The work has only recently become known with the identification of two manuscripts in Turkey by the late Mūkrimī Hallī Yūnān and İbrahim Kafesoglu; a detailed analysis of the work, with the parallels in it to the Subh, indicated, is given by Kafesoglu in his article Kalkasandîn’in beli neyven bir esseri, Mecâsir 1-Indfa, in Tarih Deriğisi, viii, no. 11-12 (Istanbul 1956), 99-104. A printed edition of the Maʾḏāhir, based on an unspecified manuscript and with no acknowledgement of the contribution of Turkish scholars, has been given by ‘Abd al-Sattār Ahmad Farrāfī (Kuwayt 1963, 4 vols.).

(2.) A famous family of Shafiʿī scholars, originally from Kalkashanda but settled in Jerusalem, retained al-muṣīr al-muṣfir wa-dāndān al-dawā al-muṣāmīr, dedicated to Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Bāṭnī, who later became kāḥīr al-sīr (the first volume only of this printed at Cairo, 1334/1916). The Dawā appears to contain a few items of information not found in the Subh.
the nisba of "al-Kalkashandi", including Takl al-Din Abu Bakr b. Muhammad b. Isma'îl al-Ma'dîsî (783/1382-862/1453) and his nephew Karîm al-Dîn 'Abd al-Karîm b. 'Abd al-Râbîm b. Muhammad b. Isma'îl al-Ma'dîsî (808/1405-855/1542), both of whom achieved fame in Cairo and in Palestine as teachers, authors and muftîs, see Sakhwî, Dawât, iv, 311-12, xi, 69-71, and idem, 'âlamîn, in Rosenthal. A history of Muslim historiography3, 439-40. Probably to be attached to this Jerusalem family also is Burcham al-Dîn Abu 'l-Fatb Ibrahim b. Ali al-Makdisi, d. 922/1516 in Cairo, author of collections of traditions and of a treatise Ta'jibîl al-mulîk bi-ta'fûrî bawilîf ta'allâ 'ali al-khummah mâlîk al-mulîk, none of them published, see Brockelmann, II, 94, S 11, 85.

Bibliography: As remarked above, the primary sources for al-Kalkashandi's life, outside his own works, are exiguous. See Sakhwî, al-Dawât, iii, 8; Ibn al-Sâ'dî, Shahrârî al-dhâhâb, vii 149. Makrizî, K. al-Sulâk, iii, 821. Ibn Taghribirdi, al-Manhal al-sâfi, Cairo 1375/1956, i, 330-1. Tâshkûrûzâde, Mîlâh al-sâ'dâda, i, 182. For secondary sources, see the biography prefixed to vol. xiv of the Subb; Sarkis, ii, 1231-3; Kahfcala, al-Dawât, i, 317. Zirikhî, al-A'lam, i, 173. Gaudefroy-Demblonye, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks d'après les auteurs arabes, Paris 1923, V-XV; Brockelmann, II, 166-7, S 11, 164-5; I. Kafesoglu, IA art. s.v.

Studies based on the Subb (in addition to those older ones mentioned in Brockelmann's EI art.) include: M. Amari, De titoli qui usavala la cancel-\l


(C. E. Bosworth)

KALLALA, GUELLALA, a Berber-speaking village situated to the south of the Isle of Djebra [q.n.], famous for its pottery workshops. A great variety of models (at least 120 types) are made there and sold throughout Tunisia. Formerly, they were exported to Algeria, Sicily and Tripolitania, but in recent years the manufacture of pottery has suffered a slight setback as a result of the importation of cheap European ware, some of it made from plastic. Kallala pottery is of two types. The large teffayya, which demands great skill, is designed to support considerable pressure. Pieces can be as large as 1.50 m., with a low centre of gravity to allow the potter to operate the lathe and fashion the upper part at the same time. It is even necessary to make these pieces in several parts. The sfri (Berber amiris), a large container for oil or water (holding 200 to 250 litres), is made of four pieces mounted one on the other. The smaller harrdscha type is more finely finished and is used for a great variety of receptacles (for water, flour, oil, delicacies, spices), for casserole, lids, pipes, lamps, perfume-holders, etc. Enamelled and decorated pottery is also made here. On the occasion of a marriage, neighbouring potters give the young couple a large glazed earthenware jare for storing part of the trousseau (blankets and winter clothing).

The Berber spoken in Kallala (Arabic Gellâla, Berber Ikallâm = "the potters") has preserved a number of archaic features. The dynamic accent has a phonological value: they say afrûhî âmaâkhun, "the little boy", and tafrûkhî tâmîkhun, "the little girl", but afrûhî 'amâkhûn, "a little boy" and tafrûkhî tâmîkhûn, "a little girl"; the feminine is definite or indefinite solely according to the placing of the stress. Vowel length is also a phonological factor: akmûrûn is "bread", but akåmûrûn (with a long û) is "his bread" and akmûrûn-nûn (with a short û) is "their bread". There is a difference between rakabûk al-bûsî, "I have gone to his father's house" (movement, bâb-is) and yâllâ al bân-is, "he is at his father's house" (rest, bân-is). On some occasions the noun following the genitive is shortened: 1mî, "mouth" or "gate" (with a long i), but 1mî-lûsh, "an area in front of the house" (with a short i). Numerals and prepositions can also influence the pronunciation of the nouns they accompany: bôrkûsh, "couscous", but edh berkûshes, "with couscous" (with a short u). Sîlûsh means "house" but they say wîshâ d-s-sîlûsh (with a long û) for "I have come from the house". A number of nouns have a pronoun value: alqâmûn, "his camel", alqâmûn-is, "his camel"; albâgbûl, "mule", albâbgûl-is, "his mule"; albakânhâth, "coffee", and albakânhûn-is, "his coffee". Two things should be noted in this last example: the voiceless dental is pronounced th (aspirant) after a vowel and l (occlusive) after a consonant and the closed syllable remains so by means of gemination in a new syllabic structure. The treatment of f and th resembles the Âgâšehfet consonant. Some of the opposing ones at Kallala are th = b; dâd b, gûs, kûs (= postpalatal voiceless aspirant which tends to a "hushing" quality) and dâd (often pronounced d). In some cases analogy and a massive intrusion of Arabic words have shattered the harmony of the system, but the whole has the same correlations to be found among the Ghumara of Morocco and the Zenaga of Senegal. Kallala, along with Sedikesh, Almay and Adjin, is one of the last strongholds of the Berber tongue on the Isle. An oral literature (songs, tales and riddles) still remains, but the language is sorely threatened by schooling, radio and television as well as by contact with the Arabic-speaking population.
KALLALA — KALPAK


(W. Vycichl)

KALPAK, the Turkish name for a Mongol people, the Oyrat, who in the time of Çingis-Khan [q.v.] inhabited the forests to the west of Lake Baykal. The name is derived (probably only by popular etymology) from the verb kalmak, “to remain” and distinguishes the Oyrat, who “remained” pagans, from the Onggans (the Chinese-speaking Muslims), who had “returned” (the verb dönmek), according to the well-known Muslim idea, to Islam. A group of the Oyrat had accompanied Hülegü to the west and played a certain rôle in Il-Khânid Persia. The people as a whole, however, came into their own only after the collapse of the Mongol dynasty in China, when they wrested the greater part of Mongolia from the Çingizids and laid the foundations of the Kalmuk empire.

From the time of Wāy Khān (1418-28) the Mongols of the Ṭīn [q.v.] had to fight against the “infidel Kalmak”; accounts of these wars are given in the Ta’rikh-i Rashidi. Wāy Khān was twice taken prisoner by the Kalmuks and had to give his sister in marriage to their chief, Esen Tawakkul. Toghon, the latter’s father, was then ruling in Mongolia on the Chinese frontier, where he was succeeded in 1439 by Esen Tawakkul. After the death of Esen Tawakkul (1455) the great nomad empire of the Oyrat broke up; individual princes are mentioned from time to time later as ruling in the neighbourhood of Muslim lands; at the beginning of 864/1459 a Kalmuk embassy appeared in Harat. The Muslim sources also report the restoration of the Oyrat empire under Khara Khula (d. 1634). In Turkestan during this period also the Kalmuks were regarded as powerful foes of Islam. The Kazakh Khan Tawakkul (Tefkel in Russian) had to flee before them to Tashkent, where he was received by the Uzbek ruler Nawruz Aḥmad (d. 963/1556); in reply to his appeal for help, Nawruz declared that even ten princes such as themselves would be no match for the Kalmuks. At a later date, however, on the occasion of his embassy to Tsar Feodor (1594), Tawakkul was described in Russian documents as “king of the Kazakhs and Kalmuks”, perhaps because a few bands of Kalmuks had attached themselves to him. In the winter of 1603-4 there occurred the first invasion of the Kalmuks into Khārīzim. Soon after, under Tsar Vasili Shuisky (1606-1610), the Kalmuks entered into relations with the Russian government for the first time, though it was not until 1612 that they settled on the Volga on a large scale. This branch of the Kalmuks had separated from their kinsmen, under the leadership of Kho-Oorrhok, as early as 1618. The territory of the Volga Kalmuks did not therefore form part of the empire founded by Kharà Khula, although relations between the two branches of the people had not yet been severed. Representatives of the Volga Kalmuks still appeared at the kurilay [q.v.] of 1640; Batur, the son and successor of Kharà Khula, gave his daughter in marriage to the grandson of Kho-Oorrhok. By the same kurilay the dominance of Buddhism was firmly established among all branches of the Kalmuks. The progress made by Islam described in the Ta’rikh-i Rashidi (p. 91) in connection with the above-mentioned marriage was apparently not maintained. Most of the Muslim territories in Turkestan were under the suzerainty of the Buddhist Kalmuk ruler on the Ilī, the founder of the last great nomad empire in Central Asia, which lasted until it was destroyed by the Chinese in 1758; as late as 1749 the regent (ālātik) of Bukhara and his opponent had to submit a dispute to the verdict of an embassy from the Kalmuk ruler. A great part of the Kazakhs’ pasture land was now seized by the Kalmuks, and Islam was almost completely banished from the southern part of Semireçeye. Several Buddhist monuments, including Tibetan inscriptions, date from this period. It was only after the decline of the Kalmuk empire that these areas were re-occupied by the Muslim Kazakhs. The wars of the Volga Kalmuks with the Crimean Tartars and their raids into Khārīzim had less effect on Islam; from 1724 the Kalmuk chiefs on the lower course of the Volga were regarded simply as viceroyos (nemestnik) of the Russian tsar. They had no longer any connexion with the ruler on the Ilī. The decision of the “viceroy” Ubashi and a large number (about 300,000) of his people to migrate from Russia and settle in Chinese territory proved disastrous to the Volga Kalmuks. During the migration heavy losses were inflicted on them in Central Asia, especially by the Kazakhs (1771). Henceforth the Kalmuks were of no political significance in either Russia or in China. During the Muslim rising in the Ilī valley the great Kalmuk temple of Buddha near Kuldi was destroyed.


(J. A. Boyle)

The Modern Period.

After 1771, some 50,000 Kalmuks continued to live west of the Volga. Their descendants joined the anti-Bolshevik Southeastern League but after its disintegration in 1920 they were formed into an “Autonomous Oblast” (province), which was raised to the status of Autonomous Republic in 1933. In 1939 the population of the republic was 200,000 including 134,000 Kalmuks. It was partly occupied by the Germans in 1942 and abolished by the Soviet Government in 1943, when all the Kalmuks were deported to Central Asia on the grounds of alleged collaboration with the enemy. A Soviet decree of 1957 provided for the return of the Kalmuks to their territory, which was reconstructed an Autonomous Republic in 1958 with its capital at Elista (formerly Stepnoy), 150 miles south of Volgograd. According to the 1970 census, the population of the republic was 268,000, of whom 110,000 were Kalmuks. This constitutes 80 % of the Kalmuks living in the USSR. A few thousand still live in the Sinkiang-Uygur Autonomous Region of China, where they are known as Oyrats. Only a small number of Kalmuks, less than 2,000 living in Semireçeye, ever embraced Islam, the rest remaining actual or nominal adherents of Buddhism.


KALPAK [see LIBAS].
KALPÍ, once a powerful town in Uttar Pradesh, northern India, 26° 8' N., 79° 45' E. The old town and fort stand on clay cliffs overlooking the river Dījamnā [q.v.]; there is a modern town to the south-east of the old one, which has some commercial importance and where a fine quality paper is still made by hand. The town was traditionally founded by a rādīd of Kānwadjī in the 4th century A.D., and fell into Muslim hands in the first conquest in 591/1196. The high fort, walled on three sides and defended on the fourth by the cliffs and river, was an important stronghold on the Dījhī sultans' line of communication along the Dījamnā. In the early 9th/15th century, after Tlmur's devastation of Dījhī, Kalpī became independent for a short time under a former governor, Muhammad Kāhn b. Malikzāda Frūz, until in 837/1433 Ibrahim Shāh of Dījawpurna sought to annex it to the Sharkī sultanate; a counter-attack by Mubārah Shāh Sayyid of Dījhī regained it, but in the following year during the Dījhī-Dījawpurna wars it was seized by Hūjang Shāh Ghōrī of Mālwa and remained in the possession of Mālwa for the next ten years. About 847/1443 it was sacked by Māhmūd of Dījawpurna, but after the eventual fall of the Sharkī sultanate to Bahēlī Lodī, Kalpī reverted to Dījhī, and Bahēlī appointed Kuthū Lodī Kāhīn as its governor.

There were in addition several minor incidents during the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries in which possession of Kalpī fluctuated between Dījhī, Dījawpurna and Mālwa. It fell into Mughal hands in 933/1527, and under Akbar became the headquarters of a sarkār and a copper mint. After the Marāfha wars in the early 16th century Kalpī became the residence of a Marāfha governor.

Among a number of old Muslim tombs to the west of the old town, one is outstanding, the Cawrāsī Gunbād (lit. "84 domes"); this name is obscure. This is a square, nine-domed structure in a walled courtyard, with two graves under the central dome; popular belief assigns it to a Lōdī sultan; it is possible that it may have been of a Lōdī governor, as the style of its arches and the supporting systems is consistent with a late 9th/15th or early 10th/16th century date; certain Dījawpurna motifs in its decoration do not necessarily vitiate this conclusion, as stonemasons would have had no difficulty in travelling from one area to another to the Dījamnā. It is possible that the "84" of its name represents a date; if so 1358 V.S., about 934/1527-8, would be the most likely.

Bibliography: A. Cunningham, in ASI, xxi (1888), 131-3; J. F. Blakiston, The Jami Masjid at Badawin and other buildings in the United Provinces, [= ASI, xix], Calcutta 1926, 6-7 and plates xvi-xxi. See also Bibliographies to Dījhī, Dījawpurna, Mālwa, Sharīds. For the Lōdī style of building see HIND, Architecture.

IKALDIYA [see KALWADHA].

KALWAHDHĀ, a locality situated on the left bank of the Tigris, not far south of East Baghdād, capital of a district (jāmīlat) of the same name. Here the Nahr Bin flowed into the Tigris; a branch of the Nahrawān, it provided East Baghdād with a network of canals. Kalwāhdhā was a large town endowed with a Great Mosque frequented by the people of Baghdād since it was only a short distance to travel (Ibn Rusta- Wiet, 214, estimates it at three parasangs, but Yāhīdī, s.v., reduces it to one parasang, specifying that in his day the place was in ruins). The town is often mentioned in verses of the 12th/18th century which extol its pleasures.

Tradition attributes its foundation to Kalwāhdhā, son of Tmūr, but philologists connect the name with kalwādāh, the Ark of the Covenant, which was supposed to be buried there.

Bibliography: Ibn Hawkal-Wiet, 234; Salmon, Introduction, 151 n. 1; Le Strange, index; idem, Baghdād, 193-6.

AL-KALWADHĀNI, Abu ʿl-Khaṭṭāb Maḥfūz b. Ahmad b. 'Alam b. Ahmad al-Baghdrādī, a celebrated jurist (fākhī) of the Hanbali school and one of the architects of what Makdisi called "the resurgence of traditionalist Islam in the 15th century". Born on 2 Shawwal 432/6 June 1041, he was the disciple of Abū Yaʿlā during the same period as Ibn ʿAqlī. He studied ʿadāb and fikr under his master "until he was pre-eminent in his knowledge of the Hanbali rite" (baraʿi fī midqāshā). His other teachers were less well known, apart from ʿAbd Allāh al-Wannī (d. 450/1058), under whom he studied the law of inheritance. It is said that he and Ibn ʿAqlī attended al-Ghazālī's classes at the Niẓāmīyya, but nothing is known of his opinion about the young man from Khūrāsān who had just arrived in Baghdād (484/1091, see Ibn Radjal, Dālay l, 177). Like the majority of Hanbalites, Abuʿl-Khaṭṭāb did not share al-Ghazālī's taste for theology and philosophy. His speciality was fikr, and in this field he acquired the status of a mujiṣāhīd who was accorded the right to put forward, in particular cases, new solutions according to his own judgement. Ibn Radjal (op. cit., 147-54) gives a number of examples of these solutions; in one striking case Abuʿl-Khaṭṭāb went against the consensus of scholars (idjmā) in deciding that a marriage contract is not automatically broken when one of the partners is held prisoner of war by non-Muslims. In defence of his opinion he even declared that a ṣādīq of Abū Saʿīd, recorded in Muslim's Ṣāḥīḥ, was not authentic; according to this ṣādīq a marriage is broken when the wife is held captive in the dār al-harb, in the country of the impious.

Despite such independence of spirit, in most of his works al-Kalwāhdhānī is much more classical and less original than his rival, Ibn ʿAqlī. Among his works, Ibn Radjal thought the most important were: al-Hīdāya fi ʿl-fikr, al-Khīlāf al-hābir, also called al-Insiār, and al-Khīlāf al-saghir, which is also known as Ruṣūs al-masāʾil. Manuscripts of the first two are extant in Damascus, along with al-Tamīḥ fi wuqūf al-fikr (see Brockelmann, S I, 687), an important work on the basic of the law.

Al-Kalwāhdhānī died in Baghdād, where he seems to have spent all his days, on Wednesday, 23 Dijmādār II 510/3 November 1116, and was buried at the feet of Ibn Hanbal beside another celebrated Hanbali contemporary, Abū Muḥammad al-Tamīnī. By far the most important of his disciples was ʿAbd al-Rādī al-Dījāla, who studied under him and Ibn ʿAqlī at the same time.


KALYĀNĪ, a fortified town of the Deccan [see DAKHAN], 17° 53' N., 76° 57' E., about 37 miles west of Bidar [q.v.]. In the 14th/15th and 5th/16th centuries, it was the capital of the Late Western Calkūyā rādīsān, passing later to the Yādavas of Devagiri (= Dvatalabād, [q.v.]); after the foundation of the Bahmanī [q.v.] dynasty at Devagiri, Kalyānī was annexed as one of the strongholds on their northern borders; but there had presumably been a previous
Muslim conquest of the town since an inscription is preserved of a dārābī masjd founded by Ulugh Khan (later succeeded as Muhammed b. Tughluq) in 723/1323; and another Tughluq inscription of 734/1333 is known. The fort was rebuilt by the Bahmans at the end of the 9th/15th century after the introduction of gunpowder. The fort was maintained in good repair, as is evident from a series of inscriptions on its bastions, in the 10th/16th century; these show that it was held by the Barīd Shāhīs [q.v.] as the successors to the Bahmans in Bidar until 981/1573, after which it passed to the ‘Adīl Shāhs of Bidgāpur [q.v.]. It fell to the Mughal empire, after a protracted siege by Awrangzīb, in 1067/1657, and was included in the Mughal īṣbā of Bidar. When the Deccan became independent of the Mughals under the Bahmans in Bidar until 981/1573, after which it passed to the Mughals under the first Nīfām of Haydarābād [q.v.], Kalyānī was one of the possessions included. From 1278/1664 it was governed by a line of Nawwābs of Kalyānī, of whom the first was Mir Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Khān, a son-in-law of Aṣāf Ḍāḥ of Haydarābād.


KALYOMB, a moderate-sized town in Lower Egypt, with a railway station 10 miles north of the central station at Cairo on the Cairo-Alexandria railway. The town proper lies about a mile west of the station and about 3 miles from the right bank of the Nile, on the Turʿat al-Sardūsīyya. Down to the middle of last century, Kalyūb was the capital of the Mudiyya al-Kalyubīyya, but then in 1871 under the Khidges Ismāʿīlī, the Dīwān of the Mudiyya was moved to Benhā. Since that date Kalyūb has been a markaz (district capital). Branch lines run to Zakāţik and the Barrage du Nil. The majority of the inhabitants are Muslims. According to ‘All Paşa Mubārak, Kalyūb possessed a Shariʿa court (maḍāma sharīyya) and a hospital. Cf. ‘All Paşa Mubārak, al-Khalīj al-ḥādīda, xiv, 114 ff.; Baedeker, Egypt (1914), 34; Samībey, Kāmūs al-Aʿlām, Istanbul 1352/1935, vol. 4, 363 ff. The population of the mudiyya of Kalyūb was 930,000 in 1871.

A Greek Kαλύπτων—not yet, however, found—is at the base of the name. In the Scales it is found under the form Καλύπτων (Muspero-Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géogr. de l’Egypte, Series 1, 152).

Historical: John of Nikius mentions Kalyūb in his Chronicle, ch. 113 (ed. Zotenberg, 321, 509). ‘Amr b. al-ʿAṣ [q.v.] had a bridge thrown over the canal at this town to be able to conquer the other towns of the province of Misr (ca. 20,642). In 549/1154-5 the caliph al-Zahir granted Kalyūb as a fief to his great favourite Naṣr b. ʿAbbās. Usāma b. Munkīdī so depreciated this present in the eyes of Naṣr and his father that it became one cause of the murder of the caliph by Naṣr and ‘Abbās (Ibn al-ʿAṯr, xi, 126; Usāma b. Munkīdī, ed. Dörnberg, i, 145; Ibn Muyassar, ed. Massé, 93). In the fighting between Selmī I and Qatān-Bey, Kalyūb did not escape the raids of the Arabs (Ibn Iyās, Taʾrīḵ Shīr, under ʾĪṣār 923/March 10 1527). For embassies etc., Kalyūb was the stage before Cairo. Thus, for example, in Rabīʿ I 923/March 1519 ʿĪsār Bey had the Sulṭān’s envoy received there with the greatest ceremony by the Kādī Barakīt b. ʿAbd-al-ʿAṯr (Ibn Iyās, op. cit., iii, 109). The town had again to submit ignominiously to the burning of soldiers and Mamluks in the years 1292-93/1804-5; cf. al-Djabarti, ʿAḏḏāb al-ʿAṯrāb, sub annos. Kalyūb, as a result of its situation close to the gates of Cairo, probably did not escape on other occasions the effects of the political happenings in the capital. Ibn Dukmāk (803/1400) and al-Zahirī (839/1434-5) report that in their day Kalyūb was for the most part lying in ruins.

Economic: Almost all sources praise the wealth of Kalyūb in gardens and trees, among which the acacias (ṣaʿat) are mentioned as particularly valuable. In spite of the restrictive edicts of al-Malik al-ʿĀṣīlī, the ground was very badly farmed, so that Kalyūb’s prosperity suffered considerably (cf. ‘Uqmān b. Ibrāhīm al-Nabulūsī—wrote 637/1240-9. Brockelmann, GA, I, 409—who devotes a longish section to Kalyūb in his Lumaʿ al-Kawānīn al-Muṣṭaʿīn al-Dawāsīr al-Dīyār al-Miṣrīyya; quoted in ‘All Paşa Mubārak, op. cit., 114 f.). In 1240/1854-5 Muhammad ‘All built a cotton mill in Kalyūb and later a barracks and a remount depot were established there. The al-Shawārībī family deserves special mention for its share in the economic development of Kalyūb, where they also built a seray with a mosque. There are six mosques in Kalyūb, in one of which the Friday service is held. Among these the “great Mosque”, formerly called Dījmāʿ al-Zaynabi, with its great Manāra, made a great impression on Ibn Djabari, 578/1182-3 in Egypt; cf. Brockelmann, I, 629; ‘All Paşa Mubārak, op. cit., 114 f.) According to the inscriptions on its minbar and above the door, it was renovated in 1148/1735-6 by the Shaykh al-ʿArab of Kalyūb, Abmad al-Shawārībī. Among the tombs of saints the most important is that of Sīdī ‘Awwād.

‘All Paşa Mubārak gives a very full account of the above-mentioned al-Shawārībī family, as one of the most prominent in the town. Al-Malik al-ʿĀṣīlī Baybars gave them charge of the new bridge over the Bahr Abūl Manadījja (cf. also al-Kalkashandi, tr. Wüstenfeld, 28) and granted them large estates as fiefs and an annual pension (which lasted till 1275/1858-9). Mustafā Paşa granted them the supervision of the whole province of al-Kalyūbiyya. Various members of the family also filled important posts in the administration, besides the office of Shaykh al-ʿArab of Kalyūb, which seems to have been hereditary amongst them. Sulaymān al-Shawārībī’s patriotism cost him his life; in Radjab 1213/Dec. 1798 he was beheaded by the French for his part in an attempted rising (cf. al-Djabarti, iv, 37 f.).

According to Ibn Dīthān (cf. ʿAbd al-Latif, al-I ḥāda ma-ʾrūbār etc., French tr. de Sacy entitled Relation de l’Egypte etc., 595) the province of al-Kalyūbiyya comprised in his time (777/1375-6) 59 townships and yielded a revenue of 419,054 dinārs (but on p. 599 a list of 61 townships is given). Ibn Dukmāk gives 60 with a total revenue of 383,140 dinārs. In the time of the French expedition, the revenues of the province from the estates (Descr. de l’Égypte, i, 306 ff.) amounted to: (1) for the payment of the mirʾ, 3,390,742 dinārs; (2) for the kushātīyya, 1,710,462 dinārs; (3) for the fiʿāl, 15,119,199 dinārs. The Bahr al-Dardūr—according to legend built by Pharaoh and enlarged by his “vizier Hāmān” (Ibn Dukmāk, al-Kalkashandi)—was, according to the enthusiastic description in Ibn Dukmāk (whom al-Kalkashandi follows), a large canal, apparently with water always in it. This is indicated also by two documents of 922/1516 and 1550-1 (quoted by ‘All Paşa Mubārak) in the possession of the al-Shawārībī family. Al-Kalkashandi notes that the canal in his time had disappeared and
that its place had been taken by the Abu 'l-Manadżdia canal (cf. Wiistenfeld, op. cit., 25 f.); Kespero-Wies., op. cit., 105). According to 'All Pasha Mubarak, there was only a small channel in his time: the Turṣat al-Sardūsīyīya. Ibn Khallīkān, Butrus al-Bustānī and 'All Pasha Mubarak give several scholars who bore the nisba al-Kalýūbi. The best known of them is Shīhāb al-Dīn al-Kalýūbi [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** Besides the works quoted above: Ibn Muyassar, Aḥkār Mīr, ed. H. Mass, Cairo 1910, 23, 60, 93; Abū Shāma, Kiāb al-Rawḍafayn, in the Hist. des Crois., iv, 147; al-Dīmāṣhī, Nabhāt al-Dīr fī Ḡābīb wa-l-Barr wa-l-Bahr, ed. Mehen, Copenhagen 1874, 231; al-Makrīzī, al-Ḫuṣayf, ed. Wiet, i, 313, ch. 25, ii, 85, n. 1; Ibn Dūmād, Kiāb al-Inṣāfār, ed. Vollers, with title Deser de l'Égypte, Būlāk 1309, v, 43, 47; al-Kalāṣāhāndī, Suḥb al-ʿĀrīq, in Wüstenfeld, Calculschandī's Geography u. Verwaltung von Ägypten (Abb. d. Kgl. Gesellschaft. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, xxv 1879), 25 f., 28, 109; al-Ẓāhirī, in De Sacy, Chrestomathie arabe, Paris 1826, ii, 5; Ibn Iyās, Taʾrīḵ Mīr, Būlāk 1311, ii, 54, 109, 157, 204, ii, 110, 190, 206, 286, 303, 318; d'Anville, Mémoires sur l'Égypte., Paris 1765, 381; al-Dībārātī, Fawdādī al-imenti fī Īlādī in the Zahiriya or in the Carnab, his investigations of celestial and meteorological phenomena, the camera obscura, and other topics in optics. His theory of the rainbow is particularly important as he demonstrates the combinations of refractions and reflections of sunlight within a drop of water that result in both the primary and the secondary rainbows; his investigations of celestial and meteorological phenomena with the camera obscura were brilliantly conceived and executed. Unfortunately, this work has been little studied.

Besides the Tābkī, works by Kamāl al-Dīn existing in manuscript are: Tādhrīk at-ṭabībī (e.g., Köprülü 941, fol. 128v-136, copied at Bābdād in 733/1337; cf. Ḥādīḍī Khaltīs, ii, 257), on "friendly numbers"; Babā al-fawdādī fī ʿush al-fawdādī (Köprülü 941, fol. 1-128v, and in other Istanbul manuscripts; see M. Krause, passim.) to which he added appendices on the refractions and reflections of a sphere, the rainbow, the halo, the camera obscura, and other topics in optics. His theory of the rainbow is particularly important as he demonstrates the combinations of refractions and reflections of sunlight within a drop of water that result in both the primary and the secondary rainbows; his investigations of celestial and meteorological phenomena with the camera obscura were brilliantly conceived and executed. Unfortunately, this work has been little studied.


**KALYOB—KAMAL AL-DIN ISMĀ'IL**

The place had been taken by the Abu 'l-Manadżdia canal (cf. Wiistenfeld, op. cit., 25 f.); Kespero-Wies., op. cit., 105). According to 'All Pasha Mubarak, there was only a small channel in his time: the Turṣat al-Sardūsīyīya. Ibn Khallīkān, Butrus al-Bustānī and 'All Pasha Mubarak give several scholars who bore the nisba al-Kalýūbi. The best known of them is Shīhāb al-Dīn al-Kalýūbi [q.v.].
KAMÁL AL-DÍN ISMÁ'ÍL — KAMÁNCA

KAMÁL AL-DÍN SHIR ‘ALÍ [see BANNA’YÍ]

KAMÁL KHUÐJANDÍ (KAMÁL AL-DÍN MAŠÚD), Persian lyric poet and mystic, was born in Khuðjand (Transoxania), later settled in Tabriz, where he lived the rest of his life and, according to Khán-dámír, died in 803/1400-1. Kamál Khuðjandí’s modest diván contains short, exquisite ghásals of five to seven verses with love, Lebenslust and frustration as central themes, and permeated with a deep pantheistic mysticism reminiscent of the school of Ibn al-‘Arabí and Djaláli al-Dín Rúmí. True to the tradition of the great Persian mystics, he never condescended to write panegyrics on potentates, and was often critical of the ‘ulama’ (even in his capacity as Shaykh al-Islám) and the temporal authorities. Háfíz held Khuðjand in high esteem and exchanged poems with him. Revered and much visited by the people, the shrine of Shaykh Kamál was long regarded as a sanctuary.


KAMÁL PÁSHA ZÁDE [see KEMÁL PÁSHA ZÁDE]

KAMÁNCA [see MÁLÁHÍ]

KAMÁNCA (KAMENIEC, KAMENET PODOLSKI), a fortress town of the Ukraine, situated in the region known as Podolia. Kamánca rose to prominence as a stronghold guarding the southern border of Lithuania and (after 1432) of Poland against the incursions of the Tartars. It was important, too, as a station on the commercial route extending from the Black Sea and Moldavia to Poland and the Baltic. The fortress occupied a position of great strength on a high spur of rock, a little above the confluence of the River Smotrych with the River Dnestr (cf. Dupont, 29, who describes it as “le boulevard de la crétenté dans cette partie de l’Europe”). Ottoman forces appeared before Kamánca in 1044/1633 (Fedélhe, ii, 160). Not until the Polish-Ottoman conflict of 1085-7/1672-6, however, did the town become subject to the Turks, falling to the Grand Vizier Ahmed Köprülü in the first year of the war (1083/1672). Kamánca was not destined to remain for long under Ottoman rule, being returned to Poland in 1107/1699 at the Peace of Karlowitz which brought to an end the War of the Sacra Liga (1684-99). The town passed into the hands of Russia at the time of the Second Partition of Poland in 1793. In 1918, at the end of World War I, it reverted to Poland once more, but since 1945 it has been included in the U.S.S.R.

Al-Kamar (a.), the Moon.

I.—Astronomy.—Al-Kamar is the one celestial body that in fact orbits the earth as mediæval Muslim astronomers, following their predecessors, assumed all seven “planets” to do. The actual motion of the moon in its orbit is extremely complicated, as it is effected by a combination of the gravitational pulls of the sun and of the earth. It was a major aim of Muslim astronomers to devise a cinematic model that would enable them to predict this motion accurately, as several lunar phenomena, and in particular the first visibility of the lunar crescent after conjunction (ru’yat al-hildl), which determines the beginning of a month, were of great significance to them. They did not fully succeed in their efforts, though they did conceive of a model essentially identical with that of Copernicus.

Among the pre-Islamic Arabs as among the Muslim, the basic calendaric unit was the lunar month, which began at the sunset following the first visibility of the lunar crescent after the moon’s conjunction (ru’yat al-hildl), which determines the beginning of a month, were of great significance to them. They did not fully succeed in their efforts, though they did conceive of a model essentially identical with that of Copernicus.

One method of intercalation of the pre-Islamic Arabs according to Al-Birûnî was essentially by observation of the mansûl (lunar mansion) occupied by the moon at first crescent. The risings of the 28 mansûl [48], which are individual stars or groups of stars that the moon conjoins with roughly at the rate of one each night of a sidereal month, were originally used for weather-predictions (e.g., in the Kitâb al-Asrâb of Ibn Kutayba), but the conjunctions of the moon with these mansûl later became an important element of catarchic astrology on analogy with the Indian usage of the conjunctions of the moon with their 27 or 28 nakshâras. In general, the moon plays an important role in astrology as the transmitter to the world of the four elements of the influences of all the higher celestial spheres as well as of its own.

Muslim astronomers date the epoch of their era, the Hijrâ, variously at sunset of 14 or 15 July 622 A.D. Each normal year thereafter contains 354 days. But, because of the slight inaccuracy of the estimate of 29½ days in a synodic month, an intercalation-cycle is employed according to which 12 years out of every 30 contain 355 days. The earliest known such intercalation-table, the Mudjarrad, is for 210 years (30 x 7), so that the weekdays on which years and months begin are also cyclical; it occurred in one of the works of al-Fazârî (fl. 1437-82 - ca. 1747/90) (D. Pingree, in JNES, xxix (1970), 110-1), but is often repeated thereafter.

The earliest Muslim theories of lunar motion were based on Indian and Indo-Sasanian developments of Greek theories as found primarily in the Zidî al-Sindhindî and in the Zidî al-Shâhî. In these theories there was only one inequality in lunar motion—that explained by the assumption of an epicycle on whose circumference the moon (or rather the moon’s apogee) rotates in the opposite sense to the rotation of the centre of the epicycle on the circumference of the deferent (see, e.g., D. Pingree on Mâghârîl ‘Ilâhî’s De elementis et orbibus coelestibus). Rather crude “Indian” methods of estimating the time of the occurrence of the first visibility of the lunar crescent are often found in the early Muslim astronomers (see, e.g., E. S. Kennedy on Ya’qûb ibn Târik in JNES, xxvii (1968), 126-33), as are also Indian procedures for computing lunar parallax in latitude (see, e.g., O. Neugebauer, The Astronomical Tables of Al-Khwarîzmi, Copenhagen 1962, 71-2 and 121-6, and E. S. Kennedy in Isis, xlvii (1956), 33-53). In general, Muslim lunar eclipse-theory is Ptolemaic.

During the third century after the Hijrâ Muslim astronomers gradually adopted Ptolemaic models of planetary motion, retaining from the earlier material mainly some new parameters and the use of sine and related functions in place of chords. For the moon Ptolemy hypothesized a deferent circle whose centre rotates on a small circle about the earth (the “crank-mechanism”) in the direction opposite to the order of the signs at the rate of double the moon’s elongation from the sun. On the circumference of the deferent in the direction of the order of the signs rotates the centre of the lunar epicycle at the rate of the moon’s mean velocity. On the circumference of the epicycle in the direction opposite to the order of the signs rotates the moon itself at the rate of its anomalistic motion. The plane of this mechanism is inclined to that of the plane of the ecliptic, and the diameter of the intersection of the two planes rotates in the direction opposite to the order of the signs at the rate of the moon’s nodal motion. Further, the apogee of the lunar epicycle, from which point the moon’s anomalistic motion is counted, is not the intersection of the line extending from the earth through the centre of the epicycle with the epicycle’s circumference, but the intersection of the line extending from the point on the little circle about the earth opposite to the centre of the deferent through the centre of the epicycle with the epicycle’s circumference, which is the point on the little circle about the earth opposite to the centre of the deferent through the centre of the epicycle with the epicycle’s circumference (prosnexus). The choice of different parameters (that is, ratios of the radii of the three circles to each other, rates of (mean) motion of the moon, the sun, the lunar anomaly, and the lunar node, and...
inclination of the lunar orbit) for use in this model will lead to different predicted longitudes and latitudes for a given time, and generally Muslim astronomers simply adjusted the parameters so that these predicted longitudes and latitudes would better conform to observed or otherwise determined “true” longitudes and latitudes.

There are two principal exceptions to this rule. Astronomers at Maragha in the late 7th/13th century began a process of revision of the Ptolemaic planetary models in order to obtain more “perfect” models in which all motion is circular and constant about the circle’s centre and in which, for the moon, its distance from the earth at quadrature is not as small an amount as will result from Ptolemy’s model. The culmination of these efforts lies in the brilliant work of Ibn al-Shāṭir (fl. 750/1350) of Damascus, whose lunar model is essentially identical with that of Copernicus; the latter must somehow be dependent on the former. Ibn al-Shāṭir achieves his desired result by replacing the circle about the earth on which the centre of the deferent revolves according to Ptolemy with a second epicycle bearing the moon, whose centre revolves on the circumference of the first epicycle (see V. Roberts in Isis, xlvii (1957), 428-32; F. Abbud in Isis, lii (1962), 492-9; and E. S. Kennedy in Isis, liv (1960), 365-70). The second revision was due to the Jewish astronomer Levi ben Gerson (1288-1344) of Orange in southern France. His complicated lunar models will be described in a major forthcoming publication by B. R. Goldstein (meanwhile see B. R. Goldstein in Proc. Israel Acad. Sci. Hum., lii (1960), 239-54). The “Aristotelian” model of al-Bīrūnī (B. R. Goldstein, Al-Bīrūnī, New Haven 1971, i, 36-9 and 142-54) is no improvement over Ptolemy’s.

One other problem relating to the moon that interested Muslim scientists was that of the nature of its light, or rather in what fashion the moon’s light was reflected especially in Persian and Turkish poetry. Some poets, however, apparently employing Bedouin maxims, lay stress on the deficiencies of the moon, in a manner which seems sacrilegious to literary theorists. The mystics sought to make it the symbol of ineffable realities, a symbolism reflected especially in Persian and Turkish poetry.

The crescent moon sometimes appears in Muslim painting, but mainly at a later date in India under European influence. Above all, however, it is a decorative theme, stemming from pagan religious symbolism. In astrological treatises representations of the moon derive from Babylonian models by way of orientalized Hellenistic imagery.

Popular traditions of many kinds, handed down from antiquity, associate the moon with particular agricultural practices, attribute particular illnesses to its influence, and so on; from it are derived meteorological predictions, omens and various signs. Popular literature, proverbs and riddles often refer to the moon. Likewise, it is often personified. In many cases this is no more than a rhetorical device, but often too a true personalization is involved. The vocabulary and tales usher in a whole sub-mythology which is rarely accompanied by associated popular ritual practices, and yet God is never absent. The Moon, although subject to God, has its own power. It is said to have rendered homage to Muhammad through a miracle which places the apocalyptic forecast of the Kur’ān (LIV, 1) “the Moon has been split”, in the Prophet’s day. Eclipse particularly induced mythological comment. Popular magical practices in the Maghrib make appeals to the Moon.

crescent, always employed as a decorative motif, eventually became the emblem of Islam to Europeans, and was accepted as such by the Ottoman empire in the 19th century [see nI]).

Pre-Islamic astral paganism endured for many years among the “Sabeans” of Harran, who invoked the Moon, among other deities. Traces of its influence can be found among the Yazidis and also the Nuṣayris of Syria, where ‘Ali and Salamán are identified with the moon and where a religious sub-group is called the Khamsa.

Bibliography: Apart from the articles cited above, see M. Rosdinson, La lune chez les Arabes et dans l’Islam, in La lune, mythes et rites, Paris 1962 (coll. Sources orientales, 6), 153-215, where the relevant references will be found. (M. Rosdinson)

KAMARAN,珊瑚岛 (island with numerous small islets) in Yemeni territorial waters, less than three miles from the Sall peninsula, 200 miles north of Perim; its length is 14 miles, its maximum breadth 6 miles, its area 22 sq. miles. The impoverished inhabitants, who number between 1000 and 3000, are Sunnís of mixed origin (Adeni, Ethiopian, Somali, Indian); they cultivate cotton and fish for pearls.

At the end of the 19th/20th century the king of Yemen kept prisoners on Kamaran; in the first half of the 20th/21st century the island was occupied and fortified by the Portuguese. In the second part of the 19th century Turkey, by virtue of the international health regulations, established there a quarantine station for pilgrims arriving through Bab al-Mandab; they used to contract a disease called in Mecca “Kamaran sickness”. In June 1915, as the Turks were attacking Aden, Kamaran was occupied by the British. In the early 1920s the British raided all Red Sea islands, ceased in 1923 under Article 16 of the Treaty of Lausanne. The quarantine station had passed under British administration; Holland became a participant in 1928, Italy in 1938; the Anglo-Italian Agreement provided that Great Britain should not “establish its sovereignty or erect fortifications or defences” on the island. When the quarantine station was closed in 1952, thanks to improvements in health conditions on the mainland, it was said to receive 100,000 pilgrims yearly.

The international status of Kamaran is peculiar: in 1948 the Kamaran Order in Council declared that the United Kingdom had “power and jurisdiction” over the island and appointed the Governor of Aden as Governor of Kamaran, stating however that the island was not part of Aden Colony or of the Aden Protectorate, and that the Foreign Jurisdiction Act applied to it “as if it were a British colony or possession”, a formula resembling that of trusteeship agreements (mandates). Since 1928 Yemen has constantly and unsuccessfully claimed sovereignty over Kamaran and protested against British concessions for oil research on it (the one given in 1955 to the D’Arcy Exploration Co. proved fruitless). On 1 December 1967 the “Peoples’ Republic of South Yemen”, following a British communication to the United Nations dated 30 November 1967 to the effect that the Kurya Murya islands would be restored to the sultan of Maskat, issued a decree naming its own governor for Kurya Murya, Perim and Kamaran.


KAMH, the name for wheat in Syria and in Egypt; in 'Irāḳ wheat is called bīna and in Arabia it was called biyūr. These different words are also used in the literary Arabic of the western and eastern provinces of the Muslim empire.

Wheat was the main grain crop in the Near East from the beginning of the Muslim period (and much earlier), while in Europe in the Middle Ages even the upper classes ate bread made from barley and rye. The predominance of wheat among cereals distinguished Muslim countries from the Far East also, as Chinese travellers observed.

Muslim physicians recommended abstention from other bread and literary evidence shows that in the caliphal period only the poor classes of southern 'Irāḳ ate rice bread. In Ḵhūzistān and in some Caspian provinces, such as Māzandarān, however, there were extensive rice plantations or rice was even predominant. But in the central provinces of the Muslim world people ate bread made of cereals other than wheat only in times of distress, e.g., famines, or when the general prosperity had decreased considerably, as in Egypt at the end of the 9th/13th century. Bread made of barley was the food of ascetics.

The accounts of the 'Irāḳ treasury of the 3rd/9th century, which have come down to us in extracts included in the works of the geographers Kudāma b. Dja'ar and Ibn Khurraḍāḏbih, contain information on the quantities of wheat and barley received as taxes in kind. These figures point to a slight predominance of barley, but this cereal was used for animal fodder. Furthermore, the accounts show that barley was grown mainly in districts where the soil was apparently less adapted to wheat growing. It is worth noting that the equilibrium between wheat and barley was a striking feature of agriculture in 'Irāḳ from Sumerian times and is still characteristic at the present day. In the days of the caliphs Upper Mesopotamia produced great quantities of wheat which were shipped to southern 'Irāḳ. In Syria the provinces of Ḥamā, Ḥims and Ba'bābak, and particularly the Hawrān, were veritable granaries, supplying the surrounding regions with wheat. In Palestine wheat of excellent quality was grown in the coastal plain, so that al-Muḫaddasī could praise the quality of the bread of Ramla. Egypt, which had earlier supplied Rome and Constantinople with wheat, exported it in the days of the caliphs and their successors to the Ḥidjāz and to other countries. The main wheat-growing region was the Sa'īdī, the southern part of the country. Arabic authors emphasise that some types of Egyptian wheat were unequaled. barley-growing had been decreasing in Egypt before the Muslim conquest and probably continued to decline thereafter. European travellers who visited Egypt in the 8th/14th century dwell on the excellent quality of its wheat breed. So over many centuries the predominance of wheat remained unchanged. Throughout the coastal regions of North Africa wheat was produced and was the staple food, at least of the town-dwellers. Speaking of the province of Būna, the geographer Ibn Hawkal says that wheat and barley were so plentiful that their quantities could not be measured. The Muslim merchants of North Africa exported wheat to the countries then called Ghāna and Takrūr, now part of Senegal and Mali.

The predominance of wheat was universal in
Muslim lands. Only in very dry regions, such as Kirmān and Nubia, was dhura (sorghum) grown. Of course the wheat grain was not of the same variety elsewhere. The grain enquirer al-Bakṛr says that in the province of Sījlīmās, in western Morocco, there was grown a small-grain "Chinese" wheat. All the texts quoted so far refer to the golden age of Muslim civilization. In the later Middle Ages the cultivation of wheat declined in many regions of the Muslim world, as regards both the extent of the areas cultivated and the quality of the grain, this being a result of bedouinization. The papyri, the Arabic chronicles and the writings of various Arabic authors contain extensive data on the prices of wheat and of barley. In the Near East in the 'Abbāsid period their price ratio was 2:1 and in the later Middle Ages 3:2. It is evident that grain prices rose under the Umayyads and the 'Abbāsid caliphs, both in 'Irāk and in Egypt, by 900 per cent or even more. Prices in Egypt were however much lower than in 'Irāk. From the end of the 4th/10th century the price of wheat began to fall in 'Irāk and from the end of the 5th/11th century in Egypt, a fact probably connected with the main trends of demographic development: the growth of population (i.e., of consumers) in the caliphal period and the decrease from the period of the Crusades.

The measures in which the grain prices are given are in the classic period the kurr (2025 kg.) in 'Irāk, the ghirāra (208.8 kg.) in central Syria, the makkāk of Aleppo (about 82 kg.), the ʿtilīs (75.5 kg.) and later the irdāb (69.6 kg.) in Egypt and various mudd in the provinces of North Africa. Bibliography: A. Mez, Renaissance, 405, Eng. tr., 430; Kudāmā b. Ǧīrād, K. al-Ǧaḥriḥ, 237 and 400, 401; De Goeje, 180; ibn Khurradadhbih, 8 fl.; al-Masʿūdī, Tabbāt, 22; al-Mukaddasī, 136, 145, 151; D. Müller-Wodarg, Die Landwirtschaft Ägyptens in der frühen Abbasidenzeit, in ISL. xxxii (1957), 17 fl.; Ibn Hawkal, 76, 77, 80, 81; al-Bakṛr, Description de l'Afrique septentrionale (ed. de Slane), 151, 158; al-Īstakhri, 91; Spuler, Iran, 387; E. Ashtor, Essai sur l'alimentation des diverses classes sociales dans l'orient méditerranéen, in Annales Éc., v (1968), 101 ff.; idem, Histoire des prix et des salaires dans l'Orient médiéval, Paris 1969, 42 fl., 77 fl., 100 fl., 124 fl., 242 fl., 282 fl., 392 fl., 451, 453 fl.; E. Ehrenkreutz, The kurr system in medieval Iraq, in JESHO v (1962), 309; X. de Planhol, Les fondations géographiques de l'histoire de l'Islam, Paris 1965, 90. (E. ASHTOR)

KĀMIL, MUSTAFA [see MUSTAFA KĀMIL].

AL-KĀMIL (AL-MALIK), title of two Ayyūbid princes.

1) al-Malik al-Kāmil Nasīr al-Dīn Abu 'l-Ma'āliMuḥammad, the eldest son of al-'Ādīl [q.v.]. Abu Bakr b. Ayyūb, born 573/1177 or 576/1180. In 593/1197 he left the Dījāzra, where he had begun his political career as his father's representative (from 587/1281), to come to the aid of al-'Ādīl at Damascus in his struggle against al-Afdāl b. Saḥāb b. al-Dīn. After the latter's defeat, father and son marched into Egypt, entering Cairo on 22 Rāmāzān 595/27 August 1200. Al-'Ādīl was proclaimed sultan of Egypt and Syria. After the formal investiture by the caliph in 604/1207, al-'Ādīl distributed his provinces between his sons [see al-'Ādīl], al-Kāmil was to remain viceroy of Egypt for the rest of his father's reign. In 604/1207 he moved his residence to the newly finished Kaṭāf at al-Dījāzra.

In 615/May 1218 the Franks made an un-

expected attack on Egypt (fifth Crusade [see CRUSADES]), landing at Dimyāt [q.v.]. Al-Kāmil was unable to prevent their capture of the Burd al-Salsala (Tower of the Chain), the main stronghold of the harbour. Shortly after receiving news of this, al-'Ādīl died in his camp near Damascus (Friday 7 Dījūmādād II 615/31 August 1218), and al-Kāmil became sultan of Egypt and supreme head of the Ayyūbid realm. On 25 Shawāl 616/5 November 1219 the Franks finally succeeded in conquering the town of Dimyāt. For nearly two years al-Kāmil was able to hold them at bay from his new camp, called al-Manṣūra, south of Dimyāt, until the combined forces of al-Ashraf [q.v.], al-Muʿṣāẓm [q.v.] and other Ayyūbid princes, following their brother al-Kāmil's demand, reached Egypt in August 1221. The Franks, who had lost irretrievable time, tried to march against Cairo, but were encircled from all sides and after heavy fighting were forced to surrender (7 Radjab 618/27 Aug 1221) and to leave Egypt: the fifth Crusade had reached its inglorious end.

The second period of al-Kāmil's reign was marked by the struggle for the leadership among the Ayyūbid brothers: al-Kāmil against al-Muʿṣāẓm of Damascus (1221-1227) and—after the latter's death—against al-Ashraf, who succeeded him (1227-1237).

As early as 619/1222 al-Ashraf visited his brother in Cairo and they concluded an alliance against al-Muʿṣāẓm, who subsequently had to give way to al-Ashraf in two separate disputes (succession at Hamāt, 619/1222; possession of Akhṭāt [q.v.]). An alliance between al-Muʿṣāẓm and the Khārazmshāh Djalāl al-Dīn [q.v.], concluded during 622/1225, tilted the balance of power, and al-Ashraf was compelled to seek an arrangement with his brother. In Shawawl 1227 he left Egypt and submitted to al-Muʿṣāẓm and to renounce his supremacy over Hamṣ and Hamāt; until Dījūmādād II 624/May-June 1227 he was forced to remain as de facto prisoner. The Ayyūbid realm was on the verge of dividing into two states when the situation was completely altered by the sudden death of al-Muʿṣāẓm (Friday, 1 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 624/12 November 1227). His son al-Malik al-Nāṣir Djalāl (q.v.), in power for 21 years, at once submitted to al-Kāmil, recognizing his supremacy.

In the same year 624/1227 rumours of a new Crusade reached Cairo. Presumably considering the situation desperate, al-Kāmil contacted Frederick II, offering him all Saladin's conquests. Frederick II accepted, and on 7 September 1228 landed at Acre. After hard bargaining the famous treaty which delivered Jerusalem to the Franks was signed on 7 February 1229.

Al-Kāmil's cordial relations with his nephew al-Nāṣir did not last. At a meeting with al-Ashraf at Tell al-Aqūdāl (near Ghazza), he therefore agreed that al-Nāṣir should cede Damascus to al-Ashraf; a treaty was signed at the end of 623/1228. The two brothers then marched against the Syrian capital. After a short siege, al-Nāṣir surrendered (22 Radjab 626/15 June 1229) and had to accept the frontiers of al-Karak and al-Shawbak in exchange. Damascus was handed over to al-Ashraf; al-Kāmil was recognized as overlord of the realm. Princes favouring al-Kāmil were installed in all the minor principalities and took over al-Ashraf's possessions in the Dījāzra, thus further enhancing al-Kāmil's influence and control.

After a prolonged visit to the Dījāzra, al-Kāmil returned to Egypt in Radjab 627/May 1230, but only two years later the situation demanded his return. He marched to Salamiyya to prepare with the assem-
bled Ayyūbid princes against an expected attack by the Mongols. As no attack materialized, he decided to expel the ill-famed Artukid ruler of Amid, al-Mas'ud b. Rukn al-Dīn Mawdūd (Dhū 'l-Hijjād 629/ October 1232). The Artukid soon surrendered and was sent into captivity at Cairo. Ḥīn Kayfā, the other important fortress of the prince of Amid, capitulated soon afterwards and was given to al-Kāmil's son Nadīm al-Dīn Ayyūb, who in 634/1236 also took over Amid. Even in the Dżazira al-Kāmil had become the most powerful sovereign, so that the other Ayyūbid princes were bound to feel threatened by him.

Al-Kāmil returned to Cairo in about Djiwād I 630/February-March 1233, but his stay was once more brief. The capture of Aklūbāt by the sultan of Rūm Kaykobād [g.v.] (at the end of 629/1232) led him to mount a general attack on the Sālidūqs of Asia Minor; probably he planned to transfer—after the expulsion of the Sālidūqs—the Ayyūbid princes from Syria to Asia Minor, Syria to be governed as a united state like Egypt. The invasion began from Sālamiyyā in Ramadan 634/June 1234, but failed. The distrust and opposition of the Ayyūbid princes then forced al-Kāmil to abandon his plans; he returned to Cairo in Dhū 'l-Qa'da 631/August 1234, but soon he had to hurry back to repel with the help of al-Asīraf the counter-attack of Kaykobād, in places covered with Ayyūbid princes and the town in 658/1260, in spite of the brave resistance of the latter.
expectant mother is placed in the hand and the louse dropped into it; if it runs out the child will be a girl, if not, a boy, since in the latter case the milk is thicker. Other beliefs are attached to this pest; for example, a man who throws away a living louse forgets his acquaintances.

Although translators of the Kur'an, basing themselves on Exodus VIII, 18, freely employ the word "lice" for summâl in VII, 130/133, where the places of Egypt are mentioned, commentators offer different explanations of this term, which is held to designate either crickets or a sort of moth (ṣirdān, ḥalam, etc.).

Other insects related to lice are bugs and fleas. Bugs, hemipters of the cimex family, are distinguished by their stench and by the odour of bitter almonds which is given off when they are crushed. They are called baḥğ and banād al-bāṣir because they hide in the bedmatting, but they are sometimes included (see LA, s.v.) in the species called baʿād, "mosquitoes", because the latter were regarded as a metamorphosis of the bug, as were fleas, of which, the Arabs thought, they constituted a variety. Bugs may be killed, under the same conditions as other vermin, but as they appear mainly at night and in dwelling places, they were less of a problem to the fūfraghd* than lice and fleas.

The latter, diptera of the pulx family, were called burqāṭh, and also Abū Ṭafīr, Abū ʿAdī, Abūl-Wathīhāb, Tāmir b. Tāmir, colloquial names inspired by the backward leaps they make. They are born in the earth, in dark places, at the end of winter and in early spring, and they also change into mosquitoes. They can be got rid of by the use of talismans (as burqāṣ) or of a reed smeared with asses' milk or billy-goat's fat, on which they will gather in return for a promise that they will be thrown outside without being killed and to the accomplishment of the appropriate formulas. It was popularly believed that if a fox whose coat was full of fleas took a tuft of wool in his mouth then the fleas would gather on it; if he slid gently into the water, they would be carried away.

According to tradition, injuring fleas is prohibited because they woke up a prophet in time for the morning prayer. However, killing them is permitted, except in the mosque or the state of šīrām, and, as with lice, it is advised that they should not be thrown in the fire. At an early date the question of whether the blood (or rather excrement) of fleas on the clothing or body necessitated washing was discussed, but the majority of fūfraghd consider that a few stains do not impair ritual cleanliness.

Bibliography: Diābīṣ, Ḥayawān, index, s.v. kaml; idem, Buḥuqālī, ed. Ḥājīrī, 199 (Arabic), 192/5, 327; Damtri, s.v.; Kayrawānī, Rūsāla, index, s.v. poux. (Ed.)

Al-Kammān, by-name of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir, a Ḥanāfī sharīf from Constantine who moved to Fez, where he taught ḥadīth, logic and dialectic. None of his works has survived, but some noteworthy responsa (adjwāba) on a number of cases of the category of (nazāṣil) reveal his competence in the subject. He died in 1116/1704-5.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 288 and n. 2; Ṭāhirī, Naṣrī, 184; idem, al-Naṣrī al-habīr, II, fol. 53 r.; idem, Iltībā, fol. 57 r.; M. Lakhdar, La vie littéraire au Maroc sous la dynastie Almoravide (Casablanca, 1955); M. Lakhdar, Kammān, cumin (Cuminum Cuminum), an unbelliferous plant which seems to be a native of eastern Iran. At an early date it was found in the Near East (Syria, Palestine, the upper valley of the Nile), then spread throughout the Mediterranean basin. The Hebrew is kāmān, Greek kāmīn, Latin cuminum.

Wild or cultivated, its aromatic seeds were much sought after. Physicians recognized its many virtues: carminative, emmenagogic, sudorific, etc. in potions and in electuaries (maṣāḏān). Dieticians knew it as an aid to digestion.

Many varieties were known and these were variously appraised. Cumin from Kirmān (q.v.) was considered the best; pharmacists described it as bāṣīlahān, "royal". After this came cumin from Fāris, Egypt, Syria, the land of the "Nabateans", and Abyssinia (ḥabbāṣī).

Allied to a determinant specifying the type of the plant, the word kammān was used as a generic term to designate other plants, not necessarily unbelliferous ones, which bore aromatic or medicinal seeds. Kammān armani, "Armenian" or kammān rūmī, "Byzantine" was in fact caraway (Carum Carvi). It was also called kammān barī, "wild cumin", as it is in some regions of France, where it is known as cumin des prés, "meadow cumin". Kammān hulā, "sweet cumin", was one of the names for aniseed. In Bougie, in eastern Algeria, kammān al-dījābal, "mountain cumin", was the name for Manicarum mansamicum Jacq.. Kammān aswād, "black cumin", was fennel-flower (Nigella sativa), a ranunculus properly called ḥānīts. It was also known as al-habba l-sawād, the "black grain", and is called ḥabbet el-baraka in modern Syria.

According to the Arabic-speaking world in using, alongside kammān, diffused throughout the Arab world, is found another much rarer term. The consonantal variant is kāmūn, but its exact pronunciation is not known: sannāṯ, sunnāṯ, or sinnaṯu? Lexicographers also give it the meaning of "honey", "fruit syrup" (rubb), "cheese" and several other conditions. This rare term appears in some hadīths; it seems to be a Yemenite word. A denominative verb, sannata, is attested, with the imprecise meaning of "to throw s-n-w-t in a pan".

The Muslim West. Seeds of cumin were cultivated and used widely, both in medicine and in cooking; they were also attributed with magical and beneficial properties. Muslim Spain differed from the rest of the Arabic-speaking world in using, alongside kammān, a dialectical phonetic variant, kāmūn, where it seems that the reduction of the gemination was compensated for by the lengthening of the preceding vowel. This form kāmūn also gave rise to a derivative: kāmīn, kaimīn. Here we find the mutation ā-ā = ay-ā, which is attested in Spanish Arabic dialect for other nouns of the same morphological type: kānān, lābūl, dāsūs (for dāṣūs); this may be a case of pronunciation with ūma [ū.]

The Spanish word alcamondas, signifying a range of aromatic seeds, cumín, caraway, aniseed, fennel-flower, etc., is an Arab loan-word given a Romance plural. It is the equivalent of the quatro semences chaudes majeures, "four main warm herbs", of the old French pharmacopoeia. In Old Spanish the original Latin name for cumin often appears in a plural form, cominos.

In the Maghrib, Morocco is characterized by the widespread use of the Spanish form, kāmūn. In the extreme north-west of the country (the regions of Tangiers and Tetuan), the variant kāmūn is preserved. Herbalists in Fez sell a variety of this grain called kāmūn ẓef or kāmūn bū-nilfa, "fluffy cumin", imported from the Tuat. A potion made from it is used to cure pains in the entrails or stomach. In the
rest of the Maghrib, it would seem, kammun/lutmamn is the one name used for cumin.

In Tunisia kammun symbolizes grace, charm (sirr), the absolute perfection of a beauty. Its seeds, thought to generate attraction, are one of the essential ingredients of love potions. The plural, kmmamn, designates "an assortment of aromatic seeds: cumin, coriander, aniseed, caraway, fennel-flower, etc."; a synonym for this is the plural srr, "seeds". This is an equivalent of al-camunds and also of the Moroccan rrs l-kamn, lit. "the essentials in the shop (of the druggist, 'attar)". In Malta cumin is called kemmun, alcamonias and also of the Moroccan kammuni, is used for aniseed (cf. above).

The Persian name for cumin is kammun. The composites shk-srra and sirra-rs designate caraway. A particular dish, containing cumin, is called shrbd, sirbd; in the archaic form shrbd (for shrbdg), the dish and its name passed into the Arabic culinary vocabulary of the east and Muslim Spain. Alongside the learned-word kammun the Turkish of Turkey uses a popular form, kemyon; the adjective kemyon means olive green. The Persian dish mentioned above is called srra and today describes "a dish of calves' feet with rice and garlic"—and apparently without cumin.

Finally, proverbs which feature cumin are found sporadically throughout the whole Islamic world. These belong to two series: in the first the cumin is promised that it will be well watered, tomorrow—this is the prototype of empty promises; in the second the cumin says, "rub me between your hands and I will release my good smell", which is the equivalent of "ring for service".


AL-KAMMUNI, MUHAMMAD B. IBRAHIM AL-TAMMI, a Kayrawânî paneyst of the Zîrîd al-Mu'izz b. Bâdis (first half of the 9th/10th century), was admired by the critics for the abundance and perfection of his laudatory, descriptive and elegiac poetry, remarkable alike for the choice of themes and the perfect rhythm of the verse. But the vogue his poetry enjoyed during his lifetime was equally due to the verse, humour and sprightly imagination with which he recounted the vicissitudes of his disordered and picturesque life, and denounced the failings of some of his fellow citizens. However, very few lines of this classical yet personal output have survived.


KAMRAN DURRANI, a son of Bâbur and of Gurkûl Bâghûn, and half-brother of Humâyûn; he was born in Kâbul ca. 915/1509. He was cleverer than Humâyûn and had a poetical turn, but he was cruel and vicious and a restless schemer. He repeatedly rebelled against Humâyûn, who was at last compelled by his officers to make him innocuous by blinding him in 960/1553. He went to Mecca in 954/1554 and died there in Dhu 'l-Hidjja 904/October 1557. The most interesting thing about him is the devotion of his wife, Mâh Cîchâk Bégâm Aghûn, daughter of Shâh Hasân of Sind. She insisted on accompanying him to Mecca, in spite of her father's remonstrances, saying that he had given her to Kamran in the days of his greatness (in 954/1546) and that she would not abandon him now in the time of his misery. She died at Mecca a few months after her husband.

Kâmrân was put in charge of Kandahâr by his father, and in the beginning of Humâyûn's reign he was governor of the Panjâb. During the interregnum, when Humâyûn was in Persia, Kâmrân and his younger brother, 'Askârî, ruled over Afghanistan. He left one son and three daughters. The son, Abu 'l-Kâsim, who inherited his father's poetical talents, was confined in Gwâilor by Akbar in 964/1557, and was put to death some years later as a dangerous competitor. All three daughters were given in marriage; one of them, named Gurkûl, was a woman of masculine spirit; she married Ibrahim Husayn Sultân, and she and her son were thorns in Akbar's side. (Firîshta, lith. ed., 221, and Muhammad Husayn, Darbâr-i-Akbâri).

Bibliography: Abu 'l-Fadl, Akbar-nâma, i; Muhammad Haydar, Ta'rîkh-i-Rashîdî, Eng. version by N. Elias and E. Denison Ross; Djawhar Aûtâbî, Memoirs of the Emperor Humâyûn, tr. Stewart (Or. Transl. Fund 1832); Bâbur's Memoirs; Erskine, Memoirs of Babur; Bûgdban Bégâm, History of Humâyûn (O. T. F.), London, 1902; Bâdû'în, Muntashir al-Tanâsîsî, i, 457 ff.; Elliot-Dowson, iv, 496, v, vi. There is a copy of Kâmrân's Divân in the Oriental Public Library, Bankipore, Cat., ii, 245, 215, where a biography of the author is given. (H. BEVERIDGE*)

KAMRÂN SHÂH DURRÂNĪ, ruler of Harât in succession to his father, Mâhêmûd Shâh (d. 1244/1288). By alienating the powerful Bârzkaz family Kamrân contributed to the fall of Safawid rule in Afghanistan in 1235/1818. Subsequently, Mâhêmûd and Kâmrân disputed possession of Harât, which comprised an area extending from the Harf Rûd in the west to the Hilmand river in the east and from Sîstân in the south to Maymûna in the north, although their authority in the outlying areas was always contested. In his early years Kâmrân revealed energy and ability, but during the last five years of his reign power passed to his able son, Yâr Muhammad Shâh. Kân Alkozay (d. 1267/1851), who secured his position by control of the only effective military force, of the revenue and of the British subsidy negotiated in 1255/1839 and who deposed and murdered Kâmrân in 1258/1842. Kâmrân and Yâr Muhammad continu-
ued the Haratl tradition of alternately acknowledging and rejecting Iranian sovereignty and in 1253-4/1837-8 withstood a prolonged Iranian siege which devastated the Harat valley.


**KAMRÚP, a region in western Assam (q.v.),** the most north-easterly limit of penetration by Muslim armies in India. Conquest was not followed by any great settlement of Muslims in the region, which was in fact held only for limited periods. The few Muslims in the district today are mostly traders in the towns; for the history of the district as it affects Islam, see Assam. In the Muslim geographers (Hadid al-Qiam, Marwazi) it is often referred to as Karmun.

**KÂMÛS (a.), dictionary.**

1. **Arabic Lexicography.**

The word kâmûs/kawmas, from the Greek ὑκενσός appeared in Arabic, at the latest at the time of the Prophet, with the meaning of “the bottom, the very deepest part of the sea” in the sense of the centre, and used as a metaphorical concept for the origin of a language - and its root. This is what the Arabic geographers borrowed the Greek word again, in the form Ubâyînûs, and applied it to “the mass of water surrounding the earth”, particularly the Atlantic Ocean, which was called Ubâyînûs al-muhîfî, then more simply al-Kâmûs al-muhîfi. As this latter term was employed in a metonymical sense, it had a special meaning in the language of the time, and was used to denote the origin of a language, in contrast to mu’djam (q.v.), “Lexicon”. This distinction, however, was not general nor absolute, so that nowadays mu’djam tends to be used in the same sense as kamûs. In classical Arabic, the concept of “dictionary” was not covered by any single term, each lexicographical work bearing its own title. A number of these titles included the word lugkah, “language”, and lexicography was called fiml al-lugkah “the science of language”. Sometimes this was confused with “philology”, today which is called fikh al-lugkah, an expression already employed in the Middle Ages by Ibn Fâris (q.v.) in the title of his celebrated Sâhibîl. The neologism mu’djamîyyàt is now tending to gain currency.

In Persian, the general term for a dictionary was farhang, but, as in Arabic and also in Turkish, various expressions were also used in titles.

Mediaeval Arabic dictionaries may be classified in three groups, according to the arrangement used:

I. Those arranging roots anagrammatically, treating all permutations of a group of root letters under one heading, and separating biliterals, triliterals and longer roots. Almost all such dictionaries adopted an alphabetical order based on phonetic principles, beginning with gutturals, a practice somewhat reminiscent of the order of the Sanskrit alphabet. This system was first used by al-Khall (q.v.).

II. Those employing the “rhyme order”; that is, arranging roots primarily under the final radical, then the first and any intermediate radicals. Within this framework, the normal alphabetical order was followed. The first major work to use this system was al-Djâhwarti’s Shahâbî. This system soon gained the ascendency in general dictionaries, and was not seriously questioned until the 19th century, under European influence.

III. Those arranged, more or less, on the modern European pattern insofar as roots are concerned. The earliest example, Abû ‘Amr al-Shaybânî’s Kitâb al-Djim, lists all words with the same initial in one chapter, but in no obvious order within the chapter. This has been called the “Kufan Method” (J. A. Haywood, Arabic lexicography). The modern arrangement proper goes back at least to Ibn Fâris. However, it found favour largely in specialized dictionaries such as those of the Kurân and hadîth. Al-Zamakhshâri’s Asâs al-balâgha adheres most closely to this arrangement.

The following are the principal mediaeval Arabic dictionaries, arranged in rough chronological order. (The Roman numerals I, II, and III in brackets after titles indicate the arrangement used in accordance with the above classification).

2nd/18th century: Al-Fâris (Ed.).

3rd/19th century: Ibn Durayd (q.v.), al-Djâmharâ fi ‘l-lugkh (I). This combines the anagrammatical arrangement with the normal alphabetical order. The Haydarabâdh (Decani) edition (1344 AH) has a useful index listing the content in the modern order.

4th/19th century: Al-Sâhib ibn ‘Abhabî (q.v.), al-Mûhîfî fi ‘l-lugkah (I), Ms. only (“Trûk Nat. Mus.”).


5th/20th century: Ibn Sîdahîd (q.v.), al-Mukam al-‘mûhîfî al-‘asâm fi ‘l-lugkh (I), Cairo 1958. This work was compiled in Spain.

6th/21st century: al-Zamakhshâri (q.v.), Asâs al-balâgha (III), Cairo 1953, largely concerned with the language of rhetoric.

7th/21st century: Ibn Mukarram or Ibn Manşûr (q.v.), Lîsîn al-‘Arâb (II), Bâlâk 1300-8 AH, Beirut 1955-6. This is still the best-known large-scale dictionary.

8th/24th century: al-Firûzâbâdî (q.v.), al-Kâmûs al-Muhîfî (II). This is the standard handy dictionary, containing a very large vocabulary compressed into small space by the omission of supporting examples. It has been frequently printed, mostly in Cairo and in four volumes.

12th/18th century: Though not strictly mediaeval, Murtâdâ al-Zahîd’s Talîh al-sârîs min qawm al-Kâmûs (II), Bâlâk 1306-7 AH, Kuwait 1965, is best mentioned here. It is an expansion and extension of the Kâmûs, on the scale of the Lîsîn al-‘Arâb.
The modern (European) dictionary arrangement is now normally used by Arabs. Butrus al-Bustani used it for his 2-volume *Maqālāt al-musīkā* (Beirut 1867-70), basically a re-arrangement of the *Kāmūs*. No large-scale Arabic dictionary has appeared in the Arab world since the Tādīl al-ʿarāṣī. The most popular one-volume work is Louis Maṭṭī al-Muḥammadī, *Beirut 1908*; Beirut 1965. Bi-lingual dictionaries were rare in the Arab world until the present century. Kāimpūrī’s *Dīwān lugāt al-Tūrī* (5th/11th century) explains Turkish words in Arabic, while al-Zamānkhāshī’s *Muḥammadī al-adāb* (Samācṣṭherī Lexicon Arabicum Persicum, ed. J. G. Wetstein, Leipzig 1843-50) gives the Persian equivalents of Arabic words. Neither is very conveniently arranged. To list all bi-lingual Arabic dictionaries published since the Renaissance would take several pages. Those mentioned below are of the literary language only, and do not include polyglot dictionaries.

Jacob Golius’ *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, Leiden 1653, with a Latin-Arabic index, was pre-eminent until G. W. Freytag’s larger work, with the same title, was published, Halle 1830-7 (also has a Latin-Arabic index). Both are based on the *Kāmūs*, recast in modern arrangement. A. de Biberstein Kazimirski’s *Dictionnaire arabo-français*, Paris 1860, pays some attention to dialectical Arabic and is still very useful, since it is more complete than Père J.-B. Belot’s *Vocabulaire arabe-français*, which has enjoyed general favour since 1883. Edward William Lane’s *Arabic-English Lexicon*, London 1863-7, repr. 1955-7, though incomplete, is still widely used. These 19th-century works may well be superseded by two new dictionaries in the course of publication: The first, *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache*, published in Wiesbaden in fascicles since 1957, is sponsored by the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft (the present editor (1974) is M. Ullmann). Definitions are in German and English. It begins at the letter ʿāf, where Lane’s *Lexicon* becomes mere sketches, because of the urgent need to supplement the deficiencies of Lane. The second is the *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français-Anglais*, edited by Blachère, Chouémi and Denizeau, published in Paris in fascicles from 1961. It covers both the classical and the modern languages.


The above account does not include dictionaries from European languages into Arabic. No comprehensive work has yet been published. Illüss Bochtor’s *Dictionnaire français-arabe*, which appeared in a third edition revised and supplemented by Caussin de Perceval in Paris in 1864, has been practically forgotten. Belot’s *Vocabulaire français-arabe* has gone through many revisions since 1889, but it is still inadequate. G. P. Badger’s *English-Arabic Dictionary*, London 1913, is worthy of note. But the late Elias A. D. Al-Tal’s *Modern Dictionary*, Cairo 1913, has been very widely used. Mumir Bašković’s *Al-Mawrid*, Beirut 1965, is fuller and more up-to-date, with considerable scientific and technical vocabulary, but Arabic definitions do not include some information—such as broken plurals—useful to European Arabists. There is a useful Russian-Arabic Dictionary by Baranov, Moscow 1961; Supplement, Gotz Schregel’s *Deutsch-Arabisches Wörterbuch*, 1st fasc., Wiesbaden 1963, at present under publication, will be of benefit. Two French-Arabic dictionaries have been published in Beirut: the first, *al-Manhal*, is the work of Dliabbār ʿAbd al-Nūr and Suhayl Idrīs (1970); the second (1972) is a French-Arabic *Mundīj*.

**Bibliography:** The following general works contain bibliographies:


(J. A. Haywood)

2. **PERSIAN LEXICOGRAPHY**

The normal Persian word for “dictionary” is *fārang-i furs*, which also retains its original meaning of “learning, education”. In its Middle Persian (Pahlavi) form it is applied to two glossaries which, though undated, preserve pre-Islamic material. The *Frahang-i ʿoim ek*, named after its first entry, lists Avestan words with their Pahlavi equivalents. The *Frahang-i Fakhravī* provides mainly the Persian equivalents of the basically Aramaic ideograms used in Pahlavi, with their traditional mnemonic readings. Owing to the great ambiguity of the Pahlavi script, many of these readings are fantastic, e.g., *binmin* (Aram. *br* read as *bmn* for *pus*, "son").

The earliest named dictionary of modern Persian is the *Risāla of Abū Ḥasy-i Soghdī*, variously attributed from the 1st/7th to the 5th/11th centuries. Although no longer extant, this work seems to have been still available to compilers of the 11th/17th century. The *Lughat-i furs* from the poet Abū Maṣūr ʿAllāb, Ahmad Asadi Tūst is the oldest surviving Persian dictionary. Compiled about 500/1105-1106, its purpose was to explain about 1,200 rare and archaic words in the older poets of eastern Iran. It is arranged alphabetically by rhymes, each entry supported by a quotation in verse. A slightly earlier work by the poet Kārina of Tabrīz, *Tadsīsīr fi lughat al-furs*, is lost. No other Persian dictionary is recorded until the beginning of the 8th/14th century. The lexicographers of the period devoted their energies instead to the analysis of Arabic, particularly of the Kūrān, in both Arabic and Persian. Of lexica with Persian glosses we have the *Kitāb al-maṣādir* and *Tarjumān al-Kūrān* of Husayn Zawzanī (d. 486/1093), Dastūr al-lugha al-ʿarabīyya and *Kūrān al-mīrāḥ* by Husayn Natanzī (d. 490/1193), al-Sāmī fi *l-ʿāsāmī* (497/1104) by Abu ʿl-Fadl Maydānī, the celebrated *Muḥaddāmat al-adāb* (before 521/1127) by Abu ʿl-Kāsim Maḥmūd al-Zamakhshārī, Tādīl al-maṣādir by Djiʿarāk Bayhaḵī (d. 544/1149); a work of this name is also ascribed, almost certainly wrongly, to the poet Rūdkā, d. 1390-1. *Dastūr al-lugha* (545/1150-1) by Abu ʿl-Fadl Hubayyash Tīfīḏ, a work based on al-Djwārī’s Arabic *Al-Sīḥā* called *al-Sūrah min al-sīḥā* (685/1282-3) by Djamāl al-Kurāghī, and several others.
Also based on the Arabic Siḥāl is the Persian Siḥāl afīrs (or, al-ṣājdām) by Muḥammad Hindī-šāh. Shakhdawānī Shams-i Mungī, written in 728/1327-8. The third oldest Persian dictionary, forming the fourth part of a treatise on poetics called Miṣyār-i Djamālī, by Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Faḵrī Ṣafā-hānī (Shams-i Faḵrī), an older contemporary of Haftī, is written in 745/1344. It is modelled on Asadī’s work, but supports the verses for its 1,600-odd words are mostly by the author himself, and so less accurate.

After this time the centre of Persian lexicography moved to India. Two works of the 8th/14th century are preserved, the Farhang-nāma (700/1300) by Mubārak Shāh Ghānawī, Faḵrī-i Kawwās, and Baḥr al-fadāʾil (ca. 795/1393 ?) by Muḥammad b. Kiwām al-Bāqli. The Adāt al-fadāʾil (822/1419) by Kāḏī-ḵān Muḥammad Dihlawl Dharwal names other sources since lost. Many more Persian dictionaries were compiled in India in the next two centuries, of which it is possible to name only the Shāraf-nāma-i ʿAḥmad Munayrī (878/1473-4) by ʿĪbrāhīm Khān al-Dīn Fārūḵī, based on the poets, the Tuhfat al-saʿāda (928/1520-2) by Māḥmūd b. Shayah Diyaʾ-ʾāl-Dīn Muḥammad, without quotations, Muʿayyid al-fadāʾil (925/1519) by Muḥammad b. Lād Dihlawl, Farhang-i Waʿfī (933/1526-9) by Ḥusayn al-lughdt (ca. 1,054/1549) ? by ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. Ahmad Sūr, and Maddar al-fadāʾil (1,001/1593) by Ḥālādād Fawīdī Sīrhīndī.

The same period saw the rise of another stream to feed the Persian sea, namely the efforts of Turks to interpret Persian writers. After the anonymous and undated Abnānī-i ʿṣādjām, the first important works of this type are the three compilations by Luṭf Allah b. Aḥd Yawūf Ḥallīn, Baḥr al-ṣaḥīḥūb, Niḥāyāt al-muṣākh (872/1467-8) and the shorter Kaftāna (917/1511-2). Ḥallīn stands out by reason of the critical attitude he adopted towards his sources. Among similar contemporary works were Ṣāḵmīl al-lughdt (900/1495) by Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn Karabāḏīrī, Wasīlat al-maḏābīd (903/1497-8) by Ḥafṣī b. Rustam Mawlāwī, and the Tuhfa-yi Ṣāḥīḥī (920/1514-5) in verse, by ʿĪbrāhīm b. Ḥūḍyādve. All but the last of these works were used by Niḥāyāt Allah b. Aḥd Mūḥārak al-Rūmī in the preparation of his celebrated Lughat-i Niʿmat Allāh (before 947/1540).

At the beginning of the 11th/17th century two major compilations appeared. In 1008/1599-1600 Muḥammad Kāšīm Kāšānī Surūfī produced his Maddār al-fadāʾil for Shāh ʿAbbās Ṣafawī. Thirty-eight earlier dictionaries are named among his sources and nearly 6,000 words defined. At the same time, at the Moghul court, Djamāl al-Ruṣūl, Burhdn, produced his famous Burḥān-i ḥāṯī in Haydarābād, Dakhān, and two years later ʿAbd al-Raḥīm al-Ḥusaynī al-Tattawī his Farhang-i Ṣafāhī. Rashīd sought to shorten his work by omitting much of the quoted verse. Burḥān’s changes were more sweeping. For the first time the vocabulary, of some 20,000 words, was arranged completely, alphabetically. Of Rashīd’s successors, almost every page of Shams-i Fakhri’s work contains invented words, supported by bad verse attributed to fictitious poets. Their origin will probably never be known.

More than any previous dictionary, the Burḥān-i ḥāṯī gave rise to a series of works criticizing or defending it. The most valuable of these is the Sirāḏī al-lughdt (1147/1734-5) by the poet Sirāḏī al-Dīn ʿAllāh Ḵān Arūz. This was shortly followed by a vast compilation called Bahār-i ʿṣājdām (1160/1750) by a pupil of Arūz, Rāy Ṭabāī and Bahār, from whose time onwards the vocabulary of contemporary writers began to find a place in the dictionaries beside that of the classics.

By this time European contacts with Iran and India had led to a lexicographical interest. In 1669 Edmund Castell contributed the first printed Persian dictionary in his Lexion heptagloton, quoting Niʿmat Allah’s Lughat and a manuscript work by Jacob Golius (1596-1668) as his sources, but evidently not also using Shu’urī’s Al-Ālia. In 1680 Franz von Menšgīn Meninski’s Turkish-Arabic-Persian Thesaurus appeared, incorporating the works of Ĥallīn, Niʿmat Allah and Shu’urī, and the Tuhfahīnī. Meninski’s was the mountain from which John Richardson’s Dictionary Persian Arabic and English (1777-80) was quarried, later to be enlarged by Francis Johnson (1809). J. A. Vuillers’ Lexicon Persicum (1855-64), I. J. P. Desmaisons’ Dictionnaire persan-français (1908) both drew on these European works, but also on the Burḥān, the baletl Shu’urī, the Bahār-i ʿṣājdām, and other oriental works. F. Steingass’s Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary (1892) goes furthest on the downward path of omitting all references to sources.

In the 13th/19th century many more Persian dictionaries in the classical tradition appeared in India, including Shams al-lughdt (1220/1805-6) compiled under the direction of Joseph Barretto, Haft kulzum (1237/1822) by ʿAffūl Muḥammad, but ascribed to the sultan of Awadh (Oudh), Ḥiyātī al-lughdt (1242/1826-7) by Muḥammad ʿAffūl al-Dīn, and the Farhang-i Amadadā (1306/1889-90) by Muḥammad Pāḏāsh Sāḥēb Shād. In Iran Rādī Kull Ḥidāyat’s compilation, Farhang-i anjuman-ār-yi Nāṣirī (1286/1869-70), was the most significant, despite his swallowing the Dasādīr whole.

The foundations of modern lexicography in Persian, relying on direct recording of the spoken and written word, may be said to have been laid in 1874 by J. L. Schlimmer’s Terminologie médico-pharmaceutique et anthropologique française-persane. The number of present-day Persian lexica is legion. Mention can be made only of two outstanding but disparate ventures: in Europe Fritz Wolff’s Glossar zu Firdosi’s Schönname (1935), with full references, and in Iran...
the encyclopedic Lughat-nāma, begun by Ali Akbar Dihkhuda (1879/1956) and continued under the direction of Muhammad Mu'in and others.


(D. N. MacKenzie)

### 3. Turkish Lexicography.

**a) Oriental Dictionaries.** Turkish lexicographers maintained the arrangement of Arabic and Persian dictionaries.

The first Turkic dictionary is Mahmūd al-Kāshīgar's Diwan lughāt al-Turk, written in Baghādād in 466/1074 (ed. Kilissi Ri'fāt, Istanbul 1333/1915-77; dictionaries based on it by C. Brockelmann 1826, B. Atalay 1943). It deals with the standard language of the Karahāżdēs Empire, including a number of dialect words. The meanings are given in Arabic and illustrated by quotations from Turkic folk poetry.

Kāshīgar's work served as a model for the Kipchak Turkish dictionaries produced in Egypt and Syria in the 8th/14th-9th/15th centuries (O. Pritsak in *PAA*, i, 75-61; Abī Hayyān, K. al-Ṭirāq (712/1313, ed. A. Caferoğlu 1931); the anonymous Tārdīμān Turkī (743/1343, ed. B. Flemming in *IS*, 1866), 226-9, ed. M. Th. Houtsma 1894; Djamāl al-Dīn al-Turkī, K. Buğdun al-muḥāfs (8th/14th cent., ed. A. Zajaczkowski 1954-8); the anonymous K. al-Tūbāf al-Zāhiyya (8th/14th cent., ed. T. Halasi Kun 1942, B. Atalay 1943); the anonymous al-Kawānsīn al-kulliyā (9th/15th cent., ed. Fuad Kūprūlī 1928) and the recently discovered K. al-Durrā al-muṣīla (partial ed. by A. Zajaczkowski in RO, xxiv [1965]).

In Khârazmī al-Zamakhāshīgar's Muḫdaddat al-adāb was popular. No less than 15 manuscript copies of this work, provided—fully or partly—with Khârazmīan Turkic glosses, have survived (Z. V. Togan in *TM*, xiv [1964], 81-92).

The Caghatāy dictionaries were compiled primarily to facilitate the reading of the works of Nawāzī (844/1439-906/1502). Their arrangement is alphabetical and within each letter are entered according to the vowel which follows the initial letter. Poetical quotations help to illustrate the meanings of a word. Important are: Tālī' Imānī of Herāt, Badāṭī al-lughāt (Cagh.-Pers., before 912/1506, ed. A. K. Borovkov 1961); the anonymous Aḥwāska (Cagh.-Ottoman, first half of the 10th/16th century, ed. A. Vambéry 1862, V. Velyaminov-Zernov 1968); Mirzā Mahdī Khān, Sangālīkā (Cagh.-Pers., ca. 1172/1758, ed. Sir G. Clauson 1960).

Ottoman lexicography starts with versified vocabularies, averaging 2,000 Arabic or Persian words explained in Turkish. These vocabularies, destined to be memorized, are divided into bīfūs (sections) in which words of similar form or sound are grouped together. One of the earliest is the Tuhfet-i Ḥusainī (Pers.-Turk., 802/1790) by Ḥusain, mentioned in the Tuhfet-i Shāhīdī (see below). Famous were: Fīrīght-eokhulu ʿAbd al-Lāṭif (d. before 870/1474), Lughāt-i Fīrīght-eokhulu (Ar.-Turk.), printed in the margins of another Ar.-Turk. versified vocabulary, Subha-i Şīyān (n.d.); Şāhīdī Ibrahim Dede, Tuhfet-i Şāhīdī (Pers.-Turk., 920/1514, litb. 1275/1859); Sīmābdāde Mehmēd Vehbi (d. 1809), Tuhfet-i Vehbi (Pers.-Turk., 1st ed. 1213/1798) and Nakbhe-i Vehbi (Ar.-Turk., 1st ed. 1220/1805); Hasan ʿAynī, Naṣīr al-Dīn wālah (Ar.-Pers.-Turk., printed 1250/1834-5); Ahmed ʿAṣīm (d. 1235/1819), Tuhfet-i ʿAṣīm (printed, Būlāk 1254/1838-9).

Large dictionaries were also produced. In the Arabic-Turkish dictionaries the Arabic words are arranged in bābs either according to the initial or according to the last letter, and, under each bāb, divided into fasās according to the second and following letters. The best known are: Muṣṭafā b. Şams al-Dīn al-Karābāshī, Aḥkārī Kābir (Aḥkārī-i Kābir) or Lughāt-i Aḥkārī (952/1554), at least 15 editions between 1826 and 1906; Ahmed ʿAṣīm, al-ʿOqlāymās al-ʿAsāsi (1st ed. 1230/1813-1818), the translation of al-Fīruzābdālī's Kāmūs al-Muḥtāb; Mehmēd b. Muṣṭafā al-Wānī (Wānkūl), Tarḍīṣamī Sīhāb al-Dīnāhahrī (printed by İbrahim Mütferrika, 1141-1729), the translation of al-Dīnāhahrī's famous al-Sīhāb. In the Persian dictionaries the Persian words are arranged in bābs according to the initial letter, and within each bāb in three sections according to the dārs (vowel) after the first letter. Important are: Allāh b. Ahmed, Lughāt-i Niʿmat Allāh (947/1540, unpublished), in which verbs and nouns are dealt with separately; Hasan ʿShūrī, Fārsān-ī Shūrī (1808/1692-1692/1682, printed by İbrahim Mütferrika, 1157/1742); Ahmed ʿAṣīm, Tibāyn-i nāftī (1st ed. 1214/1900, 1800), the translation of al-Ṭarīqī's Durān bābī, with an arrangement as in modern dictionaries. The best known Turkish-Arabic-Persian dictionary is Eṣfād Mehmēd b. Ahmed ʿĀṣīm, Lābād al-lughāt (1145/1732-3, printed 126/1860-2).


The vast majority of (non-Ottoman) Turkic languages are spoken in the Soviet Union. Before the Soviet period dictionaries of several of these languages already existed. However, their systematic investigation began only after World War I. Today dictionaries...

**KANÀ [see KUNÀ].**

**KANAMI [see KANEMI].**

**KANAN**, the biblical Kana'an, is a personality regarding whom the few extant traditions agree on scarcely a single point. Al-Bayadawi (ed. Fleischer, i, 513) mentions him as the father of the famous Numru'd (Numru'd according to the LA and the TA); he is also regarded as the ancestor of the Kana'iniyyun (LA, x, 191) and of the Berbers (al-Mas'udî, Muraji, index; al-Dimashki, Nukhbat al-dahr, ed. Mehren, 266; Ibn Khaldun, Tarih, vi, 93, 97). Very little is known about him. Many believe that the story in Sura XI, 44 ff. about a son of Nuh who disregarded his father's fervent pleas and refused to take refuge in the Ark, thus perishing with the unbelievers, refers to him (al-Bayadawi, ad loc. and al-Tabarî, Kisas al-anbiyd', Cairo 1324, 36). Al-Tabarî (i, 199) also mentions a son of Nûb called Kan'ân who lost his life in the Flood, but treats the question as referring to Yam b. Nûb (see Tafsir, ad loc.), although in i, 199 he identifies the latter with Kan'ân.

While Kan'ân appears here as a son of Nûb and Ibn al-Kalbî mentions "Shallum, that is, Kan'ân" as Nûb's fourth son (in Yâkût, iv, 311), in the passage parallel to Genesis, ix, 25 (in al-Tabarî, op. cit., 212) he appears as a son of Hâm b. Nûb (cf. al-Yâ'qûbî, i, 13 ff., 16; cf. also al-Mas'udî, iii, 240, 244). According to a third tradition (in Yâkût, op. cit.) Kana'an was a son of Sâm b. Nûb, and according to a fourth—but unreliable—tradition a son of Kûsh b. Hâm (al-Dimashki, op. cit.).

(B. Joel*)

**KANAN PASHA [see KANAN PASHA].**

KANAT (A.), pl. kannawa, kanâ, kuni, aköiya, “canal, irrigation system, water-pipe”. Used also as a baton, a lance, etc., the term originally meant “reed” [see KASABA] and it is with this meaning and as “reed” that the word kanal in Akkadian (cf. Zimmer, Akkad. Fremdwörter, Leipzig 1913, 51), becoming kanah in Hebrew and kanâ in Aramaic, it passed into Arabic and was also borrowed in Greek and Latin in the forms kánwa, kánwa (kánwa), canna, by an evolution parallel to that of kana, the Latin word canalis “in the shape of a reed”, acquired the meaning of “pipe, canal”. In Persian kanât is used today especially for those underground water pipes which are the subject of this article (hydraulic methods in general are discussed in M; Dîrî, Filâkî; see also KANTARA, etc.).
The kândt, a mining installation or technique using galleries or cross-cuts to extract water from the depths of the earth, has been described as the greatest contribution made by Persians to hydraulics. Kândts are a special feature of the Persian plateau, where geological conditions are favourable to the enrichment of underground pools of water and so to the spread of kândts (see further H. Goblot, Le problème de l'eau en Iran, in Orient, xxiii (1962), 46-55, also published in an English translation in The economic history of Iran 1800-1914, ed. C. Issawi, Chicago 1971, 214-19). They are mainly associated with large alluvial fans in the piedmont zone between the high mountains and the kavir or salt desert, or in large alluvial valleys on the desert margin, but are also found in the larger intermontane valleys of the Zagros Mountains. By means of a gently sloping tunnel, which cuts through alluvial soil and passes under the water-table into the aquifer, water is brought by gravity flow from its upper end, where it seeps into the gallery, to a ground surface outlet at its lower end. In eastern and south-eastern Persia, Afghanistan, and Balîstân these installations are known as kârânis.

The origin of the techniques used in the construction of kândts is to be sought in the old kingdom of Urartu around Lake Urûmiyya (Rûdâyiyya in north-western Persia) (R. J. Forbes, Studies in ancient technology, Leiden 1955-5, i, 153 ff.). A kândt built by Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.), whose father, Sargon II, claims to have learnt the secret of tapping underground water in his campaign against Urartu, still carries water to the city of Erbil (J. Laessøe, Refections on modern and ancient oriental waterworks, in Journal of Cuneiform Studies, vii (1953), 5-26). With the establishment of the Achaemenian empire kândts appear to have spread westwards to the Mediterranean and Egypt and southwards to Oman and Southern Arabia. In Egypt kândts, probably built during the Persian occupation, have been found in the Kharga oasis and Matrûh (A. T. Olmstead, History of the Persian empire, Chicago 1948, 224; H. J. L. Beadnell, An Egyptian oasis: an account of the oasis of Kharga in the Libyan desert, with special reference to its history, physical geography, and water supply, London 1909, 171; idem, Remarks on the pre-historic geography and underground waters of Kharga oasis, in Geographical Journal, 1933, 128-39; G. W. Murray, Water from the desert: some ancient Egyptian achievements, in Geographical Journal, 1955, 171-81; G. F. Walpole, An ancient subterranean aqueduct west of Matrûh, in Survey of Egypt, Cairo 1932). The second major diffusion of kândts took place in the early centuries of Islam, when they were introduced into Spain by the Umayyads of Spain (see J. O. Asín, Historia del nombre "Madina", Madrid 1959) and thence to Marrakesh, where there are known as kâtaras or rûkharas, the Canary Islands, Mexico and Chile (C. Troll, Qanat Bewässerung in der alten und neuen Welt, in Mitteilungen der Österreichischen geographischen Gesellschaft, 1963, 313-30; idem, Techniques agricoles, milieu naturel et Histoire de l'Humainîte, in Bull. de la société géographique de Liége, December 1967). In the 4th/10th century they spread to southern Algeria, where they are called joggara (fâhîrâ). They are also found in the Damascus oasis, east of the River Jordan near Shunut Nimrûn, south-east of Riyâd at al-Khardî, north of Djîhânât at al-Kâffî, in Cyprus and in the Turfân oasis, where the technique was apparently introduced in the 18th century (M. Cable and F. French, The Gobi desert, New York 1944, 184-5. See further C. Troll and C. Braun, Madrid, Die Wasserversorgung der Stadt durch Qanale im Laufe der Geschichte, in Abhandlungen des mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, 1972, No. 5, 105-90 for a discussion of the geographical disposal of kândts).

Kândts are constructed by specialists called mu-känns (tâkhîî in Kirmân and Yâzîd, cf. Muhammad Mufîd, Dîamîn Mufîd, ed. Irâdi Afsâh, Tehran 1961, i, 127; Iskandar Beg, 'Alâmârâ-i 'Abbâsî, Isfâhân 1956, i, 473; kumûgh, Hasan b. Mu'âmmad b. Hasan al-Kumî, Ta'rîkh-i Küm'm, tr. into Persian by Hasan b. 'Abbî b. Hasan b. 'Abîd al-Mallîk, ed. Sayyid Dîjâl'al-Dîn Tehrînî, Tehran 1934, 42; 'Alâmârâ-yi 'Abbâsî, i, 473; Kûrîskân in Afghanistan; and Kumûghkân in Kurdisân), whose knowledge and skill are largely passed from father to son. The inhabitants of certain districts, notably Yâzîd, are highly rated for their skill as mu-känns. The traditional techniques of the mu-känns are described in a 5th/11th century Arabic work, Anbâ' al-miyyâ al-ghâfiyya, by Abû Bakr Mu'âmmad b. al-Hasân al-Hâsîb al-Karâdîji, whose patron was Abû Ghânîm b. Mu'âmmad, the hasanîr of Manû'îr b. Wûshmîr. This work was printed in Haydarâbâd, Decan, in 1940. An abbreviated translation entitled The construction of subterranean water supplies during the Abbaside caliphate, was published by F. Krenkow in 1951 (Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society, xii, 23-32). In 1966 a Persian translation, with the title Istikhrâjî-i dâhâ-yi panhânî, by Husayn Khâdiv Dîm in appeared in Tehran. This clarifies some of the difficulties in the published Arabic text. Al-Karâdîji states in his preface that he had referred to various books by earlier writers on the exploitation of subterranean water and found them lacking. No craft was more beneficial than that which was concerned with the exploitation of subterranean water, because by its help the earth was made to flourish, men's lives achieved order, and abundant benefit accrued (Istikhrâjî-i dâhâ-yi panhânî, 2). His account makes clear that the techniques employed by mu-känns were mining techniques.

The first step in making a kândt is to sink a trial shaft (gamânâ) to prove the presence and depth of the ground-water-table. The choice of location of the trial shaft is affected by the slope of the land, general topographical conditions, variations in vegetation, and the site of the land to be irrigated or the settlement to be provided with domestic water (cf. Istikhrâjî-i dâhâ-yi panhânî, on the indications by which the presence of underground water can be recognised, 15 ff.). When the trial shaft is sunk and water reached, the mu-kânî then has to determine whether the well has struck a constant flow of water in an impermeable stratum (âb-i kalîrî). If this is the case, the alignment and slope of the well has to be adjusted so that it hits the impermeable stratum at the greatest depth, which becomes the mother well (mâdâr tâkhî), to the point where the kândt is to come to the surface above the land which is to be irrigated, has then to be established. If the gradient is too steep, the water will flow too fast and erode the walls and the tunnel will fail in. Work on the kândt usually begins at the lower end, i.e., where the water of the kândt is to come to the surface. The mu-kânî, using a small pick and shovel, digs back towards the mother well, though occasionally work is begun simultaneously at both ends. One of the most difficult problems of the mu-kânî is to avoid the rush of water when the tunnel enters the water-bearing section and a break-through is made (cf. Istikhrâjî-i dâhâ-yi panhânî, 34).
on the digging of the trial shaft or gamdna, 35).

Vertical shafts are sunk from the surface to the tunnel every 20-150 yards or so, or are sunk first and then connected by a tunnel. The cross-section of a tunnel is usually elliptical with a height of ca. 4 ft. and a width of ca. 2V2-3 ft. It is usually unlined, but if it passes through soft soil, baked clay hoops (kanad, nay, tanbusha) are used to prevent collapse (cf. Istikhrādī, 54 ff., 60 ff.). The vertical shafts are approximately 2 ft. 6 in. in diameter and their upper portions are strengthened by mud or stone linings. Their purpose is to give ventilation and to enable the soil excavated to be hauled to the surface in a bucket by a windlass. If the shaft is unusually deep a second windlass may be set halfway down in a bucket by a windlass. If the shaft is unusually deep a second windlass may be set halfway down in a bucket by a windlass. If the shaft is unusually deep a second windlass may be set halfway down in a bucket by a windlass.

Vertical shafts are sunk from the surface to the tunnel every 20-150 yards or so, or are sunk first and then connected by a tunnel. The cross-section of a tunnel is usually elliptical with a height of ca. 4 ft. and a width of ca. 2V2-3 ft. It is usually unlined, but if it passes through soft soil, baked clay hoops (kanad, nay, tanbusha) are used to prevent collapse (cf. Istikhrādī, 54 ff., 60 ff.). The vertical shafts are approximately 2 ft. 6 in. in diameter and their upper portions are strengthened by mud or stone linings. Their purpose is to give ventilation and to enable the soil excavated to be hauled to the surface in a bucket by a windlass. If the shaft is unusually deep a second windlass may be set halfway down in a bucket by a windlass. If the shaft is unusually deep a second windlass may be set halfway down in a bucket by a windlass. If the shaft is unusually deep a second windlass may be set halfway down in a bucket by a windlass.

The discharge of the water of kanadīs varies according to ground-water characteristics, the nature of the soil and the season. Those which tap a permanent aquifer tend to have a constant flow throughout the year. If a kanadī does not tap a stable ground-water source or is in porous soil, its flow may be reduced to virtually nothing in summer, or in a dry year. The water of such kanadīs is known as ab-i riʿī. The flow of some kanadīs may reach 400 gallons a minute, but that of most is much smaller, dropping to 30 gallons a minute or less. It is a disadvantage of the kanadī system that the water, since it flows all the year round, may be wasted when irrigation is not needed.

Regular cleaning and repair of kanadīs is required, though the frequency with which this is necessary varies with the soil and the configuration of the land (cf. Istikhrādī, 120 ff. on the maintenance of kanadīs). They are subject to damage and destruction by flash floods. The shafts are sometimes covered by a slab of stone to prevent them being filled by blown sand (see also below.)

In 1962 a distinguished French water engineer, M. Henri Goblot, estimated that about half the land under cultivation in Persia was irrigated by kanadīs, while some of the crops under dry farming in the plateau would not have been cultivated if the construction of a kanadī had not made it possible to establish a village in the neighbourhood. The total number of kanadīs is variously thought to be between 30,000 and 50,000 (see further H. Goblot, Le problème de l’eau en Iran, op. cit.). Dr. Esmail Feylessoufi, writing in 1958, put the number at the lower figure, of which he believed some 22,000 to be in running condition, and their estimated discharge to be 560 cubic metres per second (Underground water kanadīs and deep wells in Iran, publication of the Independent Irrigation Administration, Tehran 1958, 9 ff.). M. Goblot accepts a rather higher figure, namely 40,000, with a total discharge of 600-700 cubic metres per second (see also idem, Le rôle de l’Iran dans les techniques de l’eau, in Technique: revue de l’enseignement technique, 135-6 (January/February 1962), 12).

Kanadīs have played an immensely important role in Persia, both in contributing to the spread of cultivation and also in influencing the site and nature of settlements. Hamadān, Kazvin, Tehran, Nishāpūr, Kirmān, Yazd (cf. the legend of the foundation of Yazd by Alexander, which was preceded by the
making of a kandāt, Muḥammad Muṣaff, Dhāmis-i Muḥfa, iii, 731–2), and many other towns owe their existence to kandāts. Until 1930, the water supply of Tehran, the modern capital, was provided by twelve kandāts. In some districts there is a heavy concentration of kandāts. Aerial photos, for example, showed that there was a total of 266 kandāts in the Varamīn plain, twenty-five miles south-east of Tehran, in the last quarter of the 19th century (P. Beaumont, Qanats in the Varamīn plain, Iran, in The institute of British geographers, transactions and papers, 1968, publication no. 45, 172).

From the point where a kandāt comes to the surface, fields and gardens spread out round it and its branch canals, and settlements grow up along or near the kandāt, their size and number depending upon the volume of its flow.

Sometimes the ownership of the kandāt is in the same hands as the land which it waters. Sometimes the different parcels of land have a prescriptive right to the water of a kandāt with or without the payment of dues. Frequently the ownership of the land and of the kandāt is in different hands and the water is bought and sold. Many kandāts are waḥīf property or ḥāliṣa (cf. a miṣkān granting tax immunities to Fayyābdād, Bālāh, which states that four dāngs of any kandāt brought into operation belonged to the dīwān, H. R. Roemer, Staatschreiben der Timuridenzeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 18 b).

The distribution of the water of a kandāt is based on time. The rotation period varies from kandāt to kandāt, and the order in which the different parcels of land receive the water is sometimes permanent and sometimes settled from year to year by the drawing of lots or some other method. Normally land higher up has the right to water before land lower down. The shares are often fragmented into very small units of time. If the flow of a kandāt is considerable and those having a right to the use of its water numerous, the distribution of the water is likely to be under an official known as the mirāb, who is chosen by the joint users, or, in the case of a ḥāliṣa kandāt, by the government, and is paid by a special due. The division of the water of some kandāts through branch canals goes back many years: that of one in Ardīstān is reputed to have originated in Mongol times.

The need for the careful regulation of the water of a kandāt among the various parcels of land it waters, or between the inhabitants of a town for which it provides domestic water, and the need to keep it in good repair impose a certain solidarity upon the users, though this does not prevent frequent, and sometimes bloody, disputes over the use of its water, or usurpation of this by those higher up to the detriment of those lower down. The maintenance of a kandāt in the case of joint ownership clearly poses certain problems, but there are numerous instances of kandāts owned by one or several persons being successfully operated. A substantial body of law concerning kandāts, based partly on custom and partly on the Shari'a, has grown up over the centuries. This includes especially the question of the harim, i.e., the land bordering a kandāt in which another well or kandāt cannot legally be sunk, and access to kandāts (see Iskād-i dāh-i pānkhān, 42 ff.). Some of this law goes back to pre-Islamic times. Gardeners mention that ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭāhir (governor of Khusrawān 213/828–230/844) assembled the fukahā from Khusrawān and ʿIrāq to write a book on kandāts and rules for the distribution of their water, since disputes were continually taking place over them. He states that the book which resulted from their labours, the Kiāb al-kūnī, was extant in his day (Zayn al-akhbār, ed. Muḥammad Nāṣim, Berlin 1928, 8). In modern times customary law and the Sharī'a have been supplemented or superseded by the civil law and governmental regulations (see further A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant, London 1953 and eadem, The Persian Land reform 1962–1966, Oxford 1969).

There is frequent mention in histories of the repair of old kandāts, and the making of new ones by rulers and others. The upkeep of irrigation works (which included kandāts) was, indeed, one of the traditional functions of the ruler. There are also records of the destruction of kandāts by acts of war. In recent years, as a result of the use of power-operated wells in regions formerly watered entirely or partly by kandāts, and the construction of dams controlling surface irrigation water, the ground-water table has fallen, and many kandāts (whose flow is governed by the height of the water table) have become dry or their flow has been seriously depleted, (cf. P. Beaumont, Qanats in the Varamīn plain, 177 ff. and idem, Qanats systems in Iran, in Bull. of the International association of scientific hydrology, xvi, 1:15971, 40).

kandāts, however, still play an important part, sometimes the only, source of irrigation and domestic water supply in many parts of Persia, but in the more densely populated districts they have lost their importance as the main suppliers of water.

Oman and Trucial Oman. A considerable number of kandāts, or afldād (sing. falādād) as they are known, some in operation, others abandoned, are to be found in Oman, Trucial Oman, and Bahrain. Many of them are sited near wāddāts and the alignment is often adjacent or parallel to the wāddā bed. They are liable to damage in time of flood. For this reason the vertical shafts are frequently covered by stone slabs to lessen the danger of destruction. Tradition attributes the building of afldād to Sulaymān b. Dāʿūd. It seems probable that, in fact, the kandāt system in Oman was developed first in Achaemenian and then in Sassanian times, while many kandāts appear to have been restored under Yaʿarıba rule (see further J. C. Wilkinson, Arab settlement in Oman; the origins and development of the tribal pattern and its relationship to the imamate, unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Oxford 1969).

One of the afldād of Iskī is by tradition supposed to have been destroyed by Ḥadīdādād b. Yūsuf (q.v.) during his expedition against Oman. At the present day the technique of making afldād is confined to certain groups of the ʿAwālmī tribe.

In general the kandāts of Oman are neither so deep nor so long as those in Persia. At Nizwā there is a falādād the mother well of which is ca. 60 ft. deep; in the Burayml oasis, which is irrigated by afldādī, the longest is ca. 9 km. In Central Oman an inverted syphon (gharrāf falādād) is used in kandāt building to cross wāddās. There is considerable variation in the ownership of the afldād, their administration, and the distribution of their water. In some cases the ownership of the falādād and the land it irrigates is in the same hands, but more often it is separate and the water is bought and sold. A special feature of the afldād in Oman is that a share of the water belongs to the falādād, the revenue from which is devoted to its upkeep. Many afldād have a special book recording the ownership, sale, and distribution of the water. The rotation period of the water varies from falādād to falādād. It is measured by the sun by day and the stars by night. The water is divided into shares called bāda and subdivided into rabi'a, kāmā, aẓhar, and bīyāds. The official in charge of the water
distribution is commonly known as the ārif, who, in some cases, has under him a subordinate official or officials, known as bādhīr. Another official, the wakil, is normally in charge of the upkeep of the falādi. The ārif and the wakil, who are elected by the owners of the water, are paid by dues or a share of the water.


II. In Arab Countries

The Persian word ḥaṭṭāhārēs (see Vullers, *Lex. pers.-lat.*, ii, 707, 927; Desmaisons, s.v.), which was originally applied to underground irrigation systems before being replaced by kanāt, passed into Arabic in the form ʿṣṭāḥrāfūḥārdī, which generally designates a cistern, kanāt having a wider current use. Yākūt (s.v. kanāt) believes that the ḥārā of al-Kanāt (in the Arabian provinces and the al-Djizīrā) took its name from underground water pipes, and these have been found near Karyatayn on the ancient road from Damascus to Palmyra (Moritz, *Die antike Topographie der Palmyrener*, in *Abb. Pr. Ak.*, iv (1889), 12); and in *Paysans de Syrie et du Proche-Orient* (Paris 1946, 283 and fig. 85), J. Wente notes that near Sābīr (in the Damascus region) there are draining systems of 8 to 10 km. long, sunk at a level of 10 to 12 m., sometimes terminating in underground reservoirs whose water is drawn by norias. Basing his observations on al-Nābulusi’s *Rīḥā*, J. Nasrallah (Voyages et pêlerins au Qalamīn, in *B.E.t.O*, x (1943-4), 26) reports that a village named al-Ṣālīḥīya, which lies between Yābrūd and al-Nabīk (north of Damascus), had a kanāt, which, legend has it, dried up when a Maghribī whom the village people had made unwelcome cast a spell on it; the ruin of the whole locality ensued. The same writer notes that the clearing of the kanāt begun shortly before the Second World War restored the prosperity of the region.

Methods of underground canalization spread from Iran to the Yemen and thence to Hūǧāz where the canals were called ḥāṣīma (pl. ḥāṣīmām). Among various meanings, this term, according to al-ʿAsmaʾī (*apud* LA and TA, rad. k-f-r; cf. Yākūt, s.v. kanāt), especially designates a series of wells sunk at a certain distance from one another and linked by a gallery (kanāt) laid out at a level that does not tap the underground water. The water tapped by this method flows gently towards the centre of habitation so that it supplies or irrigates. The water outlet is known as a ḥāfīr (pl. ḥafūr), but this term (cf. LA and TA, rad. f-k-r) is also used for a well or a group of wells linked by a gallery, that is, it is practically synonymous with ḥāṣīma.

Al-ʿAsmaʾī’s description corresponds to a method which consists of tapping underground water, from an altitude higher than that of the intake point, by means of a series of wells linked by a gallery high enough to permit a stooping man to move through it (1 m. to 1.50 m.). Such a technique has the virtue of dispensing with machinery to raise well water to the level of the ground, reducing loss due to evaporation, tapping the seepage water, and finally of giving a gentle, regular incline to the underground draining system, less steep than that at ground level.

That the Romans may have known of this technique is suggested by remains found in the Kayrawān region in Tunisia (see M. Solignac, *Recherches sur les installations hydrauliques de Kairouan et des steppe tunisiennes du VIIe au XIe siècle* (J.-C.), in *AIEO Alger*, 1952, 1-272, esp. 60 ff.), but the Arab origin of their works in North Africa is not in doubt. They have been found in Tunisia near Gasba (Burseaux, *L’Oasis d’El-Guettar*, ses ressources, sa découverte, in *RT*, (1910), 364-73), among the Nafzawa, where they are called ḥāridja, and even in the immediate vicinity of Tunis (see M. Solignac, *Travaux hydrauliques hafsides de Tunis*, in *R. Afr.* (1936), 517-80).

The method employed in the Algerian oases of Touat, Gourara, Sétif, Mâdâb, Tididelt and Figuig (Fi-дж) is called ḥaṭṭāhārēs (< ḥaṭṭāhārē), pl. ḥaṭṭāhārē, which seems to come from the same root as ḥaṭṭāhārē, although f-d-r and f-w-r are also possible. Described many years ago by J. Brunhes (*Les oasis du Sous et du M’sab*, in *La Geographie*, v (1902), 180), they consist of underground canals sunk at a depth of 8 to 55 m., connected to the exterior by shafts originally designed to collect rainwater; at the outlet the main canal branches out so that gardens can be irrigated. In the central Sahara and at Fazzān a pump well has been called a ḥhāṭṭāhārēr (pl. ḥhāṭṭāhārēr), implying the notion of movement to and fro, but in Morocco this term is applied to the underground draining systems.
existing in Tafillalt, here and there in other regions, and especially in Marrakush. Wells sunk to a depth of 40 m. at the outset and spaced out at 10 to 20 m. on average, with shafts set out at similar distances over a total course of 4 to 5 km., are linked as before with a gallery at a slope of about 1%. Water from the aquiferous stratum and stream-level was distributed by conduits lined with stonework and earthenware (khdas; Sp. arcuatus) for use in irrigating gardens and drinking-water. The works were built between 1519 and 1635, during the reign of Akbarl records it as the headquarters town of sarkdr. In the 12th/18th century, with the decline of the Mughal power, campaigns of 932/1526, to lose it, and his kingdom, brother Barbak [see SHARK!].

In the 12th/18th century, with the decline of the Mughal power, campaigns of 932/1526, to lose it, and his kingdom, brother Barbak [see SHARK!].

KANAWDJ or KANAWDJ (Sanskrit Kana- kubja; known to the Arabic geographers as Kana- kubja, Kanauj, Kinnawdi, the latter form used also in Arabic). It was a town that Muhammad b. Kasim, the conqueror of the Ghurids, captured in 796/1394; and, in his new governorship which was necessary for Iltutmish to attack it again later — presumably decisively for a few years later we find his young grandson ‘Ali al-Din Mas‘ud appointing a cousin, Djialal al-Din, to the governorship of Kanauj in 1240/1243. Thereafter it figures frequently in the histories of Khalji and Tughlukid times, doubtless on account of its strategic importance on the banks of the Ganges; Ibn Ba‘thita refers to it as well built and strongly fortified, and mentions its sugar trade. Kanauj figures as one of 23 provinces in the time of Muhammad b. Tughluq (Mas‘ulik al- Absár, Eng. tr. Spies, Aligarh 1943, 16).

Towards the end of the 8th/14th century Kanauj was one of the centres of activity of the Hindù “rebels” against whom Malik Sarwar was despatched in 796/1394; and, in his new governorship which was soon to become the sultanate of Dijnawpur, he was in charge of a region extending from Kanauj to Bihâr. When the sultanate al-shark achieved independence from Dihîf, Kanauj, as its westernmost stronghold, was often a point of contention between the sultanates of Dihill and Dijnawpur, and there were many battles in its vicinity. The town was taken by Mahmîd Tughluq in 804/1402-3, who held it as his temporary capital (probably with the connivance of the Sharkî ruler) against his recalcitrant wâris Malik Ikhlîl Khân Lodî [q.v.]; after the death of the latter it was recovered by the Sharkîs in 809/1407 (Ta‘rikh-i Mubârak Shâhî, 175). It again figured in the Dihill-Dijnawpur conflicts at the time of Bahîl Lodî versus Husayn Shâh Sharkî, and Sikandar Lodî versus his brother Bârbak [see SHARK!].

Humâyûn took Kanauj for his father Bâbur in the campaigns of 932/1526, to lose it, and his kingdom, to Shâh Shâh in 1469; and, in the Mughal recon- struction the history of Kanauj seems to have been largely peaceful, and the A’in-i Akhbar records it as the headquarters town of sarbâr. In the 12th/18th century, with the decline of the Mughul power,
Kanawdj was variously in the hands of the Nawwabs of Farrukhabad, the Nawwabs of Awadh, and occasionally the Marathás.

Kanawdj appears as a mint town, Khanwadj 'urf Shérchema, under Shēr Shāh and the later Sūrīs; its name was changed by Akbar to Shāhghar, although under the later Mughals it appears as Shāhghābd. Its monuments are poorly described, although there are many tombs and shrines in the neighbourhood. The Dājīmī mosque, built by Ibrāhīm Shāhī, using much Hindu and Jain temple spoils, shows the westernmost extension of the Shākhi style [see Dāwnpur, and Hind, Architecture].

**Bibliography:** In addition to references in the article: Istākhri, 9; Ibn Hawkal (BGA), 14, 227; Muqaddasī, 477, 480, 485; Masʿūdī, Mūrūdī, 3, 162, 178, 372, 374 (= tr. Sprenger, 175, 193, 386, 382; = tr. Pellat, index); al-Bīrūnī, India, ed. Sachau, 11, 97; tr. 21, 199; Ibn al-ʿĀbiḥ, ix, 186, 217 f.; M. Reinaud, Mém. sur l'Inde, Paris 1849, 136-43; idem, Géogr. d'Aboulfibāda, i, pp. cccxxvii ff., ccclviii, i/2, 120; Relations de voyages et textes géogr., tr. G. Ferrand, i, ii, Paris 1913-14, index s.v. Kanūdji; J. Marquart, Erstsahr, Berlin 1901, 263-5; Walters, Yuan Chuan, London 1904; McGeown, Ancient History of Ptolemy, Bombay 1885; Beal, Travels of Buddhists pilgrims, London 1869.

(M. LONGWORTH DAMES—[J. BURTON-PAGE])

**KANBĀNIYA** (also kanbāniya, with kanbāniya once attested in the Calendrier de Cordoue), from Spanish campañ, in general denotes in Spanish Arabic usage, the countryside, but in particular the Campiña, sc. the vast, gently-undulating plain which forms the southern part of the hūra of Cordova, al-Irdīsī, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, ed. and tr. Dozy-De Goeje, 174, 209, makes it an ikllm whose capital was Cordova and its main towns al-Zahrāʾ, Eclia, Baena, Cabra and Lucena. After leaving the capital, the approach to it was first through the Bāb al-ʿAnfara and across the Roman bridge spanning the Guadalquivir near the caliphal palace and the great mosque, and then through the famous Rabad (q.v.); several roads then ran across its expanse. In addition to cereals and fruit, this fertile plain produced a celebrated variety of grapes called kanbāni. The plain was much used for hunting, and the upper ranks of Cordovan society liked to reside in the numerous country houses (menya) built there; moreover, the Christians themselves had churches there.

The Campiña's strategic situation made it a route for the passage of troops to attack Cordova in times of trouble, and is specially mentioned in regard to the revolt of Umār b. Ḥaṣān (q.v.), who managed to capture the fortress of Bullay (Poley = Agualar de la Frontera), from which he was able to send out expeditions, lay waste the agricultural lands and seriously threaten the capital's food supplies.

**Bibliography:** E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. de l'Esp. Mus., index and bibl. cited there; R. Castexon, Cordoba califal, in Bolitin Acad. Córdoba (1929), 257; the Arabic geographers dealing with Muslim Spain (Yākūt cites a village called Kanbān, which he seems to have formed from the nisba of al-kanbānī, but he also mentions the Kanbāniya). See also al-Andalus, Kūrtuba.

**KANBĪYA** [see Kārib, 318].

**KANBOH** [see Sukkar].

**KAND (see Sukkar).**

**KANDĀBIL** (the earliest form of the name found in Arabic works), GANDĀBĀ (current from the 16th century), or GANDĀVĀ (the term found in classical Balātī poetry of the 15th century, and widely used since the 18th century) was a town standing on a high elevation (Balādūr, Futūḥ al-buldān, 445), alone on a desolate plain (Istākhri, Cairo 1966, 106; Ibn Hawkal, Beirut 1962, 281), and from it routes led west to Kūzdār, north to Mastandj, east to Multān and south to Manṣūra (cf. Ibn Khurraḍābīh, Leiden ed., 55-6; Istākhri, 106, 179; Ibn Hawkal, 282; Muqaddasī, Leiden ed., 408). Only the modern Gandāvā, situated 28°37′ N and 67°29′ E in the Kačchī district of Balāḍīstān Province, Pakistan, answers this description in all details. It stands on a hill 321 ft. high, at the head of the flat, desolate plain of Kačchī, and from it the old routes lead in the directions specified in the sources (see Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, London 1867, i, 385).

The founding of Kandābil was ascribed to the legendary Bāhman Ardashīr "to demarcate the boundary between the Indians (Sindians) and the Turks" (Muṣlaṣm al-tawārīkh, 177-8), i.e., between Turan or Kaykān and the flat Budha country of the Sindian people (Yākūt, Muṣlaṣm, s.v. Kandabl). In the seventh century, Budha included within its boundaries the present district of Kačchī and the western areas of the districts of Jacobabad, Surāk, Larkana and Dadu (Fathnāma-i Sind, 15, 39, 125). Kandābil was the chief town in the northern part, while the capital was at Kākārādī (= Kakar, in Dadu district) in the more fertile southern part. With the Arab conquest (93/712), the whole of southern Budha was integrated with the central province of Sind (ibid., 122-3) and the subsequent boundaries of Budha embraced only the northern part of Kačchī, i.e., the present Kačchī district and the country around it (Istākhri, 104). The country was called Budha, Budhiya or Bidhiya, not because of any links with Buddha or Buddhism but because the bulk of the inhabitants were Buddh; Zuṭṣī also lived there (Balādūr, Futūḥ, 436, 445). Both these communities (now Muslim) have survived, the Budhs living mainly in Mutt and the Zuṭṣī scattered over the whole country.

According to Fathnāma, 73, the Arab armies reached the Kandābil region as early as 23/644 but withdrew after receiving the news of Caliph Umār's death. From 23/644 until 92/711, the Kandābil region of Budha, though subjugated by the Arabs, became a refuge for Arabs fleeing from the Umayyad government and was occupied by the Brahmin kings of Sind. In 660, Ḥaṭḥ, the ruler of Sind, led a successful expedition through the country of Kandābil (Fathnāma, 49). During the caliphate of Muʿāwiya (42/661-680), the commander Sinān gained a victory in Kaykān (Balādūr, Futūḥ, 433), but when he advanced through Kaykān into Budha on his second expedition he was killed there (Fathnāma, 85). In 69/688, the Khāzādī rebel ʿAṭīya b. al-Aswad al-Ḥanafī was pursued by a section of Muhallab's army "to Kandalb in Sind" and killed there (Balādūr, Ansāb). Six years later ʿĪfāf rebels slew ʿAṭīb b. Aslam, commander of the Makrān district, at Kandābil (Balāḍūr, Futūḥ, 435). Al-Ḥadidjābī despatched Mudjdīdā in 85/704 to punish the ʿĪfāfs, but they fled to Sind before his arrival; however, he subjugated the "tribes of Kandābil" (ibid., 435), who had probably aided the ʿĪfāfs. Subsequently (704-11), Kandābil was occupied by Dāhrār, ruler of Sind, who appointed his nephew, Dhol son of Chandar, as the governor of "Budhiya" (Fathnāma, 94).

After the conquest of Sind, including "Budhiya",
by Muhammad b. al-KasIm in 92/711 (ibid., 121-4), the region of Kandabil became an administrative division of the Sind province and peace reigned, apart from occasional disturbances. In 101/720, the rebel sons of Muhallab reached Kandahel, regarding it as their last refuge, but their trusted ally WadA' closed the gates and barred their entry into the town; they died fighting outside the walls of Kandabil against the superior forces of HilAb b. Abwaz al-Tamlmi, who had pursued them relentlessly (see as-Muhallab. In 55/754 Kandahel was occupied by a group of Arabs, but they were ousted by HishAm b. 'Amr, governor of Sind. Some time in 222/837, another usurper, Muhammad b. Kbalh, occupied Kandahel, but 'l MrAm, then governor of Sind, attacked him, conquered Kandabil, and transferred the local chiefs involved to Kuzdar (BalAdhuri, FutA'I, 445). Firmly checking all disturbances, 'l MrAm brought lasting peace and prosperity to Kandabil. A century later it had developed into the central market-place of the Budha hinterland, where "the Budh people" sold their produce and obtained all their supplies (Istakhri, 105-6). Palm trees were planted later, and in the 11th-12th century Kandabil was a "big city, prosperous and pleasant, producing large quantities of dates" (Hudud al-'Adlarn, 123).

The city remained an administrative district of Sind, under the rule successively of the SumAmars, the Sammas, the ArgAmns and TurkAmns, the Moghuls and the Kalhora rulers [see SIND]. In the second half of the 9th/11th century Kandahel, then known locally as GandAv and associated with Sibi province, became the capital of the LashAb Baluch confederacy in alliance with the Sammas. In 924/1518, ShAb Beg Arghun, en route for his conquest of Sind, sent a force to occupy "GandjAbh". It fell to the Moghul Emperor Akbar in 1574, was included in the sub-division (mahdA) of Fatbhpur (Ta'rIkI-i SInd, 130, 186, 235-6) and was governed from Bahkhkhar. Nadir ShAh, who had subdued the Kalhoras of Sind, transferred the KalCh district, including GandAv, to KalAt in 1870 and thereafter (1740-1955) it became part of the khanate of KalAt, political capital of the KalCh district and the winter resort of the khans of KalAt.

The city wall, repaired by MurAd (an able officer of the Kalhoras) in the early 18th century, was still intact in the 19th century, but is now dilapidated and in ruins.
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**KANDAHAR, a city in southeastern AfghanIstAn (in modern times giving its name to a province) situated in latitude 3°27' N. and longitude 65°45' E. at an altitude of 3,460 ft. (1,000 m.), and lying between the AfghanArd and GhOrB Rivers in the warmer, southern part of Afghanistan. Hence snow rarely lies there for very long, and in modern times the city has been favoured as a winter residence for KAbuls wishing to avoid the rigours of their winter (see J. Humlum et al., La geographie de l'Afghanistan, etude d'un pays aride, Copenhagen 1959, 142-2; Ibn BAt'tIla, iii, 84, likewise recorded in the 8th/14th century that the inhabitants of GhAnA moved to KandAhel for the winter). Since it is one component of the triangle KAbul-Kandahel-HArat, possession of which gives military control of Afghanistan, and is also at the end of a route via the modern railhead of Caman to Quetta and northwestern India, Kandahel has been of strategic and commercial importance all through recorded history. Even in the Stone Age, the inhabitants of the nearby settlements of Mundigak and Deh Morasi Ghundai (4th-2nd millennium B.C.) traded with northwestern India, eastern Iran and the Eurasian steppes. In Achaemenid Persian times, the region of Kandahel was possibly to be identified with the Achaemenid satrapy of Harahuvat; in the Persepolis Fortress tablets (c. 500 B.C.) there is more than one mention of the issue of rations for journeys between Susa and Kandaraqh (R. T. Hallock, The evidence of the Persepolis tablets [= ch. from the Cambridge history of Iran, iii, Cambridge 1971, 13, 29).

In Hellenistic times, the region of southeastern AfghanIstAn was known as Arachosia, and the town of Kandahel itself is probably to be identified with the mptoporqai 'Apa/'Apa of, e.g., Isodore of Charax (on the problem of the city's ancient name, Alexandria of Arachosia or Alexandria of Kandahel, see G. Pugliese Caratelli and G. Garbini, A bilingual graco-aramean edict by A'rekon, Serie Orientale Roma xxix, Rome 1964, 19-22). Then as now, Arachosia was famed for its grapes; the Indian author Kautilya (4th century B.C.) speaks of Harahuraka as a place whence wine was obtained. However, Greek rule here can only have lasted some 25 years, 330-305 B.C., for in the treaty between Seleucus I and Chandragupta, see G. Pugliese Caratelli and G. Garbini, op. cit., one in Greek in 1963 (see Schumberger, Une inscription greco-arameenne d'A'rekon, in CRAIBL (1964), 126-40) and an Aramaic one also in 1963 (see A. Dupont-Sommer and E. Benveniste, Une inscription indo-arameenne d'A'rekon provenant de Kandahel (Afghanistan), in JA, cxlvii (1958), 1-48, and Caratelli and Garbini, op. cit.), one in Greek in 1963 (see Schumberger, Une seconde inscription greco-arameenne d'A'rekon, in CRAIBL (1964), 126-40) and an Aramaic one also in 1963 (see A. Dupont-Sommer and E. Benveniste, Une inscription indo-arameenne d'A'rekon provenant de Kandahel (Afghanistan), in JA, cxlvii (1958), 1-48, and Caratelli and Garbini, op. cit.)

The name Kandahel is the ancient name of the ancient city of Kandahel, among the old city of Kandahel, including one in Greek and Aramaic discovered in 1958 (see D. Schumberger et al., Une bilingue graco-arameenne d'A'rekon, in JA, cxlivii (1958), 1-48, and Caratelli and Garbini, op. cit.)
possible that the name was transferred southwards to Arachosia by some migration of Gandhārans; there are stories, retailed by Chinese Buddhist pilgrims, of the Buddha's begging bowl being preserved in Kandahār (at a later date, it was shown in a Muslim shrine outside the city), brought thither by Gandhāran Buddhist refugees.

The actual site of Kandahār has varied at different periods of history. The old city, abandoned since the time of Nādir Shāh, lay 3 miles (5 km.) to the west-south-west of the modern city, at the foot of a rocky spur called the Kātyūl, the site being now called the shahr-i kuhna. Here archaeology has revealed a walled city, clearly dating back to Hellenistic times, and successively occupied in the ensuing Buddhist and Islamic periods (see Fussman, op. cit., 33 ff.).

Very little is known on Kandahār in the Kusān period, but under the rule of the southern branch of the Hephthalites, the Zabuls (see HAYĀṬILA), Kandahār fell within their kingdom (see R. Ghirshman, Les Chroniques-Hépatilates, Cairo 1948, 104 ff.). In the Umayyad period, Arab raiders penetrated into the region of Kandahār after their occupation of Sīstān and their establishment of a bridgehead of Muslim arms at Bust [q.v.]. Arabic sources call the region around Kandahār al-Rukhkhad (see Acchasia); the name survives today in the site of an Islamic settlement now called Tepe Arugh or Zamindawar; it was the centre of a powerful local dynasty who bore the title of Zumbils, epigoni of the southern branch of the Hephthalites; down to the Saʿfārīd period (later 3rd/9th century) they constituted the main obstacle to the spread of Islam in eastern Afghanistan. Baladhuri records that the governor of Sīstān under Muʿawiya, ʿAbbād b. Ziyād b. Abī Saʿīd, led a raid against Kandahār and captured it after bitter fighting; the poet Ibn Mufarrig probably accompanied the expedition, for he composed an elegy for the Muslim dead (these verses, not related to any specific occurrence by Ch. Pellat, Le poème Ibn Mufarrig et son oeuvre, in Mélanges Massisqou, Damascus 1956-7, ii, 217, can therefore be pinned down to ʿAbbād’s expedition). Baladhuri mentions the characteristic high caps (kaldan-i tūs) of the Kandahāris, and although his Arabic text is somewhat ambiguous here, it seems that ʿAbbād now re-named the town ʿAbbādiya after himself (Baladhur, Futūḥ, 434, repeated in Yākūt, Būdān (Beirut 1374-6/1955-7), iv, 402-3; cf. K. Fischer, Zur Lage von Kandahār an Landverbindungen zwischen Iran und Indien, in Denner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landmuseums in Bonn, clxvii (1967), 192-3, and Marquart, Erānšahr, 270). But Muslim control must have been thrown off by the time ʿAbbād was recalled from his governorship in 61/1260-1; the name of ʿAbbādiya is heard of no more, and at the time of the Muslim dāfolc in Zamindawar in 79/698 (see C. E. Bosworth, ʿUbaidallāh b. Abī Bakra and the "Army of Destruction" in Zābulistān (1979/36), in Ist., 1 (1973), 268-83), there was no Muslim-controlled territory east of Bust.

In this early Islamic period, Muslim authors tended to reckon Kandahār as part of the province of Sind (e.g., Ibn Khurraḍādjudhī, 65, and Yākūt, loc. cit.; Yaʿqūbī, Būdān, 281, tr. 90, links Kandahār with Sind also), probably because the indigenous religion of the people of Zamindawar, the cult of the god Šāh, was considered as related to Indian faiths. In the reign of the ʿAbbāsids caliph al-Mansūr there is mentioned a campaign by the governor of Sind, Hīshām b. ʿAmr al-Taḥlabī, against Multān, Kashmir and Kandahār, but Marquart, following Reinaud, identified this Kandahār with the classical Gandhāra on the upper Indus, and in particular, with Ψυχίνη, capital of the Buddhist pilgrimage places of the Buddha's begging bowl being preserved in Kandahār (at a later date, it was shown in a Muslim shrine outside the city), brought thither by Gandhāran Buddhist refugees.

However, Marquart commented how infrequently the name of Kandahār in Afghanistan appears in early Islamic sources. More commonly mentioned as the main centres of the region of Zamindawar are the towns of Panjwāy (al-Rukhkha), said to be “the name of a region, and Panjwāy is its capital”) and, then, one day’s journey further on from Bust, Tīgnābād. Ancient Panjwāy was apparently situated on the road from Kandahār to modern Panjwāy, according to Mir Husain Shah, Panjwainī-Fanjuwaī, in Afghanistan, xvii/3 (Kabul 1962), 23-7; cf. Le Strange, 346-7. The exact site of Tīgnābād, mentioned by Djuwainī in the 7th/13th century and appearing on an 18th-century European map as Tecniabād, is still unknown (see Fischer, op. cit., 191-2). Marquart thought that al-Rukhkhad, the "two Rukkhadiyān", mentioned in the account of a raid into the region by Hārūn al-Rashīd’s governor Ṣīsā b. Ṣallī b. Māhān, referred to these two places Panjwāy and Tīgnābād (Masʿūdī, Muraḏjī, viii, 127, cited in Erānšahr, 272). It is certainly these two towns which are mentioned in sources from the Ghaznavid and Ghurid periods (e.g., Gardīzī, Bayhaḵī and Dīḏgānī), but there is no doubt that Kandahār itself continued to exist and to flourish. The Islamic old city of Kandahār, in whose remains one can clearly discern the classical eastern Islamic division of a citadel (kāfār, khandizī), a town proper within the walls (madīna, shahrastān) and suburbs (rabād bārān), probably developed during this time (cf. Fussman, op. cit., 39-42).

With the destruction of the Ghaznavid centre of Lāšḵkāri Bāzār, Kal’a-yi Bīst by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Djiḏhuṣūz in 545/1150 (see GIORDANI), the name of Kandahār comes back into prominence and is henceforth mentioned continuously. In 680/1280 Kandahār was conquered by Ṣamḥ al-Dīn II b. Ṣukn al-Dīn Kart, the vassal ruler in Harat for the Ilkhanid Abaka (B. dhūrūn), the characteristicians (hāḏūrūn) of the Ilkhanid Abaka (B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, Berlin 1955, 158). Timūr conquered it and bestowed it on his grandson ʿIr Rūḥ al-Muḥammad in 785/1383. In 821/1418 Kandahār became part of Sūyūrghānīsh b. Shāh Rukh’s appanage, and in the later 9th/15th century it appears as a minting-place for Husayn Mīrza Bayḵārā of Harat (875/1470-912/1506). It was under this latter ruler’s lordship that the Ardabīlī ʿAbd al-Nūn Beg added the region of Kandahār and the adjacent parts of what is now northeastern Balūcistān, sći. Sībī, Mustang and Quetta, to his other territories and made Kandahār his capital. This eventually led to conflict with the Timūrid descendant Bābūrs, who was carving out for himself a principality on the Indo-Afghan fringes. Bābūr captured Kābul from Ḥujj al-Nūn’s son Muḥān in 910/1504, and Muḥān was allowed to fall back on Kandahār. However, Bābūr felt that his hold on the Kābul River valley would be insecure whilst the Arghunids remained in eastern Afghanistan, so he attacked Muḥān and his brother Shāh Beg in Kandahār in 913/1507-8. Nevertheless, Shāh Beg was able to obtain Shāyḵbānd help and return. Kandahār was not finally captured from him till 928/1522, after a drawn-out but intermittent siege (exaggeratedly enumerated in the sources as of five years’ duration), the city’s strong fortifications preserving it; Shāh Beg now retreated southwards permanently to Sībī, Quetta and Sind (Mīrza Muḥān-
The Mughals did not enjoy unchallenged possession of Kandahar for long. After Bābur's death it was held by his son Kāmrān Mīrzā, but was also coveted by the vigorous and aggressive Safavid state in Persia under Shāh Ṭahmāsp I. After prolonged warfare with the Ozbegs, the Safavids had fallen heir to most of the Timūrid inheritance in Khurasan, being in firm control of Harat after 934/1527-8; they accordingly wished to consolidate their position by the addition of Kandahār. Kāmrān Mīrzā held the city against Safavid attacks in 941/1534-6. In the inter- nal disputes of Kandahār and his half-brother Humayūn [q.v.], the latter was in 950/1543 forced to take refuge with Shāh Ṭahmāsp. In 952/1545 Humayūn and a Persian army took Kandahār, but a month later Humayūn turned on his Persian allies and seized the city for himself. In 965/1558 Ṭahmāsp recaptured it from the Mughal Emperor Akbar, and the latter did not regain it till 1003/1594-5. The Persians again took it from Dīhāngrā b. Akbar in 1031/1622, and after ten years' reversions to Mughal control it passed in 1058/1648 into the hands of Abbās II, remaining with the Safavids till 1111/1700. The Safavid province of Kandahār also included the southerly districts of Mīnsk, Sībī, Kākār, etc.; at various times in the 10th/16th century it was governed by royal princes of the Safavid house (cf. K. M. Röhrborn, Provinzen und Zentralgewalt Persiens im 16. und 17. Jahrhun- derti, Berlin 1966, 12-14, 35-6, 42). It is from the mid-11th/17th century that we have a drawing of the walled city of Kandahār as it existed before Nādir Shāh's destructions, given by J. B. Tavernier in his Travels; he passed through Farah, Kandahār and Kabul on his way from Isfahan to Āgra (the picture is reproduced in Fischer, Zur Lage von Kandahār, 149).

The end of Safavid rule in Kandahār came at the hands of the Ghilzays [q.v.], an Afghan tribe who had settled in the vicinity of Kandahār on lands left vacant when Shāh Abbās I had moved a considerable part of the original Abdali [q.v.] occupants to the Harat region. In the course of the 11th/17th century, the Ghilzays had generally supported the Safavids cause rather than that of the Mughals, but the leader of the Hōtak clan of the Ghilzays, Murāwīs, was now rebelled against the Safavids, and in 1121/1709 declared his independence, though he contented himself with the title of ḫāqān, "reign". On his death in 1127/1715, Murāwīs was buried in Kandahār, and his grave was, until recently at least, regarded as a source of baraka or blessing, despite its being overshadowed by that of Ahmad Shāh Durrānī (see below). Murāwīs's son Māhmūd (d. 1137/1725) consolidated his power, and it was from Kandahār that the Ghilzays streamed westwards into Persia and overthrew the decrepit Safavid monarchy (see L. Lockhart, The fall of the Safavid dynasty and the Afghan occupation of Persia, Cambridge 1958). However, the Ghilzays were unable to build a lasting state in Persia out of their conquests, and in 1150/ 1738 their original centre of Kandahār was lost when Nādir Shāh [q.v.], with support from the Abdālīs of Ilārār, captured it after a lengthy investiture (Shaw- wāl 1150/1738, 1-Ka'da 1150/February 1737- March 1738; Lockhart, Nādir Shāh, London 1938, 114). Kandahār was at this time apparently called Husayn- ābād after the city's Ghilzay governor Husayn Sūltān. Nādir now destroyed the "Ghilzay fortress", meaning here the whole of the walled city and not just the citadel. Today, the walls of the Islamic city are somewhat reduced in height, Nādir's destruction being aggravated by the depredations of local seekers of building materials, although as late as A. Le Murr's time, substantial remnants of the triple enceinte were still visible (see his Kandahār in 1879, London 1880, 245-6). Nādir built a new military encampment, Nādirābād, to the southeast of the old city; the camps were marked by walls inscribed with the names of both Nādirābād and Kandahār, but the former was abandoned on his death in 1160/ 1747 (see Lockhart, Nādir Shāh, 120).

The development of the present-day city of Kandahār is connected with the replacement of Ghilzay power in the area by that of the Abdali Afghāns, for Nādir (in whose army Ahmad Kān Abdālī had been prominent) allowed the Abdālīs to return to their original home. After Nādir's assassination, Ahmad established his power in eastern Afghanistan. He founded a new city of Kandahār to the east of the old one, enclosing it with a wall and making it his capital; the city was named Ahmad Shāhī and this name, together with the epithet Ashraf al-bilād, "most noble of cities", appears on the coins which he minted there (see Ahmad Kān Durrānī). He was buried there, and Elphinstone reports that 40 years after his death his tomb was much venerated by the Abdālīs or Durrānīs, and that a right of sanctuary existed at it (An account of the kingdom of Caubul, London 1839, ii, 132).

Under the Durrānī Amirīs, Kandahār still remained liable to vicissitudes. In the civil warfare among Ahmad's grandsons Sara Shāh, Māhmūd and Shudūd al-Mulk pursued the city from one to the other; the Bāarakzay amir Dūst Muhammad [q.v.] became unchallenged ruler in Kābul in 1241/1826 and transferred the capital thither, leaving his brother Kūhandil Kān as governor in Kandahār. During the latter's governorship, Shāh Shudūd [q.v.], of the line of Sādūzay Durrānīs dispossessed from control of eastern Afghanistan, had endeavoured to reconquer Kandahār (1250/1834) during the First Afghan-British War, Shāh Shudūd temporarily became amir of both Kandahar and Kābul (1255/ 1839). In the Second Afghan War, Kandahār became for a few months in 1297/1880 the centre of an independent Afghan state under a member of the Sādūzay family, Sādūzay Shāh 'Ali. But after the attempt to seize Kandahār made from Harat by 'Abd al-Rahmān Kān [q.v.]; for a detailed account of all these events, see Afghanistan, v, History.

The modern city of Kandahār had a population estimated in 1962 at c. 120,000, and the province of which it is the capital had in 1969 an estimated population of 724,000. The whole area round the city is a rich agricultural one, supplying the colder regions of northern Afghanistan, and also Pakistan, with fruit and vegetables; water is brought to many parts of this agricultural hinterland by a complex system of underground channels or kāris or the nearby hills (see kānār). In the 1960s Kandahār acquired an airport of international dimensions, and the roads connecting it with Kābul and Harat were metalled. As opposed to the capital Kābul, Kandahār is in the centre of a strongly Pashto-speaking region, and has thus had an important rôle in the govern-
mental policy of encouraging that language; it was, for instance, in Kandahar that the Pashto propagandist society *Wish Zalmyán, "Awakening Youth"*, was founded in 1947. It has nevertheless lagged behind the capital in social and educational progress. Holdich remarked on the tolerance towards foreigners of Kábul compared with the fanaticism of Kandahár (*The gates of India*, London 1910, 377). In connection with this, Kandahár was the scene of anti-government riots in 1959, primarily caused by grievances over taxation, but also involving an element of conservative protest at the permissory abolition of the veil for women.

**Bibliography:** Given substantially in the article. For earlier history, the two works of K. Fischer, *Kandahar in Arachosien*, in *Wiss. Zeitschr. der Martin-Luther-Univ., Halle-Wittenberg, Geschichte-Sprachwissenschaft*, vii/6 (1958), 1151-64, and *Zur Lage von Kandahar* ..., in *Bonner Jahrbücher* ..., clxvii (1967), 129-232, are valuable. For the Islamic and modern periods, see the bibliography to *Afghanistán*, v. History, and scattered references in the standard histories of Afghanistán by, e.g., Fraser-Tytler and Masson and Romodin. For the 19th century onwards, the accounts of travellers, diplomats and soldiers (e.g., Elphinstone, Masson, Bellew, Le Messurier, Holdich, etc.) contain much relevant information.

**KANDAHAR** (Deccan), locally often spelt Kandhrär, Kandhar to distinguish it from its illustrious Afghan namesake, is a plains fort and the surrogate of Nikki. Having been sent by his father to fight against the king of Niampangou, he was welcomed with so many gifts that he revealed the purpose of his mission; unable therefore to return to Nikki, he settled in Kandi, his mother’s homeland, where he fought against brigands and pacified the whole region. He gave himself the name Mo (*"elder brother"* in Bariba), which was corrupted to Mo by the local Mokoče. The seventh ruler, Guezere, was granted the insignia of authority by Nikki—a drum, covered with human skin, which was beaten with two human bones, and a commander’s baton which was provided with a new leather cover every year. The most celebrated of the subsequent rulers of Kandi was Zibiri II (1911-29), who helped Geay, the administrator, to quell the revolt of 1917.

Since there were five generations between the first ruler and the 18th, it appears that the installation of the first Saka in Kandi occurred during the early decades of the 19th century. Although the first migration of the Bariba from the Niger was set in train by the invasion of the Muslim conquerors, hostility to Islam largely disappeared. Contact with islamiﬁzed groups of Fulani led to the islamiﬁzation of Bariba villages. In the town of Kandi, islamiﬁzation appears to have been more rapid on account of the visits there by Hausa or Diérma merchants.
KANDIYA, Ottoman name of a town on the north coast of Crete, the Herakleion of antiquity, which was captured by the Ottomans in 1080/1669 after a twenty-seven month siege by the grand vizier Köprülümkâde Fâdîl Ahmed Pasha, this event marking the end of the struggle to wrest Crete from the Venetians which had been waged intermittently since 1055/1645.

The mediaeval Islamic name of the island of Crete, al-Ibrîtîsh [q.v.], was not known to the Ottomans, nor were they unaware that Crete had once before formed part of Dâr al-Islâm (cf. the post-conquest historical excursus in Silahdâr, Ta’rîkh, i (Istanbul, 1928), 530-5, which draws largely on the K. al-Rawd al-mâ‘atir of Ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’tamîm [q.v.] (wrongly attributed by Silahdâr to a certain ‘Abd Allâh b. Wâhîb); on Şhâhib al-Din Nûwaryî; and, for the 10th/16th century, in the Babriyye of Piri Re’is). In common usage, however, the Ottomans preferred the forms Giritî and the metropolitan Giritî (the “en-trenched” fortification set up on the site by the first Muslim conquerors) > Gk. χελβδας (accus. χελβδακας) > Venetian Candica or Cantiga (13th century) > (by false etymology) Candia (15th century) > Candia, although commonly used (with variants: ia Candie, etc.) in western sources during the entire period of Venetian and Ottoman rule to denote the island as well as the town, was used by the Ottomans to denote only the town and its encircling walls (hal‘-yi Kandiya) and the metropolitan sandjak which was dependent on it. Locally, among the Greek population, the name Khândak passed out of use after the Byzantine reconquest and was replaced by Megalokastron, or Kastron, the Castle par excellence (also occasionally found in 17th century western sources: Castron), which usage continued until the officially inspired revival of the ancient name of Herakleion, which the town has borne since the establishment of Greek rule in Crete at the end of the 19th century.

The fortress of Kandiya capitulated to the Ottomans on 5 Rabî‘ II 1092/2 September 1669; after the handing over of the fortress and its contents, and the ceremonial entry of Ottoman troops, a truce was concluded between the two commanders on 9 Rabî‘ II/6 September. The history of Kandiya in the period from the conquest to the temporary occupation of Crete by Muhammad ʿAll Pasha in 1821—i.e., the years of more or less undisputed Ottoman rule—is obscure. For the immediate post-conquest period Ottoman historical and literary sources, most accessibly reproduced in Râhid and Silahdâr, and the vigorous account given by Ewliya Celebi, combine eyewitness accounts of the surrender of the fortress and its immediate “Ottomanisation” (sc. the conversion of the churches and other public buildings to Muslim use) with texts of the more formal jehân-nâmes and diplomatic correspondence engendered by the occasion. Cf. also the Kanun-nâme for Kandiya, drawn up in 1081/1670 (text in Barkan, Kanunlar, pp. 350-3).

Both Muslim and western sources agree that the damage caused to the town and the fortifications by the prolonged siege was considerable. Despite repairs put in hand by Fâdîl Ahmed Pasha before his departure, and official attempts to encourage the inhabitants of the hinterland to settle in the town, the signs of depopulation and devastation remained visible for many years. An interesting byproduct of the destruction was the export to Venice or Zante of timber from the ruined houses. Described as “Cyprus wood”, it was used for the manufacture of chests or cabinets, which found a ready market in England.

The Ottomans had entertained high hopes for the riches to be garnered from Crete after the conquest of Kandiya: “a second Egypt”, as Ewliya Celebi called it, but these hopes, particularly for Kandiya itself, were not to be realised. Shortly after the conquest the population was estimated at “not above 100,000, with Greeks and Jews”, and Canea (Hanya) was ca. 1680 spoken of as “much better inhabited than Candia” and as the main centre for the trade of the island.

Perhaps the most important reason for the steady economic decline of Kandiya during the Ottoman period had little to do with its change of masters, being in fact the progressive siltling up of its port. Already in the 1680s it was described as having “not water enough for ships of any considerable bigness” and as being largely choked with rubbish washed into it from the town, despite the initiative of a French merchant in bringing “an engine” from Marseilles to clean it. At this time, galleys were still being repaired in those bays (“arches”, göz) of the Arsenal which had survived the siege, but no new construction of ships was carried on there.

There seems to be little to distinguish Kandiya in the 12th/18th century from other Ottoman provincial centres of similar rank and function. Authority was vested in a pasha of three years’ tenure (khândîk); appointed triennially; real power obviously resided in the local military forces. These, in mid-century, apparently consisted of the 6,000 or so Turks who were able to bear arms, for, according to Richard Pococke, “all the Turks belong to some military body”. The upkeep of the local military establishment was provided for from the ḥârâṣ and gümûrûk receipts, with the exception of the pay for the Janissaries, which was remitted from Istanbul.

Throughout the 12th/18th century, and into the nineteenth, Kandiya steadily lost ground to Canea (Hanya) as a port and commercial centre. The necessity of transhipping cargoes into small lighters offshore, and the character of the town as a garrison centre and seat of a pasha, together conspired to encourage particularly the economically-dominant Marseilles merchants and their consulate to settle at Canea. Although Kandiya remained, with its still splendid Venetian monuments and broad streets, the capital of the island until 1855, its day was long past. In the last decades of Ottoman rule its trade, largely in olive oil, soap, raisins and wine, amounted only to some 20% of that of the island as a whole, while administratively it sank to the level of a sandjak under the charge of a mutassarîf. With the rising tide of Greek nationalism, the Muslim population of Kandiya, which ca. 1889 had been estimated at 17,000 out of 24,000, shared the same fate as their co-religionists in other parts of the island.

With the abandonment of Ottoman rule, and through communal strife, emigration and population transfer, Kandiya had, by 1923, ceased to exist as a Muslim town.

Bibliography: Ewliya Celebi, Seyhâhat-nâme, viii (Istanbul 1928), 376-570 (pp. 478-498 contain the so-called Kandyâye-nâme, Ewliya’s account of his participation in the siege); Flndlkull Hümez Silahdâr Âgha, Ta’rîkh, i (Istanbul 1928), 511-513; Mehmed Râhid, Ta’rîkh, i (Istanbul 1282), 164-

KANDI — KANDIYA
KANDIYA — KANEM


KANDŌRI or kandūra or kandūrī a Persian word meaning a leather or linen tablecloth; in Hindustān this word means also a religious feast held in honour of a venerated person like Fātima. In this latter meaning the word has been imported, apparently, from India into the Indonesian archipelago. In Acheen the word is unchanged, while in Java it is slightly altered into kēndfūrī or kēndfūrā; and may be noted that nowadays the more usual terms in Java are sadekā or sadekā, from the Arabic sadakā, sīamān, from the Arabic salāmāt, or hādījāt, a well-known Arabic word, meaning need, want of a man's sustenance which give rise to it are numerous, for instance: dhakār, or the word meaning a leather or linen tablecloth; in Hindu-Arabic, dhikrs, or dhikrs, are sadekā, sedekah, or dhikrs, from the Arabic dhikr, prayer, the commemorative ones by the kandūrī, or kandūrī should have a religious character; the poor must be invited, forbidden things should be avoided, but the strong local 'iddat is always prone to look for means of effecting a compromise. Every complete kandūrī, especially those in commemoration of deceased relatives and those given on the anniversary of a saint, is sanctified by means of recitation of the Qurān, azrāk or prayers; popular superstition, however, regards such kandūrīs as consisting of actual offerings of food to the deceased. Almost every kandūrī is opened by a prayer, the commemorative ones by the do'a kwbur. In Acheen some months are called kandūrī with a second word indicating the food the sacred meal consists of.


(Ph. S. V. Ronkel?)

KANEM (A. Kanim), today the name of a prefecture (capital Mao) in the republic of Chad. It is bounded in the north by Borkou, in the east by Batna, in the south by Chari-Bagarmoss, in the southwest by the department of Lac and in the west by the republic of Nigeria (population 170,000). Its borders do not correspond exactly to those of the region which was one of the most ancient kingdoms of Africa and stretched, according to the most widely accepted view, as far as the caravan route from Kawar (q.v.) to Lake Chad in the west, to Babr al Ghazal (q.v.) in the south, to the depression of the Eguel in the east, and in the north to a line drawn from Belgashipari to Birpo by the lake. The most characteristic topographical feature of Kanem is the existence of numerous sand dunes running N.W. by S.E., separated from one another by hollows several hundred yards broad and sometimes four or five miles long. Dunes and depressions are specially marked in the northern part. The hollows, which are given the name of wad (sedah), are dry except during the rainy season, when ponds are formed in the deepest parts; their bottoms consist of soil impregnated with natron. Below this, to a depth of 3 to 30 feet, lies a vast waterbearing stratum. The climate of Kanem is that of tropical regions. The rains are unequally distributed and diminish from south to north. The date-palm grows wild in many of the wads. It even forms a regular oasis at Mao. Cultivation is limited to the area around the villages, built on the slopes of the dunes. The most common crop is the millet, to which may be added wheat, beans and cotton. The rearing of horses, cattle, sheep and camels is also a very important source of income for the inhabitants. The fauna is very rich and varied: the elephant, the rhinoceros, the hippopotamus, lion, buffalo and panther abound in Kanem proper and the ostrich, antelopes, gazelle and giraffe on the northern steppes.

The population is far from being homogeneous. The diverse elements which compose it belong some to the negro group and some to the Arab group. To the first belong the Kanembū, the Buddhama, the Kūrī; to the second the Ulād-Slimān and the Shōa; to the Tundjūr and Tubu are classed between the two. The Kanembū, descendants of the first settlers in Kanem, constitute basis of the population, upon whom they have imposed their language. They are dark grey (aarak) in colour and tall in stature. Industrious and peace-loving, they are settled and devote themselves to agriculture. They profess Islam and are fairly strict Muslims. In their midst live groups of individuals called Ḥaddād (in Kanembū dogos) who, although of the Kuri group, are not Muslims. Furthermore they have imposed their language. They are dark grey (aarak) in colour and tall in stature. Industrious and peace-loving, they are settled and devote themselves to agriculture. They profess Islam and are fairly strict Muslims. In their midst live groups of individuals called Ḥaddād (in Kanembū dogos) who, although of the Kuri group, are not Muslims. Furthermore they have imposed their language. In the course of last century. The Buddhama and the Kūrī inhabit the islands of Lake Chad. The Buddhama, who occupy the northern archipelago, live by fishing, cattle-raising and the cultivation of millet. They have, for the most part, remained fetish-worshippers. The Kūrī, on the other hand, while living the same sort of life as the Buddhama, are completely islamized.

The Ulād Slimān who came from Tripolitania and Fezzān in the middle of the 19th century, speak Arabic. Nomads and robbers, almost their sole means of existence was the slave trade and brigandage. The Shōa, long established in Kanem, continue to use the Arabic language but their physical type has been altered by admixture with the black population. The Islam which they profess is fairly strict. Nomads in the dry regions near the desert, they have become settled in the moister southern regions.

According to the Arabic sources studied by Marquart (see Bibl.), the kingdom of Kanem seems to have been founded by the Zaghistā. Al-Bakrī (de Slane, 29) mentions the inhabitants of Kanem as idolators and al-Idrist (ed. Naples-Rome 1970, i, 29), who cites the town of Mānlām, seems also to consider them as such. Islam was introduced in the 4th/10th
century by the Tubu (Teda). This occupation seems to coincide with the accession to the throne of the Yanzin, who claimed to be descendants of Sayf b. Dhi Yazan (q.v.) and became the disseminators of Islam, which had been introduced by al-Hādī al-
"Uthmānī, the predecessor of the Yanzins. The Kitāb al-
Istibdār (ed. von Kremer, Vienna 1852, 32, tr. Fagnan, 61) places the conversion to Islam of Kanem about 500/1106-7. According to a Hausa legend, Abū Zayd al-Fāṣārī (end of 6th/12th and beginning of 7th/ 13th century) preached Islam in Kanem and Bornu. Another tradition refers the introduction of Islam to the end of the 5th/11th century, under Sultan Omé (1085-97), who was probably assassinated during a pilgrimage to Mecca.

Sultan Selma (Abd al-Dhājjil) (1195-1220) enlarged the kingdom; his son Dunama I (1222-59) further extended it to Fazzān and Waday and in the west as far as Niger. During the latter’s reign, some Muslims from Kanem founded a Malik school in Cairo (between 640/1242 and 650/1252), and in 657/1257 an ambassador was sent to the Hafsid court in Tunis. The soi-disant descendants of Sayf remained in power as long as the kingdom existed. During a troubled period beset with the So and Būlala revolts, four kings of Kanem fell in campaigns against the Būlala. Their successor, after a brief period, eventually conquered the country. Sultan Dāwūd (1377-85) was driven from his capital, Njijimi. ‘Umar b. Idris (796/1394-800/1398) had to retire to the west bank of Lake Chad, where one of his successors founded the kingdom of Bornu (q.v.).

In the 16th century, the sovereigns of the new state took the offensive against the Būlala. ‘Ali Dunama (876/1472-909/1504) and his son ‘Idrīs Katakarma (876/1472-909/1504) forced the Būlala to submit, by Muhammad al-Amin, ruler of Bagirmi (1817). Became in 1902 the sultan of German Bornu. ‘Umar Sawda, Ḥāšim’s eldest son, finally became in 1902 the sultan of Bornu. Kanem, which was included in the French zone of influence at the Anglo-French conference of 21 March 1899, was occupied between 1901 and 1905. European domination provoked the hostility of the Sanūsyya (q.v.), but the capture of their ṣūwāya at Bp’r Alali in 1902 weakened the rebels and their chief, Shaykh Ahmad, submitted in 1905.


AL-KĀNEMĪ (AL-HĀḌĪḤ MUḤAMMAD AL-ĀMĪN B. MUḤAMMAD NIKHĀM), b. 1189/1775-6 1253/1837, a scholar of Kanem origin who founded the Shehu dynasty of Bornu (q.v.). Brought up in Murzik (Fazzān) where his father had property, he received an Arabic education, travelled in Egypt and the Hijāz, and eventually settled in eastern Bornu. There, his learning and the following he acquired among Arab and Kanem tribesmen enabled him to play a decisive role in Bornuan politics at the time of the Fulani rebellion. Eventually the Mai Ibrāhīm (1818-46) came completely under his control, and he shook a sect in his own name in 1235/1819-20. As the power behind the throne of the Mai, he succeeded in defending the ancient emirate of Bornu from the serious dangers which faced it. His support of the Mai Dunama ended the Fulani rebellion. Although he was unable to prevent the establishment of Sokoto emirates in the old western dependencies, he
engaged the Sokoto ‘ulamah’ in a famous correspondence which seriously weakened their resolve to continue their warfare against Bornu, and he obtained the emirates of Katagum and Hadejiya by a great campaign in 1826 which carried him as far as Kano before he was forced to withdraw. He secured the eastern frontier south of Lake Chad by operations against Bagarmi in 1821-4. In the first of these he was assisted by the Ottoman ‘alim-makâm of the Fazzâni [q.v.], and he later maintained the Fazzân connection (of commercial importance to Bornu) by alliance with the Awlâd Sulaymân, who also helped him strengthen his influence in Kâném as a buffer against Wadâ‘i.

As well as this, he radically reformed the structure of government in Bornu, replacing the ancient and ineffective feudal levies of the Maîs by a new army of Kânemî infantry and Shuwâ Arab cavalry with a mamlûk officer corps owning personal loyalty to him. The old Kanûni sieâf-holding offices remained in existence, but fiefs were progressively transferred to supporters of al-Kânemî, and a new council of advisers dominated the government. These advisers, mainly non-Kanûni, represented a new and reforming element in Bornuan politics.

Al-Kânemî, though a scholar of considerable standing, was not a prolific writer, only one short work of fikûh, Nasîhât al-akhkhâm, and a poem, Nasîm al-sâlah, being certainly attributable to him. A number of his letters, however, are preserved.
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(Abdullâhi Smith)

KÎNGÁWAR [see KINIKWÂR].

KÎNGHILÎ, KÂNGÜÎ, the name of a Turkish people living in mediaeval times in the steppes of Turkestan and south-western Siberia. We do not find mention of the Kânîgî under the Arab and Persian geographers and travellers of the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries, as we do of several other Turkish tribes. For Mâ‘mûd Kâghgâri, kângûî was not an ethnic designation, but was, as a proper name, “the name of a great man of the Kîlpêqâq”, and as a common noun, “a heavily-loaded cart” (Dîwân lîghât-at-turk, tr. Aâtây, iii, 379). In some early Turkish sources on the legendary origins of the Turkish tribes, e.g., the Ôgûn-Ômâna, we find the story that the tribe got its name from the man who first constructed and used these heavy wagons for transport across the steppes (see Marquart, Komaran, 163); but Sir Gerard Clauson thought it equally likely that the wagon used by the Turks got its name of kângûî, kângîhîlî from the fact that it was introduced by the Kânîghîlî people to the steppe Turks, see his The name Uygur, in JRAS (1953), 147-8, and An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish, 638.

The Kângilî are most frequently mentioned in the sources pertaining to the century or so preceding the Mongol invasions of the 7th/13th century, and are often spoken as part of the Kîlpêqâq federation, i.e., they belonged ethnically to the south-western group of Turkish peoples. They are also associated with the Kimâm [q.v.], themselves apparently one of the more ancient groups existing in the area. Concerning their habitat, Abu ‘l-‘âshî in his Sha’djâra-yi Tarâkîma retails a legend that the Kânîghîlî had a kâm, Gôk-‘Othîlî, whose centre was on the Yayik or Ural River (Barthold, Four studies, iii. A history of the Turkman people, 132), but by the beginning of the 7th/13th century they and the Kîlpêqâq were also close neighbours of the Mongol Bayan on the Irrîsh (idem, Zweif Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Turkmen Mittelasiens, 151, Fr. tr. Histoire des turcs d’Asie Centrale, 118). Minorsky read a passage in one of the manuscripts of Dîrzî-

jânî’s Tabâhî-sî nûsûrî, where there is mentioned a punitive expedition into the steppes in 645/1248 by the Khârazm-Shâh’s ‘Âlî al-Dîn Muhammad, as referring to “Kâdir Khan Yughûr, ruler of the Kânîghîlî Tarars”, whose lands stretched far north into the region of perpetual twilight in summer (see Huddûd al-‘âlam, 309). It seems that the Kânîghîlî nomadised over an extensive area of western Siberia, but came as far south as the Sîr Darya and northern fringes of Transoxania, where Dîwûynî mentions them several times in his story of the irruption of the Mongols into Transoxania. Kânîghîlî and Karluq [q.v.] had been amongst the rebellious troops of the Kârâ Khândî ruler, and their unrelulous had led the latter potentate to call in the Kârâ Khâtây, with disastrous results to his line (see Kârâ Khâtây).

At the time of the Mongols’ appearance, the Kânîghîlî had a settlement called Karakûm on the lower Sîr Darya, not far from Lâmbâta (I. 373), as the place to which the Merkit lêd after Cîngî Khân had defeated them and the Bayan on the Irrîsh in 1208; it was also the place where in 617/1220 the Mongol general Cîn Temûr rested before going on to occupy Dîjand (Barthold, Turkestân down to the Mongol invasion?, 361-3, 370, 415). Many Kânîghîlî tribesmen obviously formed part of the Khârazm-Shâhî armies confronting the Mongols, and they suffered heavy losses when Buqjârâ and Samârcând were stormed by the Mongols; there seems to have been some dynastic connection between the Khârazm-Shâhs and the Kânîghîlî, if Dîwûynî’s report that Sûltân Dîjalî al-Dîn’s mother Terken Khâtûn was a Kânîghîlî is true (see Dîwûynî, tr. Boyle, i, 91, 106, 121, ii, 370, 465, and Barthold, op. cit., 415); Nasawî, however, makes Terken Khâtûn from the Yayûk or Ural River (Barthold, iii. 309). It seems that the Kânîghîlî were not massacred by the Mongols must have melted into the Turkish hordes making up a large proportion of the Mongol armies; western travellers to the court of the Mongol Khâns like John of Plano Carpinî and William of Rubruck mention them as the Chogtâi and Cangle respectively. Thereafter, they disappear from recorded history. They can hardly have been touched by Islam, indeed, the only reference to their religious beliefs is that the Mongol general Tolûy Khân or Ulûgh Noyan employed a Kânîghîlî versed in the art of using the yâx or rainstone (i.e., he was a shaman) to conjure up rain during his campaign against the Chinese in 628/1231 (Dîwûynî-Boyle, i, 193; Boyle, The successors of Genghis Khan, New York and London 1921, 37).

Bibliography: in addition to the references given in the article, see especially Marquart’s detailed discussion of the Kânîghîlî in his Über das Volkstum der Komanen, in Abh. G. W. Gött., N. F., xiii (1914), 163-72.

(Albert F. Bosworth)

KANGKHYER [see KANKHYER].

KANGRÀ, the Nagarkot of Muslim historians of India, occasionally mentioned, is identified as to Kôt Kangrâ, is also the headquarters of the tâkštî of the same name in the Indian Panjûb. Kangrà lies between 30° 5’ N. and 76° 16’ E. on the northern slope of the
low mountain ranges which run through the district, facing Dharamsāla, a fine hill resort in summer, and commands a view of the verdant Kangra valley below.

The pre-Mughal history of the town is not definitely known. It was, however, a stronghold of the Kaṭār and one of whom, Sansar Cand I, is mentioned in a Sanskrit inscription of c. 1430 A.D. found in the temple-wall of Devi Bādreshṛ, the local fire-deity. This historic inscription was unfortunately destroyed in the severe earthquake of April 1905.

Firighā describes Nagraṅk while recounting the exploits of Fīrūz Tughluq (cf. Brigg's tr., i, 454-5). The fabulous riches of the town of Nagraṅk had earlier tempted Māhmūd of Ghāzna, who in 399/1008 overran the valley, captured the fort, which stood on the lofty ridge south of the town and was surrounded on three sides by extremely steep and inaccessible hills, and is reported to have carried off as booty an incredible amount of gold and silver, jewels, pearls, diamonds and rubies. However, neither Sudjan Rāḥi Bhandārī, the Hindu historian of the reign of Awrangzīb, nor Muhammad Aslam Ansari, the author of Fūdiddr of Nurpur and the rebellious chief was pardoned and the rebellious chief was pardoned and was restored to the line of the dispossessed Rādīpūt princes of Kangra. In 1221/1806 the Gurkhas defeated Sansar Cand, who had attacked Bilaspur and obtained possession of the valley. They perpetrated scarcely credible atrocities on the population. In 1224/1809 Kangra was captured by Ranḍīt Singh, Sansar Cand's overlord. It passed to the British in 1826/1846 after the first Sikh War. During the military uprising of 1857, some disturbances took place in and around the valley but these were soon firmly suppressed.

Kangra now forms part of the Indian Republic; its sacred temple of Bādreshṛ is visited by thousands of pilgrims every year. Awrangzīb is said to have brought a canal here from the river Beas; when a burning torch or taper was cast into the water, the flames were not extinguished (cf. Muhammad Aslam Ansari, Farbat al-Nāṣirin, extracts, Karachi 1972, 222-3).

The terrible earthquake of April 1905 resulted in irreparable damage to the fort and temples as well as harm to other buildings of archaeological importance. The place, apart from being a hill-station, abounds in game including several species of pheasants, partridges, quails, snipe and deer. Mango grows wild in abundance, but the fruit is poor. The handful of Muslims living in the valley, mainly members of the lower class, were expelled during the communal disturbances of 1947 in the wake of partition.

Bibliography: Firigha, Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmi (Ta'rīkh), Lucknow 1281 A.H., 147 ff., Brigg's transl. i, 48-9, 454-5; Muhammad Nāẓim, The Life and times of Sultān Māhmūd of Ghāzna, Cambridge 1931, 90-1 (where several other authorities, other than Firigha, are quoted); Tūzuk-i Diaghāngiri, Eng. tr. Rogers and Beveridge, ii, 183, 223; Šamsam al-Dawla Shāhnawāz Khān, Maḏīṯir al-Umārā, Urdu tr., Lahore 1966, 1969, i and ii, index (under Kangra); Imperial Gazetteer of India, xiv, Oxford 1908, 382-6, 397-8 (chronology inaccurate); Sudjan Rāḥi Bhandārī, Khuldsat al-Tauḍrīthī, Delhi 1918, 71-2; Muhammad Aslam Anšārī, Farbat al-Nāṣirin, Bodl. Ms. 119, extracts published by Ayyūb Kādirī, Karachi 1972, 222-3 (mainly summarises the account of Kangra given by Maḏīṯir al-Umārā); Cambridge History of India, iii, iv, index; Cyclopaedia of India, London 1855, ii, 494-5; Dā’ilāl al-Dīn Ṭābṭābā, Zafarnāma-i Kangra or Šokh faẖat-i Kangra, Ms. in the Punjab University Library, Lahore; Raza Husain, The Zafarnāma-i Kangra, or an account of the conquest of Kangra during the reign of Jahangīr, in Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society, ii (1919), 67; Ṭa’rīkh-i Firūzshadhi, Calcutta 1890, 32, 90, 186-7; Muhammad Sāliḥ Kanbū, Ṭamīḵ-i Sāliḵ, Lahore 1958, i, 90 ff., ii, 266 ff.; Banarsi Prasad Saksena,

A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI

History of the Kalhoras, in prose and verse, undertaken at the command of Ghulam Shah Kalhafa, (Rieu, iii, second volume, containing his humorous and satirical verses, many of which are extremely lubricious, contains what may be regarded as his more serious work. The circumstances of the compilation of the Tufyfat al-kirdm, a general history of the 12th/nineteenth century in 1202/1787, lives of saints and Sufi poets is divided into twelve chapters in honour of the Twelve Apostles (Ms. in Topkapi Sarayi, Emanet Khazlnesi, f. 5 5a) merely repeats the information found in Djevdet Pasha, Ta’rikh, Istanbul 1309, v, 234, which was itself taken from the history of the wa’k-nu’as of Edib Efendi; the brief notice on him in Siybdrar-zade Mehmed Emm (‘All Emm, no. 795, f. 576) is incorrect. Ali Emm, no. 794, 163-4) does no more than quote six ghazels and one na‘t from his poetry. The most recent study of Kani is in the anonymous article in the IA, vi, 158-9, to the bibliography of which should now be added Istanbul Kitabhaneyi, Türke tce Yazma Divanlar Katalogu, ii, Istanbul 1967, 862-6. (J. R. WALSH)

KANI, Mi‘ALL SHER, historian of Sindh, son of ‘Izzat Allah al-Husayni al-Shirazi, was born in Thatta, the capital of Sind in the Mughal and pre-Mughal period, in 1440/1727 and died there in 1792. In poetry he acknowledged as his teacher Abû BAKR, a prominent Ottoman poet and prose stylist of the 12th/18th century. He was a native of To kad, and although Ebu ‘I-Diyâ gives the date of his birth as 1112/1712, this conflicts with Edib Efendi’s statement that he was still a young man (new-diewdn) when he left for Istanbul. He received his education in To kad, where he also entered the order of the Meeweli dervishes, becoming the disciple (mûrid) of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Wâhid. Fa‘Ìn relates that at some period of his early life he was employed as a secretary in Erzurum, yet it was from To kad that he accompanied Hekim-oghîl ‘Ali Pasâ to Istanbul early in 1168/1755 when the latter passed through that town on his journey from Trabzon to assume the office of Grand Vizier for the third time. In the capital he entered the Imperial Divan as a secretary, rising rapidly to the high rank of hâddjegdn. When, and under what circumstances, he left Istanbul for the Danubian provinces is not known, but from the early 1180s the letters in the Mi nge6e the show him to be in such cities as Silistra, Ruse (in Bulgaria), and Bucharest, serving as secretary to both of the wa’qas of Wallachia and ‘Abd Yege’s Hâddj Mehmed Agha (later Pasâ; cf. the djevât of Ahmed Djawid to ‘Othmân-zade Tâ’ib, Hadithat al-Wisâretâ, Istanbul 1271, 32). When the latter became Grand Vizier in 1196/1782, summoned him to Istanbul; but once here Kani’s disrespectful attitude so angered his master that it was only through the intercession of the reis ul-kirdtâ Khayri Efendi that he escaped being put to death and was sent instead into exile on the island of Lemnos. The date of his return to Istanbul is unknown, but he died there in Rabî’ II 1206/Dec. 1791 and was buried near the türbe of Feridün Pasâ in Eyyüb. A portrait of him with the vâhid Alexander is said to hang in the Pelev Museum in Sinaia, Roumania.

Kani’s poetic work is represented by two divâns, both of which were collected posthumously. The first, and most important, was compiled by the wa’k-a-nu’as Khalll Nörl Efendi on the instructions of the reis ul-kirdtâ Mehmed Râshid (most probably during his second tenure of this office, Dhu ‘I-l-Qa’da 1206-Muhabarram 1209/July 1792-Aug. 1794 and contains what may be regarded as his more serious work. The circumstances of the compilation of the second divân, containing his humorous and satirical verses, many of which are extremely lubricious, have not been determined. Kani’s poetry is of such uneven quality that one should be cautious in accepting general appraisals of its value. Certainly there is throughout an intrusive facetiousness, a fondness for word-play and an unconventional recourse to the vernacular which often obscures the meaning; but there is, too, that same verbal inventiveness and freshness of imagery that marks his prose, and which must have had the charm of novelty to his cultivated contemporaries.

Kani is generally more highly esteemed as a prose-writer than as a poet, and in the personal letters which are included in his Mi nge6e the he does, indeed, show a highly individual style, and is himself presented as a personality of irrepressible wit and insouciance (Bosdeck). The Mi nge6e the, in the main, is a collection of the official correspondence written while he was secretary to Vehmen Mehemet or the voivods of Wallachia, the letters therein being grouped in accordance with the social station of the person addressed, and obviously intended to serve as models for this type of composition. Kani, also, enjoys the distinction of having composed the first phrase-book in Ottoman Turkish, the Bürüd-g Fûnân, divided into twelve chapters in honour of the Apostles (Ms. in Topkapi Sarayi, Emanet Khazlnesi, no. 1158). It was commissioned by Constantine, the Scarlet voivod of Wallachia, for the use of his brother (ti-i bursu’d-šârân oman Aleksandri Beg-zâde) and presents very interesting specimens of the formal polite language of the period. None of Kani’s works has yet been published, apart from a few extracts in anthologies.

Biographiy: Study of the Mi nge6e the could greatly supplement the biographical information found in Ebu ‘I-Diyâ Tewzik, Nûmûns-i edebiyât-i ‘Othmânîyye*, Istanbul 1239, 49-54, from which Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iv, 159-74, derives. Of the teâşker-writers, Fa‘Ìn Efendi, Khâhmei al-egdr, Istanbul 1271, 352, gives some erroneous details of his life, while ‘Aref Hikmet (‘All Emm, no. 789, f. 55a) merely repeats the information found in Djevdet Pasha, Ta’rikh, Istanbul 1309, v, 234, which was itself taken from the history of the wa’k-a-nu’as Edib Efendi; the brief notice on him in Siybdrar-zade Mehmed Emm (‘All Emm, no. 795, f. 576) is incorrect. Kâni, and was sent instead. Asil Mutahhirkât (‘All Emm, no. 770, 163-4) does no more than quote six ghazels and one na‘t from his poetry. The most recent study of Kani is in the anonymous article in the IA, vi, 158-9, to the bibliography of which should now be added Istanbul Kitabhaneyi, Türkûcîcî Yazma Divanlar Katalogu, ii, Istanbul 1967, 862-6. (J. R. WALSH)

KANI, Mi‘ALL SHER, historian of Sindh, son of ‘Izzat Allah al-Husayni al-Shirazi, was born in Thatta, the capital of Sind in the Mughal and pre-Mughal period, in 1440/1727 and died there in 1792. His grave still exists on the nearby Makki hill. He received his education from local scholars, some of whom are mentioned in his Mâbâlî al-şüprî (Karachi 1957, 114, 150, 339, 359, 817). In 1715-1761 he was commissioned by the Kalhafa ruler of Sind, Ghulam Shâh ‘Abbâsî (1170-86/1757-72), to write a Persian history of the ruling dynasty on the lines of the Shâhânmâ of Firdawsi (q.v.), but this was never completed. Five years later he began compiling his Tuftat al-kirâm, which he finished in 1181/1767.

A born poet, Kani wrote many verses while still a boy of 12. In poetry he acknowledged as his teacher Mi‘Abû Turâb Haydar al-Dîn ‘Kâmil’, a great-grandson of Abû ‘I-Kâsim Namâkîn, a poet of no mean achievement and a nobleman of the times of Shâh Diâhân (q.v.).

The most important works in his large output in prose and verse are: (i) Tuftat al-kirâm, a general history in 3 vols., of which the last is mostly biographical and devoted to Sind (Lucknow and Bombay 1304/1886); (ii) Mabâlî al-şüprî (composed in 1174/1772, alphabetically arranged lives of the poets of Sind who wrote in Persian (ed. Karachi 1957); (iii) Mabîl Nâmâ o Bûstânn-i bañâr, a poetic description in prose and verse of the tombs and social scenes on the Makki hills, the necropolis of Thatta (ed. Hyderabad 1967); (iv) Tuftat al-ṣalâhîn-i tarikh (1202/1887), lives of saints and Sûf poets from the time of Muhâmmed to the close of the 12th/18th century in 12 mi‘yars (ed. Haydarâbâd 1968); (v) Ta’rikh-i Abbâsîya, an unfinished history of the Kalhfa, in prose and verse, undertaken at the command of Ghulâm Shâh Kalhfa, (Rieu, iii,
KANIK, Orhan Veli (1914-1950), Turkish poet who introduced major innovations to 20th century Turkish poetry. Kanik's early poems, published under the pen name of Mehmet Ali Sel, were formal lyrics written in traditional metres. After 1936 he adopted free verse, which had first been introduced in the 1920s by Nazim Hikmet (1902-1963). Kanik's first collection of poems, Garip (1941) also contained poems by his colleagues Oktay Rifat (b. 1914) and Garip (1947), Destan Gibi Yenis (1949).— sought to further the aesthetic principles set forth in the manifesto. His poetry, written in free verse without rhyme, utilized a straightforward style based on the natural rhythms and the idiomatic resources of colloquial Turkish, shunning conventional moulds and metres and avoiding the stereotyped metaphors which had characterized the work of most of his predecessors and some of his contemporaries. Kanik championed a form of poetic realism which often featured the man-in-the-street as the modern hero. His poems about the sea and the city of Istanbul are notable for mellifluous lyricism. Satire is a prevalent element in Kanik's poetry: some of his satirical lines have become proverbial among Turks. Kanik's later volumes—Vazgecemedigim (1945), Destan Gibi (1946), Yenis (1947), Kar9s (1949)—sought to reflect and address itself to the tastes of the masses. Kanik's complete poems were posthumously published in 1951 under the title Biiuin Siiiri, which had gone into eleven impressions by 1971. He was also a leading translator of French poetry and drama. In 1949 he published his poetic versions (in rhymed syllabic metres) of 72 selected anecdotes of Nasreddin Hodja.


KANISA (pl. kisata), synagogue, church, temple.

(i). Etymology and meaning. The word kanisa is the Arabicised form of the western Aramaic k*nisat (eastern Aramaic k*nishtâ), which means "meeting, assembly". Some Arab lexicographers (Ibn Manzûr, al-Fîrûzbâdî and al-Zâbîdî) give this etymology, but others (al-Khafâfî, al-Bustînî) derive the word from the Greek ékklesia, as does the 4th/10th century Coptic writer, Ibn al-Muqaffa, (cf. J. Assafal, Die Ordnung des Priestertums, Cairo 1955, 3). The word kanisa is not found in the Kur*an, unlike its synonym bû'a (pl. biya*), which appears once (XXII, 40). On the other hand it is found in hâdîth, archaic poetry, capitulation treaties made by the caliphs and their generals with the inhabitants of conquered cities, and also in papyri.

As used by Muslim authors, historians and geographers, the word kanisa designates equally the cultic place (muta'abbad) of the Jews (synagogue), of the Christians (church) and of the pagans (temple).
In the work of Christian writers, kanisa means both the assembly of the faithful and their meeting-place. In Bible translations, both it and itsa are used indiscriminately for the two Greek words άγραναι and συναγωγή, or the two Syriac words ʿiddā or ḵanāsī. The relative adjective is kanasi or ḵanāsī, "ecclesiastical" (al-Sifr al-khanāsī = The Book of Ecclesiastes).

(ii). The Christian building. Despite some differences depending on periods and rites (Chaldean, Syrian, Byzantine, Copt), all churches are built on much the same plan, whether in Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine or Egypt. The eastern church is rectangular in form, always orientated towards the east, and is divided into two main parts, the sanctuary and the nave.

The sanctuary (kaykal) or Holy of Holies (Kuds al-aqdas) is separated from the nave in the Chaldean or Syrian church by a wall with two doors, and in the Byzantine or Coptic church by a marble or wooden screen with three doors. A veil (ṣarīr) hangs over the main door. In the centre of the sanctuary is the altar (maḏbah), surmounted by a ciborium (kubbah), except in the Chaldean church, where the altar is placed against the eastern wall. A lamp (kandil), which must be kept burning night and day, is kept in front of the altar. In the Chaldean church, at the far end of the sanctuary, in the apse which forms the eastern wall, is found the bishop's throne (kursi); the Chaldean sanctuary, which is topped by a dome, has no apse. In all rites, entry to the sanctuary is strictly forbidden to the laity. At the left of the sanctuary is the diaconicon or sacristy (bayt al-maʿmudiyya), at the right the baptistry (bayt al-maʿnaw), both covered by domes. The position of these two places relative to the sanctuary may be reversed.

The nave (ṣabn) includes a varying number of bays. In Chaldean and Syrian churches the aisles (minassas) are situated in the anterior bay, where in Byzantine and Coptic churches the apse is found (khsars), often covered by a dome. The Chaldeans and Syrians place the pulpit (kamāl) in the central bay, on the left side is the site of the ambo (aṃbīt) in Byzantine and Coptic churches. On the dais, in the choir on the pulpit two lecterns (karraṭa) are placed. The front of the nave is reserved for men and the rear, formerly separated by a wooden screen, for women. The nave may be preceded by a narthex on the western façade or bordered with a gallery on the north or south side.

In all rites, the church building is consecrated (laḏqān), and the dedication of the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem is celebrated on September 13. Oriental church symbolism is particularly rich, each part of the building having its own spiritual significance (cf. J. Perier, La pele précieuse, in Patrologia Orientalis, xvi, 58-70, 159-68).

After the Muslim conquest, the Christians were forbidden from building any new churches; all they could do was repair and restore existing buildings, in which theory they were permitted to keep. In fact, however, over the centuries numerous churches were confiscated and converted into mosques, or even destroyed (cf. A. Pattal, Le statut legal des non-musulmans en pays d'Islam, Beirut 1938, 174-203).

Bibliography:
S. Fraenkel, Die aramdischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen, Leiden 1886, 275; Vorstellung der hebräischen Sprache, Wiesbaden 1970, i, 385. (Very many refs.); J. M. Fiey, Mosaïque christienne, Beirut 1959 (for Chaldean and Syriac rites); A. Couturier, Cours de liturgie grecque-mélkite, Jerusalem 1912 (for the Byzantine rite); O. H. E. Burnezer, The Egyptian or Coptic Church, Cairo 1957 (for the Coptic rite).

(K. Troupeau)

KANIZSA (Turkish Kânizhâ), a notable Hungarian fortress dominating the region between Lake Balaton and the River Mur. Kanizsa stood amidst marshes: "caenoos palustrique loco sita est, fluviolo stagnante, et nullis coercito ripis, sed magis late diffuso ac carectis, multaqua aino et arundine impedito, endique cincta" (Istvandios, 774). The Ottomans conquered the fortress in 1009/1600 after a wearisome siege, demanding the construction of approach roads across the marshes which were built of reeds and had to be renewed each day. Once taken, Kanizsa (with Szigetvár, Eszék, Siklos and Pécs) was entrusted to the care of Tiryakî Hasan Pasha. Alarmed at the loss of this important fortress, the Christians attempted to regain it in 1010/1601, but their attempts were foiled by the vigorous defence against them conducted by Tiryakî Hasan—a defence which became famous among the Ottomans and the details of which are recorded in the well-known Ghasawîl-i Tiryakî Hasan Pasha (cf. A. S. Levend, 99 ff.). Kaniza remained under Ottoman rule until the war of the Sacra Liga (1648-9), yielding to the Christian forces in 1651/1600 and then passing definitively into the control of Austria.

it seems that his mention of the powerful ruler of Djurfattan, whose ships traded with the Persian Gulf, 'Umnān and South Arabia, refers to the local ruler there (Rīḥā, iv, 82-3). Abūmad b. Māḏqid (wrote ca. 895/1490-90) certainly speaks specifically of the "Bay of Kannānūr" in his account of the Malabar coastline (G. R. Tibbett, *Arab navigation in the Indian Ocean before the coming of the Portuguese*, London 1971, 203, 457). In the 8th-9th/14th-15th centuries the dominant power in Malabar was the line of Hindu rulers in Kalikut (q.v. in Suppl.] (Calicut), the Zamorins, whose authority extended from Kannānūr in the north to Cochin in the south, and to whom the local Kolatirri Rādās in Kannānūr were tributary.

Islam must have come to Kannānūr with the arrival at an early date of Arab traders, one local tradition putting the origins of the family of Āli Rādās (Malayalam, "Lord of the Sea") at the beginning its name from its being admirals for the Kōlātirri, and these Āli Rādās were also heads of the local community of Malabar coast Muslims, the Māppillas (q.v.) or Moplahs, who were perhaps originally built round a nucleus of Arab merchants, but with increasing numbers of indigenous Malayali adherents; Kannānūr remains today an important Māppilla centre. From ca. 1500 onwards, the Kōlātirri Rādās of Kannānūr also exercised suzerainty over the Laccadive Islands (q.v.), and in the mid-16th/17th century they granted these to the Āli Rādās as a ḍāgīr (q.v.) or assignment in return for annual tribute; Kannānūr Māppilla merchants monopolised the lucrative coir trade of the Islands until the revolt in 1786 of the islanders against their harsh exploitation. The connection of the rulers of Kannānūr with the Maldives Islands (q.v.) comes also from an early date, with the king of the islands being tributary to the Rādās by ca. 1500.

The arrival of the Portuguese in South India was at first welcomed by the Kōlātirri Rādās, who hoped to throw off the control of Kalikut. Vasco da Gama was at Kannānūr in 1498, and Cabral in 1500, and on his second voyage to India in 1502, da Gama made an agreement with the Rādās and established there a stockade and a garrison of 200 men. The first Portuguese viceroy, Francisco d'Almeida, established four forts on the Malabar coast, at Anjediva Island, Kannānūr, Cochin and Quilon, the Kannānūr stockade being erected into a proper defensive position, Fort St. Angelo, in 1505, probably on the site of an existing stronghold. In 1506 and 1507 the Portuguese garrison there fought off naval attacks by the Zamorins of Kalikut; Almeida made it the headquarters for his fleet, and it was from Kannānūr that the destruction of the combined fleets of the Egyptian Mamluks and of the Zamorins at Diw (Diu) in Shawwāl 944/February 1500 was organised.

The Dutch captured Kannānūr and Cochin in 1663 and took over the Portuguese position on the Malabar coast. But by the end of the 17th century the trade of the Dutch East India Company in Malabar declined as that of the English East India Company grew, and the Kannānūr fort was reduced to one tower. Hence in 1771 the Dutch sold Fort St. Angelo and other forts to the Āli Rādās. In these decades, the latter showed themselves as generally unfriendly to the British East India Company, intriguing with the Dutch and French and consistently supporting the expansionist policies of Haydār Āli (q.v.) (Hyder Ali) of Mysore. The Bibī of Kannānūr (sc. the female representative of the Āli Rādās line) further supported Ħaydār Ālī's son Tīpū Sultan; hence in December 1783 Kannānūr was occupied by a British force under Col. MacLeod, and again captured in December 1790 by General Ralph Abercromby, when the Bibī submitted and 5,000 of Tīpū Sultan's troops surrendered. An agreement made in 1796 with the Bibī left her Kannānūr and the Laccadive Islands in return for an annual assessment of Rs. 15,000, an arrangement which continued in force down to the 20th century.

Kannānūr eventually became part of the Madras Presidency, with Kannānūr as the chief town of the District of Malabar. Its importance and size grew in the 19th century, especially as it was also till 1887 the military headquarters of British forces on the west coast of South India, and a cantonment was laid out, with Fort St. Angelo separating it from the Māppilla Old Town. In 1861 the Laccadive Islands were sequestered from the Bibī on account of misgovernment, and again in 1875, this time permanently. In modern India, Kannānūr is now in the northernmost part of Kerala state, and since the administrative re-organisation of 1958-9 has formed one of the eight constituent districts of that state; according to the Census of India 1961, Vol. vii, Kerala, Pt. iii/A, 40, 118, Pt. iic, 152-3, the population of Kannānūr district was then 1,760,294 (including 1,237,254 Hindus, 418,832 Muslims, 123,575 Christians, and 551 Jains), and that of Kannānūr town (municipality plus cantonment) 48,960.


**KANNAS (A.), lit. sweeper, is a term synonymous with kassākh; other words used in the Arab Orient for the same occupation are sammād and zabābāl, which denote "dung collectors" or scavengers who collected garbage, such as animal dung, to be used as fertiliser. The kannāsīn, the sanitary workers, swept public squares (riḥāb) and other places such as prisons (ṣudāsīn), dungeons (madābībāl) and latrines (hawībāl), and transported garbage in carts or by other means to places outside the cities. The earliest known report in Islamic literature of scavenging is a tradition collected by Abū 'Ubayd b. Sallām (q.v.), who noted that the indigenous Arabians (known to the Arabs as Ḥādā, sing. Ḥādā) cleaned a dung-hill at Bayt al-Makdis during the caliphate of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. The Ḥādā of Syria and ʿIrāk are reported as having been used occasionally as forced labour by the Umayyad government.

There is evidence to suggest that the kannāsīn and the kassākhān were organized into guilds throughout the ʿAbbāsīd period. Dībīr (q.v.) speaks of a certain ʿarif al-kannāsīn who was the chief of the scavengers living in the Karšī quarter of Baghālād in the 3rd/9th century. Al-Rāghib al-Īṣfahānī, writing in the 5th/11th and early 6th/12th century, also gives evidence that scavengers' guilds were found in Arab society during the later part of the ʿAbbāsīd period. The bulk of literary evidence relating to workers of the ʿAbbāsīd epoch gives the impression that the so-called "low crafts" such as those of the
dustmen, cuppers, weavers, leather workers, brokers and fishmongers, were stigmatized. Some of those groups of workers kept apart from each other and shared only a mutual dislike. In one anecdote, presumably not to be taken literally, a kannás was described as preferring to drink from a filthy pot for conveying human excrement than drinking from the clean cup of a cupper. A proverbial saying kanndsun was shared only a mutual dislike. In one anecdote, they are equally worthless. Similar attitudes prevail today among different groups of low-caste workers in India.

It is interesting to note a contrasting view on the status of scavengers presented by the authors of the epistles (rasā‘il) of the ʿIkhwān al-Ṣafāʾ [q.v.], who pleaded that the dustmen’s rôle in urban society was of greater public utility than that of the perfumeurs (ṣaffārūn). So the scavengers deserve honour (ṣara‘af), the ʿIkhwān writers argued, although there is no evidence that such logic had any influence on public opinion. The general contemptuous attitude towards the kannāsūn was not confined to the society of the Umayyad and ʿAbbasid periods; it is equally noticeable in Arab society under the Mamluks. Some Muslim jurists, while discussing the law of kafʿa [q.v.], stated that the kunnās are not acceptable as marriage partners by other groups in society. Scavenging therefore tended to be a hereditary occupation and the kannāsūn lived as a closed, endogamous group.


KANO, a city in northern Nigeria situated in lat. 12° N., long. 8° 30′ E. Its population was estimated to be 295,432 persons at the 1963 census. Kano State has an area of 16,630 square miles and an estimated population of 5,774,842.

History and Politics: Kano is reputed to have originated before the 4th/10th century as a pagan settlement at the foot of a hill said to be a hill, a large rock outcrop which dominates the present city. The traditional accounts of this early period suggest that the inhabitants adhered to an animist, spirit-possession cult similar to the bori cult which has survived in northern Nigeria to the present day, and that the cult head combined his priestly functions with those of a temporal ruler.

In the 4th/10th century the city was visited by “strangers” under their leader, Bagauda, who are described as having come from the north under pressure of famine in their own country. They settled in Kano with the consent of the indigenous inhabitants and then, by superior skills and cunning, established mastery over them. Whether these immigrants were Muslims is uncertain, although according to the traditional account Bagauda also bore the name Dāwūd. But they clearly did not belong to the indigenous cult and the Kano Chronicle (see Bibli. below) records that some generations passed before they became integrated into it. Their contribution to the development of Kano seems to have been that they set up a city state, with fairly clearly defined territorial boundaries and an administrative centre within the walled city, where previously there had existed only a stateless, hunting and primitive agriculturalist society living in scattered open hamlets and clearings in the bush.

After Bagauda, the first Islamic name to occur in the king-list is that of Osumanu Zannagawa, who reigned from 743/1343 to 750/1349 by the Kano Chronicle dating. According to the same source, his reign was followed by the arrival in Kano of the Wangarawa, that is Islamic missionaries from Mali, during the reign of Yaji (750-87/1349-85), but a recent account based on the discovery of a 17th-century chronicle of the Wangarawa (Muhammad al-Ḥaḍīḍ, A Seventeenth-Century Chronicle of the Origins and Missionary Activities of the Wangarawa), in Kano Studies, li [E], suggests that this event took place in the 9th/15th century and not in the 8th/14th century. Other evidence also tends to support the view that the 9th/15th rather than the 8th/14th century was the point at which an Islamic presence became firmly established in Kano, even though some indeterminate Islamic influences may well have been abroad at an earlier date. For instance, it is between 793/1390 and 813/1410 that the quilted horse armour (Arabic al-libd, Hausa hididi) together with mail shirts were introduced, a fact which suggests contacts with Islamic North Africa. Also, between 824/1421 and 841/1438 a “prince” and his followers arrived in the city from Bornu, a kingdom where Islam had already been established since, reputedly, the 5th/11th century. This was followed by the opening of trade relations with Bornu. By 856/1452 camels are said to have appeared in the city and slave-raiding in the country south of Kano had become a profitable occupation of the aristocracy. All of this suggests that Kano had, by the middle of the 9th/15th century, become involved in the trans-Saharan caravan trade and this, of course, offers a reliable indication for the chronology of islamization.

The next major landmark in this chronology is the arrival in Kano of the well-known ʿAbū ʿAbd Allāḥ Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḵarm b. Muḥammad al-Maḡīlī al-Tilmāsāni (d. 909/1504), a Muslim ʿālim and missionary from North Africa. This personality became the focus of the Islamic tradition in Kano, and indeed in Hausaland as a whole. He is credited with introducing the ʿŠarīʿa and Sulūm and indeed all things Islamic into the city. Whether he was a follower of Sūnūn or Maḡīlī. No doubt he was personally important; but the true significance of his presence in the city is that it signals the time when, as a result of increasing involvement in the Saharan trade complex
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and political contacts with Bornū, Kano became opened up to the surrounding Islamic areas of North Africa and Egypt. A further step on the way toward fuller islamization took place during Muhammad Rumfa's reign (867-904/1463-99). He is said to have introduced Islamic segregation of the sexes, the public observation of Islamic festivals and he also appointed eunuchs to office, thus possibly copying a practice common in the courts elsewhere in the Islamic world during the Mamlūk and Ottoman periods.

Kano's relations with the other Sudanese and Saharan states during the period before the Fulani dżihad are both involved and sometimes obscure. They are treated in Johnston (op. cit., Bibl.) and Høgben and Kirk-Greene (op. cit., Bibl.) and need only be reviewed in outline in an article essentially concerned with Islamic aspects. In the 11th/12th century Kano was probably subject to Bornū, to the extent of paying tribute. In the early 10th/16th century it was defeated by Songhai, but the native dynasty remained in power, paying tribute to Songhai but apparently otherwise undisturbed. Songhai control seems soon to have lapsed and later in the century Kano came under the domination of the Sokoto kingdom after a period of debilitating wars against its neighbour Katsina. Throughout the 11th/12th century both the city and the state of Kano were the targets for constant attacks by the warlike Kwararafa from the Benue area. During the first half of the 12th/18th century Bornū again became overlord of Kano, but its place was later taken by the Gobir kingdom, whose king, Babari (1155-84/1742-70), established mastery and levied tribute. These military defeats, however, seem to have had little detrimental effect on the wealth and prosperity of the city, while the rulers appear to have retained all their authority within their kingdom and to have increased in pomp and circumstance.

For instance, Babba Zaki (1182-90/1768-76) introduced a uniformed bodyguard of musketeers into his court and is described as having deliberately imitated the ways of the Arabs—in the first instance presumably the life-style of the Arab merchants resident in Kano, but through them the ceremonial and protocol of North African and Egyptian courts. He ruled as an able but ruthless despot. There is evidence of some factional divisions in his court, however, while the account of the reign of one of his near predecessors, Kumbari (1143-58/1732-43), tells of popular resentment against excessive taxation. These scraps of evidence may point to a state of affairs that brought about the events of the reign of Muhammad Alwalli (1195-1222/1782-1807), namely the successful Fulani dżihad in Kano, the expulsion of Alwalli and the installation of the first Fulani amir of Kano, Sulaymanu (1222-55/1807-9), who founded the Fulani dynasty. Kumbari ruled the emirate since that time. Sulaymanu was followed in 1235/1819 by Ibrahimu Dabo, a renowned warrior who earned the Hausa epithet Ci gari, "conqueror city". During the following half-century frequent attacks on the city by the ousted Habe dynasty were defeated, while intermittent war was carried on against the Ningi pagans, a powerful group who still held an enclave on the southern border of the amirate which had not been pacified during the dżihad.

During the reign of the amir Usuman (1262-72/1846-55) the German explorer, Heinrich Barth, visited the city. He describes it as a thriving centre of trade, with a market plentifully stocked with goods of European and North African origin. He also provided a sketch map of the city as it was at that time and estimated its population at 30,000 (op. cit., Bibl.).

In 1311/1893 a civil war broke out in Kano, occasioned by a succession dispute between two contenders for the throne, Yusufu and Tukur. Tukur, the nominee of the caliph in Sokoto, proved unacceptable to Kano, but at the root of the trouble lay Kano's resentment at Sokoto's interference. The civil war subsided on the death of the two principal protagonists but served to establish the limitations on caliphal authority. The tension between Sokoto and its powerful feudatory Kano has continued to be a factor in their relations ever since.

Kano figured prominently in the events leading to the British occupation of Hausaland early in the present century. It was visited at the end of the 19th century by the British missionary Canon C. H. Robinson and again early in the 20th century by a party of which Dr. Walter Miller was a member. Both gave somewhat unfavourable accounts of Islam and of the Kano administration, which probably contributed to the climate of opinion in the United Kingdom which made the occupation possible. On the eve of that occupation the amir of Kano, Aliyu (1312-21/1894-1903) gave asylum to the Magajin Keffi, the murderer of Sir Frederick Lugard's emissary, Captain Moloney. This provided Lugard with part of his justification for military intervention and in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1320/February 1903 the city fell to a British force after a brief and ineffective resistance.

During the colonial period, Kano developed both as a centre of the newly introduced Western system of education and as the emporium of the new ground-nut trade upon which the economy of northern Nigeria came largely to depend. It was the locale of the School for Arabic Studies, an institution set up by the colonial government to train teachers of Arabic and the Islamic sciences in modern pedagogic methods. Abdulahi Bayero College, a college of Ahmadu Bello University, was also founded in Kano.

The city has always been, and still is, an important centre for Sūfī activities. Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Karim al-Maghīlī is traditionally supposed to have introduced Sūfism to Hausaland, and Kano and Katsina were the two centres he visited. It may be assumed that the Kādirīyya (q.v.) was the first of the jāriḳas to be established there and it is still probably the jāriḳa of the majority even at the present day. But the Tijānīyya (q.v.) are also strong, reflecting, perhaps, the rivalry with Sokoto referred to above. The Sokoto ruling family is identified with the Kādirīyya and indeed bases its claim to political authority largely on the sīsāla of Shehu Usman Dan Fodio (Uṣūmān b. Fodil) linking him to 'Abd al-Kādir al-Ǧīlāṇī. This is perhaps not unrelated to the fact that the former amir of Kano, Muhammed Sanusi, became at one time the official head of the Tijānīyya in northern Nigeria.

During the closing era of the colonial period, which saw the rise of European-style political parties in northern Nigeria, the two jāriḳas were deeply involved in the political struggle for power which the prospect of independence provoked. The Kādirīyya in Kano was, on the whole, identified with support for NPC, the party of the establishment led by the late Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello, a scion of the Sokoto ruling house, while the Tijānīyya tended to favour the northern Nigerian opposition party, NEPU, led by Malam Mainu Kano. While
the Kano ruling dynasty was bound by its essential interests to support NPC, the rivalry with Sokoto was by no means healed and in 1963 the reigning amir of Kano, Sir Muhammadu Sanusi, “resigned” under pressure from the central government headed at that time by the premier of the Northern Region of Nigeria, the late Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello. This event, symptomatic of the clash of interest between the traditional “given” authority of Sokoto arising out of the Pulani ḍirīkā in the early 19th century, and the rising economic and political power of Kano in a changing world, gave rise to agitation for an autonomous Kano state. This has, in some measure, been conceded by the present military administration.

These tensions, which were real and which at times manifest themselves in a violent fashion, should however be seen in a proper perspective. They were inevitable in a society that has a long and sophisticated political tradition. But at a social and cultural level the people of Kano, and indeed their rulers, shared, and still share, with those of the rest of northern Nigeria, including Sokoto, a strong sentiment of their common Islamic identity and a corresponding sense of solidarity.

Learning and literature: The tradition of Islamic literacy in Kano goes back to the late 9th/15th century ʿAlītim and Islamic missionary, al-Maghīllī, who composed a set of ṣafāwī for the benefit of Muhammad Rumfā, ruler of Kano from 886/1473 to 904/1499. Later scholars such as, for instance, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿUmar b. Muḥammad Ākīṭ and a certain ʿAbd al-ʻAzīz b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Kaṣāfīr are said to have visited Kano shortly after al-Maghīllī, although the exact chronology of their visits is uncertain. No record of any composition from their pens survives but they may reasonably be supposed to have nourished the tradition of Islamic learning established in the city by this time. Later, ca. 937/1530, Makkāhī b. ʿAll b. ʿAlīgīt al-Bilbīsī resided in the city and it is likely that, through his acquaintance with the fiḥāb al-ʿĀkīṭī b. ʿAbd al-ʿĀlīm al-Anṣāmūnī al-Massūrī, he was a link with the Egyptian polyhistor, Djalal al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (see AL-SUYUTI), at that time by the premier of the Northern Region of Nigeria, the late Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello. This is a typical versification on fiḥāb al-ṭawīl metre, giving great prominence to the miḥḍāj and displaying late accretional influences which seem to reflect his familiarity with the writings of Ibn ʿArabī and such later popular writers on this sense as al-Ǧhayṭī and al-Dādirī.

Another well-known literary personality who was a native of Kano and received part of his schooling there before settling in Salaga, northern Ghana, was Alhaji Umaru Salaga (b. ca. 1271/1854; d. 1353/1934). One of his well-known Hausa works is Wakar Nasara, the “Song of the Christians”, in which he gives an account of the British occupation of Hausaland as seen through Hausa eyes. Some also attribute to him the otherwise anonymous works Wakar Bagauda (see Bībīl.), and Bakandamiya, also a Hausa versification on the occupation, but these attributions are uncertain. He composed a number of works in Arabic as well as in Hausa.

Among mid-20th-century authors in the Islamic tradition the best-known is probably Alhaji Muhammadu Šan Amu, a writer of muḥāfīb in Hausa, whose long Hausa māzuwina with the Arabic title Mansūma fi bayān al-din is widely read in Northern Nigeria. Much of this Islamic writing consists of panegyric to ʿAbd al-Ḵādir al-Dīlabī and ʿAbd al-Tīḏānī. Typical of this genre is the composition of Malam Abubakar Atiku, a well-known member of the Tīḏānīyya in Kano, which bears the Arabic title, ʿAybat al-ḏubarkar, and is a macaronic poem in Arabic and Hausa praising al-Tīḏānī. An important part in the Islamic life of Kano City is played by the makaranan simi, the schools of higher Islamic learning. There are at least twelve substantial establishments of this type in Kano city, although in fact the total number is much greater than this, for any Muslim literate may set up such a school. In these institutions higher Islamic learning—ṣīkh, ṣadīq, tāfṣīr and such classical literary masterpieces as the Muṣallakāt, the Makāmot of al-Harīf and the works of Ibn ʿArabī—is taught. Kano is now well known for the excellence of its higher Islamic schools and is a centre to which students come from all over the western and central Sudan. The makaranan simi, which exist independently of the secular, state education system, foster a continuing and still vigorous tradition of Islamic scholarship in the city and it seems probable that Kano has now overtaken Katsina and Sokoto—both earlier centres of learning—as the focus of traditional Islamic education in northern Nigeria.

Bibliography: Two main sources for the...
history of Kano are available in English translation: First, "The Kano Chronicle", in H. R. Palmer, Sudanese Memoirs, iii, Lagos, 1928; an Arabic text of the chronicle is also preserved in Ibadan University Library, a prose work originally in Arabic, written down at an undetermined date but probably ca. 1298/1880 (see M. Hiskett, The Kano Chronicle, in JRAS (1957)), and quite clearly the record of a very old oral tradition; second, Hakkar Baganda, the "Song of Baganda", a Hausa verse chronicle which is also a 19th-century record of an ancient oral tradition, broadly repeating the account given by the Kano Chronicle but diverging from it considerably in its early chronology, for the Hausa text, English translation and critical commentary see Hiskett, in BSOAS, xxvii/3 (1964); xxviii/1 (1965) and xxviii/2 (1965). An important source in Hausa is Alhaji Abubakar Dokaji Kano, Kano ta Dabo Cigari, Zaria 1959, the history of the city according to local tradition. In addition to these primary sources an Arabic Ta'rikh Kano is listed by Adeleye (op. cit., below) under Ibadan, 82/212; an unpublished Arabic account of the Kano civil war by Muhammad Buhhari, vizier of Sokoto (d. 1528/1910) is preserved in the Nigerian National Archives, Kaduna; it has not yet been transcribed (Kaduna 4, 2, 30). An unpublished Hausa versification in praise of Kano and its notable personalities by Aliyu San Sidi, amir of Zaria from 1321/1901 to 1339/1920 circulates in Ms. in northern Nigeria; Alhaji Muhammad dan Amu (see above) has also written an unpublished verse history of the city and its surrounding villages, a copy of which is held in the author of this article's personal microfilm collection.

Among the accounts of the 19th-century European travellers that of Denham, Clapperton and Oudney, Narrative of Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, London 1826, is the earliest and those of Heinrich Barth, Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, London 1857, and P. L. Monteil, De St. Louis d'Tripoli (1957)), the Treaty of Faydjakbadd made in 1775 with the Naurabs allowed the British to garrison two places in his territories. From 1778 onwards, Kano was occupied by General Henry Havelock on 17 July and only lost again for ten days in November when mutineers from Gwalior took it temporarily (cf. Sir George Trevelyan, Caunpore, London 1894; P. C. Gupta, Nana Sahib and the rising at Caunpore, Oxford 1963). Lesser incidents worthy of note include the Plague Riots of 1900, when six policemen were killed by a mob which attacked huts in which plague victims were isolated, and the 1913 Mosque Riot, when there was a disturbance arising out of road-widening plans involving the demolition of a latrine attached to a mosque and 18 Muslims were killed (see M. Yanuck, The Kano mosque affair of 1913, in MW, lxiv (1974), 307-21.

Kano has since grown into the most populous city in Uttar Pradesh and one of the largest in India. Social contours of an industrial city: social survey of the city accorded to the 1961 census, 973,907, of which the vast majority were Hindus, and of the district, 2,381,353 (including 2,059,930 Hindus, 286,147 Muslims, 24,397 Sikhs, etc.); 1971 census preliminary estimate, city 1,151,955, district 2,992,533. Situated as it is on the Grand Trunk Road connecting Dilli with Calcutta, and at a nodal point of the north Indian railway system, Kano has been well-favoured to become the modern industrial centre of the present day, with extensive textile, leather, food processing and general engineering plants (cf. D. N. Majumdar et alii, Social contours of an industrial city: social survey of Kano, 1954-6, New York 1960). Kano now has a university which includes the Indian Institute of Technology. The surrounding Kano district forms an extremely fertile part of the Ganges-Djamna Doab, and has flourishing agriculture and forestry.

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the article, see Imperial gazetteer of India, ix, 306-20, and District gazetteer of the United Provinces, Allahabad 1903-11. (C. E. Bosworth)
Al-Ghawri’s situation at the outset was precarious. Two of his predecessors were still living. A more serious threat came from the veteran royal mamluks (karânisâ), since their privileged status was weakened on the accession of a new sultan who would recruit his own mamluks. In the first month of his reign, al-Ghawri sought to anticipate trouble by ordering the mamluks of al-Âdil to go to Upper Egypt. Nevertheless, in Diwân 911 (4 May 1506), Sibay held Damascus until his death at the age of about sixty years old, and he had not played an outstanding part in the politics.

Al-Ghawri’s efforts to improve his forces and armament in the face of the growing external threat from the Portuguese, who were establishing themselves on the coast of India and seeking to exclude Muslim shipping from the Red Sea. In Diwân 912/1511, an expeditionary force was sent to assist Muhâmmad Shâh, the ruler of Gudjarat [q.v.], against the Portuguese. It included royal mamluks, awwal al-nâs, negro archers (more probably, arquebusiers) and Turks, under the command of the amir Husayn Murshid al-Kurdi, who fortified Jeddah [q.v.].

A revolt against the Sharif Barakât of Mecca, which broke out in 907/1505, was finally suppressed in 913/1506. An ominous new danger appeared in the Portuguese, who were establishing themselves on the coast of India and seeking to exclude Muslim shipping from the Red Sea. In Diwân 912/1511, an expeditionary force was sent to assist Muhâmmad Shâh, the ruler of Gudjarat [q.v.], against the Portuguese. It included royal mamluks, awwal al-nâs, negro archers (more probably, arquebusiers) and Turks, under the command of the amir Husayn Murshid al-Kurdi, who fortified Jeddah [q.v.].

Extortion, practised upon disgraced officials or after the death of rich persons, was another expedient to fill the treasury. The strain on the finances of the Mamlûk state was increased by al-Ghawri’s efforts to improve his forces and armament in the face of the growing external threat from the Portuguese, Shâh Ismâ‘îl and Sultan Selîm I. Al-Ghawri organized (from 916/1512) a unit armed with handguns. Since such weapons were dispised by the genuine mamluks, this Fifth Corps (al-fabaka al-khâmsa) was recruited from heterogeneous elements: Turkomans, Persians, awâlî al-nâs [q.v.] and local artisans. The Fifth Corps was a cause of tension between al-Ghawri and his giûlbân. Al-Ghawri also made a serious and sustained effort to build up a stock of artillery. He established a cannon-foundry, and was frequently present at the testing of the new pieces from 913/1507 onwards.

During most of the reign, Damascus was governed by Sibây, who as governor of Aleppo had rebelled in 910/1504-5, but had subsequently made his peace with al-Ghawri. Appointed on 7 Shawwâl 911/13 March 1506, Sibây held Damascus until his death at Mârdî Dâbîk. Apart from operations against the local Beduins, he led expeditions against Muhammad b. al-Ânâsî, the powerful mukhâdam of al-Biqa‘î (Mubârram 912/June 1506), the Band Lûm tribe in the region of Karak and al-Ghawri’s (Sa‘fawî) (918), and the chief of Hawrân, Ibn Sâ‘îd (Rabî‘ II 916/July 1510), the last two of which threatened communications with the Hijâz. In 917-8/1517-18, friendly relations with each of these were established. As Şâfawî and Ottoman power developed on the Syrian frontier, al-Ghawri sought to ensure the continuing loyalty of Sibây by the marriage of Sibây’s daughter to his own son (920/1514).

A revolt against the Sharîf Barakât of Mecca, which broke out in 907/1505, was finally suppressed in 913/1506. An ominous new danger appeared in the Portuguese, who were establishing themselves on the coast of India and seeking to exclude Muslim shipping from the Red Sea. In Diwân 912/1511, an expeditionary force was sent to assist Muhâmmad Shâh, the ruler of Gudjarat [q.v.], against the Portuguese. It included royal mamluks, awwal al-nâs, negro archers (more probably, arquebusiers) and Turks, under the command of the amir Husayn Murshid al-Kurdi, who fortified Jeddah [q.v.] against a Portuguese attack. Husayn, who, in combination with the fleet of Gudjarat, won a naval victory off Cawl (Ramadan 913/January 1508), was heavily defeated by the Portuguese near Dîl [q.v.] in Shawwâl 914/February 1509, and withdrew from the Indian Ocean.

Al-Ghawri was meanwhile striving to construct warships in the gulf of Suez. He was obliged to obtain materials from the Ottomans. A gift of timber, iron and powder from Bâyazîd II reached Bûlâk in Shawwâl 916/January 1512. When in Mubârram 919/3 March—April 1513 the Portuguese attacked ‘Adan [q.v.], al-Ghawri appointed Husayn Murshid governor of Jeddah, while a force of the Fifth Corps and royal mamluks was ordered to Suez, to protect the fleet in building there. After prolonged procrastination the Fifth Corps left Cairo in Rabî‘ II 921/August 1535. By that time about 2000 Ottoman sailors under the command of Selmân Re’îs were at Suez. An expedition by Selmân Re’îs and Husayn Murshid coincided with the fall of the Mamlûk sultanate and laid the foundation of Ottoman rule in the Yemen.

The rise of Şâfawî power threatened Mamlûk control of northern Syria. A crisis occurred in the autumn of 913/1507, when the Şâfawîs invaded the Dulgâdir
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(Dhu l-Kadr, [q.v.]) principality, at that time, under al-Dawla, a dependency of the Mamluk sul-
principality, at that time, under

Kansu; Szechwan and Shensi and in the west and north by

suchou (Kiuchuan); both towns are already men-

in the form Khamdiu (in the Mongol period Kamdju)

and Gardizi, the former

mentioned in the

in the form Khuddi (or Hsi-hsia)

dynasty (1322-1352) with the capital at Ninghsia
(Yinchuan). Rashid al-Din, in giving a list of the
twelve provinces (sheng, Chinese sheng) of China,
divides the Tangut region into two, with Kindjanfu
(now Sien, the capital of Shensi) and Kamdju (Kan-
chou) as their respective capitals. In actual fact,
Kanchou was the capital of Kansu; Kansu and
Shensi were then, as later, combined in a single
government, the only difference being that the
residence of the governor was then in the capital of
Shensi and not, as later, in the capital of Kansu. The
boundary between Kansu and Shensi was formed by
the Hwang Ho, so that Lanchou, the present-day
capital of Kansu, then belonged to Shensi. In
connection with Quenguifan (i.e., Kindjanfu, Sian)
Marco Polo mentions Prince Mangalay (d. 1280, the
Mangar of Rashid al-Din) who definitely as ruler of Tangut, while Rashid al-Din refers to his
son Ananda; according to Rashid al-Din, he was the
founder of Muslim dominance in this area. Born about
1270 (at the beginning of the 14th century he was
thirty years of age), he was brought up by Muslim
foster-parents; but it was only after the conversion
of the Il-Khan Ghazan (i.e., ca. 1295) that he openly
professed Islam. He converted the greater part of
his army, numbering nearly 150,000 men to Islam,
and the people of Tangut, except the peasantry, were
likewise converted. Taken to task by his cousin the
Great Khan Temur Öldjörtü (1294-1307) for his
conversion, Ananda remained faithful to Islam and after
a period of interruption was restored to his dominion.
In 1307 a party wished to raise him to the throne of
the Khánate, but he was put to death after the
success of a rival candidate, Temür's nephew Khey-
ghan (1307-1312). It was not until 1323 that Ananda's
son Örüg-Temür was appointed prince of Tangut.
As Marco Polo shows, there were already Muslims
in Kansu before Ananda's time; however, he says
nothing about the dissemination of Islam south
of the Hwang Ho. The Turkish-speaking Salar, who
live at the present day on the southern banks of that
river, are mentioned as living there as early as the
Ming dynasty (1368-1644) and described as unruly
subjects, although no Muslim risings are recorded
during this period. The story which reached Timür's
territories about 1358 to the effect that the founder of
the Ming dynasty had ordered the massacre of
some 100,000 Muslims and had completely eradicated
Islam in China finds no confirmation in any Chinese
source.

Bibliography: ʻUdād al-Salām, 85, 232; Rashid al-Din, ed. Blochet, 484-98, 595-602; The
Successors of Genghis Khan, tr. J. A. Boyle, New York and London 1971, 281-3, 323-6; Waṣṣīm,
Yule and Cordier, i, 203, 319, ii, 24; V. V. Barthold, Successors of Genghis Khan, tr. J. A. Boyle
Notes on Marco Polo, s.v. Campciòo.

1. In the post-Mongol period. After the collapse of the

Yuan dynasty which took place in 770/1368,
Muslims in Kansu, as well as those of other provinces of China, were put under the rule of the newly established Ming dynasty, which, at the beginning of the new régime, adopted a discriminatory attitude against non-Chinese. It oppressed Hui-hui or Muslims, and generally speaking, the Hui-hui under the Yuan dynasty were obliged to settle in China, and began to be assimilated to the Chinese way of life through intermarriage with native Chinese women. They were physically and linguistically incised as time went by; Hui-hui under the Ming dynasty gradually changed their original, Islamic surnames to Chinese ones (e.g., from Muhammad to Ma, etc.), and adopted Chinese languages; nevertheless, they adhered strictly to Islam. This process also affected Kansu Muslims, with some characteristics different from those of China proper.

In the early Ming period there were many Muslims in Kansu, while some of them are reported to have returned to Samarkand, according to the Ming Shih-lu or the Veritable Annals of the Ming Dynasty. At Kanchou, Liangchou and Suchou there were some Muslims who had newly emigrated from Central Asian countries in the middle Ming period (Ming Shih-lu, sub anno 1527), and some from the Komul region, with which the Ming dynasty had had political relations. Apart from such Muslims, native Muslims originating from the Yuan period greatly increased in number and were distributed in south-eastern parts of Kansu as far as adjacent parts of Shensi. There were also Muslims in districts of Kung-ch'eng-fu, Chinchou, T'aochou and Kuyian in the Kansu Province, according to the Ming Shih-lu and local gazetteers of the Ming dynasty.

Under the Ch'ing dynasty, which succeeded the Ming in 1644, the situation of Muslims in Kansu, Ninghsia and Shensi changed little; however, we have much more information on the Kansu Muslims under the Ch'ing, as seen in the Ch'ing Shih-lu and other historical sources and local gazetteers of the dynasty. In the Ch'ing period, Kansu had one of the densest concentrations of Chinese Muslims. Chinese-speaking Muslims of Ch'ing China were generally called Hui-min ("Islamic people") in Chinese. The main habitats of Kansu Muslims were Kanchou, Liang-chou, Lanchou, Kuyian, Ching-chou, Hochou, Ching-yian, Piliang, Fuchiang, etc.; other places lived in Suchou segregated from the Chinese there. Though his description is in some parts ambiguous, we may conclude that there were Muslims at Suchou with which the Ming dynasty had had political relations. One Ma Ming-hsin, a native of Antung, Kansu, started to spread the so-called "New Sect" in 1762. This propagated a mystical ritualism characterized by: (1) loud chanting of religious songs, as opposed to the low chanting by the Old Sect or Old Teaching; (2) prayers with head-shaking and body movement in a dance-like manner—foot-stamping, hand-waving, and face turning up towards heaven; (3) belief in miracles, visions, apparitions of spirits, and omens; and (4) worship of Muslim saints and their tombs. Ma Ming-hsin was revered as the saintly founder of the sect. However, one cannot consider the "New Sect" founded by Ma Ming-hsin as a reform movement reacting against the traditional sects, generally called Ancient or Old Sects (K'w-pai, Chie-pai and K'w-hsing-pai).

In ca. 1760-80 the centre of the Hsin-chiao was at Hsinhia, a town near Hsining, where Hsin-chiao adherents quarrelled incessantly among themselves in the 1760s and 1770s; and in 1781, Ma Ming-hsin and Su-ssu-shih-san led an attack on the Muslims belonging to the Ancient Sect. Government suppression of sectarian strife led Hsin-chiao adherents to open rebellion against the Ch'ing dynasty in that year, and, though it was suppressed by the Ch'ing army, a second revolt broke out in 1793 at Shih-fang-pao, Kansu. Since the 19th century, major centres of Hsin-chiao adherents have been in Chang-chia-chuan, Kansu, and in Chi-chi-pao, Hsinghsia.

In 1862 a new revolt broke out at Ch'in-chi-pao, where Ma Hua-lung who came from the direct "apostolic" line of Ma Ming-hsin, maintained his quarters. Ma Hua-lung is reported to have been a mystical saint who was able to perform miracles; but his rebellion was suppressed in 1871 by the Ch'ing army. The mystic order of Ma Hua-lung was called Djahriyya from the 19th century onwards (D'Ollone); the headship of the Order passed to Ma Yuan-ch'ang, a disciple of Ma Hua-lung, who had his headquarters at Chang-chia-chuan, Kansu. Ma Yuan-ch'ang is mentioned by G. Andrew who visited him in the early 20th century; he died in 1920 during an earthquake which occurred in Kansu during that year.

Besides Hsin-chiao, another characteristic of the Sufism of Kansu Islam is the institution of meng-kuan. Meng-kuan, especially the Four Great Meng-kuan, was reported in Ch'ing sources for the first time in 1786; the Six Great Meng-kuan were also reported in 1943. They are (1) the Hui-fei-yeh sect, including Pi-chia-chang kung-pei, Lin-chia-chang kung-pei, etc.; (2) the Ka-ti-lin-yeh sect, including Ta-hung-pai, Yang-men, etc.; (3) the K'w-pu-lin-yeh sect; (4) the Sha ta-lin-yeh sect; (5) the Sze-ai-lo-lo-lin-yeh sect; and (6) the Che-ko-lin-yeh Djahriyya sect.
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According to the missionary D'Ollone, who made a study of aboriginal peoples in the borderlands of China, 1906-9, the tombs of three Islamic saints were revered among Kansu Muslims. "followers of Tomb Teaching". Thus, the Djahriyya sect of Kansu Muslims may be said to be one of meng-kuan, tomb-worshippers.


KANTARA, pl. kantārī, means in Arabic (1) bridge, particularly a bridge of masonry or stone, one of the most famous of which is that of Sandía (q.v.); also (2) aqueduct (especially in the plural), dam, and finally (3) high building, castle (similarly ḥāšālī = aqueduct from ḥāšāl = castellum; see kantārī); cf. TA, iii, 509; Dozy, Supplément, li, 412; de Goeje, BG, vi, 334; and particularly R. Geyer in SB Ak. Wien, cxliii/6 (1905), 114-9. The original meaning of the word "arch, stone archway" is found in the earliest Arabic lexicographers; cf. Dozy-de Goeje, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne par Edrisî, 369, Divri (q.v.), a bridge of wood or boats, or the opposite of kantāra, which is of stone in time; however, the two words came to be used as synonyms (see Dozy, Suppl., i, 194).

No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the origin of the word. The oldest reference is found in a verse of Tarafa (iv, 22; see The Diwans of the six ancient Arabic poets, ed. Ahwardi, 1870, 55). On account of this early occurrence of the word, Yāḏūt (iv, 187) considers the word to be genuine Arabic. But we may with considerable certainty regard it as a loan-word. Vollers and Geyer thought that it was borrowed from Latin or Greek. The former connected (ZDMG, li, 376; ZA, viii, 100-1) kantāra with the mediaeval Latin word centrum (French centre, arch, vault), while Geyer (op. cit., 118-9) sought the original either in κανθγής = basket, κανθάρια = wickerwork used in the making of roofs and buildings, or in κανθταρά, κανθταρόν = depository (cf. also κανθτάρα = rounding, curve), from which Vollers (ZDMG, li, 302) derived Egypto-Arab. khamjar. But all these explanations are to be rejected, because there are phonetic objections to them and they partly rely for the meanings of the words cited on obsolete, farfetched glosses; cf. for objections to these explanations, Fränkel in ZA, xix, 270-1, and Nöldeke, op. cit., 408. Kansu is most probably to be derived from the Aramaic, and, as Nöldeke, op. cit., thinks, in the first place from kēṯārā = hoop, arch (see Payne-Smith, Thesaurus Syriac., col. 3591; note specially kēṯārā in Bar Bahlul, Lexicon, col. 1768). The above-mentioned word gisr also comes from the Aramaic (Fränkel, Die aram. Fremdwörter im Arab., Leiden 1886, 285 and D. H. Müller in WZKM, i, 31), but can actually be traced back to the Assyrian or Accadian (cf. Meisner in ZA, ix, 269, and Zimmerm, Akkadische Fremdwörter, Leipzig 1915, 31).

Al-Kantara has survived in Spanish in the diminutives alcantarilla = little bridge, gutter and alcantarillado = arched aqueduct; see Dozy-Engelmann, Glossaire des mots espagnols et portugais dérivés de l'arabe, Leiden 1869, 47; Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana por la Real Academia Española, xiii, Madrid 1899, svv; J. Oliver Asín, Historia del nombre Madrid, Madrid 1959, index.

Al-Kantara and al-Kanṭārī are frequently found —sometimes with descriptive additions, e.g., Kanṭārī Fiṛawn—as names for places like quarters of a city (notably in BaghdaĎ) in areas where Arabic was, or is, spoken in the mediaeval or modern East. In his geographical Dictionary (iv, 180, 180-92, vi, 179-80) Yāḏūt gives a dozen places named al-Kantara and four called Kanṭarī (cf. also, for example, the indices to al-Ṭabarī, Annales, 759-60, and Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, xiii, 790). For the numerous districts of BaghdaĎ named after particular bridges under the Caliphate see the index to GUY le Strange, Baghid during the Abbasid Caliphate, London 1900, 368. Of the places named al-Kanṭara, the following are worthy of special mention:

1. An oasis on the southern slopes of the Atlas in Algeria at the exit of a narrow pass through which run the road and railway from Constantine to the desert regions; it is a station on the Constantine-Biskra line, 35 miles north of the latter. This, the most northern oasis in Africa, consists of three villages with about 3,500 inhabitants and possesses a very dense date grove. From its situation it was an important military station and, as Roman inscriptions found there show, settled in ancient times. It is presumably identical with the station Ad Calcem Herculis of the Roman itineraries (see Dessau in Pauly-Wissowa, iii, 1345). The name al-Kanṭara is derived from the Roman bridge, restored in 1862 by the French, which spans in one huge arch the ravine, the 150 feet wide Fumm al-Ṣahārā = the mouth of the Sahārā (so-called by the inhabitants), through which flows the Wād al-Kantara (cf., for example, Vivien de St. Martin, Dict. de Géographie Universelle, Paris 1879, i, 66 and Kobelt, Reiserinnerungen aus Algerien und Tunis, 1883, 322).

2. Al-Ḳantarā, a little town of great antiquity in the province of Cæces, district of Estremadura, in the province of Caceres (district of Estremadura) in Portugal, which flows the Wad al-Kantara (cf., for example, Vivien de St. Martin, Dict. de Géographie Universelle, Paris 1879, i, 66 and Kobelt, Reiserinnerungen aus Algerien und Tunis, 1883, 322).

3. A small town with a mosque in Egypt, on the Asiatic side of the Suez canal, half-way between Port Ṣaţf and Isma'iliation, a station on the railway connecting these two towns. It lies on a low narrow
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tongue of rising ground, which runs out between the
large Menzaleh lake in the north and the little Balafç
lake in the south. It is unlikely to take its name
from this "land bridge", however, but from a bridge
which already existed here probably in the early
Middle Ages.

The Arab geographer Ibn Fadl Allâh al-Umarî, who
wrote ca. 741/1340, mentions the arch of a
bridge, called Kantarat al-Dîsîr, near the old caravan
station of al-'Akûda, under which the superfuous
water flowed into the desert at the time of the Nile's
inundation. There was still a bridge here at the be-
ginning of the 19th century, built over a canal con-
necting the two lakes already mentioned. The modern
al-Kantara arose on its present site after the making
of the Suez Canal. The old settlement was a short
half-hour's journey to the east and is marked by the
mouth of ruins Tell Abû Sêfe (on the maps also
called Tell al-Abmar). This place may be regarded
as the key to Egypt, for it has always been used by
conquerors as the gateway to the Nile valley. Its
strategical importance led to its being occupied in
remote antiquity. Tell Abû Sêfe (with ruins of a
temple of Ramses II and remains of the Ptolemaic
and Roman period) marks the site of the ancient
Egyptian town of Zaru (7, s w), the capital of the
fountain district of Lower Egypt, which was
already a fortress in the time of the Middle Kingdom.

In the later classical and Byzantine literature it
appears as Sile, Sele (Selle); according to a Latin
inscription found here, it had a Roman garrison in
888 and was later also the seat of a bishop. In the
Middle Ages it was called al-'Akûda (on the name
al-'Akûda = "the bend", cf. DAVR AL-'AKûl), a name
which was temporarily supplanted by that of the
castle of al-Kusayr during the Mamluk period. In
which was temporarily supplanted by that of the
Akula (on the name al-
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considerable remains exist at the present day;
according to Arab legend, it was built by Queen
Zenobia (Zaynab); cf. Fr. Müller, Studien über Zenob-
bia und Palmyra (Diss. Königsberg 1902), 14-15.

6. Kanûrî Fir'awîn ("Pharaoh's aqueduct"), a
great aqueduct in the south of Syria, which,
beginning at Dilli, at the western foot of the lava
plateau of Lejjû (west of Hawrán), runs in a south-
western direction for some sixty miles as far as
Mukûs (Gadara), providing many villages with
the necessary drinking-water in the summer months. It
is identified by Wetzstein—probably rightly—with
the Kanûrî mentioned by Hamza al-Isfahání (An-
ales, ed. Gottwaldt, 117). But the Ghasâûnd Djabâla
b. al-Hârîth, who reigned about 500 A.D., can hardly,
as Hamza says, be the builder of this marvellous
piece of work (cf. Nödeke, Die phasaßen. Fürsten . . .
in Abb. Pr. Ak. W., iv, 1887, 50). It certainly dates
back to ancient times. For further information see
Wetzstein, Reiseberichte über Hawran und die Tracho-
en, Berlin 1860, 123-5.

The diminutive Kuna'yi'ra (popularly Kûnîtra
or Kenêtri) is occasionally used as a place name,
e.g., a town in Syria in the Djawlân (Golân) district,
to the north east of Jordan (see Baedeker, Palestine
and Syria', 1912, 268; R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie orientale (Paris 1927, 387), and also a newly established town in Morocco,
called Knîtra, then Port-Lyautey, then Knîtra again.
The town was first a disembarkation area, then a
fairly important port, on the River Sebou, some way
from its mouth. This port superseded the ancient al-Mahdiyya
situated on the mouth of the same river.

(M. STRACK*)

KANUN, pl. KAWmüN, Arabic derivative from
Greek xwîôv, which meant firstly "any straight
rod", later "a measure or rule", and finally (in the
papyri of the 4th and 5th centuries A.D.) "assessment
for taxation", "imperial taxes", "tariff" (Liddell and
Scott, revised ed., London 1940; for its meanings in
religious literature, see G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic
Greek lexicon, Oxford 1961). The word was adopted
into Arabic presumably with the continuation, after
the Muslim conquest of Egypt and Syria, of the pre-
Islamic tax system (C. H. Becker, Islamstudien,
Leipzig 1924, 218-62; F. Lokkegaard, Islamic taxa-
tion, Copenhagen 1950, 118-20). Whilst the word
preserved in Islamic states in general its special
meaning as a financial term belonging to the field of
land-taxes, it acquired also the sense of "code of
regulations" "state-law" (sc. of non-Muslim origin).
The two senses must be discussed separately.

1.—Law

In theory, the gharï'a regulates the whole of the
public and private life of the Muslim, but since works of
fiqh barely deal with the provisions of common
law, and also since it became apparent very early on
that the greater part of the Muslim penal system was
inapplicable, the guardians of public order (especially
the governors) took to issuing regulations (kawmün)
in these two fields, although they had no such legis-

ative authority. At the time, these developments did
not shock even the strictest of the 'ulâmî, because
in administrative matters there was no conflict
between the kânîn and the gharï'a, the latter general-
ly being silent on such matters. Similarly with penal
law, the kânîn did not appear to infringe on the
gharï'a, for the governors had the sense either to
restrict themselves to substituting the discretionary penalty
of the ta'zîr [q.v.], fine or flogging, punishments laid
down in works of fiqh, for the seriously mutilating
punishments of the Kur'an (hudud, pl. of ādād), such as cutting off the hand or stoning.

Under the Ottoman sultans, the term kânûn came to be applied mainly to acts in the domain of administrative and financial law and of penal law. The first kânûn-nâmas promulgated under Mehemmed II (855-861/1451-1481) were indeed confined to this restricted field, but a century later, through the impetus of Abu 'l-Su'ud, grand mufti of Istanbul from 952/1545 to 982/1574 (q.v.), kânûn-nâmas began to offer legal solutions to questions which had hitherto been exclusively the province of the shari'a, particularly property law. Abu 'l-Su'ud was a jurist of such great ability that this was done without the kânûn and the shari'a ever coming into opposition with one another.

Nowadays, in all Middle Eastern countries, the term kânûn denotes not only those codes and laws which are directly inspired by western legislation, such as civil and commercial law, administrative and penal law, but also those laws and codes which are confined to reproducing, albeit simplifying, the provisions of the shari'a. To name but a few examples, the Syrian Code (kânûn) of Personal Status (1953), the İrâfî Code (kânûn) of Personal Status (1959) and the proposed Egyptian Family Code (also called kânûn) fall into this category. The Order in Council is designated by the rubric kânûn. However, the word kânûn, which, as we have noted, originally signified a ruling of the administrative authority, is not used in this sense today, being replaced by lâ'îba (pl. lââ'îbât) in Egypt and by nişâm or tartîb elsewhere.

Whether it is inspired by western legislation or comprises only provisions adopted from Muslim law, the actual kânûn is prepared by a commission, passed by it or by the legislative assemblies if need be, and promulgated by the executive, the same procedure being followed in both cases. In addition, in the case of a kânûn concerning personal status or inheritance laws, and therefore one deriving from Muslim law, the discussions in the Assembly are no more than formalities. In such cases it is the preceding phase, the one developed by the commission, which is the most important.

Born in the East, the word kânûn as the designation of the superior form of legislation (Law and Code) is current only in the Middle East, or, more precisely, in those countries which came, however partially, under the influence of Istanbul. It was rarely used in Saudi Arabia, which escaped Ottoman domination; there the word preferred to cover the legislative work of the secular authority was nişâm.


---

ii.-Cadaster

The administration of taxes usually comprised two sections, one dealing with assessment and one with collection. The assessment of taxes was based on various principles and resulted in a basis for calculation, the aqîl. Kânûn was used to refer both to these principles as a whole and to the resulting sum due from the taxpayer, either in the case of a single property or all the properties in one district taken together. The assessed value of the revenue on an estate was known as the 'îbra. In those provinces—never the entire Muslim world—where many lands were assessed by the procedure of kânûn, this word came to mean a kind of fiscal cadaster.

In Egypt, traditionally subject to a special régime in which state control was particularly extensive and which is fairly well documented, the "cadaster" was made by measuring the area of each plot of land, placing it into a category according to its position in the Nile flood and thus determining the most suitable type of crop, and finally assessing the duty which, barring accidents, should result and could be fixed in advance. The general process of the cadaster is known as ra'uh (q.v.) (verb râha). These administrative operations give rise to the following documents: a) an original (ṣift) kânûn establishing the characteristics of a region so as to determine its 'îbra on a permanent basis—according to al-Maqrîzî, in his day this was revised every thirty years; b) an annual kânûn, established by a local dâlî, consisting, on the basis of the foregoing, of a statement of the characteristics of each plot after the flood, by which characteristics the dâlî decides which crops should be cultivated; c) a kânûn establishing the most suitable crops and the resulting fiscal distribution, listed both by holdings and by crops. Finally there was a series of other documents more specifically concerned with tax collection, such as the kânûn-proclamation.

The measurements were made by a bâsîb (from kâsâba, unit of length); the mâsîb (surveyor) calculated the areas on the basis of measurements taken. It would seem that sometimes he cheated in the geometry, and Ibn Mammâtî takes great pains to remind his readers of the rules for calculating areas. The various kinds of land were classified according to type, degree of flooding, and finally according to taxation, and the vocabulary used for such terms appears to be in part non-Arab and pre-Islamic (see *JESHO*, v (1962), 259-60, from Ibn Mammâtî and Malghâmî).

It would be useful to classify the published papyri in the categories listed above. Al-Nâbulusî's description of the Fayûm (Ayyûbid period) in fact gives a detailed picture of taxes in general, but not precisely, of the cadaster for this province, locality by locality and category by category.

Far less is known of the methods employed in the rest of the Muslim world. However, the main outlines seem clear. There it was impossible to draw up for fiscal purposes a precise survey of crops, nor therefore of the return anticipated from them, since there was neither a regular flood nor a sufficiently close administrative control. It was, however, at least possible to measure area, and even to classify land according to average yield, thus allowing a tabulation of taxes, subject to last-minute modification in the light of the actual harvest. This was done in the majority of regions, where a definite sum in money was levied by area and crop, as against those where a proportion of the crop was levied. There were also, however, regions which followed the Roman tradition. In these the unit was not of area, which gives a variable yield, but one of labour or of exploitation, where a variable area produces a fixed yield. A traditional vocabulary less complex than that of Egypt also designates the different types of land. As in Egypt, the 'îbra was determined. Measuring was done by the māsîb sometimes with the help of a controller (muwâsîr) or a divider (bâsîb). In fact, if not in law, their salary constituted an additional charge. However, even in Egypt, there continued to be many properties which for one reason or another were registered "without mîsâhā", and thus taxed outright without having been surveyed in
this way. On the documents see the article on DASTAR and, following the Ta’rikh-i Kumm, A. K. S. Lambton (Landlords and Peasants in Persia, 1953, ch. 2).

In the West, or at any rate in the Maghrib, cadastral survey seems to have been slower and less precise. It is possible that it was not introduced to Morocco before the time of the Almohads, when it was brought back by Ibn Tumart from his voyage to the East. Here, even less than in the East, not all estates were covered.

**Bibliography:** Scattered references can be found throughout the sources; only the most important are mentioned here: Ibn Mammâtî, Kawnîn al-da’wânîn, ed. 'Atiya, 1953, tr. R. S. Cooper, Ibn Mammâtî’s rules for the ministries, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley 1973, unpublished; Ta’rikh-i Kumm, ed. Djalâl al-Dîn Thârânî, Tehran 1934; the analyses of Makhûmî and Nâbulûsî in the articles by Cl. Cahen cited below; Nuwâyri, Ni’âya, viii; Khwârazmî, Majûfîâ al-‘ulâm, ed. Van Vloten; and the papyri, especially the Cairo ones published by Grohmann where an index of technical terms facilitates consultation. Modern works: there is nothing systematic, but we may cite F. Løkkegaard, Islamic Taxation, index; A. K. S. Lambton, Landlords and Peasants in Persia, 1953; Cl. Cahen, Quelques problèmes économiques et fiscaux de l’Iraq buyide, in AIEO, Algiers (1952); idem, Les impôts du Fayyum asyûbî, in Arabic (1955); idem, Contribution à l’étude des impôts dans l’Egypte médiévale, JESH (1962); Hassanine Rabie, Le financial system of Egypt A.H. 54-741/ A.D. 1169-1341, London 1972; see also the articles dastar and Kânhûn. (Cl. Cahen)

iii.—Financial and Public Administration

1. From the earliest days of the conquest onwards, Kânûn preserved the meanings of “registers and lists recording land-taxes” (Kânûn al-Khârdâd, also dâ’ârâd‘âd) and the regulations there laid down (al-kawnîn al-mukharrara, cf. al-Mâwardî, ed. Cairo 1936/1966, 215, tr. Fagnan, 465). This principle of assessing tax can be traced back to the time of the second caliph ‘Umar, to whom is attributed the measurement of the lands in the Sawâd and the imposition of a fixed tax on a specified area of land (Abû Yûsuf, K. al-Khârdâd, Cairo 1302, 36-8, 48, 60, 85, 218; al-Mâwardî, 148-52, 174-6; Løkkegaard, 106-25). This measure was considered to be the continuation of the Sasanian system of assessment for tax (Abû Yûsuf, 38, 57; al-Mâwardî, 78, 148, 173-5; ‘Tabarî, i, 62); and as in the old Iranian tradition so in the Islamic period strict adherence to the explicit entries and regulations of the official registers (hîṣâ al-a’zâlîn, al-Mâwardî, 215) was regarded as the foundation of sound and just administration (al-Mâwardî, 151, 215-8). In the period of the classical caliphate the Persian terms dâ’âr and muhâlî came to be used as synonyms of kânûn in the sense of “tax-list” (Løkkegaard, 170, 265). This kânûn also signified the conditions (qawînî) governing the levying of land-taxes by mukâhâ ‘a[q.v.] (Løkkegaard, 107). The term kânûn must have spread only later into Irâk and the eastern provinces, since though it is frequently used by al-Mâwardî (d. 450/1058) it is not used by Abû Yûsuf (d. 182/798). After the Abbâsid period kânûn remained in use as a financial term with some hâfîzî meaning (Ibn Mammâtî, Kawnîn al-Dawânîn, ed. A. S. ‘Atiya, Cairo 1943, 305; ‘Uthmân al-Nâbulûsî, K. Luma‘ al-a’zâlîn, see Brockelmann, GAL, S. I, 573); in Persia (Rawandî, Râhât al-ṣuyûr, ed. M. Iqbal, 856, 214-7, 398; Nasîr al-Dîn al-Ṭâ’î, reda‘ published in THTM, ii (1932-3), and in BSOAS, x (1940), al-Mâwardî, Ta’rikh-i Mubârâk-i Ḡâshânî, ed. Jahn, GMS, 306; ‘Abd Allâh b. Kiyâ, Resâlî-yê Falakiyyd, ed. W. Hinz, Wiesbaden 1953, 23, 172, 182-4; Muhammad b. Hindûshâ al-Nâbdûwânî, Dâ’sür al-kâtîb, i, ed. A. Allâzade, Moscow 1964, 123-5; al-Ṭâ’î, al-Mawârdî, 148-52, 174-6; Lokkegaard, 106-25, 274-6, 318).

Finally, kânûn might imply “rules of conduct” (as in kânûn al-a’sâda: Resâlî-yê Falakiyyd, 2); and also
the general principles or the basic information in one of the non-religious sciences (as in kānūn al-badgha or kānūn fi 'l-dīb).

3. Kānūn (in the sense of non-religious legal prescription) and its relation to the sharī'a. Even from the time of the first caliphs there are records of legal prescriptions imposed solely at the will of the ālu ʿl-amr [q.v.], e.g., ʿUmar's decision regarding the lands of the Sawād (Abū Yūsuf, 47-56, 97). Such prescriptions were usually incorporated into the sharī'a as it took shape. Administrative regulations and practices [see ṣamā', amr] entered the sharī'a just like ʿurf and ḍāda [q.v.], because of the broad interpretation of the concept of sūnna [q.v.] and thanks to recourse to the principle of istiḥlās [q.v.] (see J. Schacht, Origins, 99-112). But this process was ended after the time of al-Shāfiʿī, particularly of Ibn Ḥanbal and Dāwūd b. Khālaf [q.v.], with the narrower interpretation put upon sūnna and the rejection of istiḥlās.

Matters of public law were treated within the framework of the sharī'a firstly with regard to legal regulations concerning land-tax (as by Abū Yūsuf, Yahyā b. ʿAbdūn, Abu ʿl-Farādī Küdāmā), and later (from the 4th/10th century) in connection with more general matters: the source of political authority [see ʿamām], administrative law [see māṣūla], market regulations [see ʿibāda], and penal law [see ʿaṭāʾa] (see al-Māwardī, Abū Ḥaylā, Ibn Dāmās, Ibn Taʿmīyya, Ibn Kayyīm al-Ǧīziyya, ṣassīm). After al-Shāfiʿī, the boundaries of the usūl al-fiḥḥa were drawn so narrowly that new administrative regulations were left outside them and became the province of a new "state law" or "ruler's law". This process was encouraged also by political developments in the caliphate: in the "sultanates" establishing themselves in Persia (Būyids, ʿSāmānidūs, Ghānasīmīdūs, Sālūqūsīdūs), the native bureaucracy [see kātib] strove to revive the old Iranian traditions of the state and of state administration in order to strengthen the absolutism of their masters, and won for political authority and state law an independent status vis-à-vis the sharī'a. The conflict between kānūn and sharī'a in this period reflects the rivalry between sūlān and khalifa. It is in this period that al-Māwardī, 77-8, maintained the necessity of secular power (Kawāna al-salātana, or āmāra) to ensure the implementation of the sharī'a (tanzīḥ al-ḥakīm) and the protection and survival of the Muslim community (ḥirāsat al-dīn wa-strīyat al-dunyā). In other words, the public interest [see māṣla] was recognized as the basic principle justifying an independent political authority and its competence to make laws and issue regulations. This argument was regularly repeated in Muslim sultānates (including the Ottoman, cf. Tur- sus, Taʾrīḵ-i Abū ʿl-Fath, 13) as the basis for the sultan's authority as law-giver. In this period too the concepts of ʿaddā [q.v.] and kānūn, linked to the Iranian view of the state, began to be treated as a separate subject in works written by faṭḥiṣ on politics (cf. al-Māwardī, 77-95).

As to the matters regulated by this "secular" law, they fell, naturally, within the field of public law — a field distinguished by the sharī'a by the terms al-ʿamal al-sūmā, siyāsa [q.v.], and hubb Alāh [q.v.] — and covered such questions as military and governmental organization, taxation, especially land-taxes [see khārīdī] and the closely-related land-law, matters concerning the bayt al-ʿamal [q.v.], and penal law. The sharī'a conceded to the imām authority to promulgate and implement regulations governing the scales of non-Muslim taxes, the use to which con- quered land or mawādī [q.v.] land should be put, the severity of ʿaṭīr [q.v.] punishment, and the protection of the community's economic interests [see ḥisāb]. The sharī'a recognized also the authority of the imām-sulṭān to decide and to legislate, if the public interest required it, upon any matter not treated by the sharī'a. It came to be agreed that the individual was under a religious obligation to obey the sultan's command in matters not regulated by ḥaṣṣ [q.v.] (cf. the introduction to the Kānūn-i ʿOthmānī, in Istanbul Un. Lib., MS. T. 1809).

Furthermore, some fubāḥaʿ regarded decisions taken on the ruler's authority as essential for the solution of various problems which concerned the sharī'a (cf. the fatwās in Abūl-Su faʿdī's Maʿāḍī, MTM, i, 337-48 = P. Horster, Zur Anwendung des Islamischen Rechts im 16. Jahrhundert, Stuttgart 1935). In cases where the sharī'a permitted two solutions, the decision of the ālu ʿl-amr was decisive (Abū Yūsuf, tr. Fagnan, 103-4); again, in cases of serious ṣīḥīḥat [q.v.] among the fubāḥaʿ, the ruler might, in public interest, in order to ensure uniformity of practice and avoid rifts within the community, decree that the precepts of one specific madhhab [q.v.] were to be followed: thus under the ʿAbbāsīdīs [see IBN AL-MUKAFFA] and later under the ʿĀbdīl-kūtīs (see sīrat ʿAbbāsī, Khānasī, 1966) it was made obligatory for the kādīs to follow the Hanafi madhhab [see Abū Naṣīr], a new stage began, a period when new legal rules could be made in the forms of fatwās [q.v.] on the one hand and, on the other, the decisions of the Kādīs' courts and regulations promulgated by the sultans.

In the period following the Mongol invasions, the concept of independent state law was greatly strengthened: in the Ottoman Empire, in Central Asia, in India, and in the Timurid dominions, decrees issued by the rulers on matters of state organization, military affairs, taxes, land-tenure and penal law created a rich corpus of state law, entirely independent of the sharī'a.

In the ʿIkhšāni state, whilst the old Iranian concept of the state of law was making headway thanks to the efforts of Persian bureaucrats, the Mongol aristocracy was endeavouring to assure the supremacy of the legal system of the yasa [q.v.]. The traditions and beliefs current in the steppe empires of Central Asia encouraged the view that the state subsisted through the maintenance of the tūriʿ (Arabic ʿārāʾ), see ṭūrūk) laid down by the ḥaṣāṣ (see H. Inalcik, Kutadgu Bilig'de Türk ve Iran davet ve siyaset nasıriye ve gelenekleri, in Reşit Rahmeti Arat için, Ankara 1967, 259-71). This view was brought by the Turkish and Mongol ruling houses into the Middle East and survived in the states that they founded there (the Ottoman state included: for the Ottomans, the establishment of their sovereignty over a region was dependent upon the introduction there of the Kānūn-i ʿOltānā). It should not be overlooked that some early Ottoman writers (e.g., ʿAhmedi, see TM, vi (1936-39), 111) praised the yasa of Čingiz-Khan as having promoted justice, and that Ottoman state-regulations were often referred to as yasa or yasak-nāme. In Egypt and Syria, too, yasa merged with siyāsa (see D. Ayalon, in St. Isl., xxxviii (1973), 113), tended to be accepted as a legitimate law. In these new states the conflict between state law and the sharī'a overlay a politico-social struggle among the bureaucracy, the ʿulamāʾ, and the military
class. In Persia and in Anatolia, after the collapse of Mongol rule there was powerful pressure to do away with the Turco-Mongol state law (Afze Astarabadi, Basım u razm, Istanbul 1928, 223; Z. V. Togan, Umumt Türk tarihine giris, Istanbul 1946, 271, 320, 376; for the reign of Shahrukh, see MTM, ii, 357; for Syria and Egypt, see D. Ayalon, in St. Isl., xxxii, 97-140; xxxiv, 151-80, xxxvi, 113-58; for Iran, see Spuler, Moslolithen, Berlin 1968, 235-44.). Some ‘ulamā’ in state service attempted to preserve the legitimacy of the principle of an independent state law by appeal to such Islamic principles as istislah, maslaha, and especially ‘urf [q.v.].

In later years, the states which, on the basis of these principles, developed furthest the domain of state law were the Ottoman Empire and the Turco-Mongol states of India. Ottoman legists, emphasizing these points, accepted the principle that state law, as having from of old been the concern of independent yargu [q.v.] courts, should be applied by the kādīs; all the same, the special courts of the political and military authorities continued—the divešnās of the Grand Vizier, of the Agha of the Janissaries, of the Kapudan Paşası, of the Defterdar.

In the Ottoman state, the conflict of the sharī‘a and the ruler’s law manifested itself in various stages. Mehmed II [q.v.], as the promoter of a centralized and absolutist imperial system, strengthened the principles of kānān and ‘urf and encouraged the independence of “secular” law. He promulgated the Ottoman Kānānnāme, and brought the ‘ulamā’ more closely into an integrated state-controlled hierarchy of offices. According to a contemporary historian belonging to the bureaucracy (Tursun, 13), the “good order” (niṣām) of this world necessarily requires the absolute coercive authority of the sultan (yasadh-i fādshdhi) and the sultan’s promulgation of decrees of his own single will. The early years of his successor Baysız I saw a strong reaction by the upholders of the sharī‘a against his untrammeled legislative activity. Selim I relegated the intervention of the religious authorities in state affairs (cf. Ali Djemâl, cited in Bibi.), although Sulaymān I was inclined to assert the sharī‘a’s control over state law, the latter preserved its independence as being the province of the nișandji [q.v.]. It seems that the relative influence accorded to sharī‘a and kānān depended to a degree on distinctions of madhhab: thus Abu ‘l-Su‘ūd regarded the use of money to establish a waqf as entirely acceptable to the sharī‘a, on the ground of istislah, whereas Mehmed Birgewi [see BIRGEWI] regarded it as utterly illegal; Birgewi and the Kāfizadels were no doubt following Hanbali doctrine. From the 11th-17th century onwards the scope of the kānān evidently began to contract to the advantage of the sharī‘a. Fatwās of the muftis progressively restricted the law-making powers of the nišandji, and the influence of the Şaykh al-Islām in state affairs progressively increased—to such a degree that in 1007/1596 the use of the word kānān side by side with the word sharī‘a was forbidden by a firman of the Sultan (O. Nür, Medalle-i umr-i beledisyeye, i, Istanbul 1922, 568).

Nevertheless, in the later periods of reform the activity of making kānāns, independent of the sharī‘a, increased once more, and the struggle between kānān and sharī‘a, now exacerbated by social and political factors, revealed itself in overt collisions [see H. Veldet, Kamunlaştırmalar hareketleri, in Tansımatı, i, 139-209]. As a result of the challenge of Europeanization and modernization, new movements arose in the second half of the century. On the one hand, young intellectuals and ‘ulamā’ disputed the question of whether the “door of tādhīb” could be opened [see NAMIK KEMAL, SHAMAL AL-DIN AL-’ABDUH, MUSLIM MADHİ ‘ABDUL]; on the other, a section of the Ottoman intelligentsia [see VENI ‘OCTMANLI], influenced by the French school of sociology, maintained that the sharī‘a in regard to its mu‘āmalāt [q.v.] was a social and historical product of a high degree of mū’tamād al-‘ilm which could alter in accordance with the needs of society, and that these changing needs could be satisfied by new legislation within the framework of nasṣ through a national assembly, a şāhīr [q.v.]. These currents of thought facilitated a radical alteration in family law in 1917 and the placing of the kādīs’ courts, removed from the control of the Şaykh al-Islām, under the Ministry of Justice. Later still, merging with the agitation for the abolition of the Capitulations [see IMTIYAZAT], they produced the uncompromisingly secular legal system of the Turkish Republic. In other Muslim states, however, the desire to maintain the attachment to the Islamic sources of the law has continued into recent times [see İSLÂH].

4. The procedure for making and promulgating kānāns in the Ottoman state. The source and justification for kānān-legislation was the principle of ‘urf [q.v.], in the sense of the Sultan’s unrestricted executive authority (and its synonym, yasa). Hence every sort of kānān was issued in the form of a bukm [q.v.] of the sultan, the typical formula being: Kānān emr edeb buyurдум ki . . .”, “having ordered [the promulgation of a] kānān, I have commanded as follows . . .” (cf. Belleten, xi/44 (1947), 700, doc. 10). In practice, the procedure was as follows: a clerk attached to the office of the Nishandji or the Defterdar drew up a bukm in the form of a firman or a berād. This draft, after being checked by the Nishandji or the Defterdar, was confirmed by the Grand Vizier, with the word şah ("correct"). Important kānāns were confirmed by receiving the khaṭṭ (autograph minute) of the sultan. There is evidence that some kānāns were dictated personally by the sultan (cf. İstanbul, Süleymanıye Lib., MS. Reisülküttab 1004, fol. 34 a). Kānāns relating to timârs ("fefts"), agricultural taxes and land law were the province of the Nişandji; those relating to other financial matters were enregistered in the office of the baş-mulâzîme, under the Defterdar. Copies of the kānâns were sent to the Defterdar or the Nishandji for their implementation—variously, the kādīs, governors, müftis, emîns of the customs, etc. Kādîs and governors would register them and make the neces-
KĀNŪN

sary entries in the appropriate registers, either by a marginal note or by attaching a slip to the page. Kānūns which affected the populace in general were proclaimed by criers (mūndūd) in such public places as the market or the mosque courtyard or were read and explained by the ḥādī to the as-rūn [q.v.] and the aṣḥāf, who had been summoned to the court-room for that purpose. The original document was preserved in the bestdan of the city or in a chest under the kānūn. Bibli. Nat., kadi’s Belgeler, iii (1965), 49-145, or the promotion of reforms. A kānūn might confirm ḥādī [q.v.] ("custom") or amīdī (["precedent"], or—with or without modification—the kānūns of a state newly occupied by the Ottomans. Appeal to "traditional practice" is a common feature of Ottoman kānūns.

An indication of the independent status enjoyed by kānūn in the Ottoman state is the fact that they were entirely under the supervision of the Nişāḫandji. Their final and official promulgation lay in his hands, for he possessed the responsibility of affixing to them the tughrā [q.v.] by which they were authenticated. It was he who determined whether a kānūn remained in force, and whether new hālums issuing from the various departments of the administration were in conformity with the existing corpus of kānūns. Since kānūns so largely dealt with land matters and the timur-system, with the decline of the latter the scope for kānūn activity contracted, and the Nişāḫandji lost his former importance.

It is not correct that outside the Ottoman Empire, the principle of independent legislation by kānūn was established, particularly in India and in those Muslim states founded by Turkish dynasties who had migrated from Central Asia. There too the kānūn, or rather, to use the terms there current, the dābīja, dīn, dastūr, or shāhī tarmān, is to be traced back both to the Iranian concept of "justice" as the ruler’s principal concern and to the central Asian tūrū or tūsūk. According to Dīyāʾ al-Dīn Bārānī (writing c. 760/1359), a dābīja, or state law, is "a rule of action which a king imposes as an obligatory duty upon himself for realizing the welfare of the state and from which he absolutely never deviates" (tr. M. Hābib and Salim Khan, Political theories of the Delhi Sultanate, including a translation of Ziauddin Barani’s Faṣawa-i Jahandari, circa 1358-9, A.D., Allahabad-Bombay-Delhi, n.d. (esp. ch. iv); W. Husain, Administration of Justice during the Muslim Rule in India, Calcutta 1934 (Qa’nun-i shāhī and Jus genuinum, 134-45); Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556-1707), Bombay 1963; Abu’t-FAdil, A’in-i Akbar, tr. Blochmann, Calcutta 1867-77; Persian Sources of Indian History, ed. G. H. Khare, Poona 1937; D. Ayalon, The Great Yasa of Chinzig Khan, a re-examination, in SI, xxx, 97-140, xviii-xix, 131-80; xxvi, 113-58, xxviii, 107-56; R. Anhægger and H. Inalcik, Kudum-Nezârat name-i ’Arif-i ʿOzmān, Cairo 1956; R. Anhægger, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bergbaus im osmanischen Reich, 2 vols. and Nachtrag, Istanbul 1943-5; N. Beldiceanu, Les actes des premiers sultans ottomans, II: Les lois miniers, Paris-The Hague; Kānūn-i-‘Al-i ʿOzmān, ed. M. Ārīl, TOEM supplement, Istanbul 1929-30; Kamani i Kanunname, in Monumenta Turcica, ser. 1, no. 1, ed. B. Durdev and others; Paul Horster, Zur Anwendung des islamischen Rechts im 16. Jhdt. Bonner Orientalist. Studien, Heft 10, Stuttgart 1935; G. D. Galabov and H. W. Duda, Die Protokolbiblraphien des Kadi-amtes Sofia, Munich 1960; Ō. L. Baik, XV ve XVI inces asırlarda Osmanlı Imparatorluğu nda sirla ekonomisinin hakuk ve mail esasları, I, Kamani, Istanbul 1943; S. J. Shaw, The financial and administrative development of Ottoman Egypt, 1517-1970, Princeton 1966; Uriel Heyd, Studies in Old Ottoman Penal Law, ed. V. L. Ménage, Oxford 1973; R. Mantran and J. Sauvaget, Règlements fiscaux ottomans, Les provinces syriennes, Beirut 1951; A. S. Tveritinova, XVI. Yüzyıl Osm. İmp. mali ve idars sistemini ılgilendiren bazı belgeler, in Tarih Araştırmaları, vii/12-13 (1969), 65-88; H. Scheel, Die staatsrechtliche Stellung der kamenischen Kirchenfürsten in der alten Türkei, Berlin 1943; F. Selle, Prozeßrecht des 16. Jahrhunderts im osmanischen Reich, Wiesbaden 1962.
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IV.—BERBER USAGE

The word kanun was adopted by various Berber groups, especially in Kabylie and the Aurès, to mean the customs, mainly as regards penal matters, of the Kabyle and the Aures, to mean the traditions of the old Middle Eastern cultures and the other the traditions of the Turco-Mongol empires. The codes of the Mamluk Kaykabys, which were applicable to the whole Empire or to a particular region or social group. The practice in Islamic states of issuing official, codified kanun names has two apparent sources, one being the traditions of the old Middle Eastern cultures and the other the traditions of the Turco-Mongol khanates (see Kânün). To prevent abuses by officials, the old Iranian Empires established the practice of issuing legal clauses—particularly tax-laws—on stone, in places always visible to the public. This was possibly a tradition descended from the older Mesopotamian civilisations (see M. Tosun, Sumer, Babyl and Assyriularda Hukuk, in Belleten xxxviii/48 (1973), 563; W. Hinz, Steuerinschriften aus dem mittelalterlichen vorderen Orient, in Belleten, xliii/2 (1949), 745-2). Similarly, in Fez, the sultan, being the traditions of the old Middle Eastern cultures and the other the traditions of the Turco-Mongol empires, could have issued legal clauses in particular topics. In the collection of (KANUN) in the collection of taxes (Kiya Mazarandarâni, Resdâ-ye Falakhsyâ, ed. W. Hinz, 57). In the Mongol-Iranian Empire, the yasa [v. Kabyle, the qanun, the law, the term yasa, the term yasa, and the term yasak, continued as a name for collections of the old Iranian Empires established the practice of issuing legal clauses on a particular topic. In the 9th/10th century the term yasa was extended to refer to regulations which viziers and pashas had enacted (see Kânun), and in particular to the term yasa was extended to refer to regulations which viziers and pashas had enacted (see Kânun). While the Ottomans first occupied a newly conquered territory, they usually maintained existing kanun names and sometimes adopted them with slight modifications, in this way the codes of the Mamluk Kaykabys, the Aq-koyulu Usun Hasan and the Dulkadir 'Ali al-Dawla have reached us in their original forms under the name of Ottoman kanun names. An Aq-koyulu source confirms that Usun Hasan [v.] issued a penal kanun name for general use throughout his territory, whose application was compulsory (M. Schmidt-Dumont, Turkmenische Herrscher..., nach dem Tarih al-Giyâni, Freiburg 1970, 219; J. Woods, From clan to empire, 1758-1826, Princeton University, 1974). Usun Hasan's kanun names or yasas were current in eastern Anatolia, Adarbasâyân, 'Irak-i 'Arab and 'Irak-i 'Adjam (Sharaf Khan, Sharafnâme, ii, 120, cited by J. Woods, op. cit.). The Ottomans confirmed those in force in eastern Anatolia, applying them from 922/1516 to 955/1548. Thus the Ottomans, while abolishing Safarid yasas after the conquest of 'Irak, retained those of Usun Hasan [see H. Inalcik, Adletnamesleri, in Belleten, iii/54 (1965), 140-2]. The main purpose of these kanun names was to show the rates and methods of payment of 'süfi taxes and market taxes or bâdi [see TAMGA]. The Dulkadir (Dhu 'l-Kâdiriyeye) kanun names are essentially...
criminal kanunnames (see Ö. L. Barkan, Kanunlar, i, Istanbul 1943, 119-29). The Ottoman kanunnames for Cilicia, Syria and Egypt comprise the kanunname attributed to Kaythay (q.v.) dealing with 'urfî taxes, customs duties and gifts (see Barkan, op. cit., 200, 223, 226, 361, 364, 365, 370). Certain Indian collections of Sultanic laws and regulations, such as the Tüsükî attributed to Timûr (see Tüsükî-i Ti-mûrî, ed. Major Davy, Oxford 1783), the ʿĀrin-i Aḥbarî, or the ʿAbāhm-i ʿAṣâmîrî, are well known, but only the criminal code (kanunname) for Cilicia, Syria and Egypt comprises the kanunname intended to be enforced throughout the Empire. Apart from occasional legal clauses, obviously summarized from books. In particular, it fixes the amounts of fikh taxes levied by the sipdhis.

The opposition of the 'ulumâ to such compilations usually made the Sultans reluctant to give kanûns a permanent character by publishing them in codified versions. They preferred to issue kanûns in the form of single imperial decrees (fermdns) on a particular topic and, as a result, there are few codified kanûnnames. Mehemmed II (q.v.) appears to have been the first Islamic sovereign to issue a codified and officially promulgated kanûnname intended to be binding on posterity. In this he was perhaps conforming to the legal practice of the Turco-Mongol baghâns. He issued two kanûnnames, one for the reşîdî and one for state organisations.

Mehemmed II's kanûnname for the reşîdî aimed firstly to prevent the malpractices of the 'askerî (q.v.) class who gathered a number of taxes directly from the reşîdî, and secondly to fix the rates of taxes and money fines, and in this way to realise the state's ideal of bringing protective justice to the people. This kanûnname was issued on the pretext of fixing the rate of poll tax levied by the sipdhis and governors in settling disputes. The reşîdî kanûnname follows a specific pattern (for the theory that kanûnnames follow no set pattern, see Ö. L. Barkan, op. cit., liv-lxiii). The first three chapters contain criminal clauses applicable to both Muslim and non-Muslim reşîdîs. The arrangement of the subject matter is the same as in fîhbk books. In particular, it fixes the amounts of fines due to the 'askerî class from the reşîdî (see Inalcik, Osmanlılar da rûsûmu, in Belleten, xxii/29, 576-78). Added to the end of the third chapter are the rates of other taxes levied by the sipdhis decree (see Kraelitz, op. cit., clauses 11-18).

The fourth chapter of the reşîdî kanûnname lists the regular taxes which the reşîdî pay to the sipdhis. It comprises seven sections based on the seven duties which the reşîdî have to perform for the sipdhis and gives fixed taxes in lieu of these services (see Inalcik, op. cit.). This section again follows a clear pattern. It deals first of all with Muslim reşîdîs liable to cift (q.v.) tax. Then a separate section shows the organisation and obligations of the yârûks (kanûn-i yârûkhân) who were exempted from all services. The next section shows taxes paid by Christian reşîdîs liable to the ʿispândje (see Inalcik, Osmanlılar da rûsûmu, 602-8). The final section lists the sipdhis taxes, payable in town markets (Kraelitz, op. cit., clauses 9-28) and applicable to both Christians and Muslims.

In general, Ottoman kanûnnames were systematically drawn up according to the logic of the Ottoman tax and administrative system. Only kanûns added latter were contrary to the system. The four chapters in the kanûnname of the Conqueror, setting out taxes and relations between reşîdîs and sipdhis, follow the same system as the sanâjah kanûnnames and sbârîb registers. These lists, in turn, cift tax and similar imports, tithes (aštâb), orchard tax, beehive tax and the like, then taxes paid on animals and, lastly, fines (djârîm) and irregular taxes (bâdî-i haâd). Some sanâjah kanûnnames, like the kanûnname of Mehemmed the Conqueror, contain a supplement showing bâdî taxes (cf. the kanûnname of Aydınl in Barkan, op. cit., 6-18).

Most Ottoman kanûnnames can be classified, according to their form, under four main headings:

1. Kanûnnames in the form of decrees of the Sultan
   These were issued as fermdns or berâis in answer to particular administrative problems or needs, and required governors and sipdhis to put them into immediate effect. Most of them are in genuine kanûnname form and contain a number of clauses on a specific topic. Complete or abridged copies existed in official registers in the capital or in sipdhis' registers in the provinces. Valid official copies of the decrees could be issued from these sources (see Belleten, xi/4 (1947), 693-703).

   It is likely that such kanûns in the form of decrees were collected in book form to meet the needs of secretaries. The oldest known collection dates from the reign of Bayezîd II (see R. Anhegger and H. Inalcik (eds.), Kanûnname-yi ʿAbâhâm-i ʿAṣâmîrî, Ankara 1956). Other important collections, dating from the 10th/16th century are as follows: Library of the Topkapî Sarayî, MSS. Revan Nos. 1935, 1936; Istanbul University Library, MS No. T. 2753; British Museum, MS Or. No. 9503; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ancien fonds turc, MSS Nos. 34, 85; Sarajevo, Orientalni Institut, MS Turcica No. 3; Istanbul Bayezid Library, MSM Velîyûdîn No. 1970; Istanbul, Süleymanîye Library, MS Rehûlûtûtûbû, No. 1085).

2. Sanâjah kanûnnames
   The government of Ilkhanid Iran maintained separate registers showing taxes and regulations for each region, known as Kânûn-i mamâlûkî. The custom, no doubt, went back via the ʿAbbâsids to ancient Iran. The Ottomans continued to practice with their regional viyâyet or sanâjah (list) kanûnname.
   These kanûnnames were confirmed by the Sultan's cipher (şugḥra, q.v.) and placed at the beginning of the detailed (muассâl) cadastral registers of each province. They existed for provinces where the system of state (mûrîd) lands and timars (q.v.) was in force, with the primary aim of preventing and settling disputes between the reşîdîs and the timar-holders.
   They were like the Kanûnname in the form of decrees in that they were official and in force at a particular date. The beylerbeys' councils and sipdhis' courts had to give judgement in accordance with these codes.

   The arrangement of clauses in Ottoman sanâjah kanûnnames follows a specific pattern (see above).
   Sanâjah kanûnnames followed well-defined principles in the formulation of reşîdî taxes and land laws. These principles probably took on the character of a system in the first half of the 9th/15th century, or perhaps a little earlier and, under the title kânûn-i ʿothmânî, displayed the peculiarities of the Ottoman régime (see Inalcik, Sulêiman the Lawgiver, in Archivum Ottomanicum, i (1969), 128-35). Mehemmed the Conqueror was the first to have these principles codified in his reşîdî kanûnname which was to be enforced throughout the Empire. Apart from occasional legal clauses, obviously summarized from
țărnăvă in the form of decrees, the detailed cadastral registers from Mefcemmed the Conqueror’s reign contain no sandiqlăț țărnănmățe. The oldest surviving sandiqlăț țărnănmățe is that of Khudavendigăr (Bursa), dated 892/1487 (see Barkan, op. cit., 1-6).

The practice of placing at the front of the detailed cadastral surveys for each sandiqlăț separate țărnănmățe showing the țărnăvă in force in the sandiqlăț, dates from Bayezid II’s reign. The Khudavendigăr țărnănmățe of 892/1487 appears to be a model for later ones. Some sandiqlăț țărnănmățe have been collected and published (Barkan, op. cit., contains about 80 sandiqlăț țărnănmățe. Other collections are J. von Hammer, Des osmanischen Reichs Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung, i, Vienna 1815; Kanun-i kanun-name, Monumenta Turcica, series i, No. 1, Sarajevo 1957).

Since Ottoman Law was in general based on precedent, it is possible to divide sandiqlăț țărnănmățe into related groups based on chronology and geography. Taking the rate of taxation as a basis, we find that the țărnănmățe from the eyalet of Anadolu in western Anatolia form a group with the țărnănmățe of Khudavendigăr. Central Anatolia—Karaman, Icel and Ankara—forms a second category, similar to the first, whereas the sandiqlățs of eastern Anatolia—Malatya, Diyarbekir, Erzurum, Musul, Kharput and Mardin—and Syria form two separate groups.

The Rumelian sandiqlăț țărnănmățe form a special group. Here clauses from the typical țărnăn-i țăfnăți co-exist with Byzantine and Slav customary law and therefore, liable to tax exemptions (see Inalcik, Osmanliardta raııyet sıısıına, 594-601). In the 19th century these groups had ‘askeri status, but as their military importance declined in the 19th/20th century, they descended to țăfnă status and became subject no longer to their own, but to ordinary sandiqlăț țărnănmățe.

Secondly, certain groups engaged in production for the state had their own țărnănmățe for example the rice-field workers (elünkli) (for țărnănmățe, see Library of the Topkapı sarayi, Revan no. 1936) and the miners (ma‘dengli) (for țărnănmățe, see R. Anhieger, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bergbaus im osmanischen Reich, 2 parts and supplement, Istanbul 1943-5; N. Beldiceanu, Les actes des premiers sultans, ii, Règlements miniers, 1590-1575, Paris-The Hague 1964). Most of the miners’ țărnănmățe are translations of local, pre-Ottoman statutes. Prisoners-of-war settled in a particular place (oraklı țıllar) occupied a special position among these groups (see Barkan, Osmanlı imperatorluğunun toprak işliğinin organizasyonu iehilleri, in İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, i-3). Similarly, the gipsies of Rumelia were subject to their own țărnănmățe (Barkan, Kanunlar, 249-50).

4. țărnănmățe relating to state organisations

These form a third category. Meşmeded II’s țărnănmățe deal with state organisations (see M. Țărif [ed.], in TOEM supplement, Istanbul 1330; A. S. Tvettonova [ed.], Badăş al-Wa‘ba‘, ii, Moscow 1961, 277b-283b) states at the beginning that it was written to regulate the affairs of the sultanate. Its pattern follows the logic of the Ottoman system of government, dealing in one place with matters of the Palace, government and protocol. Its claims deal in turn with the form of government, its notables and their sphere of authority, their relationship with the Sultan, their ranks and degrees, promotion, salary, retirement and punishment. Meşmeded II’s țărnănmățe is the only one of this type. Late Sultans did issue regulations for state organisations, but they are not comprehensive. Later țărnănmățe and regulations on this topic are the compilations of statesmen and bureaucrats (among the most important are ‘Aynül ‘Ali Efendi, Kusunun-i ali ‘Othmân der külü ça yi meşhâm-i deťer-i divân, Istanbul 1280; the țărnănmățe of Nihâlbâm 1 Chadurraman Paşa, in MTV ill [1931], 494-544; the țărnănmățe of Eyüb Efendi, Istanbul University Library, MS T 724; Hetârfenn Hüseyin Efendi, Taḥkīs al-bayân fi kusunun-i ali ‘Othmân; see H. Wurm, Der osmanische Historiker Hüseyin b. Gâfer, genannt Hetârfenn, Freiburg 1971; i. H. Usuńcarlı (ed.), Kanun-ı țărnămă meşhâm-i deťer-i kââbânî, in Billeten, xv/v (1951), 361-99, and a longer version of this work, H. Hadzicbić, Rasprava Ali țălul ..., in Glasnik zemaljskog Muzej u Bosni i Hercegovini, ii, Sarajevo 1947, 146-73).

The Ottoman archives, however, contain the
Some of the works written to recommend reforms or as handbooks for Sultans or Grand Viziers contain detailed facts about kânûnûmes relating to state organisations (e.g. Lutfi Paşa, Kiâtâb-i mustedâh, ed. Yaşar Yücel, Ankara 1973; Hızır al-Mulâb, MS. Library of the Topkapı Sarayi, Revan 1622; see K. Röhrborn, Untersuchungen zur osmanischen Verwaltungsgeschichte, Berlin 1973; Köçü Beg, Râsâle, ed. A. A. Aksüt, Istanbul 1939; Şafi Mehmed Paşa, Nasâbât al-unmarâ, wa'l-unmarâ, ed. and tr. W. L. Wright, Princeton 1993. Works concerning Palace statutes and organisation: Mehmend Khâlif, Ta'rikh-i 'âtîmdânî, in TOEM, supplement, 1340; Ilyâs, Letif-i enderûn; A. 'Aṭâ, Ta'rikh-i 'Afdâ, Istanbul 1291-3). There are also kânûnûmes for particular aspects of state organisation, the Kânûnûn-i yeniteriyen (Library of the Topkapı Sarayi, MS Revan no. 1230; Istanbul University Library, MS no. T 3203), for example, dealing with the Janissaries. There are other kânûnûmes and kânûnûmâyên dealing with timars, treasury affairs, muhâlâ'as, customs, the mint, currency, the capî bûllarî, the 'ulâmâyê, cadastral surveys, military campaigns etc. (See Library of the Topkapı Sarayi, MSS Revan nos. 1935, 1936, Baghdad no. 346; Süleymaniye Library, Refülkütûbât no. 1004, Es'ad Efendi no. 2352, Bayezid Library, Velîyûddin Nos. 1969, 1970; Şehîd Ala Paşa, no. 3832; Istanbul University Library MS no. T 1438; Âtîf Efendi Library, Istanbul, no. 1734; Staatsbibliothek, Vienna, Mxtt. 478, H. O. 154; Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, ancien fonds turc, nos. 35, 85; Westdeutsche Staatsbibliothek, Marburg, Orient No. 2730; Staatsbibliothek, Munich, cod. turc. nos. 117, 118).

5. General kânûnûmâyên

This type of kânûnûmây was in force throughout the Empire. Mehemmed II's re'dîyâ kânûnûmây formed the nucleus of the codes of the following Sultans. This Kânûnûmây was promulgated under Bâyezîd II, in ca. 907/1501 in a much enlarged and modified version, under the title Kiâtâb-i kânûnûmây-i 'urfâyê-yi 'âtîmdânâyê (Koyunoglu MS facsimile edition, N. Beldiçaneu, Cûde de lois coutumières de Mehmed II, Wiesbaden 1967). It contains the amendments of Hersekâde Ahmed Paşa (q.v.) and forms the basis of the kânûnûmâyê later attributed to Sulayman I (see Inalcik, Addiletndmeler, 56; Suleiman the Lawgiver, 117-26; U. Heyd, ibid., 24-26). Their introduction and chapter headings are identical. It falls into three large chapters. The first chapter is a version of Mehemmed II's criminal code, extended and further systematised (Koyunoglu MS, 1-99; M. 'Arîf's edition, TOEM supplement, 1-10). The second chapter deals with the obligations of the sipâhî and laws affecting the sipâhî class. It then describes the sipâhî's rights over the re'dîyâ in their capacity of sahib-i re'yîyet and sahib-i arâ and the taxes which they received. This chapter also contains a bâdî kânûn related to bâdîyê and timar incomes, and a separate kânûnûmây on taxar and the piyây. The third chapter deals with the rights and obligations of the third chapter and the conditions of land tenure. Following this are special kânûnûmâyên for re'dîyâ groups performing military duties and subject to special statutes—nâshah, yûrûk, kaymanâ, etc. To conclude there are two special kânûnûmes obviously issued during the compilation of the kânûnûmây. One concerns illegal innovations (bidâ'at) in Kônîa, abrogated for contravening the kânûn-i 'ôtîmânî. The other contains regulations for collecting Palace firewood.

The compilation of the kânûnûmây seems to have followed this pattern. To start with, it makes large scale borrowings from the Kûdâvendîgâr kânûnûmây of 892/1487, and similarly from the kânûnûmâyên of the sandjarûks of Anadolu, Kârânâm and Rûm (Amasya). It also has frequent references to the kânûnûmâyên of frontier sandjarûks such as Vîdîr and Semendere (Smederevo) in Rumelia, obviously because laws outside the kânûn-i 'ôtîmânî were current in these regions. Clauses from the cadastral register of Semendere were added directly to the kânûnûmây (see Inalcik, Suleiman the Lawgiver, 120). Tax laws had a regional character, and for this reason the kânûnûmây contains no general regulations on the subject. It was rather in the fields of land law, timar holdings and criminal law that the kânûnûmây was of universal application.

Newly-issued kânûnûmes in the form of decrees and new sandjarûk kânûnûmes led to later modifications and re-issues of this kânûnûmây in the names of the Sultans following Bâyezîd II. Although Selîm I's kânûnûmây (for various versions see A. S. Vrtètînîva, Kniga zakonov Sultan Selima I, Moscov 1969) has not been widely publicised, the later version promulgated under Sulayman I has received widespread attention (for copies see U. Heyd, ibid., 24-42). In the period of the_recommendations-Tülükîdet made important changes in the general kânûnûmây, and a number of manuscripts contain kânûnûmes collected under his name (e.g., Süleymaniye Library, Refülkütûbat no. 1004). During the era of decline following the 16th/17th century, the kânûnûmây of Sulayman I came to be idealised as the foundation of the classical Ottoman régime (see Inalcik, Suleiman the Lawgiver, 105; Na'mân, Ta'rikh, v. 101). Nevertheless, the decay of the timar régime made it obsolete and in the 11th/17th century a new kânûnûmây replaced it, called kânûnûmây-yi 'efzad-i sulâhî. This was a detailed compilation widely used in Ottoman courts of the period. (There is no critical study of this text. Most versions end with a ferân dated 1084/1673 concerning taxes such as theches ("ughr")—cf. MTM, i, 330. Some versions are shorter. One version, with additions, is printed: MTM, i, 9-112, 305-48. Other important versions: Istanbul University Library MSS T 398, 400, 475, 969, 2664, 2730, 3586, 4107, 5828, 5845, 5846, 9623, 9550, 9737; Bursa Public Library, no. 1966; Library of the Topkapı Palace, Bağdad no. 347, 404; Istanbul, Millet Library, Fatih, Al Emiri no. 72, 76, 80; Tirana National Library no. 154 ff. 27-47; Vienna, Staatsarchiv, Kraft no. 470; Vienna, Staatsbibliothek, Flügel no. 149, ff. 1-43; Munich, Staatsbibliothek, cod. turc. nos. 113, 114, 115; Marburg, Westdeutsche Staatsbibliothek, Hs. or. quart. nos. 1023, 1102, 1835, Hs. or. oct. nos. 809, 843, 829; Sofia, National Library, Turkish MSS 1332/166, facsimile edition by G. Galabov, Turski Izvori . . ., Sofia 1961, 167-200; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, E. Blochet, supplement, 68, 71, 78, 79, 1311; British Museum, Rieu Add. 767, 7840; Istanbul University Library, Fatih no. 5424; Kônîa, Koyunoglu Museum, no. 12337, 11337, 12396, 12334, 12395; Ankara, Library of the Turkish Historical Society, Y 327, 325, 396).
The definite compilation of this Kânûnîmâme dates from 1084/1673, obviously as an answer to the new problems of the age of decline, in particular to land problems. Kânûns which the nîşâhîdî Dîjelâzîdî formulated in the classical age, and formulated by Nîşâhîdî Hâmzâ Pasha, the author of many reforming bânûns in the late 16th century, occupy a large part of this Kânûnîmâme. Similarly, bânûns promulgated between the years 1012/1603 and 1019/ 1609 are among the new features of this Kânûnîmâme which also makes mention of the Sultan Ahmed Khân. Another important point distinguishes it from earlier collections. This is the inclusion from the time of Ahmed I, of mûfîsî fetûds on topics previously dealt with by the nîşâhîdîs, in particular problems of land law and sometimes the law concerning sipâhsîs (see MÎM, i, 320). The compiler obviously drew them mainly from the fetûd collection of Pir Mîhmed [q.v.] (see Zâhîh al-Kudât, MS, Library of the Topkâpi Sarayî, Revan no. 1938; Süleymaniye, Esad Efendi, no. 1094; for details of the work see, Heyd, op. cit., 189-90), Şevîhü Ulî-Islâm Yâhûb (there are many copies of his fetûd collection, e.g. Süleymaniye, Esad Efendi, no. 1088; Beşîr Ağa no. 332) and Şevîhü Ulî-Islâm Bahâ (one copy of his fetûd collection, Library of the Topkâpi Sarayî, Revan no. 1938, f. 153-156).

The Kânûnîmâme-yi Dîjelâzîdî differed from the bânûn- nâmîs of the classical age which nîşâhîdîs prepared and the Sultan ratified, and which contained only 'ûrfî bânûns [see KÂNØN].

It has been claimed that none of the general bânûn-nâmîs was an official code to be enforced in the courts and offices of state (see Barkan, Kanunnlar, i, xxxiv; Osmanîs imperato-ruşânda sîrasî ekonomisinin hukukî ve mâli esaslarî, i: Kanunnlar, Istanbul 1943; H. İnalçîk, Osmanîs hukukuna giriş, in Sivasal Bilgiler Fakûltesi Dergisi, xiii (1958); idem, Suleimân the Lawgiver and Otto- man law, in Archivium Ottomanicum, i (1960), 105-38; U. Heyd, Studies in Old Ottoman legal law, ed. V. L. Ménage, Oxford 1973; N. Belicânû, Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans les manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris, Paris-The Hague 1960-4). (H. İnalçîk)

KANURI. The name Kanuri, applied to both a language and to a people, appears to be of recent origin. The earliest known written occurrence is in the 18th century. The Kanuri language belongs apparently to the Teda-Daza group, mainly located east of Lake Chad. The most recent hypothesis is that Kanembu, the language of Kanem [q.v.], evolved from various older Daza languages, as speakers of these moved south into Kanem; and that Kanuri in turn developed, partly through the influence upon Kanembu of the Chadic family spoken west of Lake Chad, among nomadic and non-nomadic speakers as they moved gradually southwest into Bornô. Kanembu is still regarded as the classical language of tafsîr [q.v.] in Bornô. The Kanuri language achieved widespread importance through the political power of Bornô, the Islamic prestige of that state, and its position at the southern end of the ancient trans-Saharan highway to Tripoli.

The Kanuri people have undergone a similar development. Traditions speak of Sayîf b. Dhi Yazar [q.v.], the great Arab folk hero, becoming leader of the Magumi nomads, and of the Magumi gradually establishing their ascendency over a number of other groups in the Kanem region. The emergence of some of organized state, embracing disparate groups, in Kanem, which may be assigned to the 9th or 10th centuries A.D., is now seen less as the result of the imposition of rule by nomad immigrants than as a disorganized local peoples than as the interaction between nomadic and settled. Early Sefawa rulers, i.e., reputed descendants of the perhaps legendary Sayîf, who are probably more accurately to be regarded as heads of the Sefawa lineage of the Magumi clan, married women of various groups which were later to help make up the Kanuri, and the children of these non-Magumi women succeeded to the kingship, which was of the “divine” pattern. Sedentarisation advanced; the first towns in Kanem are mentioned in the 12th century.
Whether the name Kanuri may properly be used of the people of Kanem at this stage is a moot point, though many recent authorities do so. The further movement of people into Bornū, the region southwest of Lake Chad, had apparently begun early. Both Ibn Khaldūn and Ibn Baṭṭūta knew the name Bornū; and in the 1390s the ruler of Kanem and his court themselves tied into Bornū, driven from Kanem by their rivals, the Baluṭa [q.v.]. Gradually Bornū, rather than Kanem, became the centre of gravity in the area, even when the old Kanem capital, Njimi, was recaptured in the 15th century, the Sefawa never returned to settle there. In Bornū, a remarkable process of amalgamation went on, facilitated by the absence of natural boundaries, and involving immigrants from Kanem, the local peoples (loosely called the So or So [q.v.], nomadic arrivals and others, and large numbers of slaves from various quarters. From this melting pot came the Kanuri proper, far more homogeneous by the 18th century than Kanem, became the centre of gravity in the region southwest of Bornū, see the article BORNU. The process of assimilation continues until today: the outward sign of it is the adoption of the Kanuri language. The Kanuri are thus, like the Hausa [q.v.], less a tribe in the customary sense than a group of people of diverse origins bound together by a common language. When, earlier in the 19th century, Al-‘Amin al-Kānemī [q.v.] rescued Bornū from the threat of the Fulani [see BULU] gūjdūd, his chief reliance was upon his Kanembu troops, and these were quite distinct from the Kanuri of Bornū.

The Lake Chad area has from a very early date benefited from the trans-Saharan route running north through Kawar and Fazzān [q.v.] to Tripoli. Slaves were the principal export. Al-Yaḥṣūbī [q.v.], in the 3rd/9th century, refers to Zawīla, then the centre of Fazzān, where slave traders even from Asia were already established. Al-‘Iṣṭāqrī [q.v.] in the 4th/10th century contrasts the slaves passing through Zawīla with those from eastern Africa, the Zanj [q.v.] among them, and finds those from the Central Sudan blacker and better than all the others. It is likely that the slave revolt in Trākī in the late 3rd/9th century, particularly associated with Zawīla, then the centre of Fazzān, where slave traders even from Asia were already established. Al-Bakrī [q.v.] in the 5th/11th century mentions slave exports from Fazzān. Ibn Baṭṭūta comments upon the excellent slave girls from Bornū, its eunuchs (fīṣyāt) and saffron-dyed fabrics. Leo Africanus [q.v.] gives an interesting description of trade in Bornū at the beginning of the 10th/16th century. Barbary merchants bringing horses for the king in exchange for slaves. Trade in slaves and other commodities continued until the end of the 19th century.

Islamic penetration in the Chad region came from the north, along the trade route. ʿUkba b. ʿAbārī [q.v.] reached Kawar in 46/666-7. Al-Bakrī mentions the descendants of Umayyad refugees living in Kanem; legends of the Umayyad diaspora are, however, frequent, and should not always be taken seriously. The first Muslim ruler, or maī, among the Sefawa was Humāil, probably in the late 5th/11th century. Al-Maqrīzī [q.v.], on the contrary, affirms that Dunama Dibbalemi, the famous 7th/13th century maī, under whom the Kanem empire reached its peak, was the first convert. Dunama Dibbalemi is said to have opened the muṣaf, or sacred talisman, of Kanem, thus precipitating civil strife; it is possible, though the evidence is scanty, that he was trying to reform local Islam, hitherto too tolerant of non-Islamic survivals. Several maïs made the pilgrimage, among them Humāil’s successor (also named Dunama), who went twice to Mecca and was dramatized on his third journey. In the 1240s, perhaps during the reign of Dunama Dibbalemi, a hostel for pilgrims and students from Kanem was established in Cairo. It is likely that two maïs in the 8th/14th century were pilgrims. Idrīs Aluwa, towards the end of the 10th/16th century, renewed the tradition, which flourished particularly in the 15th/17th and 18th centuries. After the shift to Bornū, the Kanuri began to influence their western neighbours, the Hausa. Those Hausa words for writing and reading, as well as for gun, city wall, market, and a number of other key elements, are borrowed from Arabic through Kanuri, or from Kanuri itself. Constitutional patterns also spread; the title galadima, for example, originally the governor of the western provinces of Bornū, was adopted in Sokoto, and may be found in places as distant as Fazzān and Adamawa. At the time of the Fulani gūjdūd, Kanuri Islam was harshly criticized by Fulani critics, but Sultan Bello of Sokoto nevertheless admitted that the earlier rulers had been good and devout Muslims, many among them pilgrims.

Kanuri-speakers are found in various adjacent areas, such as Mandara, Baghirmi and Kwaraw. In Kwaraw, frequented in the 15th century, Muhammad al-Ḥākim, Abu and Tuareg, Kanuri: provide most of the u lamā. For further details, particularly on the later history of Bornū, see the article BORNŪ.


KANZ, BANU ’L (AWLĀD AL-KANZ), a clan descended from Rabī’ī tribesmen who migrated to the region of Aswān in the 3rd/9th century, intermarried with Bedja [q.v.], and ultimately gained control of the gold-mines of al-ʿAllāk [q.v.]. The eponym of the clan, whose personal name was Abu ’l-Makārim Hibat Allāh, received in 957/1007 from the Fāṭimid caliph al-Ḥākim [q.v.] the honorific of Kanz al-Dawla for his services in capturing the rebel Abū Rakwa. The title continued to be borne by his successors. As marcher-chiefs of the frontier of Islam.
with the Bedja and Nubians, the Banu l-Kanz were not easily controlled by the rulers in Cairo. Both Badr al-Djamali [q.v.] and al-Adil Sayf al-Din [q.v.] undertook operations against them in 460/1070-7 and 570/1174 respectively. During the Ayyubid and early Mamluk periods, the clan extended its power southwards into the Nubian kingdom of al-Mukurra, which was (after 717/1317) ruled for a time by a Kanz al-Dawla. With the subsequent disintegration of al-Mukurra, Banu l-Kanz appear to have directed their energies against the main northwestern frontier. In the late 8th/14th and early 9th/15th centuries they fought repeatedly against the Mamluk governors of Aswan, and devastated the town and its vicinity. Their domination was countered only by another tribe, Hawsara [q.v.], a fraction of which was established in Upper Egypt by Barluki [q.v.], ca. 782/1380-1. The arabized Nubian tribe of Kunz, living between Aswan and Kurusk (with some branches also in the Sudan), claims descent from Banu l-Kanz.


**KAPAN** [see also ı ğa r a c h]:

**Kapıl,** literally "gate" in Turkish, which by extension means "Ottoman Porte", that is, the sultan's palace, and is also used for the grand vizier's palace and the seat of government. The word kapıl was used concurrently with the Arabic bāb (e.g., bāb-i ğa r [q.v.] and the Persian darād (e.g., dar-ı devlet, der-ı siye, der-ı sefād). It appears, however, that unlike bāb and der, was rarely used with a non-Turkish epithet or determinative. On the other hand, it is very frequently employed to designate military or civil functions directly subordinate to the "Porte", e.g., kapıl sulları, literally "slaves of the Porte", that is, the sultan's troops, and kapıl kethūdası, or kapıl kāhāyaç, an agent "close to the Porte" of a high dignitary of an Ottoman subject or vassal. Originally two in number, the kapıl sulları were entitled to a timar of 19,000 aspers at the end of the 16th century. The most important of them who bore the title of bāš kapıl sulları, received a dirik of 400,000 aspers and were included among the săngālāb bey. They were responsible for all matters concerning the guards: nomination, retirement, transfer and promotion. Originally two in number, the bāš kapıl sulları were increased to 4, then to 6 in the reign of Mehemmed III.

After the destruction of the janissaries in 1826, only 30 bāš kapıl sulları were retained, increasing to 40 in 1839 and subordinate to the imperial stable. Both title and function disappeared in 1908.

**Bibliography:** I. A., s.v. kapıs (by I. H. Uzuncarsılı); Mouradacea d'Ohsson, Tableau général de l'Empire ottoman, Paris 1791, vii, 57; ii, 1; I. H. Uzuncarsılı, Osmanlı devletinin saray teşkilatı, Ankara 1945, 396-407 (numerous references to Turkish sources); M. Zeki Pankal, Osmanlı Tarih Devrimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü, ii, 167-9 (art. kapıs). (R. Mantran)

**KAPLAN GİRAY I,** Crimean Tatar Khán, the third son of Hâşdi Selim Giray [q.v.], born on Rhodes in Şaban 1091/July 1686. In 1108/1697 he became temporary commander of the military forces in Buğlak [q.v.] and made a successful raid into Poland. During the negotiations at Carlowicz, he remained in defense of Ferah-Kerman, but Örek-Timur, the beg of the rebel Shirins, forced him to take refuge in Kiliya (Rafiv-UL-Abhir 1112/October 1699). He was afterwards appointed military commander of Circassia, where he fought the Kalmucks (1700) and the Beslenye Circassians (Dhu 'l-ḥidjdja 1712/ May 1701). However, Dawlat Giray did not want to...
promote him to the rank of nuradin (nur al-din) [q.v.], so he fled to the Ottoman Pasha in Kefe (Feodosiya). Dawlat Giray's influence at the Porte was instrumental in the decision to exile him to Rhodes, but on his father's request he was sent to Yanbolu. When his father became Khan on 26 Shawwal 1113/26 January 1702, he appointed him nuradin. Kaplan Giray marched against the former Khan, who had rebelled with the support of the Nogay tribes. The civil war came to an end when the Nogay mirzads deserted Dawlat Giray. On the death of Selli Giray, his second son Ghazi Giray became Khan and, on 3 Ramadan 1166/30 December 1704, he made Kaplan Giray kalghay [q.v.]. In contrast to Dawlat Giray and the new Khan, Ghazi Giray, who followed the mirzads of the Crimea in pursuing a hostile policy towards Russia, Kaplan Giray was prepared to support the Ottoman government's policy of peaceful relations. It was true that in Muḥarram 1119/April 1709 he was appointed Khan. Leaving the Russians free to act against Sweden, Kaplan Giray led a campaign against the Circassians, but was lucky to escape with his life when he fell into an ambush which they had set. The Sultan deposed him at once (Sha'ban 1120/November 1709), and his rival Dawlat Giray became Khan in his place. Eventually, the problem of the Crimean wars was solved when the Russian tsar Peter the Great signed a peace treaty with the Sultan in 1125/1713. He sent a force under the nuradin of the Ottomans' more expeditions, but the rebellions of the Circassians and the Nogays prevented his taking part in the Austrian campaign of 1128/1716, and he was again deposed from the khanate in Dhul-Qa‘da/November of the same year. The rebels who overthrew Ahmad III [q.v.] in 1143/1730 secured his re-accession, but since he afterwards became a major force in ousting the rebels, he kept his influence on the Porte. Under Muhammad III, there were clashes with the Russians in Daghistan. Crimean forces with the support of the Çeçens [q.v.] repulsed a Russian attack. In 1148/1735, on the insistence of the Porte, the Khan personally campaigned in Daghistan, but at this moment, Russian and Cossack forces advanced to Or-kapi (Perekop). However, the mirzads of the Crimea, like the Nogays, were hoping, by remaining neutral, to escape invasion and were in contact with the Russians. Ottoman sources claim that Kaplan Giray supported this policy (TV, xiv, 138), but this does not seem to be true (V. Smirnov, i, 127). He, in fact, requested military aid for the Crimea from Istanbul and tried to divert the Kalımds from their alliance with the Russians. The Ottoman commander in the Crimea, Ibrahim Pasha, agreed with him in these policies, but in Sha'ban 1184/November 1770 a decree for the Khan's deposition came from Istanbul, and in 1185/July 1771 Kaplan Giray died of plague at the age of 32.


KAPLAN GIRAY II, Crimean Tatar Khan (Shawwal 1189-Sha’ban 1189/Feb.-Nov. 1770). He was appointed nuradin (nur al-din) in 1182-1183/1768-1769 and Khan in Shawwal 1183/February 1770. He sent his kalghay and nuradin to the Crimea to defend it against the Russians, while the Ottoman commander Khâlid Pasha appointed him to the campaign intended to expel the Russians from Boghdan (Moldavia). He was unsuccessful against the Russian artillery on the Prut, and retired to Kalîm, whilst Rumyantsev crossed the Prut and routed the Ottoman-Crimean forces. The indiscipline of the soldiers prevented the commander and the Khan from carrying out their plans for a counter-attack; the fortresses of Kiliya, Bender (Bendery) and Issaill fell to the Russians, whom the Nogays then joined in Buhçak. After facing a siege in the fortress of Özi (Ochakov), Kaplan Giray was eventually able to reach the Crimea. Here, in the summer of 1184/1770, the kalghay İslâm Giray and the Ottoman commander İbrahim Pasha drove the enemy from before the fortress of Or-kapi (Perekop). However, the mirzads of the Crimea, like the Nogays, were hoping, by remaining neutral, to escape invasion and were in contact with the Russians. Ottoman sources claim that Kaplan Giray supported this policy (TV, xiv, 138), but this does not seem to be true (V. Smirnov, i, 127). He, in fact, requested military aid for the Crimea from Istanbul and tried to divert the Kalmucks from their alliance with the Russians. The Ottoman commander in the Crimea, Ibrahim Pasha, agreed with him in these policies, but in Sha'ban 1184/November 1770 a decree for the Khan's deposition came from Istanbul, and in 1185/July 1771 Kaplan Giray died of plague at the age of 32.
Turkish classified in two types:stüt üst ü ilâdja (open hot springs) and kapall ilâdja. It is possible that colloquial usage telescoped kapall ilâdja (covered hot springs) into kapALLDJA.

Hot and mineral springs are found not only in Anatolia but also in Czechoslovakia and European countries formerly under Ottoman rule such as Hungary, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. The medicinal properties of some of these kapall ilâdja and mineral springs have been recognized from very early times; for this reason, miracles were attributed to them and it was believed that each hot spring was protected by its own deity. There were sacred cleaning and washing places in all Indian temples; the early peoples of Anatolia, the Greeks and the Romans made use of hot springs in different ways, even building special washing places in all Indian temples; the early peoples of Anatolia, the Greeks and the Romans made use of hot springs in different ways, even building special baking baths and even building new ones. In time they evolved a special kapall ilâdja architecture, a building divided into three parts: dressing room, rest room and the bath proper.

Some kapAllDjas in Turkey were built by the Anatolians themselves and are still in use today, for example Karakurt (Kuşehr) built in 529/1135, Yoncali (Kutahya) built in 630/1233, Ilgm (Konya) built in 633/1236, and Eskihir. Other kapAllDjas in north-eastern Turkey were built by the Ak-Koyunlu rulers late in the 8th/14th century, such as those in Erzurum (Evlîyah Celebi, ii, 203; I. Hakki Konyah, Sarajevi 1952). The presence of a kapAllDja (germedbe fâplldja) in the Persian text in Ilgm (Konya) led to the foundation of a town there ( Ibn Bibi, Taârîh-âlî-î Saldîgah, Recueilli de Textes Relatifs à l'Histoire des Seljoucides, iv, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden 1902, 150). A beautiful building was erected; among the people who came for treatment was Djalal al-Dîn Rumi, the famous mystic. His permission to anyone to enter the Inner Palace was granted; among the people who entered was his disciple Ewliya Celebi (Ewliya Celebi, ii, 223; I. Hakki Konyah, Istanbul 1963, 434, 435). "The ghazal kapall ilâdja" Mehmed Câvuoçuâli, Zât'inÂn Leydîfî, in Edeviyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edeviyat Dergisi, xviii (Istanbul 1970), 7.


KAPU AGHASI, KAPU AGHASI (or Bâb al-Sâ'de Ḩâghsa), the senior officer in the Ottoman Sultan's Palace, until the dâr al-sâ'de Ḩâghsâ (q.v.) began to gain ascendancy in the late 10th/16th century. Like the other Palace Ḩâghsâ in continuous service, the Sultan himself selected him from the eunuchs. He had the authority to petition the Sultan for the appointment, promotion and transfer of Palace servants.

Kapall ilâdja architecture developed greatly in the Ottoman period; the building was now divided into four parts: dressing room, rest room (îâmehân), cooling room and the bath proper with private cubicles. The whole building was now connected by hot springs. Generally, the Turkish type of kapall ilâdja contains large pools and hot water pours from a hole into the pool draining out by another hole. The kapall ilâdja architecture of the Ottomans developed in Bursa where the first Turkish kapall ilâdja, called Eski Kapall ilâdja, was built by Murad I. Since it was established on the site of an old Byzantine kapall ilâdja, it was believed (see A. Gabriel, Une Capitale Turque Brousse (Bursa), Paris 1938, 155-70) that Eski Kapall ilâdja showed typical Byzantine architectural influence.

Pointing to the originality of its plan and technical construction, some Turkish art historians (Ekrem Hakki Ayverdi, Osmanlı mimarîsinin İlk Deyri, 630- 850 (1230-1402), Istanbul 1966, 280, 281, 282, 283) reject this idea, asserting that the architecture of Eski Kapall ilâdja is typically Turkish. Some kapAllDjas built in the Ottoman period are still in use in Turkey and in countries previously under Ottoman rule. The most famous are in Turkey: Buda (Budapest), Yezhildere, (Rudas) built in 1556, Hâmmâm of Vell Bey (Csarzar) and Taârîh-âlî Saldîgah (Evlîyah Celebi, loc. cit., vi, 242, 243, 249; V. Bierhauer, Les Bains Turcs en Hongrie, Budapest 1943). Some Ottoman kapall ilâdjas can be seen in Bulgaria: near Sofia (J. von Hammer, Rumeli und Bosna, Vienna 1812, 51, 88), Islîmîye, Yeni Zâgka, and in Bosnia-Hercegovina (H. Krsevlâ-Êi, Banya u Bosni i Hercegovini, 1462-1916, Sarajevo 1952).


As the sole mediator between the Sultan and the world outside the Palace, he sat at the gate known as the Inner Gate or Bâb al-Sâ'de ("Gate of Felicity") which divided the Inner (enderun) from the Outer (birûn) Palace. His office lay to the right of this gate. It was through him that the Sultan transmitted his permission to anyone to enter the Inner Palace and his commands to the government (Kânûn-âmâm of Mehemîd the Conqueror, TOEM, suppl. 1330/1923). The kapu Ḩâghsâ had the rank of vizier and in ceremonies took his place below the Grand Vizier and the shâykh al-îslâm (q.v.). Nevertheless, his daily pay of 100 aâches (q.v.) was well below the Ḩâghsâ of the Janissaries' 500 aâches (for other salaries see I. H. Uzunçar-şî, Osmanlı devletîsinin saray tevhîdî, Ankara 1945, 355).

In pre-Ottoman usage the post was known in the, 570 KAPU AGHASI — KAPU AGHASI
earliest Islamic states, as hadībī, hadībī al-hasdībī or amīr hadībī. In later times it acquired the titles hadībī al-sandād, amīr hadībī al-rūm, and hadībī al-sandād (see M. F. Köprüli, THIM, i, 208-217; hadībī in EI2; D. Ayalon, in St. Isl. xxxviii, 107-56). In the Turkish states of Central Asia it was known as agahī or sometimes ulugh hadībī (for its importance in Turkish states see Kütadgu Bilig, ed. R. R. Arat, Ankara 1959, 181-7). In the Ottoman Empire this official never, as in the ‘Abbasid and Mamluk states, annexed the role of commander of the Ottoman fleet and of supreme judge to hear non-sharia cases in the Sultan’s name. Nor as in the Saldık administration, did he ever overstep his position as chief palace official or chamberlain. To ensure that the Ottoman Sultan’s authority should remain inviolate, the commandery of his personal troops was delegated to the agahī of the Janissaries and the duty of hearing complaints to the Grand Vizier. Great pains were taken to keep these functions separate.

Nevertheless, the kapu agahī must have exercised considerable influence in the state. He played a vital part in the accession of Sultans, and was the ruler’s close adviser. Besides, he must have had some influence and authority as the one-time officer of the commandery and governors graduating from the Inner Palace. The kapu agahī’s power and influence in the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries was compared to the Grand Vizier’s (Kitāb-i mustaṭṭāb, ed. Y. Yücel, Ankara 1974, 44). His influence increased yet further when, in the reign of Sülüymān I, the superintendence of the waqfs of Mecca and Medina and later of about 70 large mosques passed to an office under his control. However, their influence decreased at the end of the 10th/16th century when, at the instigation of the waqī‘ sulūm, this superintendence passed to the dār al-sa’āde agahī. In 905/1537, this official became independent of the kapu agahī, eventually rising to the position of senior palace official. In 1116/1704, with the transfer of his powers to the siltādār (q.v.), the kapu agahī declined into insignificance.

In the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries, the kapu agahī could transfer to service outside the Palace and receive the highest governorships of the Empire, such as the beglerbegī-ships of Rumelia or Egypt. Khādīm ʿAlī, Khādīm Sinān, Khādīm Sulaymān and Khādīm Ahmad (q.v.) who are reckoned among the great statesmen of the early period of Ottoman history, are famous examples. Two more, Fīрид Ḥusayn and Mergān, are well known as founders of city quarters and charitable institutions during the reign of Bayāzīd II (q.v.) (for details of their waqfs see E. H. Ayverdi and Ö. L. Bark, Istanbul vaḵšfsa taḥrīr defteri, İstanbul 1970). From the second half of the 10th/16th century, the kapu agahī began to intervene more and more in state affairs, and became a bitter rival of the Grand Vizier in the power struggle (Meḥmed, Taʿrīkh-i şīrāzi, TOEM, suppl., 29, 39). Gazarīf Ağa, who was kapu agahī for 30 years in the late 10th/16th century is particularly noteworthy.

To judge from the entries in the Mūhimme Defteri, the term Kapuçan Paşa became current only towards 1575/1576 (when ‘All Paşa, the beglerbegī of Algiers, is referred to as Ġidżārī beq beglerbegī ve kapuçan paşa: see, e.g., Mūhimme, vol. 7, nos. 502, 507, 587, 752). Strictly speaking, therefore, it is erroneous to refer to earlier naval commanders as Kapudan Paşa: ‘All Paşa’s predecessor, Piyâle Paşa (who was granted the rank of vezir, and thus had a seat in the Divān, see İ, s.v., Piyâle Paşa, by Ş. Turan), first bore the title Kapudan Beg (Başbakanlık Arşivi, Kamil Kepeci, Ruşs register no. 214, p. 17); he is later referred to as Ġidżārī beq beglerbegi and as vezir ve Kapuçan (see, e.g., Mūhimme, vol. 1, no. 276; vol. 6, no. 112; vol. 7 nos. 138, 160).

In earlier days, the commander of the fleet stationed at Gelibolu (q.v.) had had the title Derya Begi [see DERYA BEGI], being at the same time sanjakbeği of the İzmir of Gelibolu. The Gelibolu register of 1751 uses the term re′fis kapuçan to designate the commander of the fleet (F. Kurtoğlu, Gelibolu yören ve tarihi, İstanbul 1938, 51). Gelibolu remained the principal naval base until the time of Sultan Selim I,
who ordered that a new fleet be constructed in the "new arsenal" at Istanbul (Terâne-i Âmire) in 92/1517 under the supervision of Dişdar Kapudan (cf. Ş. Tekindâğ, Hatît Terânesinde inâ-i edinin iiâ Osmanîman donanmas ve Cafer Kapudan’ın arzısı, in Bellegiler Türk Tarhi Dergisi, no. 7 (Nisan 1969), 66-70.

When Barbarossa (Khayr al-Dîn [q.v.]) entered the service of the Sultan in 94/1534, he was given the beylerbeyî of the eyalet of DJezârî (Algeria). This eyalet later became the seat of the kapudan pasha. Later on, two boz, Aynabakhti, Karll-eli, Mizistre and Midilli from the beglerbeglik of Anadolu, and those of Eghri-i, 94 ff.). The sandjâfs of Kodja-eli, Sughla and Bigha evâdlet later became the seat of the kapudan pasha. Twice, in 1026/1617 and 1027/1618 the sandjâfs of Saktö, Naksha and Mehdiye were also attached to it. In the first half of the 11th/17th century, the eyalet of the kapudan pasha consisted of twelve sandjâfs (cf. Ş. Turan, XVII. yüzylnda Osmanlı Imparatörliğinin irdar ta tramalı, in Atatürk Üniversitesi 562 Yüllü, 204).

The kapudan pasha’s residence was the Divânîhane of the Arsenal in Istanbul. His main duties were to oversee the Arsenal, to supervise all matters relating to the Ottoman fleet, to govern the eyalet of the kapudan pasha and to make all the necessary appointments in it. This entailed his visiting and inspecting each sandjaf annually. He also had to protect merchant ships against the activities of pirates in the Mediterranean and in the Black Sea (cf. Tekîfî ‘Abdürrahman Paşa Kanûnînâmî, in MTV, iii (1313/1922), 536-6). If necessary, he also cooperated with the land forces (see, e.g., Mütimme, vol. 104, no. 193; vol. 105, nos. 48-49).

The office of Kapudan Pasha carried great prestige. In the 11th/17th century it had an annual revenue of 885,000 akce (Ewlyâ Celebi, Seyahat-nâme, v, 315; P. Rycaut, The Present State of the Ottoman Empire, London 1668, 54). It also received an income of 70,000 kurush from the islands of the Black Sea on which this fortress is built. The yövoda for lîstâm (Ewlyâ, v, 316; D’Ohsson, Tableau Général de l’Empire Ottoman, vii, Paris 1791, 442); this sum was increased to 300,000 kurugh in the late 12th-13th/18th-19th century. The success of the Ottoman naval forces always depended on the ability and the seamanship of the kapudans, particularly the Kapudan Paşa. In the 10th-16th century Ottoman supremacy in the Mediterranean seems to have been largely due to the kapudans. In the following centuries the empire lost its naval supremacy, though in principle only an admiral (Kapudan-ı Hümâyûn) or a chief of the Arsenal (T popover Kethîhidâs) or, at the lowest, a sandjâf-beyî of Rhodes was eligible to become Kapudan Pasha, appointments were now made regardless of the holder’s ability. In 1014/1605 Derwish Pasha, who was Chief Gardener (Bostandîlî bağlı), was appointed Kapudan-ı Dersî, together with the rais of vizier (cf. C. Orhunlu, Osmanlı tarihimde ait belgeler: Tellüsler, Istanbul 1960, 188); in 1184/ 1170 a certain officer in the Janissary corps (sekbân bağlı) was appointed Kapudan Paşa, although Hasan Kapudan was considered a better candidate in view of his earlier achievements (cf. Topkapı Sarayî Arşivi, Istanbul, nos. E. 464 and 1032).

With the naval reorganization of 1804, in the time of Selim III, the post of the chief of the Arsenal was abolished and the office of Superintendent of Naval Affairs (Umâr-i Bahriyye Neşrâretî) established (Saﬂvet, Umâr-i Bahriyye Neşrâretî, in TOFM, no. 21 (1359/ 1912), 1350 ff.). In 1826 the title Kapudan Pasha was altered to Umâr-i Bahriyye Nâşrî. Four years later the senior admiral (baş amirî) became the commander of the Ottoman navy, and naval affairs were supervised by the Bahriyye Nâşrî or Naval Minister.


(S. ÖZBARNAN)

**KARA**, the Turkish word for "black" or "dark colour" in general. It is commonly used with this meaning as the first component of geographical names e.g., Karâ Âmîd (on account of the black basalt of which this fortress is built), or a chief of the Arsenal (sekbân bağlı) as well. Moreover, the transliteration of this term has been used in names like Karâ Oğlan or Karâ Arslan. It is also in this sense that we have the name Karâ Khan which the Karâkhâns or Ilek-Khâns (cf. sv.) assumed in Central Asia.

**Bibliography:** von Hammer-Purgstall, GOR, i, 80; Kâşhîhari, Diwan lughât-i turk, iii, 187, tr. Atlay, iii, 221-2; O. Prittsk, "Qara, Studie zur türkischen Rechtssymbolik, in Zehi Velâi Togan’a armağan, Istanbul 1950-5, 239-63; Clasun, An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Tur- kik, 613; IA, s.v. (J. H. KRAMER)

In order to preserve a logical alphabetical sequence and to place one after the other those words which comprise the element karâ, these last have been placed together in a somewhat arbitrary fashion, so that e.g. karâba comes after all the words beginning with karâ. Moreover, the transliteration of this term has been unified, and is always written as karâ, the second vowel -a being written with an alif in Arabic orthography; however, the modern Turkish orthography with a short a is indicated where relevant.
The founder of the family, Mehemd Muhyi 1-Din Efendi, was given the lahad Karä-Celebi-zade after his maternal grandfather, Karä Ya'kub. He held several positions as a müdderris, was the teacher of Sulaymân I's son Muştafa, and bâdiî in Edirne and Istanbul. His pseudonym as a poet was Hidîrî, and he is said to have left a divân of poetry. He died in 965/1557. (2) Karä-Celebi-zade Hüseyîn Hüsâm al-Dîn Efendi was born in 940/1533 in Kütahya, was bâdiî-'asker (q.v.) of Anadolu and of Rumelî, and died in Bursa in 1007/1598. His son (3) Mehemd Efendi (970-1042/1562-1632) held several posts as bâdiî and müdderris, and became bâdiî-'asker of Anadolu in 1023/1614 and of Rumelî in 1029/1619. He wrote poetry under the pseudonym Zuhûrî and built a mosque in Bursa (Bâyâkelet Aşrîvî, Kamîl Recepî, Defter no. 257, p. 233). (4) Karä-Celebi-zade 'Abd al-'Azîz Efendi, who was born at the end of 1000/September 1594, was brought to Istanbul by his elder brother, Mehemd Efendi (3), and studied canonical law under the sheykh al-Islâm Şûnî Allah Efendi. He was müdderris in madrasas in Istanbul, Edirne and Bursa and in one of the madrasas of the Suleymaniye Mosque in Istanbul. Later he became a bâdiî, being appointed to posts in Yehişhîr, Mecca (1036/1620), Edirne (1040/1630) and finally, in 1043/1633, in Istanbul. He remained in this last post for only seven months before he was dismissed and sentenced to death; through the intervention of Grand vizier Bayram Paşa, however, he was reprimed and exiled to Cyprus (1044/1634). Eighteen months later he returned to Istanbul and first became bâdiî-'asker of Anadolu. On 13 Rabî‘l ‘Awwal 30/15 Rabî‘al ‘Awwal 1044 he was nominated bâdiî-'asker of Rumelî (Bâyâkelet Aşrîvî, Kamîl Recepî, Defter no. 258, p. 59), a function he actually assumed on 19 Rabî‘ 30/August 1548 (Sadârât-i Rumeli defterî no. 79, in the Şeriye Sicillerî Arşivi in Istanbul, is concerned with this period). In recognition of his role in Mehemd IV’s succession to the throne, he was given the title of sheykh al-Islâm, an award unprecedented in Ottoman history, in Ramaçan 1058/October 1648; he in fact took up the post on 11 Diümâdî 1 1057 (2 May 1651). While sheykh al-Islâm he restored a number of old practices relating to this function, revealed some subtlety in distributing bâdiî and müdderris posts, and re-organized sakîf matters. On 15 Ramaçan 1061/September 1652 he was dismissed and a week later exiled to the island of Saîlz (Chios). He was transported to Bursa in Diümâdî 1 1061/April 1652 and died there in Rabî‘ 1061/20 October 1652. ‘Abd al-'Azîz Efendi’s periodic falls from grace were the result of his interference in the internal politics of the period. His extant poetry, written under the pseudonym 'Azîzî, consists of a divân, a mathnawi entitled Gûlcâm-i nûyân which contains details about his life as a bâdiî of Istanbul and as an exile on Cyprus, works on sakîf (Hâll al-îçhîbân 'an 'âbâ al-îçhîbân, Kâlid al-Tâhâsî fî 'l-fîh al-Hânîfîyya ve Kâfî) and on the life of the Prophet (Mir'âbî al-saîfî, consisting of bisâs, which he dedicated to Murad IV, and Hüyât al-anbîyât), and translations, one in the field of ethics (Muşsinî's Akhîb) and one...
in šīra (K̄ašarīnš Faust̄h al-mabāwiyya). His fame, however, rests on his historical works. Of these, the Sulaymān-nāme, a history of Sulaymān I’s era which he dedicated to Sultan ʿĪbārīm, and the Rawḍat al-abrār, dedicated to Mehemmed IV, have been printed (Būlāk 1248). The latter work contains a description of the events from Adam to the time of Sultan ʿĪbārīm; the printed edition relies on a defective manuscript (O. Köprüli and I. Parmaksizoglu, ʿSeyhülislâm Kāra-Celebi-Cebebi Efendi, Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi, unpublished, doctoral thesis, 1944-5, no. 359, p. 18; this work is the most detailed study available of Kāra-Celebi-zāde and his family). According to M. H. Yınıc, Türkiye tarihi, (see Istanbul: Kültüphaneleri tari̇h coğrafya yasamalar hikayeleri, Topkapı Sarayı Türkiye yasamalar hikayeleri, and the catalogues of Flügel, Fert, Rieu and Togucht), the ḍiwalk of the Rawḍat al-abrār is more in the form of memoirs and narrates events down to 1068/ 1658. Another of his historical works is entitled Tarākhī-i feth-i Revān ve Bahgādād dar ʿAzāf-nāme and deals with Murād IV’s campaigns to Erīwān in 1635 and to Bahgādād in 1638. Many manuscripts of his works are extant in libraries in Istanbul and Europe (see Istanbul kültüphaneleri tarih coğrafya yasamalar hikayeleri, Topkapı Sarayı Türkiye yasamalar hikayeleri, and the catalogues of Flügel, Fert, Rieu and Togucht).

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Efendi is known to have been short in stature, stout, with a high-pitched voice, and a ruthless and inflexible character. In Bursa he constructed works, the Muftu ʿSuyū, carrying water from the Ulu Dagh to the town, and had the water distributed to forty different public fountains (O. F. Köprüli, ʿSeyhülislâm Kāra-Celebi-Cebebi Efendi ve Mufti ʿSuyū, in Belleten, xi (1947), 137-45).

Mahmûd Efendi (997-1083/1588-1653), the son of Mehmed Efendi, was known by the lacab ʿAbū ʿl-Fadl. He rose to the positions of ḍiwalk of Anadolu and Rumelif. In Istanbul he owned a madrasa in the Şehzāde-bahšī quarter (S. Eyice, Kaṭšāker Ebu ʿl-Fadl Mahmûd Efendi medresesi, in Tarih dergisi, x (1959), 147-62), and in Bursa a mosque in the Set-bahšī quarter (Başvekalet Arşivi, Divan-I Humayun, mūsārāt defteri no. 26, p. 78; and a teachers’ seminary (muʿālim-khāne (ibid., Defter no. 25, p. 183).

Uḥmān Efendi (s. 1062/1651), son of the above, held several posts as ḍiwalk. (7) Abīm朱īd Nڶndim (see ʿNdin), the famous poet of the 18th century, is related to the family of the Kāra-Celebi-zāde through his mother.


(Nejat Gőyńc) KARADAGH, the Turkish name for the land of Crna Gora (Montenegro), at present one of the six republics of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, located in the southwestern part of that country. It is the smallest republic in Yugoslavia, being 13,667 sq. km. in area with a population of 330,361 (census of 31 March 1971). The region is primarily mountainous, the inland area differing considerably from the coastal belt, both in natural features and in the way of life of the population. The capital is Titograd (formerly known as Podgorica). Until 1918 the capital of the principality (and from 1910 the kingdom) of Montenegro was the city of Cetinje. The population of present day Montenegro is made up as follows (according to the Institute for Statistics of Titograd): 66.55% Montenegrins, 1.81% Croatsians, 7.55% Serbians and 13.44% Muslims. This is the part of the population which speaks Serbo-Croat and which declared a national or religious affiliation (0.14% of the population did not declare any national or religious affiliation and 0.28% gave a regional affiliation). In addition to other less numerous minorities, 6.55% of the population is Albanian, of which some are Muslim and some Catholic.

The Muslim religious organization in the Socialist Republic of Montenegro is an autonomous region of the Islamic Union (Islamska zajednica) of the Yugoslavia S.F.R. which has four such regions with seats in Sarajevo, Priština, Skopje and Titograd. The supreme organ of the Islamic religious organization in Montenegro is — as in the other autonomous regions — the Islamic Union Council (Sabor Islamske zajednice) with an executive body (Starsljema) at its head. The Montenegrin Islamic Union Council has 16 members, and sends three delegates to the Supreme Council of the Islamic Union in the Yugoslavia S.F.R. which has 35 members. In Montenegro there are 70 mosques and 9 Boards of the Islamic Union which carry out the basic functions of Muslim religious organization in Montenegro (data of 1969).

Montenegro is so called from the region known as the Black Mountain (Crna Gora). Originally this area belonged to the medieval Serbian state. On the disintegration of the latter in the 15th century, a separate Montenegrin state was formed under the Cnojević dynasty. From 886/1481 it was an Ottoman vassal state, and in 1401/1496 came under Ottoman rule. Other parts of present-day Montenegro had already fallen under Ottoman domination, while most of the coastal belt was under Venetian rule.

Once it became part of the Ottoman empire, the country was officially named Karadag. Within most of the country — as well as in certain outlying areas — there developed a tribal system which was the basis for development of a type of military democracy in the internal life of the country. From 919/1513 the sandjak-beg of Karadag was Iskender Beg (q.v.), an Islamicized descendant of the Cnojević dynasty. At that time the country reached certain political and economic independence. The population was no longer required to pay the giyâr (q.v.) nor to submit to the ʿughr and other taxes, but had to contribute only a gold coin (fiuri) per house and field. After the death of Iskender Beg the land of Karadag was no longer a separate sandjak falling mainly within the sandjak of Iskenderiye (Scutar), but even then the population had certain privileges. From the middle of the 10th/16th century the role of the Montenegrin bishop became stronger. In the 11th/17th century the autonomy of Karadag was established under Ottoman rule headed by a native sipahi (Serb. špaha). However, the bishop played an increasingly important role, and in the second half of the 11th/17th century he became the only representative of the people vis-à-vis the Ottoman authorities. At the end of the 12th/18th century the people of Karadag drew nearer to the Venetians, whose influence led to a swiftly suppressed revolt against Ottoman rule. In the 12th/18th century the people, led by bishops of the Petrović family from the village of Njeuš, overthrew Ottoman rule and defended their independence in many battles. In the 19th century, first under the Petrović bishops and then under lay rulers of the same family, the land developed into a state and gradually obtained international recognition. It was recognized as an independent principality at the Berlin Congress of 1878, and in 1910 was proclaimed a kingdom.
Owing to the tribal organization which predominated in the area and to the struggles against the Ottoman authorities, Montenegro acquired a warrior-like society and a strong notion of freedom. In the 12th/18th century a folk tradition developed according to which Montenegro had never been under Turkish rule. This tradition still survives in some measure and for a fairly long time prevailed in historiography too.

Montenegro participated in the Balkan War (1912-13) against the Ottoman Empire, and in World War I (1914-18) as an ally of Serbia on the side of the Entente. During World War I, it was occupied by the Central Powers, and in 1918 was unified with Serbia, becoming part of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (later renamed Yugoslavia). During World War II Montenegro was under Italian occupation, and the people participated en masse in the struggle for liberation of the Yugoslavs.

**Bibliography:** Encyklopedija Jugoslavije, ii, Zagreb 1936, 398-488 (article Crna Gora); B. Đurdev, *Turska vlast u Crnoj Gori u XVI i XVII veku* ("The Turkish rule in Montenegro in the 16th and 17th centuries"), Sarajevo 1953; *Istorija Crne Gore* ("History of Montenegro") ii 2, Titograd 1970 (volume covering the period of Turkish rule, in preparation); *Ustav Islamske zajednice u Socijalističkoj Federativnoj Jugoslaviji* ("The Constitution of the Islamic Union in the S.F.R. of Yugoslavia"), in * Glasnik Vrhovnog islamskog starješinstva i SFRJ*, xxxiii, 1-2 (Sarajevo 1970), 105-12.

**ĐURDEV**

**KARÄ DENIZ, name of the Black Sea in Turkish.**

i. — The name. — The expression "Black Sea" is encountered from the 7th/11th century in the Arabic form of al-Bahr al-Aswas (in Abû ʿAmmār al-Fāṭimī, tr., Reynaud, ii,193,316), in the Greek form in the treaty concluded in 1265 between Michael Paleologus and Venice (*Fontes Rerum Austrarum*, Section ii, xiv, 63, Vienna 1857), and among the western sources in Schilbinger at the end of the 14th century. But other expressions have for long been employed in parallel with it ("Russian Sea", "Sea of Sinop", etc.). The most frequent has been "the Great Sea", "Mare Maius", in Odoric of Pordenone, ed. G. Strasman, Berlin 1968, 38; the same, in William of Rubruck, ed. Michel and Wright, Paris 1839, *Recueil de voyages et mémoires*, iv, 214; "Mare Magnum, in Plano Carpini, ed. d’Avezac, ibid., 743), a form which appears dominant mostly in the 13th and 14th centuries in the western sources and which persisted in various aspects ("mare maggiore", "mer majour", etc.), until the 17th century, from which date the term "Black Sea" finally becomes general, and very soon in widespread use in the eastern sources.

The origin of the Turkish expression thus poses a problem. The ingenious explanation of L. de Saussure (*L’origine des noms de Mer Rouge, Mer Blanche et Mer Noire*, in *Le Globe*, xxiii, 23 ff.), calling attention to the coloured quality attributed to the cardinal points by the Chinese (and transmitted by them to the Turks), cannot be upheld. J. H. Mordtmann (*Kara Deniz in Ebn*) found the solution in its equation with the "Great Sea" of Western sources, remarking of it that the epithet ǰar always means the meaning of "great, powerful, terrible" in Turkish, particularly in the proper names. This would be the initial meaning of ǰar in Kari Deniz, displayed in its medieval western translation. The contamination of the two meanings in fact seems probable, but the explanation appears inadequate. In fact, the existence of the doublet Karâ Deniz-Ağ Deniz ("the White Sea", the Mediterranean) does not plead in its favour. Above all the expression Black Sea seems to have been well attested before the arrival of the Turks. Constantine Porphyrogenetos (De adm. imp., ed. Bonn, 132) in the 10th century, speaks of the EHICLEIA ("dark sea"). Doubtless one must accept the thesis of Aurel Diaconu (article Kara Deniz in *I4*), who supposes the existence of an ancient Iranian name (from ašāsena "dark, sombre"), Hellenized in Αἰγαίος by false etymology, then transformed because of superstition into E ζεκος; this would have survived with its original meaning in the East-Pontic regions where the Turks came into contact with this geographical concept (see also Bahr Buntus).

ii. — The Turkish conquest. — The development of the Turkish seizure of the Black Sea lands was spread over almost three centuries. Since the turmoil of the end of the 5th/11th century, Byzantium had succeeded in preserving all its fortresses on the coasts of the Black Sea, and the Seljukid Empire of Iconium (Konya) remained practically cut off from the sea. It was only at the very end of the 6th/12th century that the Turks gained a foothold there. When in 587/1191, Kilij Arslan II, divided his states between his sons, one of them, Kilâb, received the Black Sea, in advance of Tokat as its centre, the territory extending as far as the coast of the Black Sea. According to Nicetas, he laid hold on Samsun. It was also without doubt before the death of Kilij Arslan in 588/1192 that the Turkish occupation of Samsun took place, a process which developed alongside the Greek town of Amisos, which survived as a Greek, and then Genoese, city until the 14th century. In 612/1214, the capture of Sinob (Sinop) by Izz al-Din Kaykâʿus I assured the Turks of Iconium of a second important base in this central sector of the Black Sea coasts, towards which the natural routes of penetration from the great valleys of the Kifl Irnak and the Yeghi Irnak had guided the Turkish advance. On the other hand, the Greeks held on in the eastern part of the littoral, in the shelter of the mountainous and forested barrier of the East-Pontic chains which protected the independence of the Empire of Trebizond, and equally in the western sector of the coast, where Heracleum (Eregli) was doubtless only sold to the Turks in 761/1360 (Heyd, ii, 358), while Samastri (Amasra) remained a Genoese colony until the 9th/15th century.

Sinop (Sanub) and Samsun also played their part in the regional export traffic of the products of northern Anatolia, sc. wool, fur, leather and mining products. But whereas the Black Sea trade remained unbroken until then directed essentially towards Constantinople at the beginning of the 7th/11th century a considerable southern trade appears between the Turkish ports of the south and the Greek towns of the north, such as Soldâla (Sudak), an outlet for the steppes at that time held by the Khïṭâf Turks, who were still pagans. From 602/1205-6 some merchants of Iconium, Syria and Mesopotamia banded together in caravans to go from Sivas to Trebizond and, from there, to the eastern and northern coasts of the Black Sea (Heyd, ii, 93). The appearance of Turkish footholds on the southern coast stabilized this traffic to Sinop and Samsun. From the north came furs and slaves in exchange for cotton goods, silk and spices (observations of William of Rubruck at Soldâla in 1253). The Mongol conquest and the ruin of Baghdad, in deflecting the trade of Inner Asia towards the north, made a powerful contribution to strengthening trans-Pontic relations in the second half of the century. They were essentially consolidated, following the Genoese-
tente with the Paleologus dynasty, by a whole series of Genoese warehouses established in the first place on the southern coast of the Crimean between Caffa (doubtless from 1266) and Cembalo (Balaklava), including Soldalaka taken by the Genoese in 1365. Some other establishments were added there around the Sea of Azov (Tana-Azov at the mouth of the Don, Copa-Kopil, etc.), and on the eastern coast of the Black Sea (Mapa-Anapa, Sebastopol-Sukhum, Kal’e etc.). The traffic in slaves (Turks and Circassians), fish and caviar, salt, cereals and furs was directed towards Constantinople and Europe, but certainly also in an appreciable proportion towards Asia Minor and across it as far as Egypt. Besides, Christian merchants passed via Trebizond as far as Bûltanîyya in Persia. The part of the Muslim merchants cannot have been negligible in this trans-Fontic commerce, but is difficult to evaluate with precision. It was on a Greek ship that Ibn Bah’tta made his way from Kerç to Sinop in 1333 (tr. Defremery, ii, 345; tr. Gibb, ii, 468).

The capture of Constantinople, with the occupation of the Straits by the Ottomans, upset these relations. The Khan of the Tartars then diverted the merchandise and slaves sent to Sâmsun or other ports towards the points of the coast situated outside the Genoese territory, such as Eupatoria (Kerç) and Calamita (near Inkerman) (Heyd, ii, 387). Nevertheless, the policy of Ottoman expansion in the Black Sea did not begin immediately. The Bank of St. George, heir of the rights of Genoa, was able to maintain relations for some time. In 859/1455 its ships succeeded in forcing the passage of the Bosphorus and reaching Caffa and Samastri. Mehmed II took this town in 862/1455, but the trade to Caffa, henceforth a tributary of the Sultan, continued during the following years. The corn of Caffa still passed to Genoa. It was only in 880/1475 that Mehmed II made some incidents between the Khan of the Crimea and the Tartars in connection with the nomination of the governor who had jurisdiction over them a pretext for seizing the town, and the speedily, all the other Genoese towns.

iii. — The Ottoman Sea. — From that time, when the principalities of Rûm, the Crimean Tartars, the Naygar, and the western Caucasians were made vassals, the Black Sea became an Ottoman lake, for approximately three centuries, to which the Sublime Porte jealously forbade access to foreign ships. The Ambassador of France, Girardin who, in 1686, solicited authorization for French ships to trade there, received the reply that "the Grand Seigneur would sooner open the doors of his harem to foreigners" (P. Masson, Histoire du commerce Français dans le Levant au xviii® siècle, Paris 1911, 65). A similar reply was made in 1699 to the Ambassador of Russia Ukrainetz (B. Nicsky, Le peuple russe: carrière historique 862-1945, Neuchatel 1945, 189). The Black Sea was to be the base for a policy of Ottoman expansion towards the steppes of Southern Russia and the Caspian, whose culminating point was the expedition of Astrakhan in 1569 with the project of a Don-Volga canal.

This exclusive domination did not prevent, however, incursions of Cossacks in the 17th century, whose boats came at times to pillage the Anatolian coasts, for example at Giresun (Ewliya Celebi, Seyahatnamesi, ed. Zuhuri Danisman, Istanbul 1970, ii, 81).

In the Ottoman period, Black Sea trade was organized at first essentially to supply the fleet of Constantinople and Istanbul, but to a large extent also to provision a considerable area outside the city and its suburbs, including Soldalaka taken by the Genoese in 1365. Some Russian ships also accompanied the plenipotentiary of the Tsar to Istanbul in 1211/1699. Retraced to Turkey at the treaty of Pruth in 1713, Azov returned to Russia at the treaty of Belgrade in 1739, with a portion of the littoral of the Sea of Azov, but Article ix of the treaty stipulated that the Russians' trade in the Black Sea should be done exclusively by ships belonging to the Turks. On a parallel with the treaty of Passarowitz, the limit for the movement of Austrian ships on the Danube remained fixed at the mouths of the river. From 1163/1750 a first French factory was established at Caffa, where the French dragon carried on trade from 1746, but it was done in ships flying the Ottoman flag (P. Masson, op. cit., 541-3). It was only the treaty of Kucik Kaynarca (1187/1774) which opened the Black Sea to the Russian merchant ships, while the annexation of Kerç, Yeni Kal’e and the mouths of the Dnieper considerably enlarged the sea coasts of the Empire of the Tsars. The conference of Aynali Kavak in 1193/1779 completed it by according to the same ships the free passage of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. The foundation of Kherson in 1776, the annexation of the Crimea and the occupation of Georgia in 1783, the capture of Oczakow in 1788, and in 1795 that of Hodja Bey, where in 1795 the new town of Odessa was founded, marked the decisive stages of Russian installation in the Black Sea at the end of the 18th century. The Russian privileges were rapidly extended to the other European nations. In 1784 Austrian ships, in 1799 English ships, in 1802 French ships, obtained freedom of traffic. European penetration entailed considerable disturbance in the commercial currents. In 1781 the first Russian ship passed from Kherson to Marseille. In 1784 a French factory was established at Kherson. At the beginning of the 19th century several hundred
ships already participated in the trade of South Russia (an annual movement of 900 ships, of which 552 went to Odessa and 230 to Taganrog; 421 Austrian ones and 329 Russian ones, according to Anthoine, 262). Ottoman trade was progressively reduced to the West coasts of the Caucasus (with which the slave trade remained active throughout the first half of the 19th century) and to the north coasts of Anatolia. Sinop remained an important Ottoman naval base and a great centre of ship-building yards. The trans-Pontic trade of Russia to the Anatolian coasts survived on a restricted scale (fabrics from Aleppo and nuts sent from Trebizond: V. Fontanier, *Voyages en Orient... de 1830 à 1833, deuxième voyage en Anatolie*, Paris 1834, 223). But a new fact was the great rise in transit commerce from Persia via Trebizond and Erzurum, which was the normal access route from the Black Sea to Persia until the development of the traffic from Persia to Russia by land at the end of the 19th century and, more recently, the diversion of Persian transit to the Persian Gulf (C. Issawi, *The Tabriz-Trabzon Trade 1830-1900: Rise and Decline of a Route*, in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, i (1970), 18-28). Since this date, the Turkish trade of the Black Sea has been essentially a coastal traffic, notably concerned with passengers, wood, the coal of the Kürdabad basin sent to Istanbul and to which are added some direct exports of nuts and tobacco to Europe.

**v.** — Political and naval history in the modern period. — If the freedom of commercial navigation has never been called into question since the end of the 18th century, the same has not been the case in regard to the naval status of the Black Sea. The treaty of Yanklar Silesi (1249/1833), by which the Porte undertook to close the Straits at Russia's request had practically conferred on this latter power the control of the Sea. The Conference of London (1840), in closing the Straits to all warships, caused Russia to lose this privileged situation, but left her assured of dominion in the Black Sea. But after the destruction of the Turkish naval forces by the Russians at Sinop in 1853 and the victory of the Franco- Anglo-Turkish allied forces in the Crimean War, the treaty of Paris of 1856 provided for the neutralisation of the Black Sea (except for six steamships with a maximum length of 50m. at the water-mark and four light ships for each power, as well as two light ships per power at the mouths of the Danube). The Franco-German War of 1871 gave Russia the opportunity, through the Conference of London, to have this neutralization annulled and to regain her freedom of action, but the passage of the Straits remained forbidden to warships. The Conference of Lausanne in 1870, by giving Turkey the right to fortify the Straits once more, by restricting freedom of passage to the fleets of the powers bordering on the Black Sea (with exceptions for light ships) and by according Turkey the right to close the Straits in event of a war in which she remained neutral, has made the Black Sea once more a half-closed sea.


**KARA FADLI** [see FADVLI MEHMET].

**KARA GÖZ** [see KARGÖZ].

**KARA GÖZLÜ**, Turkish tribe in Iran. It is not mentioned in any 10th/16th or 11th/17th century sources. Originally a member of the famous Shâmlu tribe during the Safavids and the tribe of which a part have taken its name from one of its beys; it is probable that it originated in the Bey Dili sub-tribe of the Shâmlu.

The homeland of the Kara Gözli was the Hamadân region, but in the mid-20th century there was a small branch known by the same name in Fars. The Kara Gözli had abandoned a fully nomadic life as early as the beginning of the 19th century, and lived in large and prosperous villages on the Hamadân plain. Nevertheless, they were foremost amongst those peoples who preserved tribal unity. Today they are divided into two branches, the 'Ashkül and the Hâjjidül. All European travellers who visited the region describe them as a numerous community. Dupré (1807-9) gives their number as 12,000 (*Voyage en Perse*, Paris 1810); K. H. Macdonald Kinneir (op. cit., 1810) records that they were able to field an army of 7,000 men (*A Geographical memoir of the Persian Empire*, London 1813, 127); while Lady Shelï (mid-19th century) gives their number as 4,000 (*Glimpses of life and manners in Persia*, London 1856, 398). The population of the Kara Gözli was given as 300,000 in 1930. Travellers also describe them as one of the most warlike tribes. Macdonald Kinneir (op. cit., 49) calls them the best horsemen in Iran. According to Muḥammad Ḥāšim (*Rustam al-tawârikh*, ed. M. Moshîrî, Tehran 1348, 105), Kara Gözli Saʿid Beg was one of the most gallant amirs of the reign of Sultan Ḥusayn, the last Šāfawid ruler. Although the Kara Gözli were a closely-knit community, they chose to remain subject to other ruling dynasties; for this reason they settled in the Hamadân plain as early as the 19th century, leading a prosperous life in comparison with other tribes. This can be explained by the fact, that as members of the Shâmlu subtribe, they had had a long-established political tradition and experience.

Following the death of Nādir Shah Afshâr, the tribe accepted vassalage to Karîm Khan Zand; but in the struggle between the successors of Karîm Khan and Āḵā Muḥammad Khan Karāǰâr, the Kara Gözli promptly sided with the Kâdjar, and played an important part in Āḵâ Muḥammad Khan's accession. The tribe's loyalty to the Kâdjar dynasty continued in later years, and as a result many important military and political figures were appointed from it.
Foremost among these was Muhammad Husayn Khan (d. 1240/1824-5), who had rendered important service to Ākā Muhammad in the creation of his state. He was also known as a just and benevolent ruler (J. Morier, A Second Journey through Persia,. .., London 1828, ii, 263). Rustam Khān, son of the above-mentioned khān, and Ḥādīdī Muhammad Khān, Naṣr Allāh Khān, ‘All Khān, Māḥmūd Khān and ‘Abd Allāh Khān were the most famous political and military figures of the Kara Gözlű during the periods of Fāṭḥ ‘All, Muhammad Shāh and Naṣir al-Dīn Shāh (Mīrzā Muhammad Taẖtī, Nāṣīḥī al-lawdārī, ed. Djiẖāngīr Kā’īn Māḵḵānī, Tehran 1337, ii, 84; iii, 123; Rīdā Kull Khān, Rawdat al-saḥā-yi Nāṣīrī, Tehran 1339, ix, 636, 648; 445, 211, 226-7, 238-40, 458, 459, 467, 529). Of these, Māḥmūd Khān and ‘All Khān were married to girls of the Kaḏār dynasty (J. F. Ferrier, Voyage en Perse dans l’Afghanistan..., Paris 1860, i, 70-1). Chiefs of the Kara Gözlű were among those statesmen assimilated to Western European culture. One of these was Naṣr al-Mulk, educated at Oxford University, who was regent in 1914, while his brother Amīr Tūmān was ambassador in Washington.

**Bibliography:** For detailed information and bibliography of the Karā Gözlū see F. Sümü Kaškarlar devrinde Türk oymaklan, in Selçuklu Araştırmalar Dergisi, v (Atasözen) 1974, 3.59-66. KARA HİSAR, “black castle, black fortress”, name of several localities of Asia Minor distinguished from one another by means of other names or epithets, but nevertheless still frequently confused. One finds them already enumerated in the Mvğlum of Yāḏūt (iv, 44), in the Nuzhat al-kulub of Yāḏūt Mustawfi (ed. Le Strange, 97), in the Nuzhat al-kulub of Yafcut (iv, 44), in the Bāb al-Dawla took in the year 335/946-7 (ZDMG, x, 487; Yāḏūt, 168) must be without doubt the Colonia Cappadociae which, according to Niketas (ed. Sieveking, v, 178 = Leunclavius, Historia Musulm., col. 474); in the year 878/1473, the town was taken by the Emperor of the empire (Avicenna, Kvin al-akhbār); in the year 860/1457-8, the town is the Colonia of Justinian, it belonged to Armenia Prima; in the Novellae of Justinian, it belonged to Armenia Prima; in the Bibliography see F. Sümü: Tażrīkh, 378, 181, who designates the town as Kara Hisar of Kemâk; also Sa’d al-Dīn, i, 287 = ‘All, Kvin al-akhbār, v, 178 = Leunclavius, Historia Musulm., col. 474). In the year 978/1473, the town was taken by the Sultan of the empire (Avicenna, Kvin al-akhbār); in the year 860/1457-8, the town is the Colonia of Justinian, it belonged to Armenia Prima; in the Novellae of Justinian, it belonged to Armenia Prima; in the Bibliography see F. Sümü: Tażrīkh...
The old name of Colonia was adopted by the Seljukids under the Armenian form Kughuniya that we encounter (Ibn Bibi, ed. Duda, Copenhagen 1959, 151, 152, 306), in Hamid Allah Mustawfi (op. cit., where the readings of the manuscripts Limuniya or Lisiuniya must be corrected to Kighuniya), and on the money of Eretan (Ahmed Tawhid, Meshekub-i Kadiim-i İslamiyye, iv, 439). If, as appears almost certain, the Mavro-Kastran mentioned by Michael Attalista (ed. Bonn, 125) and by Skylitzes (679) as being "situated on a hill in Armenia difficult of access", can be identified with Colonia, it seems then that alongside the name of Colonia the name of Karahisar was already known at this period; likewise, we encounter among the Greeks of the 18th century, alongside Colonia, the term Garasar which is a corruption of Karahisar.

The majority of the population has remained Christian for a long time. A census of 925/1529 counted 213 Christian houses there as against 84 Muslims. In 1022/1710 there were still 240 Christian houses as against 217 Muslim. Ewliya Celebi, who has left us a highly imaginative description, counted 1600 houses there, 750 shops, 42 mosques (1057/1647). There were 70 houses within the citadel, where the villagers of the Black Sea coasts, exposed to the ravages of the Corsairs, came to store their precious objects. A. D. Mordtmann (1858) counted 2400 houses there, 500 of them Armenian and 100 Greek, and Vital Cuinet, 11,700 inhabitants (of whom 2,750 were Armenian and 1,650 Greek). Trade, judged to be in decline by Barth in 1858, appeared to have become active once more at the end of the century, according to Cumont and Cuinet.

The richness of the gardens and vineyards adjoining the town always formed a primary basis of this activity. Schilberger (Reisebuch, ed. Langmantel, 57) calls Karassere "a land rich in vines"; these vines, which still exist today, were always less famous than the rich mines of alum of the neighbouring village Shakhane, mines from which was extracted the "alume de rocca di Colonna" (that is to say Colonia) in the 16th century. It must be identified with the bucan of Kara Maçar, between Yozgat and Akdağ Madeni (and not the Carahisar Kemalisi), as is noted in the Djihannuma, 613. This locality is today the Karahisar Tatlısî marked by the Şakşer Yerler Kilavuzu (Ankara 1946) as a parish of the Kara Hisar that the old Ottoman chronicles cite in connection with Prince Mehmed's battles with the chief of the Yürük Gözleroğlu in ca. 805/1402 (Leclercq, Hist. Musulm., c. 386; Sa'd al-Din, i, 200). Kiepert's map marks in this place, a little to the north of the Alaca Höyük, two places with the name of Karahisar near to one another, one mentioned as a ruin, the other as a village. The Turkish 1/200,000 map marks in this place a ruin of a fortress on a hill at 1250 m. altitude, and two villages, to the north-west of Akdağ Madeni and 30 km. to the north-east of the former.

The town suffered greatly from the 1914-18 War, when it found itself close to the front in 1916 at the time of the Russian troops' advance, and was abandoned by a part of its population. After the disappearance of the minority population, there were no more than 7,091 inhabitants in 1927, and 7,600 in 1950. The castle, encircled by surrounding walls in which some old wells seem to indicate a pre-Hellenic settlement, is no longer inhabited; within these fortifications, on the summit of the mountain, there is a small keep with an octagonal tower. The fortifications date from the Byzantines and were completed by the Muslim governors of the town.


4. Karahisar-i Behramshah (Bayrampasha), already cited by Hamid Allah Mustawfi, Nuzul al-kulub, 97; Sitti Reş's (16th century) visited this place at the time of his journey from Siwás to Bozaş and Kırşehir (Miri'āt al-mamālik, Istanbul 1312, 96). In the age of Ewliya Celebi it was a jurisdiction (başk) of the eyâlet of Siwás (Djihannumā, 613). This locality is today the Karahisar Tatlısî marked by the Şakşer Yerler Kilavuzu (Ankara 1946) as a parish of the bucan of Kara Maçar, between Yozgat and Akdağ Madeni (and not the Carahisar Kemalisi), as is noted in the Djihannuma, 613. This locality is today the Karahisar Tatlısî marked by the Şakşer Yerler Kilavuzu (Ankara 1946) as a parish of the Kara Hisar that the old Ottoman chronicles cite in connection with Prince Mehmed's battles with the chief of the Yürük Gözleroğlu in ca. 805/1402 (Leclercq, Hist. Musulm., c. 386; Sa'd al-Din, i, 200). Kiepert's map marks in this place, a little to the north of the Alaca Höyük, two places with the name of Karahisar near to one another, one mentioned as a ruin, the other as a village. The Turkish 1/200,000 map marks in this place a ruin of a fortress on a hill at 1250 m. altitude, and two villages, to the north-west and to the north-east, called respectively Türk Kalehisar and Çerkes Kalehisar (surely for Karahisar).
several mistakes. Following the information of Ahmed Weflk (op. cit.), who mentions KARA HISAR as the chief place of a nāhiyye of the badā' of Serik in the sandjak of Adalia, and the information of Ewliya Celebi (Stedthainmesi, i, 290) according to which the place was built at the foot of a mountain called Serek dagi, Mordtmann in ETI and Besim Darkot in IA have sought to identify it with the large village of Serik, a real centre of a badā' in the plain between the Aksu and the Kopri Su, nearer to this last river. This identification of the last village is incompatible with the data of the same text of Ewliya, which place it to the west of the Aksu, four hours' journey from Antalya and an hour north of the village of Kündu (still existing) on the one hand, and on the other with the information of the same, as well as of al-Kalâbâshandî (Subâh, v, 340), which places it on a lofty hill. Sulejman Fikri Erten (Antalya vilayetê tarîhi, Istanbul 1940, 90) wisely incorrectly to place it at the ancient town of Sillyon, a hypothesis compatible with the data on the elevated site but not with the information on distance and placing in relation to the river. In fact, there is no doubt that it can be identified with the ancient town of Pergum in terms of the above characteristics. Recognized since the 19th century by Krause in his articles Pamphylia and Perga in the Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste, S. 329, 244, and vol. xv-xvi (1841), 435, but without comment and information on sources, then by X. de Planhol (De la plaine pamphylienne aus lais pisidien, Paris 1858, 104, 123), it has been set out clearly in detail by Barbara Fleming (Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisidien and Lykien im Spätmittelalter, Wiesbaden 1964, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, xxx, see equally the index, s.v. for the numerous mentions of this town). 7. DEVELI KARA HISAR, i.e., the Karaşızar of Develi (develenî Karişızarî in Nehrî, ZDMG, xv, 341, and Leucaopsis, Hist. Musulm., 334) also named after the district of Develi (Houtsm, Recueil, iii, 104) to distinguish it from other towns of the same name. This town, situated in Asia Minor, 45 km. to the south-west of the Kayseri, was mentioned in the history of the Sandlıkçıs (Houtsm, Recueil, iv, passim). It was first mentioned to the possessions of the Banû Eretna (cf. Max van Berchem, Materiaux, Pt. 3, 41 and 48), then that of the Karâmân-ogullarî and was conquered in 794/1391 by Bayazid I (Nehrî, loc. cit.); at the time of the conquest of Karâmân by Mehemmed II in 879/1474, it surrendered to the Ottomans (Sa'd al-Dîn, i, 550). At the end of the 17th century, the district of Develi Kara Hisar formed a badā' dependent on Kayseriyeye Dîshîhnâmû, 620. The town then declined, without doubt due to the insalubrity of the swamps (Sultan Sazlıgî) which extend to the approaches of the town, and the consequence of this was the transfer of the centre of the badā' to Develi (or Eversel), to the south of Kayseri and 40 km. to the east, whereas Karâ Hisar, at the end of the 19th century, was no more than a nāhiyye of the badā' of Ingilis. This transfer has been at the source of a whole series of confusions between the two towns (Ahmed Weflk, Lehdis, 586, and Cuinet, Turquie d'Asie, i, 304, 320, give information which is quite obscure and false). The town, established anew as a kâsa in 1946, took the name of Yeşil Hisar. Of the ancient fortifications of Develi Karâ Hisar, only insignificant fragments remain; the town, known for its fruit production, is situated at the foot of some hills, in the midst of extensive gardens (Kunneir, Journey, 109; Hamilton, ii, 284).

There were several hundred houses at the end of the last century, with an increase to 3,800 inhabitants in 1950. In the neighbourhood of Develi Kara Hisar, 3 km. to the south-west, are the ruins of Zindîbar Kal'esi, considered formerly to be the ancient Nora (W. F. Ainsworth, Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, London 1842, i, 210) and now identified with Cuzyustra (W. M. Calder and G. E. Bean, A classical map of Asia Minor, London 1958).

Bibliography: Apart from the works already cited, I. Beldiceanu and Steinher and N. Beldiceanu, Deux villes de l'Anatolie pré-ottomane, Develi et Qarahisar, d'après des documents indits, in REI, xxxix (1971), 337-86. 8. KARA HISAR in the land of 'Uğmân (Yâkût, iv, 45): perhaps this is meant to be the Karaşına Hisar, also named Karaşız Sheher, near İnönü in the territory of origin of the Ottomans Sultans, a place which is often described even in the ancient chronicles by the name of Karâ Hisar.

9. KARA HISAR, in the territory of Ibn Torgut (Ibn Faţî Châbhî, op. cit., 350); this is, however, impossible to identify, unless it is an ancient name for Torghudu Kâşabasi near Mânsa. 10. KARA HISAR, chef-lieu of the badā' of Na'lûkhan (Na'llihan), vilâyet of Ankara (Ahmed Weflk, op. cit.). One encounters several villages of this name in the boundaries of the Sanjak, vol. x (1839), 244, and vol. xv-xvi (1841), 435, but without comment and information on sources, then by X. de Planhol (De la plaine pamphylienne aus lacs pisidiens, Paris 1858, 104, 123), it has been set out clearly in detail by Barbara Fleming (Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisidien and Lykien im Spätmittelalter, Wiesbaden 1964, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, xxx, see equally the index, s.v. for the numerous mentions of this town).

II. HAMMAM KARA HISAR, village of the nāhiyye of Günûnîzî, badā' of Sivri Hisar, vilâyet of Eskeşiher, 17 km. to the east of the chef-lieu of the kâsa. 12. VÂN KARAHİŞARİ (Ewliya, op. cit., iv, 275-6), which the traveller visited on the route from Van to Kotur, and of which he says that the Kurds call it Karadja Kale; this is today a village of the kâsa of Saray (newly called Ozalp).

A certain number of other places of the name of Karâ Hisar figure in the gazetteers of the Anatolian villages; none of them have any historical importance. See the article of Besim Darkot in IA for the enumeration of several of them. (J. H. MORDTMANN [X. DE PLANHOL])

KARA KALFAK [see KARA KALFAK].

KARA KHANIDS [see ILK KHANS].

KARA KHITAY, the usual name in Muslim sources of the sixth/12th and seventh/13th centuries of the Kitai people, mentioned in Chinese sources from the 4th century A.D. onwards as living on the northern fringes of the Chinese empire; during the course of the 6th/12th century a group of them migrated into the Islamic lands of Central Asia and established a domination there which endured for some eighty years.

In the Orkhon inscriptions of Outer Mongolia, the royal annals of the Tu-chuïche or Turks (ca. 732 A.D.), the Kitai are mentioned as enemies of the Turks and as living to the east of the Turkish heartland on the Orkhon and Selenga rivers. Ethnically and linguistically, the Kitai were most probably Mongols rather than Tungus, as some earlier orientalists surmised, though there is a possibility that they spoke a language of their own, unrelated to the above two groups (see the discussions in Wittfogel and Fêng, History of Chinese society: Liao, 21-3, and Sir Gerard Clauson, Turk, Mongol, Tungus, in Asia Major, N.S. viii (1960), 120-1, 123). There must also have been considerable Uyghur Turkish influence on them when they were subject to the Khans of the Eastern Turks.

In Chinese sources, the Kitai are first called the Ch'i-ťan (K'i-tian) and then, after 947, the Liao. In
the period of chaos after the downfall of the T'ang dynasty (907), the expansionist Kitai overran northern China and established there a ruling dynasty which, whilst retaining its basic steppe ethos, became at least superficially sinicized, so that Chinese annals account them a native dynasty; southern China, on the other hand, remained in the hands of the indigenous Sung dynasty (960-1279). The Liao empire stretched from the Pacific in the east to the Altai mountains and the Uyghur lands in the west, and their original name of Kitai, in the form Khitai or Кхатай, was applied by the Muslims to northern China, whence older English Cathay, Russian Kitay, Greek Kitâfa, etc. for the whole country of China (see Sir Henry Yule, Cathay and the way thereto, London 1913-16, i, 146; in Muslim usage Cin, Arabic form شن [q.v.] became the term reserved for southern China).

Between 1126 and 1123, however, the Liao of northern China were overthrown by a fresh wave of barbarian invaders from the north, the Tungusic Jürchen of the Amur-Ussuri basin and northern Manchuria, who formed the Chín ("golden") dynasty, Mongol Altun Khâns. A part of the Kitai remained in China with the Chin and later, in the time of Cingiz Kühn, were able to successfully rebel and restore the Kitai kingdom as a Mongol vassal state. Muslim sources mention raids westwards by the "Khitai" on Islamic territories adjoining the Semirechye during the 5th/12th century (see Ibn al-Áthir, ix, 209-10, incursion of the Khitâyya in 408/1017-18), but these attacks may well have been made by Mongol groups, perhaps the Nayman, pushed westwards by the expansion of the Kitaï proper in northern China (see Barthold, Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrales, 95). It was the migration of ca. 519/1123 and thereafter by the Karâ ("black") Khitai (in the Latin of John of Polo Carpeni, 1246, нигри Китай), Chinese Hsi ("western") Liao, which was really significant for the eastern Islamic world. One more southerly group moved into eastern Turkestan, which is perhaps too early, since in a letter from the Saldjuk sultan of eastern Persia, Sandjar, to the caliph's vizier, dated 527/1133, the victory is described as a recent event.

The adventures of the other group of Khitai are described by Djouayni, tr. Boyle, i, 354 ff. It may be that we should regard these merely as the right wing of a general Karâ Khitai advance along a broad front, successful in breaking through where the left wing thrust into Kâshgharia failed. At all events, this second group came westwards by a more northerly route, through the Kirghiz lands on the upper Yenisei, building the settlement of Emil to the east of Lake Balkhash, which they used as a base for intervening in the Karakhanid principality in the Semireche. By this time, their numbers had swollen to 40,000 tents. The Karakhanid ruler tried to win the Khitây over as allies against his own unruly Karluq and Kanhil tribesmen, but instead found himself deserted. The Karâ Khandâd, whose name appears in Chinese sources as Yeh-li Ta-shih (d. 537/1143) now, after a half-hearted attempt to organize a revanche and regain the Liao homeland in China, made the town of Balasaghun [q.v.] in the Ău valley his base for a series of attacks on the surrounding Turkish tribes and principalities.
KARA KHITAY

in the Semireçye. The Chinese history of the dynasty, the Liao Shih (completed in 1344), mentions a census taken in 1186 by the Gür-Khan Yi-li. This enumerated 84,500 households with adult males in them, but this figure probably included the indigenous Muslim population of Bâlsâğhûn and its hinterland as well as the Kara Khitay tribesmen; even reckoning two fighting men per household, the numbers of the Kara Khitay cannot have been all that large (see Wittfogel and Feng, 659-60).

Nor was there any administrative centralization, despite the fact that they did not follow the practice in other nomadic empires of granting out appanages to relatives and others of high rank; the first Gür-Khân is said not to have entrusted to any man command of more than 100 warriors. Except in Bâlsâğhûn, where, as noted above, the local Kara Khânid ruler was displaced (although the population of the town remained largely Muslim), local dynasties continued elsewhere to exist as the Gür-Khân's vassals. In some places, there were appointed permanent representatives of the Gür-Khan (Chinese chien-kuo "state supervisor", Turkish baskab, Arabic-Persian shâbna) side-by-side with the local ruler; a province like Khârazm was only visited periodically by the Kara Khitay tribute-collectors; whilst at the beginning of the 11th/11th century the sadrs or religious leaders in Bukhârâ of the Khân family (on whom see O. Pritskâ, Al-i Burhân, in Isîl, xxx (1952), 81-96) took the tribute of the city in person to the Gür-Khân's ordu, just as later under the Golden Horde the prince of Moscow took his tribute to the capital at Sarây.

The Kara Khitay administration was therefore primarily a fiscal one, and beyond the collection of taxes, the subject territories were left largely to their local rulers. Ibn al-Alhîr, xl, 56, says that the Gür-Khân imposed a tax of one dinâr per annum on each household of the conquered peoples, but we know that tribute in kind was also collected. Barthold thought that the dinâr levy on each family was a specifically Chinese feature, but it seems to have been only one method followed amongst several in a far-from-uniform system; one Chinese source says that the rural populace around Bâlsâghûn paid a tithe on their crops to the Gür-Khân. The Gür-Khân coined their own copper currency on the Liao and Chinese pattern, with the regnal period inscribed in Chinese characters, but the vassal states continued to mint their own Islamic-type coins, and as we have just seen, the unit of the Gür-Khân's currency, the dinâr, was recognised by the Kara Khitay for tax-collating purposes (see Wittfogel and Feng, 664-72). Even the numbers of the Kara Khitay cannot have been all that large (see Wittfogel and Feng, 659-60).

The Kara Khitay administration was therefore primarily a fiscal one, and beyond the collection of taxes, the subject territories were left largely to their local rulers. Ibn al-Alhîr, xl, 56, says that the Gür-Khân imposed a tax of one dinâr per annum on each household of the conquered peoples, but we know that tribute in kind was also collected. Barthold thought that the dinâr levy on each family was a specifically Chinese feature, but it seems to have been only one method followed amongst several in a far-from-uniform system; one Chinese source says that the rural populace around Bâlsâghûn paid a tithe on their crops to the Gür-Khân. The Gür-Khân coined their own copper currency on the Liao and Chinese pattern, with the regnal period inscribed in Chinese characters, but the vassal states continued to mint their own Islamic-type coins, and as we have just seen, the unit of the Gür-Khân's currency, the dinâr, was recognised by the Kara Khitay for tax-collating purposes (see Wittfogel and Feng, 664-72).

Barthold also asserted in his E1 article KARA KHITAY that the "language of the government seems to have been Chinese", but the linguistic and cultural structure of Central Asia at this time was complex and reflected the mélange of races, cultures and faiths to be found there. The Kara Khitay undeniably set a Chinese imprint on the administration and culture of the lands under their control, and Muslim authors noted a few Chinese words like fu-ma "imperial son-in-law" for the Gür-Khân's son-in-law (Duwaynî-Boyle, i, 290, 292) and p'ai-tzu, Chinese p'ei-tzu, "tablet, insignia of a government official's authority" (ibid., i, 158; Aflî, Lubbâb al-albâb, ed. Browne, ii, 385). The Gür-Khân bestowed Chinese official titles and used the Chinese script for solemn decrees, but the number of Chinese litterati at their court can never have been very large. They must have called upon Muslim scholars and secretaries for their correspondence in Persian and the Arabic script with their Muslim vassals, and probably upon Uyghur officials for correspondence in Turkish and the Uyghur script with vassals in eastern Turkestan.

The Gür-Khân administration was designed to prepare the way for eventually the Mongol Khans in the Islamic world, but they displayed the traditional tolerance of the steppes towards all faiths. Even though Islam was especially identified with the resistance in Transoxania by the Kara Khânids and by Sandjar, they did not systematically persecute Muslims, as did their brief supplanter Khâlûq (see below) in Kâshgâriâ. A contemporary Muslim author like Nûrânî 'Ardû Samarbândi gives an anecdote about the first Gür-Khân's boundless justice, his deference to the Şudâr of Bûlghûr and his removal of an oppressive representative of the Kara Khitay administration there (Cahâr maḥâila, ed. Browne, 24, revised tr. 24-5). Diûdžânî, the historian of the Ghûrids, is also remarkably enthusiastic about them; he praises the first Gür-Khân for his just rule and respect for Muslim sensibilities, and even purveys a tale that one of the later Gür-Khânids had secretly become a Muslim (Tabâkât-i Nâsîrî, ii, 96, tr. 91-2). Muslims retained leading positions in the Kara Khitay administration; the wealthy merchant Mâhmûd Tay is mentioned by Duwayni, tr. i, 357-8, as being vizier to the last Gür-Khân.

However, the religious tolerance and impartiality of the Kara Khitay undoubtedly permitted adherents of non-Islamic faiths to flourish more openly in Turkestan than under the orthodox Muslim Karakhanids. A great period of missionary activity and enterprise opened for the Nestorian Christian Church in Inner Asia; the patriarch Elias III (1176-90) founded a metropolitan see in Kâshgâr whose jurisdiction also included the Semireçye; and the oldest of the Syriac-inscribed Christian gravestones from the Qû valley in the Semireçye stem from this period (see Barthold, Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel-Asien bis zur mongolischen Eroberung, Tübingen-Leipzig 1901, 57 ff.; idem, Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrale, 99-101; the earliest inscription published by Chwolson dates from 1186). There were Chinese artisans working in Samarkand at this time, and the Jewish communities in Khorasan, Samarcand and Bukhârâ were flourishing, according to the evidence of a Jewish traveller in Persia like Benjamin of Tudela (see W. J. Fischel, The Jews of Central Asia (Khorasan) in mediaeval Hebrew and Islamic literature, in Historia Judaica, vii (1945), 29-50). Grosset commented with some justice that "the foundation of the Qara Khitay empire may be viewed as a reaction against the work of Islamization accomplished by the Karakhanids" (L'Empire des steppes, Paris 1952, 221).

As for the Kara Khitay's own religion, we can glean very little from the sources. Ibn al-Alhîr, xi, 55, calls the first Gür-Khân a Manichæan. Muslim writers usually, however, simply call them "idolaters", but we may surmise that Buddhism, which had overlaid the original shamanism of the Ch'i-tan in China, was widespread amongst them. One may accordingly say that the receptiveness of the Kara Khitay environment to differing cultural and religious traditions, and the consequent encouragement of the flowering of these traditions under the dynasty's relaxed rule, constitutes a certain achievement in human civilization, one which anticipates some justice that "the foundation of the Qara Khitay dynasty's relaxed rule, constitutes a certain achievement in human civilization, one which anticipates..."
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KARA-KOL — KARA-KOYUNLU

V. Thomsen, *Altötürkische Inschriften aus der Mongolei*, in *ZDMG*, lxxvii (1924), 154, and T. Tekin, *A grammar of Örkön Türkic*, Bloomington, Indiana 1968, 270. The lake was a celebrated wintering-place for migrating wildfowl, and therefore much frequented by hunters and fishermen. The Mongol princes Çaghatay and Ögedey wintered there in 629-620

The steppelands and pastures of the Karaköl basin are especially famed as the original habitat of the Karakul breed of sheep, whose lambs produce a glossy, tightly-curved, rich black fur, commercially known as Persian lamb, and used for making Astrakan fur: the full-grown sheep produce dark-coloured wool for carpet making. The Soviet Central Asian republics, Afghanistan and Persia are today important breeders of this sheep and exporters of its fur.

Other lakes with this toponym of Karaköl are found in the Pamirs (Tadzhik SSR) and in the mediaeval region of Semirechye near the Isik-Köl (cf. Barthold, in *Studies on the history of Central Asia*, tr. T. and V. Minorsky, ii, 134). After the Tatarian Russian conquest of the Khânate of Bukhara in the late 19th century, a fort Karakul was built to command the Çardjuy-Bukhara road, and a modern town has now grown up there.

The Karaköl basin is famed as the original habitat of the Karakul breed of sheep, whose lambs produce a glossy, tightly-curved, rich black fur, commercially known as Persian lamb, and used for making Astrakan fur; the full-grown sheep produce dark-coloured wool for carpet making. The Soviet Central Asian republics, Afghanistan and Persia are today important breeders of this sheep and exporters of its fur.

Other lakes with this toponym of Karaköl are found in the Pamirs (Tadzhik SSR) and in the mediaeval region of Semirechye near the Isik-Köl (cf. Barthold, in *Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, tr. T. and V. Minorsky, ii, 134). After the Tatarian Russian conquest of the Khânate of Bukhara in the late 19th century, a fort Karakul was built to command the Çardjuy-Bukhara road, and a modern town has now grown up there.


**KARA-KOYUNLU**, Turkish dynasty which ruled over parts of Eastern Anatolia, Ṭrāḫā, al-Dîjarzâ, and most of Ṭrân. Pir ʿAyni) Pir Hasan (Kara ʿIjasan in their works) was Kara Mefcmed’s nephew, but this is not confirmed by other sources.

Governors of the Mongols, lived in the Mosul area in winter and moved to the Mugh-ʿAlâḥāt region, and sometimes to Erzurum, in summer. Most of the local dynasties in the above-mentioned regions had been made either his allies or vassals, but although defeated, Malik ʿManṣūr, the Arūṭuk ruler of Mârdân, refused to recognize Bayram Khodja’s suzerainty, and complained to Sultan Uways, the Dialyûr ruler, about him. Thereupon Sultan Uways left Baghdad in the spring of 769/1366, took Mosul from Berdi Khodja, and after passing the month of Ramadan in Mârdân, marched against Bayram Khodja, who was with his forces on the plain of Mugh. Defeating the amir of the Kara-Koyunlu there, Sultan Uways went to Tabrız by way of Karâ Kilise (ʿAqrâ). After this defeat, Bayram Khodja seems to have become one of the tribute-paying vassals of Uways. Nevertheless, the Kara-Koyunlu beg continued his activities by besieging Mosul, which probably belonged to Uways, in 773/1371, and by capturing Sandjar in the next year.

When the Dialyûr ruler died in the same year (744/1342), Bayram Khodja severed his ties of vassalage, and, taking advantage of the situation, added Şûrmêli, Ala Kilise, Khôy, Nakhdiwân and some other places to his territories. However, Shaykh ʿUsayn, successor to Uways, and particularly ʿAdilĀkâ, who held the real power, were not prepared to overlook his activities, and the Kara-Koyunlu accepted vassalage under lighter conditions (779/1377). When Bayram Khodja died in 782/1380, the territory extending from Mosul to Erzurum was directly subject to the Karâ-Koyunlu.

Bayram Khodja was succeeded by his nephew Karâ Mefcmed, an energetic and capable amir. He gained an overwhelming victory against the Dialyûr army, which met him near Nakhdiwân in 784/1382 under the command of ʿShaḥ-ʾzâda Shaykh ʿAli of the Dialyûrs and Pır ʿAli Bâr Beg. Both the Dialyûr prince and the other commander were killed in the battle. This victory increased Karâ Mefcmed’s status, and secured the Dialyûr throne for Ṭâmâd, who probably married Karâ Mefcmed’s daughter after this defeat. His vassalage to the Dialyûrs came to an end with the murder of ʿShaḥ-ʾzâda Shaykh ʿAli. Sultan Uways, after a series of successes—forcing the ruler of Dîjar, Dōger Şâlım Beg, to take refuge with the Mamlûk sultan for robbing the pilgrims of Mosul; besieging Mârdân; defeating Malik ʿĪsâ of the Artûkids and marrying his daughter; defeating the Ak-Koyunlu with their ally Mutâḥhâr, the ruler of Ersûnjîn, and compelling them to enter the service of ʿKhâlî Burhân al-Ṭûn—Karâ Mefcmed defended his country heroically against the attacks of Tîmûr in 789/1387. In fact, taking advantage of Tîmûr’s return to Transoxania, he captured Tabrız the next year. After leaving troops to guard Tabrız, returning to eastern Anatolia, he was faced with the opposition of Pîr Hasan Beg, one of the amirs in his service. Pîr Hasan was the son of ʿUsayn Beg, who had been killed by Bayram Khodja, and he had distinguished himself particularly in the battles with Tîmûr. Encouraged by this, and determined to avenge his father, he severed his ties of allegiance to Karâ Mefcmed and attempted to capture his principality. His venture was successful; in a battle (Râbi‘ II 791/April 1389) Pîr Hasan killed Karâ Mefcmed and seized the principality. According to some Mamlûk historians (Ibn al-ʾFîrât, al-ʿAynî) Pîr Hasan (Karâ Ḥasan in their works) was Karâ Mefcmed’s nephew, but this is not confirmed by other sources.
Plr Hasan Beg's rule did not last long, and an important part of the Karä-Koyunlu Turcomans gathered round Mśr Kahdja, one of the sons of Karä Meğmed, and continued the struggle. But it soon became apparent that Mśr Kahdja was a man of weak character, and he was replaced by his brother Karä Yusuf. The bitter fighting between Karä Yusuf and Plr Hasan led to heavy losses on both sides. Finally, Dörper Sālim Beg intervened and stopped the hostilities. Although the death of Plr Hasan (793/1392) saved Karä Yusuf from his enemy, shortly afterwards he had to resume fighting with his son Huṣayn Beg. The rule of Karä Yusuf coincided with the expansion of Timūr's operations in the Middle East. Like his father, Karä Yusuf opposed Timūr and tried to defend his country against his attacks. Taking advantage of Timūr's departure, he captured Tabriz several times, and took prisoner Atlamsh, governor of Awīnik and one of Timūr's commanders, and sent him to Egypt (797/1395).

However, when Timūr started invading Anatolia, Yusuf Beg was obliged to take refuge with Bāyezid I [q.v.] (802/1400). In fact, Bāyezid's offer of shelter to the Karä-Koyunlu Beg was one of Timūr's pretexts for opening hostilities against the Ottoman ruler. While Timūr entered the Ottoman territories, Karä Yusuf left Anatolia (805/1402) and went to 'Irāk, where he helped Sultān Ahmad to suppress his son's revolt, but upon Sultān Ahmad's failure to keep his word, he attacked Baghdad (805/1403). Defeated in battle by the superior forces of Timūr's grandsons, he went to Damascus by the desert route. Karä Yusuf and Djalayir Afçamad were imprisoned in Damascus, closely, because he is a Turcoman. The refusal of Timūr to release them, the ruler of Egypt. In a short space of time, he had learnt from the modest level of a tribal chief to the exalted position of ruler of a large country. From around this time onwards, Shah Rukh in particular encouraged Karä Yūlūq Othmān, the Ak-Koyunlu ruler of Āmid, Urfa and Kamāl, the Shirvān-Shah Shaykh Ibrāhil and others, in hostility towards Karä Yusuf. The alliance of the Shirvān-Shah Shaykh Ibrāhil with Arlat Sayyidī Ahmad, the ruler of Shāk, and Kostendil (Constantine), the Georgian king, against the Karä-Koyunlu ruler, was also related to this situation. But in a battle fought on the banks of the river Kūr, they were heavily defeated (Ramadān 814/December 1412); while Shaykh Ibrāhil managed to save himself by paying a heavy ransom, the Georgian king for his own safety was put to death.

The Karä-Koyunlu territory in Anatolia covered the Erzindjan area in the north, and the Mardin area in the south. Karä Yusuf had captured Erzindjan from Shaykh Hasan, grandson of Muṭahhar (813/1410), and Mardin from Malik Sālīh of the Artuqids (812/1409). However, the Karä-Koyunlu border could be extended no further in that direction because of the resistance of Karä Yūlūq Othmān Beg of the Ak-Koyunlu. Although Karä Yusuf defeated this stubborn enemy many times, and even forced him to take refuge with the Mamluks, he was never able to subdue him. Besides this, Karä Yusuf's trespassing into Mamluk territory in an effort to catch Karä Yūlūq, and the plunder and destruction he caused there, gave rise to hostilities between the two states. Deeply concerned that Karä Yusuf, whom he knew well, would some day be a cause of serious danger, Shaykh felt compelled to support the Ak-Koyunlu Beg secretly. Returning to Mardin from Mamluk territory (November-December 1418), Karä Yusuf met with an unexpected disaster, the death of his favourite son Plr Budak; his death was
a source of deep sorrow to his father, who had returned to Tabriz. Shaykh could not forget the destruction wreaked on his territory by the Kara-Koyunlu and the threatening letter he had received from Kara Yusuf. He had started preparing for war, although he was suffering from gout at the time and had to be carried. When he received the news of Shah Rukh's attack on Kara Yusuf, he cancelled his war preparations.

Shah Rukh, who had brought under his rule the great part of the empire founded by his father Timur, would not tolerate Aqharbâyûdân, and in particular, a part of 'Irâk-i 'Adîm, remaining under the rule of Kara Yusuf. He had already made a number of attempts to crush him in 827/1420 and 827/1421, but had not been able to carry these through because of family squabbles. Peace negotiations came to nothing: Shah Rukh demanded that Kara Yusuf return the cities of Sultânîyya and Kazwîn and agree to be his vassal. The Kara-Koyunlu ruler refused, and set out from Tabriz, his capital, to meet the Caghatayid ruler. The news terrified the Caghatayid army of 200,000 horsemen, although Kara Yusuf's forces consisted of 50,000 horsemen at the most. As the historian Hâfiz-i Abru noted, everyone from the Caghatayid ruler down to the lowest-ranking soldier was doubtful of victory. Their fears turned to joy at the news of the death of the Kara-Koyunlu ruler. In fact, Karâ Yusuf had become seriously ill on his departure from Tabriz, but had insisted on being carried on a stretcher. His condition worsened when he was two leagues from Uçîn, and he died soon after (7 Dhu'l-Ka'da 827/13 November 1420).

Kara Yusuf's greatness transformed the Kara-Koyunlu dynasty. When he returned home in 827/1420, he and his retinue were in a miserable state, but at his death he left his successors a large country extending from Erzindjian to Kazwîn and from Shîrvân to Başra. He was buried at Ardjish, but the site of his lavishly-constructed tomb and zâwîya has not been found.

The panic caused by the death of their ruler and the arrival of the Caghatayid army was short lived. Most of the Kara-Koyunlu rallied around Iskandar, one of Karâ Yusuf's sons, who was known for his bravery. Iskandar defeated Karâ Yûlûk of the Ak-Koyunlu, who had attacked Mârdîn (Rabi\' II 824/ April 1422). This victory caused dismay among the forces of Shah Rukh, who then camped along the river Araz, but it raised the morale of the Kara-Koyunlu so much that they started preparing an army of 30,000-40,000 men for battle with Shah Rukh on the Alashgird plain between Erzurum and Aqhr. Knowing that elephants were employed in the Caghatayid army, they trained their horses against elephants made of mud. Shah Rukh would have preferred not to cross the shores of Lake Van and to return to Aqharbâyûdân, but on the request of Karâ Yûlûk and some local amirs he resolved to march against the Kara-Koyunlu. The three-day battle (20-30 Râjâb and 1 Shabân 824/30-31 July and 1 August 1422) fought on the Alashgird plain ended in victory for Shah Rukh thanks to the numerical superiority of his forces. He could not, however, find anybody among his sons, amirs or others, worthy to be appointed as governor of Aqharbâyûdân (which made him an object of satire by some poets); no one would accept the position for fear of Iskandar. The Caghatayid ruler therefore returned to Khurasan, leaving Aqharbâyûdân to its former owners. Although Tabriz was occupied by Isfâhân, brother of Iskandar, who had commanded the left flank of the Kara-Koyunlu army in the battle of Alashgird, he evacuated the city and withdrew to the Pasin plain when he heard that Iskandar was on his way. Some time later he went to seek his fortune in 'Irâk-i Arab.

Iskandar spent the years 825/1422 and 827/1424 punishing the amirs of Hakkârî and Bîdîsî who had betrayed him by becoming vassals to Shah Rukh, and annexing Van, Aghbâh and Mosh. Attacking the Shîrvân Shah Râkîl Allah, one of the vassals of Shah Rukh, in 831/1428, he plundered his territory, and in the next year captured Sultânîyya, Zandjian, Kazwîn and Abhar, which were subject to Shah Rukh. Concerned at these exploits, the Caghatayid ruler marched into Aqharbâyûdân with a large army. A two-day battle (17-18 Dhu'l-Hijja 832/17-18 September, 1429) fought at Salmâs ended in a Caghatayid victory. In spite of this, Shah Rukh realized that he would never be able to wipe out the Kara-Koyunlu; he therefore appointed Abû Sâ'id, the youngest son of Karâ Yusuf, as amir of Aqharbâyûdân and returned home in the spring of 833/1430.

Before long, Iskandar seized his brother and put him to death. His relationships with his other brothers were also strained. Shah Me'med had broken off relations with his family after he had taken the rule of Baghîdâd, which Isfâhân, refusing to be subject to Iskandar, went to 'Irâk-i 'Arab and captured one by one the cities in the territory of the ineffective and foolish Shah Me'med. Finally capturing Baghîdâd in 836/1433, he effectively robbed his brother of all his lands. As for Dîhnâ, whose reli was around Lake Van, he resented his brother's hostile attitude towards him. Through opening hostilities against his brother in 837/1434, he became, like Isfâhân, a vassal of Shah Rukh. The acquisition of these two vassals prompted Shah Rukh to carry out the third Aqharbâyûdân expedition, despite the opposition of most of his amirs, allied to the bitter complaints of the Shîrvân Shah, whose territories had been devastated (838/1434). Iskandar probably knew nothing definite of Dîhnâ Shah's action.

Calling Dîhnâ Shah to his presence at Ravy in 838/1434, Shah Rukh declared him the head of the Kara-Koyunlu and sent a large army against Iskandar. Withdrawing towards Erzurum, Iskandar met the forces of Karâ Yûlûk 'Ogîmân of the Ak-Koyunlu, defeated him in a bloody battle, and took refuge in Ottoman territory when pursued by the forces of the Timûrîds. Iskandar probably thought that he could deal with Dîhnâ Shah as easily as he did with Abû Sâ'id, but he suffered defeat near Tabriz (841/1438) and took shelter in the impregnable fortress of Allindjâk, which housed his family and treasury. Besieged by Dîhnâ Shah, Iskandar could hope only for military aid from Egypt, but the news of the death of Sulîn Barbây was received at Erzindjian and the Egyptian force returned. Iskandar was murdered one night by his son Shah Kûbâd (841/1438). He was one of the most courageous rulers of his time, and few were able to withstand him. It was mainly through his courage that he was able to rule his country for 18 years. However, he was devoid of political wisdom, a deficiency which led to the destruction of his lands, the misery of his people, and the sad end of his reign.

During the reign of Dîhnâ Shah (823/1323-1439-47), the Kara-Koyunlu territory grew into a large empire and enjoyed its most brilliant phase. On the death of Isfâhân in 848/1445, Dîhnâ Shah annexed 'Irâk-i 'Arab (849/1446), and taking advantage of the death
in 850/1447 of Shâh Rûgh, whose vassal he was, he attacked the cities of Sulṭânîyya and Kazvin. Not content with these victories, he later took the cities of Rayy and Isfâhan and the regions of Fârs and Kirmân. Although his Khurasân expedition failed, mainly because of the revolt of his son Hasan 'Ali in 862/1458, he signed a treaty of firm friendship with Abû Sa'id of the Ñimûrîs, and thereby obtained confirmation of his sovereignty over the territories he had gained from the Câghatayid. Dîhân Shâh had reached the height of his achievements, and was the bearer of such titles as hâkâm, hâkâhân and sultân. During his reign, the Kârâ-Koyunlu territory had become one of the major Islamic powers. Parallel to his renown as a ruler, the political, military and administrative organization of his state also reached a high level of development. Culture and learning were encouraged by Dîhân Shâh, who was also a great builder. A highly cultured man, he wrote poems in Turkish and Persian under the pseudonym of Haâkî.

Dîhân Shâh's expedition against Uzûn Hasan Beg of the Âk-Koyunlu ended in disaster through his own carelessness. He and his son Muḥammad were killed, while another son, Yûsfû, was blinded (872/1467). His son Fîr Bûdak had been put to death early (869/1465) for rising against his father. His son Hasan 'Ali, who was in prison, was therefore placed on the Kârâ-Koyunlu throne. Deficient in intelligence and weak in character, he could not hope to hold out against Uzûn Hasan Beg. In fact, he was defeated by him at Marrand, and had to take refuge under Abû Sa'id, whom he had called to his aid. When Abû Sa'id was also defeated, Hasan 'Ali fled towards Hamadân, convinced himself when he realized that he could not avoid capture (Şawwâl 873/April 1469). Although his brother Yûsfû, who had been blinded, was taken to Fârs and placed on the throne by the begs of the Bahârî, he was put to death by Uğurlû Mehmed, son of Uzûn Hasan Beg, in 874/1470. In that year all the Kârâ-Koyunlu territories passed into the hands of the Âk-Koyunlu, and Kârâ-Koyunlu power virtually came to an end.

The organization of the Kârâ-Koyunlu state was a continuation of that of the Djalâylîrûds. The fact that the last members of the dynasty, as well as some tribal begs, had such names as Yâr 'Ali, Fîr 'Ali, Hasan 'Ali, Husayn 'Ali and 'Ali Şeker may be taken as evidence of the existence of a tendency towards Shi'ism among the Kârâ-Koyunlu. Moreover it is said that Isfâhan (Ispend) had coins struck on behalf of the Twelve Imâms. On the other hand, the names of the Four Caliphs appear on the coins belonging to the reign of Dîhân Shâh, and no contemporary historian has any record of his having had any inclination towards Shi'ism. The tombstones carved in the form of rams that can now be seen in eastern Anatolia and Iran were normally erected in memory of men famed for their bravery and gallantry; some of these tombstones certainly belong to the Kârâ-Koyunlu.


KARA-KUM [see KARAKUM]

KARA MAHMÛD PASHA, ISKODRALI, BUGHATLI (ca. 1155-1211/1742-96), and important representative of the powerful north Albanian dynasty of the Bughatli (Turkish: Budjatli), which achieved local prominence in the mid-12th/18th century as holders of large mekânu'dî. This family was able, between 1163/1750 and 1247/1831, to maintain itself in control of the sandjåk of Ishkodra (İskenderiye, Scutari, Skadar, the present Shkodër) and the surrounding territories as a hereditary quasi-principality.

The origins of the Bughatli remain debatable: amongst other traditions, that of their alleged descent from Stanisha, the rebellious brother of the vâdikha Gjuraj, who, in the aftermath of the battle of Ljeshkopolje (863/1461), settled in the village of Bushât, may be balanced by a claim (unsubstantiated) to a Venetian origin, while Kara Mahmûd assigned to himself, at a critical point in his career (1201/1792), descent from Skanderbeg. Be that as it may, from the later 9th/15th until the end of the 11th/17th century, the Bughâtî are found as sandjâ'-beysî of Ishkodra. For example, ca. 1015/1604 a certain Tâhir Bey Bushâtî is found engaged as an auxilliary of the pasha against the Kilimani. After a period of confusion during the first half of the 12th/18th century, Şhâzî Mehmed Pasha, the restorer of Bushâtî power in Ishkodra, and the founder of their fortunes as aş'ârîn, succeeded from ca. 1163/ 1750 in eliminating all opposition to his rule. On his death (15 Dümâdâh 1289/14 July 1775—not, as commonly stated, in 1184/1770 or 1193/ 1779, or, as stated in EFP i, 657, in 1211/1796), power passed briefly to his eldest son, Muṣṭâfa, and then (1390/1776) to his second son, Mahmûd Pasha, who, on his own initiative, rapidly exercised “presque impunément une autorité souveraine dans ce pays” (Capriate, Venetian consul at Durazzo (Durrës), 1782).

As sandjâ'-beysî of Ishkodra, with the honorary rank of mirmîdân, Kara Mahmûd Pasha found it possible to profit from the internal weakness of the Ottoman state and its involvement in successive wars with Russia and Austria, by reducing to obedience much of northern and central Albania, and engaging in incessant warfare with, e.g., Ojihrîl Ahmed Pasha to the east and the much better-known Tepedelenî 'Ali Pasha to the south. With the wâlis of Bosnia, to the north, Kara Mahmûd Pasha also came into conflict, establishing his control over the fortresses of Podgoriçha (Podgorica) and Ishbuz (Şupër). Internally, he by reducing his power by an alliance with the highland Malisors and by an economic policy of encouraging trade—especially Venetian trade—through Ishkodra. Like his father, he drew considerable financial advantage from this commerce.

It was believed in Istanbul—and possibly with reason—that the authority of the bâhis had lapsed and that the Sharti was no longer enforced in the territories under Kara Mahmûd Pasha's control. The Porte, accordingly, declared him a rebel, sending (1199/1784-5) an expedition under the kapudan pasha Djezârîlî Hasan Pasha [q.v.]; Kara Mahmûd Pasha was forced to surrender, but was pardoned and reinstated as sandjâ'-beysî of Ishkodra. Shortly afterwards (1785) he invaded Montenegro, and at the same time began to intrigue with Austria against the sultan in exchange for a promise of recognition as an independent ruler, an act which may have precipitated an unsuccessful second Ottoman expedition against him in 1200-1/1786-7, led by Tepedelenî 'Ali Pasha and the wâli of Rumilî, Ayydoslu Mehmed Pasha. Pardoned once more, in exchange for his rendering military assistance against Austria, and after having demonstrated his loyalty to the sultan by effecting the massacre of an Austrian mission under Bruggard in Şabâbân 1202/May 1788, Kara Mahmûd Pasha was invested with the titular wâllîlık of Anatolia and appointed commander (ser'asker) of the Ottoman forces assembled at Yefi-
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pazar (1204/1789). The following year he acted as sercasker at Widin, but was soon once more in revolt, being dismissed from command.

Returned to Ishkodra, Kara Mahmud Pasha resisted successfully the new sultan, Selim III, who in 1208/1793 sent against him the wall of Rumili, resisted successfully the new sultan, Selim III, who in 1211/1796 in circumstances which are commemorated by the Montenegrin epic ballad Pjesen. His head was for long preserved in a church at Cetinje; his body was eventually buried at Podgorica.

There is no doubt that, compared with e.g. Tepedelenli 'Ali Pasha, the importance of the Bushati family in general, and of Kara Mahmud Pasha in particular, for the history of the Balkan a`yanate of the 18th-19th centuries, has been underestimated. Recent attempts, however, to read into the activities of Kara Mahmud Pasha an Albanian proto-national significance should perhaps be treated with considerable reserve.

Bibliography: Ahmed Djewdet, Ta`rikh (n.p., n.d.), iii-iv, vi, passim (biographical sketch, vi, 206-10); brief references in the histories of Montenegro by Milorad Medaković, Pobjestna Crnogor od naisiariq vremena do 1836, Zemun 1850, 67 ff.; A. Andric, Geschichte des Fürstenthums Montenegro, Vienna 1883; D. Mišković, Istorija Crne Gore, Zadar 1856, 70-1; P. Coquelle, Histoire de Monténégro et de la Bosnie, Paris 1895; more extended treatments in Dora d'Istria, Gli Albanesi musulmani; Scutari e i Buchati, in Nuova Antologia di Scienza, Lettere ed Arte, viii (1868), 221-42; S. Gopcevic, Geschichte von Montenegro und Albanien, Gottinga 1914, 222-5, 245-80; S. M. Shaw, Between old and new: the Ottoman Empire under Selim III, 1789-1807, Cambridge, Mass. 1971, 230-4. Cf. Mehmed Thurayyā (Sidnayyy), Sīdīl-i ʿOṯmānī, iv, 258, 328-9 (draws heavily on Djewdet); I. H. Uzuncarsili, Osmanli Tarihi, iv, 1, Ankara 1956, 615-7; Ettore Rossi, Saggio sul dominio turco e l'introduzione dell'Islam in Albania, in Rivista d'Albania, iii (1940), 200 ff.; S. Pollo, A. Buda and others, Historia e Shqipërisë, i, Tirane 1964, chs. ix-x. Recent detailed studies on part or all of Kara Mahmud Pasha's career are by N. P. Skerovic, "Pjesen": Črnogorska pobeda nad Škodarskim pašem Mahmudom Bušatlijem kao istorijski dokument, in Istorijski Časopis, vi (1956), 153-67; V. Vinaver, Crna Gora, Skadar i Dubrovnik (153-67); V. Vinaver, Arabische, Türkische und Persische Hss. der Universitätsbibliothek in Bratislava, 187-98. For a Ms. once belonging to the family of the Bushati family survives in part in the Albanian State Archives (see Selami Pulahā, Materiaux documentaires en langue osmano-turque des archives albanaises . . ., in Studia Albanica, iii/1 (1966), 187-98. For a Ms. once belonging to the family see J. Blaskovid, Arabische, Türke, und Persische Hss. der Universitätsbibliothek in Bratislava, no. 569. A few notices of what are doubtless far more extensive Bayvekleat Arşivi materials have been provided by I. H. Uzuncanrili and S. J. Shaw, in their works indicated above; a number of Turkish documents (şidijliler preserved in the Oriental Institute, Sarajevo) relating to Kara Mahmud Pasha have been utilized by M. Spaho, Škodarski mutesarif Mahmud Paša Bušatlijs prema turskim dokumentima, in Istoricki Zapisi, xx/4 (1963), 669-81. (C. J. HEPWORTH)

KARA MUSTAFA PASHA, MERZIFONLU, MAKTEL, Ottoman Grand Vizier.

According to the "official" Ottoman accounts (e.g., Râşid, Ta`rikh, i, 430), Kara Mustafa Pasha was of Turkish origin, born in 1044/1634-5 into the Anatolian "feudal gentry", his father, whose name is given as Unlu Beg (but as Voontho Agha in S'O, iv, 402), being a member of the a`yan-i sipahiyyan and one of those who fell in the siege of Bagdad by Murât IV in 1048/1638. A friendship was said to have existed between his father and Köprüli Mehmed Paşa, in whose household, accordingly, the son was brought up, educated with Köprüli's own son, Ahmed.

The relationship that apparently emerged between the house of Köprüli and Kara Mustafa certainly determined, in large measure, the latter's subsequent political career, but other, and often conflicting, accounts of his origins and early years have survived from the time preceding his nomination to the Grand Vizierate in 1087/1676. According to a report prepared for the French ambassador de Noielt at some time between March 1675 and October 1676 (appendix to Ch. Schérer, ed., Journal d'Antoine Galland pendant son séjour à Constantinople (1672-1673), Paris 1881, ii, 186-207), Kara Mustafa Pasha was at that time "saêg de quarante-huit ans ou environ" (i.e., born ca. 1036/1626-7) and the son of a sipahi called Derwâş Beg, of Merzifon. His father gave him, at the age of eighteen (? ca. 1054/1644-5), to Mehmed Köprüli, who made him his id-âqlan in his service, promoting him to sipâkdâr on his own appointment as müstellim for the eyâlet of Şam (Damascus) (cf. Silâhbâr, Ta`rikh, Istanbul 1928, i, 225), and, subsequently, to be his mükhârdar (seal-bearer). On the appointment of Mehmed Köprüli to the governorship of the eyâlet of Trablîs al-Şâmr (report apud Schérer, 186: in 1065/1654-5, cf. Silâhbâr i, 226) he raised Kara Mustafa to be one of his aghâs; shortly afterwards, on assuming the Grand Vizierate (1066/1655-6), Mehmed Köprüli summoned Kara Mustafa from Merzifon—where he had retired because of illness—and appointed him to his teşhid-iştâd ("celuy que le Pacha despece au Grand Seigneur lorsqu'il a quelque chose de consequence à lui faire scavoir") (cf. Râşid, i, 430-1).

A third conflicting early account of Kara Mustafa Pasha's origins is supplied in a rélazione composed c. 1680 by the Venetian baiad Morosini, published by N. Barozzi and G. Berchet, Relazioni, Series v, Turchia i/2, Venice 1872, 207, and cf. 259), which seems to reflect a tradition current even in the 1660s.
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As Kapudan Pasha, Kara Mustafa accompanied Mehmed IV on an inspection of the fortifications of the Dardanelles (Safar to Rabî' II 1076/August to October 1665), and was subsequently put in charge of naval preparations for the planned final reduction of Crete. His actions at this time, in attempting to commandeer for transport purposes ships of the European maritime powers, were resisted by their representatives at the Porte, and contributed materially to the exaggerated accounts concerning him which became current in Europe.

In Shawâbâ 1076/February 1666 he briefly resumed the post of ka'îmmâ'âm, accompanying Mehmed IV on a hunting expedition to Cataldja. While there (1-14 Shawâbâ 1076/5-19 February) he was dismissed as Kapudan Pasha but received in compensation promotion to the rank of Second Vizier, as part of a complicated reassignment of posts (Silahdar i, 392-3). At this point, with the siege of Kandiey entrusted to the Grand Vizier, Kara Mustafa became once more ka'îmmâ'âm (5 Dhû ’-l-Ka’dâ 1076/9 May 1666), a post which he retained until the return of the Grand Vizier to Edirne on 8 Şafar 1081/27 June 1670 (Silahdar i, 409, 558).

During these years Kara Mustafa Pasha remained in close attendance on Mehmed IV, but his ascendency appears to have been threatened by the sudden rise to a position of influence of the sultan's boon companion Mustafa Agha, who was given the rank of Second Vizier on 28 Muḥarram 1077/31 July 1666 (thus causing Kara Mustafa's demotion to the rank of Third Vizier) and who was regarded in court circles as equal in rank to the ka'îmmâ'âm (Silahdar i, 430).

In Shawwâl 1078/March-April 1668 Kara Mustafa accompanied Mehmed IV to Yeśliğehir-ı Fenâr (Lârisa), in order to observe more closely the progress of the siege of Kandiey. Here he lived with great pomp and magnificence—his military band attracting the particular attention of foreign visitors—dividing his time between the reception of envoys and hunting with Mehmed IV in his frequent expeditions throughout Thessaly. It was on one of these excursions, while encamped at Livadya in Djumâda 1/1080/October 1669 that Kara Mustafa carried to the sultan the news of the capitulation of Kandiey (Silahdar i, 483 ff., 501 ff., 554-5).

In the interval of peace (1669-72) between the end of the Cretan campaign and the outbreak of war with Poland, Kara Mustafa Pasha, still with the rank of Third Vizier, remained close to the sultan (cf. Silahdar i, 562-8).

Kara Mustafa Pasha played an active, if subordinate, role in the Polish campaign of 1083/1672, this being the first time since 1068/1658 that he had seen service in the field. He was present at the sieges of Khotin and later commanded the right wing at the opening of the siege of Kamianëc (1083/1672). After the Ottoman capture of Buğask (Buczacz), an operation which he commanded, he was appointed chief plenipotentiary in the negotiations with the Poles and concluded with them the cessation of hostilities which transferred Podolia to Ottoman control and recognized the western Ukraine as an Ottoman protectorate (Silahdar i, 568 ff., 582-3, 592 ff., 610, 611 ff.).

It would seem that after his return from Poland Kara Mustafa Pasha was able further to establish his influence with the sultan. Having, earlier in his

Fâddl Ahmed Pasha (Silahdar i, 231 ff., passim; Knolles, Generall Historie, ii, 163).

(cf. Roger North, Life ... of Sir Dudley North, London 1744, 73). This relates that Kara Mustafa was born "among the dregs of the people" ("nato per castigo de' popoli") near Trabzon (? a dragoman's misreading of "Merzifon"). Kara Mustafa obtained a post as one of the lowest domestics of Mehemd Köprülü—who had indeed for a short time governed the eyâlet of Trabzon ca. 1054-6/1644-5 (cf. Silahdar, i, 225) (this providing some support to the chronology of the account published by Schéfer).

Amongst this conflicting evidence no clear path can be charted. The "official" account is circumstantially weak and appears to be a romantic ex post facto construction. Epigraphic evidence, however, confirms at least that Kara Mustafa was a native of Merzifon or, more precisely, of the nearby village of Maruéjda (now Bahêkent), where he founded a mosque, a fountain, and a library (A. Gabriel, Monumenta turca d'Anatolie, ii, Paris 1934, 71; Amasya II silâhi, n.p., n.d., 187-9). Only upon the appointment of his patron, Mehemd Köprülü, to the Grand Vizierate in 1066/1656 does Kara Mustafa become a visible public figure.

He participated in the campaign undertaken by the Grand Vizier against Transylvania in 1068/1658, and, on the Ottoman capture of the important fortress of Yanova (July 1068/1 September 1668) he was employed—as tebâhûndî to Mehemd Köprülü—to convey the news of the success to Mehemd IV (Mêhemd Khalife, Ta'vrâh-i Chîlîmânî, ed. A. Reiff, in TOEM, supp., 1340, 54) and as a reward was taken into the Outside Service of the Sultan, being appointed to the office of külük mirâghor (Silahdar, i, 127, 140). On 3 Djumâda II 1070/25 February 1666 Kara Mustafa "Agha" was appointed beşer beşîgî of Sîliâstre, from which office he was removed on 26 Shawâbân 1071/16 April 1661 in order to superintend the removal of the Wâlîde sulṭân from Edirne to Istanbul. Shortly afterwards, he was raised to the rank of Vizier and appointed vâlî of Diyarbârk (Silahdar i, 181-2, 217; Râşîldî, ii, 73; i, ii, 430).

His dependence on the continuing ascendancy of the Köprülü family was also soon apparent. Shortly after the death of Mehemd Köprülü and the appointment to the Grand Vizierate of his son, Fâddl Ahmed Köprülü (7-8 Rabî' I 1072/31 October-1 November 1661), Kara Mustafâ Pasha was appointed Kapudân Pasha on 1 Djumâda 1/13 December of the same year (Silahdar i, 221; Râşîldî, i, 23). In this capacity he commanded the Ottoman fleet in the Aegean Sea, returning to Istanbul in Dhûl Qa’dâ 1/22 January 1663, in time to take part in the great military parade held before the sultan at Edirne on 28 Shawâbân 1073/30 April 1663. In the official description of this event he ranked second in the list of participants—an indication of his steadily improving political fortunes.

He did not serve in the campaigns undertaken by Ahmed Köprülü in Hungary. On the departure of the army and the Grand Vizier from Edirne (5 Ramadân 1073/13 April 1663), he was appointed ka'îmmâ'âm [q.v.], a position which allowed him to exercise an increasing influence on the sultan and on affairs of state. At the same time he was permitted to retain the office of kapudânî-i deryâ, administering it through a deputy (Silahdar i, 241; Râşîldî, i, 26-7). During this period his duties, as recorded in the Ottoman sources, have been largely only ceremonial, but it was rumoured among western diplomats that he was already aiming at the Grand Vizierate and intriguing with the sultan against
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career, married a daughter of Mehmed Köprüli, he was on 4 Rabī' II 1086/29 May 1675, as part of the ceremonies held at Edirne in honour of the circumcision of the sons of Mehmed IV, betrothed to the sultan's daughter, Küçük Sultan.

During the last illness of Fadıl Ahmed Pasha, Kara Muştafa was authorized by the sultan to take over the public functions of the Grand Vizier—functions which he exercised first at a dâ'wan held in the Ok Meydanı at Istanbul on 27 Dümâdâr 1087/28 July 1676. On 2 Şahbân/10 October of the same year he was appointed yol küimâhâtı for the journey of Mehmed IV from Istanbul to Edirne. The Grand Vizier himself, following behind, died on the road between Çorlu and Karşıklıran. The seals of office were brought on 25-7 Şahbân 1087/29 November 1676 to the sultan, who invested Kara Muştafa Paşa with the Grand Vizierate (Râşid, i, 332-4; Silâddar, i, 651-2).

Kara Muştafa Paşa occupied the Grand Vizierate for seven years (Şahbân 1087/November 1676 to 6 Muharram 1095/25 December 1683). His domestic policies were conservative, frequently rapacious, and designed both for the exigencies of a war economy and for his personal enrichment. Morosini di Alvise, for example, described him as "tutto venale, crudele e infame" (op. cit., 204), neither was on occasion allowed to override the financial interests of the state: thus in 6 Dhu¬l-Ka‘da 1091/November-December 1680 he decreed the (temporary) abolition of the khamr emdneti, the excise on wine, it being argued that for the state to profit from the sale of wine was contrary to the Şarî'a. In the same spirit he restored (1087/1676) the ancient custom that the Grand Vizier and his assistants should tour the markets of Istanbul on Wednesdays, and refused to admit to other than public audience the interpreters of western ambassadors, on the grounds that they were of rekâyâ status (Silâddar i, 735; R. Mantran, Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle, Paris 1962, 126, n; Knolles, op. cit., ii, 264).

In his dealings with the envoys of Christian states and with the merchant communities in Istanbul and the other ports of the Ottoman Empire, Kara Muştafa Paşa seems to have been animated by an "intense xenophobia" (Mantran, op. cit., 527), which had been remarked as early as 1074/1663 (cf. a harsh letter of that year to the English ambassador, omitting the customary salutations (Leicester, County Record Office), but which became more strongly marked after his assumption of the Grand Vizierate (e.g., the exactions laid upon the Dutch for the renewal of their Capitulations, upon the French over their bombardment of Chios, and against the English in a constant stream of avanias during the years 1676-83). Despite this, the Dutch ambassador Colyer could describe him in 1677 as "een stout ende prompt, onderneem enden man" (K. Heeringa, ed., Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis van den Levantschen Handel, ii (1661-1726), The Hague 1917 (= Rijks-MSS. Commission, Report on the MSS. of Allan George Finch, Esq., ii (London 1922), 62; Berchet, op. cit., 187, 209; Schefer, op. cit., ii, 205).

In foreign affairs, Kara Muştafa Paşa continued, but with less careful statecraft, the policies of his two illustrious predecessors. Circumstances, and perhaps—as was at the time alleged—his personal predilections, enforced a preoccupation with the northern frontiers of the Empire and with the Christian states—Russia, Poland and Austria—which lay beyond its borders. In his relations with these states he attempted, with little success, to make use of often refractory Ottoman vassals, such as the Cossack hetman Doroshenko, the Hungarian magnate Imre Thokoly, and the then çekân of the Crimea, Selim Giray II. His policy has been commonly regarded as war for its own sake, but some at least of his actions seem rather to have been attempts to consolidate or define the Ottoman presence in those disputed areas—most notable the Ukraine and Hungary—which formed buffer zones between the Ottoman state and the recognized lands of dâr al-ḫarb.

The years from 1087/1676 to 1092/1681 were entirely taken up with the problem of the Dniepr frontier. The settlement between Poland and the Ottoman Empire, which had been concluded at Izvandja/Zurawno shortly before the death of Ahmed Köprüli, had opened the door to Russo-Ottoman rivalry in the Ukraine, but the defection from the Ottoman camp of the hetman Doroshenko led directly to Kara Muştafa Paşa's unsuccessful first Russian campaign (1088/1679). In a second expedition which was launched in the following year, the Cossack stronghold of Çehrin was taken (Radjab 1089/August 1687) and later demolished (Silâddar, i, 672-722; the fest-nâmîs celebrating the event, ibid., 714). The essentially defensive nature of these campaigns was underlined by the construction (1090/1679) of new Ottoman fortresses on the Dniepr and Bug rivers, and by a third inconclusive campaign in 1091/1680, which led to a Russo-Ottoman truce (2 Szafar 1092/13 March 1681).

Ottoman relations with Russia and Poland being thus stabilized, Kara Muştafa Paşa was free to turn his attention to the affairs of Hungary and to the planning of offensive warfare against Austria. To this end he recognized (1093/1682) the Hungarian malcontent Thokoly as puppet ruler and refused to renew except on the severest terms the twenty-year truce of Vasvár, due to expire in 1684. At the same time extensive military preparations were undertaken; finally, in Muharram 1094/December 1682, a large army with Mehmed IV and Kara Muştafa Paşa at its head departed from Edirne for a major campaign in Hungary and for the fateful second Ottoman attempt to capture Vienna (Silâddar, ii, 2 ff.).

This final, disastrous phase of Kara Muştafa's career—the progress of the campaign, the unsuccessful siege of Vienna, and the failure of the Grand Vizier to survive politically the consequences of military defeat—cannot be treated in detail here. It has, in any case, received considerable (if often uncritical) attention from contemporary and later observers (see Bibliography, below). Nor, perhaps, should the defeat of Kara Muştafa before Vienna be viewed in the totally apocalyptic light cast on it at the time and subsequently. In the context of Ottoman warfare it may be regarded as no more than the unexpected failure of a single campaign: after the siege was lifted (20 Ramaḍān 1094/12 September 1683) Kara Muştafa Paşa fell back on Yanık (Raab, Győr) (22-25 Ramaḍān), and from there retreated to Buda, where he arrived on 30 Ramaḍān/22 September. There he attempted to regroup his forces and to restore the shattered defences of the frontier, e.g., by sending 6000 men from the Buda garrison.
to reinforce Ujvar (Sihâbdâr ii, 85-96, passim). There is no evidence that while at Buda his authority as Grand Vizier was in any way questioned, or that his standing with the sultan was impaired by his failure at Vienna; what is clear is that having strengthened, to the best of his ability, the defences of the frontier, and having left Kara Meşmed Pasha as sâdâr in Hungary, Kara Mustafa departed with the army for Belgrade, where he went into winter quarters on 28 Dhu 'l-Hijja 1094/18 November 1683 (Sihâbdâr ii, 107, 113). It was at this time that his political fortunes began to ebb. On 29 Ramazân/29 September his telkhisâtı, İsmâ'îl Ağha, had arrived at the sultan's camp before Belgrade with the news of the defeat of the Ottoman army and its retreat to Yanlış. The Grand Vizier informed the sultan that he would remain at Buda until rûs-i kâsim (46 October, old style, i.e., 5 November) and then would go into winter quarters at Belgrade, from whence, in the following spring, a large and victorious army would, with the sultan's permission, attempt to regain the losses of the past campaign (Sihâbdâr ii, 107f.). The result of this communication was a series of consultations among the officers attendant on the sultan; robes of honour and a bejewelled sword—signs of royal favour—were despatched to the sultan; other gifts such as mirrors and ostrich eggs, together with the usual courtesies of hospitality, were sent to the sultan's representative at Belgrade. By the end of the year the sultan was returning to Edirne after the unsuccessful winter campaign of 1683-4. The sultan was in a poor mood; much of the correspondence of this period reflects the sultan's despondency at this setback. The sultan was not in agreement with the suggestion of his young viziers, Azem and Cevazeddin (who also had brothers in the field), that the Grand Vizier should be recalled and that the Sultan should assume the command of the army. The Sultan was determined to carry out his plans for the following spring, a large and victorious army would, with the sultan's permission, attempt to regain the losses of the past campaign (Sihâbdâr ii, 107, 113).

Bibliography: Beyond the references given in the text, a necrology of Kara Muştafa Pasha is provided by Râşidî, i, 430 ff. and an appreciation of his character and account of his pious foundations at Istanbul, Ghalâta, Edirne, Dilîddâ, Merzifon, ibid., 431-2; cf. for further details, the article by M. Münir ii, 62 (in Turkish) on the Muştafa Paşa, Merzifonlu. The account given in SÔ is erroneous in its chronology. For general treatments of the period of Kara Muştafa Paşa see Hammer-Purgstall, vi, 334 ff.; J. W. Zinkeisen, Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches, Hamburg-Gotha, 1840-63, v, passim; I. H. Uzuncaşarî, Osmanî Tarihî iii, Ankara 1951-4; cf. further the works by Ahmed Refik and Cevat Ustîn (in Turkish) listed in Ep, by F. Babinger, op. cit., passim (167 ff., avânia levied on the Dutch ship Kleyser Oostenwanus; 228 ff., the negotiations following the renewal of the Dutch Capitulations); Roger North, op. cit., 71-102: "A Relation of diverse Turkish Avanias, since [i.e., in] the government of Cara Mustapha Basha, Vizier Azem"; Knolles, cont. Rycaut, ii, passim; Hist. Miss. Comm., Report on Finch MSS. (see supra), i (London 1913), 207 ff.; ii (1922), 62-106, passim (avânias on English trade as Kapudan Paşa, beytulmulkiyet and Grand Vizier); G. F. Abbot, Under the Turk in Constantinople, London 1920. For unpublished Turkish sources on the Cebirin campaign of 1687-8 see Ağah Surî Levend, Gazetâ-nâmele, Ankara 1956, 129-30 (an anonymous relatione), and 130: 'Abd ul-Kerim, 'Abdî-i sefer-i Cehrin; also J. Blašković, Die arabischen, türkischen und persischen Hts. der Universitätsbiblioth. in Brüssel, 1961, 346-52; extended notice of Gazanâme-i Cehrin, by 'All Beg el-Ulîçevi, who dedicated it to Kara Muştafa Paşa. The Ottoman sources, both published and unpublished, for the campaign against Vienna have been surveyed and analysed by Richard F. Kreutel, Osmanische Berichte über Kara Muştafas Feldzug gegen Wn, in W, NS xxii(4) (1969), 196-206; the dispatch to the sultan at Vienna by Kara Meşmed Pasha (supra), i (London 1913), 201 ff.; ii (1922), 62-166, passim (avanias for the campaign against Vienna, in English translation in Knolles, cont. Rycaut, ii, passim-; further the contemporary western pamphlet literature, much of it sensational and quite unreliable, is immense. For the beytulmulkiyet (invitations to submit) issued by Kara Muştafa Paşa in the course of the Vienna campaign see Khalîl Edhem [Eldem], Kara Muştafa Paşanın Şopron ahlâhisine beyân-nâmeleri, in TOEM, nos. 16-17; J. H. Mordtmann, Die Kapitulation von Konstantinopel im J. 1453, in BZ, xxi (1921): beyân-nâmé addressed to the people of Vienna; contemporary English translation in Knolles, cont. Rycaut, ii, passim. (C. J. Heywood)
Kara Othman-oghli amassed sufficient wealth and prestige for the members of his family henceforth to assume the name 'Othman-zade or Kara 'Othman-oghli. After, Kara 'Othman's death, the headship of the family passed to Mustafa, one of his four sons, the others being Ibrahim, Abd Allahu and Ahmad. During Ahmad III's reign, Hadidji Mustafa Agha increased his influence while seeking to avoid a direct clash with the government. The war with Persia led the state to neglect the Empire's internal problems, at the same time allowing influential and powerful men, such as Hadidji Mustafa Agha, to oust the less successful contenders for power in the provinces and to extend their own influence. In 1531/1532 he assisted in the operations to remove Shar Beyoglu Mustafa and other brigands marauding in the regions of Denizli, Aydin, and Sarukhan. He was later to take part in other campaigns at the summons of the government. His support of the government helped the Kara 'Othman-oghli dynasty to establish its hegemony in the region. Mustafa Agha, already emin for the best ul mal-i 'ammme and for the mukas of the Imperial domains in Manisa, profited from his activity on the government's behalf to become muhafiz of Sarukhan in 1538/1539. He retained his position until 1567/1574, when the population complained of his illegal activities as mutesellim. He was found guilty and executed in the same year (Wasif, Ta'rifah, Bollak 1534, 1, 59).

The family's influence, however, did not end with Mustafa Agha's execution. His eldest son, A'ta Allah succeeded in becoming mutesellim of Sarukhan, but in 1574/1575 he was deposed for incompetence and for improprieties committed during his term of office. He was recommended to retire to the village of Yaya, but chose instead to fight against the men who had played a part in bringing about his father's execution. He was defeated in the ensuing struggle and died in 1581/1582. The headship of the family soon afterwards passed to Hadidji Mustafa Agha's other son, Ahmad Agha, who gathered the other members around himself and succeeded, in 1583/1584, in becoming voyvoda of Akhisar. After being forced out of the post he became, in 1584/1575, voyvoda of Izmir and mukas of Sandjakburni (Sancakburnu). Close family ties and a sharp eye for opportunities enabled the Karan Othman-oghli dynasty to extend the areas under its influence. In 1587/1577, Ahmad Agha achieved the rank of kapitul baghi [q.v.] at the Palace and in 1590/1576 became a mutesellim of the sandjak. The fact that his other brother Mehmed Agha was a mutesellim of the sandjak of Sarukhan meant that the whole sandjak now came under the control of the Karan Othman-oghli family. The distinguished service of Omer and Othman Aghas in the Russian war of 1590-6/1577-92 brought further benefits to the family.

With the weakening of the provincial government towards the end of the 12th/18th century, officials of the second rank, such as mutesellims, mubassils or voyvodos, came to dominate local administrations, thanks to the wealth which they had amassed. The Karan Othman-oghli family is typical of these dynasties, which were now assuming a distinctive form under the general title of 'ayyan [q.v.]. Towards the end of the 12th/18th century, the Karan Othman family extended its power beyond the boundaries of Sarukhan. Various members of the family were respectively mutesellims of Aydin and voyvodos of Turgutlu, Menemen and Bergama. Hadiji Huseyn Agha became mukas of Izmir and, mubas of the quay. It was during the time of Omer Agha that the Karan Othman-oghli family, who by now had acquired the mutesellim-ship of Isparta and the voyvoda-ship of Gelenbe, became the most influential dynasty in western Anatolia. Omer Agha was said to be the richest of the ayyans of the period. He was among the influential ayyans of Anatolia and Rumelia who received invitations during the reign of Selim III [q. v.] to discuss the government of the empire, and he put his signature to the document of agreement (I. H. Uzuncarsli, Mebus Rumeli dyonlarindar Tirinsitk Isma, Ythkoglu Suleymdn Agalar ve Alemdar Mustafa Pas, Istanbul 1942, 142, 143, 144).

When Mahmud II attempted to establish a strong, centralised administration, he did not at first interfere with the powerful Karan Othman-oghli family. Their turn came only when the others had been removed. However, the revolt in the Morea and the opening of the Russian campaign seem to have regained for the Karan Othman-oghli family some of its former dignity, even if this was only for a short time. Then in 1824/1829 two members of the family died, one of whom was Omer Agha, the voyvoda of Bergama, and the other Huseyn Agha, the mutesellim of Manisa. No other members of the family were appointed in their places but instead the posts reverted to the government. When the central government re-established its authority in the provinces and the power of the ayyans diminished, the Karan Othman-oghli family was quick to adapt to the new conditions, as the careers of Pula Mehmend Mehmed's sons Eyyub Agha, and Yakub Pascha exemplify (Lufti, Ta'rifah, Istanbul 1835, v, 96). In 1829/1833 Eyyub Agha became mutesellim of Manisa. He was dismissed for incompetence and two years later achieved the rank of Chieftain. With his death in 1827/1826, the influence of the Karan Othman-oghli family in the district, already weakened, faded altogether.

Nevertheless, the family continued to produce some noteworthy members. Othman Beg and Khali Pascha, for example, worked with the organisations established to fight the War of Independence. When the Greeks entered Manisa, Khali Pascha began to fight at the head of a guerilla group which he had formed, but met his death on 23 June 1910. Between 1923 and 1950, the family produced such noteworthy figures as Mehmend Rida (Mehmed Riza), Suad Kani (Suat Kani) and Naim (Nain). The family's most famous member in the Republican era is the writer and politician Yakub Kadri Othman-oghli (Yakup Kadri Karacanoglu). Kadri Beg's son and Yakub Pascha's grandson. Members of the family are still living at Manisa and Kirka-aghac (Kirkaqac).

**Biography:** (in addition to the works mentioned in the text): M. Cagatay Uluay, Kara Osman ogullarina ait bir vesikal, in Tarif Veskalar, x (Istanbul 1942), 193-207; x (Istanbul 1942), 308-11; xii (Istanbul 1943), 434-40; xiv (Istanbul 1944), 279-80; K. Bulak 1243, i, 59; M. Qagatay Ulucay, Osman ogullarina ait bir vesikal, in Tarif Vesikalari, x (Istanbul 1942), 193-207; x (Istanbul 1942), 308-11; xii (Istanbul 1943), 434-40; xiv (Istanbul 1944), 279-80; K. Bulak 1243, i, 59; M. Qagatay Ulucay, Osman ogullarina ayt bir vesikal, in Veskalar Deresi, x (Ankara 1973), 161-8; Osman Bayatli, Kara Osmanogullarindar Hac Omer oglu Mehmed Aga vesikal, Izmir 1957;
KARA 'OTTOMAN-OGHLI — KARA YAZIDJI


(C. ÖRonolu)  

KARA PAPAKI [see KARAPAPAK].  

KARA ŞU [see AL-FURAT].  

KARA ŞÇ-BAZAR [see KARASO-BAZAR].  

KARA TAKIN [see KARATIGI].  

KARA YAZIDJI (1497-1511/1540-1602), whose real name was 'ABD AL-IHHAN. In 792/1390 his family is one of the best-known leaders of the Djelali rebellions [see SUPPLEMENT, s.v.] in Turkey. It was previously believed that he started the rebellions, but investigations have proved that he appeared on the scene when they were at their height. Little is known about his life. Hüseyn Hüsam ed-Din Amasya tarihii, iii, 348 states that he was the son of a Turkman called Ali from Edessa. The 18th-century Armenian writer Arakel [see Brossot, Collection d’historiens arméniens: Arakel de Tauria, 359] described him as the son of a Turk from Corum, which is historically accurate.  

Kara Yazidji's civil function is obscure; little is heard of him until after he became a prominent rebel leader. Like very many Turkish youths of his time, he left home and joined the entourage of one of the sandiafr-begs as a sekbân (soldier). In 972/1565 his name is recorded for the first time as one of the su-bâghs of Kâsim Beg, the sandiafr-beg (governor) of Divrik. During Murâd III's reign, Kara Yazidji, who had enrolled in one of the mounted bûlûks (squadrions) of the Kapu-kûls, was garrisoned with his squadron in the fortress of Damascus. Shortly after, he returned to Anatolia and was given command of a squadron of the sandiafr-beg of Malatya. When in 1003/1595 the sandiafr-beg was summoned to join the campaign of Mehmîd III to Eğri [q.v.], he stayed behind as his deputy. During the preparation of the campaign to Eğri, the Djelâlî rebellions suddenly gained strength and spread in all directions. The government then formed voluntary squadrons consisting of timar-holds who had not joined the campaign and their dependents (the youths of each village), and sent them in pursuit of the rebels. Kara Yazidji and the voluntary squadrons of his sandiafr-beg also received orders to disperse the Djelâlî rebels. In 1003/1595 he was ordered to join the forces that had been sent against the rebellious medresse students who had assembled in the mountain range between Tarsus and Silifke. In the meantime the sandiafr of Malatya had been given to another sandiafr-beg, and Kara Yazidji, as the former sandiafr-beg, faced with retirement, refused to surrender their power to the man who came to accept it on behalf of the new sandiafr-beg. Having thereby resisted the order of the government (1595), Kara Yazidji joined the ranks of the Djelâlî rebels. He enlarged the garrisons under his command and within a short time rose to the position of an unchallenged Djelâlî chief. Some who had become Djelâlîs (the majority of them kapu-kül commanders [sûvaris] who had moved to Anatolia because they could not longer live with the Janissaries in Istanbul and had become kapu-aghas of the sandiafr-begs and beglerbegs, i.e., controlling the sekbâns) began to join Kara Yazidji to escape from the persecutions of the government. Kara Yazidji, learning that the government was preparing a large campaign against the Djelâlîs, retreated to the Marâş-Edessa region, which was densely populated with south-east Anatolian Turkomans who had lived lawlessly for a long time. There, the former beglerbeg Hüseyn Pasha, who was living as a rebel in the region of Karâmân, joined him too. It has been estimated that Kara Yazidji had at his disposal a total of 20,000 sekbâns. Defeating the government forces sent against him from the sandiafr of Marâş and the surrounding area, he attained great fame. As he undertook to collect provisions by force so as to feed his men, many wealthy people fled to Istanbul and there organized a demonstration against the government. The government then sent the vizier Sinân Paşa-zâde Mehmed Paşa with a fairly large army against the rebels. In view of this, Kara Yazidji occupied the fortress of Edessa, where he was surrounded. As neither Mehmîd Paşa nor Kara Yazidji proved able to gain the victory, the government made an agreement with the rebel chief and made him sandiafr-beg of 'Ayntâb in exchange for the extradition of the rebellious Hüseyn Paşa. Shortly after, Mehmîd Paşa attacked Kara Yazidji again. Both sides suffered heavy losses and the rebel chief retreated in the direction of Sivas. The government was reconciled with him once more, investing him with the added function of sandiafr-beg of Amasya. Sinân Paşa-zâde Mehmed Paşa was dismissed in 1009/1601 on the grounds that he should have admitted that his troops plundered the people and that they were becoming worse than the Djelâlîs. As the people of Amasya began to complain more and more about Kara Yazidji, he too was transferred to Corum as its sandiafr-beg, and received orders to join the forces raised to suppress the revolts of the students in the region between Tarsus and Silifke. Once more he turned to rebellion. To feed the large masses of sekbâns whom he had assembled around him, he continued to collect provisions from the people, and to demand ransoms from the towns which he surrounded, as in Sivas in spring 1009/1601. He was contemplating seizing the fortress of Kaştamonu and quartering his men there, when the government, determined to put an end to his activities, sent the wâli of Bağhdâd, Şololluâ-žade Hasan Paşa [q.v.], against him. The nucleus of this commander's troops consisted of southern Kurdish and Arab soldiers with a strong tribal spirit. A large contingent of Kapu-kül soldiers was sent from Istanbul under the command of the former wâli of Aleppo, Hadîdîl Ibrâhîm Paşa. But in the vicinity of Kayseriyye, before Hadîdîl Ibrâhîm Paşa had found the time to unite with the main forces, Kara Yazidji mounted a surprise attack on him, inflicting heavy losses, so that he was forced to retire to the fortress of Kayseriyye. Hasan Paşa, who had great difficulty in maintaining peace among his Arab and Kurdish troops in Diyarbakir, came too late to be able to help Hadîdîl Ibrâhîm...
Pasha. The Dielâl leader ceased harrying Kayseriyye and moved to the Marâqh-Göksun region, where he met Hasan Pasha. In this battle the Dielâl sekbân suffered a heavy defeat. Karâ Yâzidji thereupon fled with the remaining troops, took refuge in the mountainous region near Dînjâk (Samsun) and died there at the beginning of 1603. His brother Deli Hasan took command of the Dielâl in his place.

Since he had succeeded in maintaining a large part of Anatolia under his control for three years, Karâ Yâzidji was suspected by his enemies in Istanbul of intending to found a separate state, a rumour spread by the wealthy people who fled from Anatolia to Istanbul in order to rouse the authorities. He neither issued fermân nor founded a corps like the Janissaries, and never chose for himself a grand vizier. After Karâ Yâzidji's defeat, the sekbân and the other Dielâl leaders who had helped the rebel chief scattered in all directions; statements from those who were captured and brought to trial, and the sealed and signed documents relating to Karâ Yâzidji that were found in their possession, have proved that such assertions about his desire for independent power are fictitious.


Karâbâ (A.), kinship, from the root ë-r-b, which has the meaning of closeness, proximity. As a technical term, karba seems to be of post-Hijra usage. It is found in the works of the Muslim exegetes, but not in the Kur‘ân itself, where the preferred word is burba, also employed in pre-Islamic poetry (cf. Tarafa, Mu‘allaba). In fact, in these cases it is less a question of kinship than of relatives, more particularly close relatives, such as dâ‘î, dhawû, dîwî ‘l-burba (Kur‘ân, ii, 83, 177, iv, 8, 36, v, 106, vi, 152, VIII, 41, IX, 113, XVI, 90, XVII, 26, XXIV, 22, XXX, 38, XXXV, 18, LXXI, 23, LXX, 7). The superlative, al-abrâbûn, is also found, with the meaning of the closest relatives, those who have a claim to inherit from a man (ii, 180, 215, iv, 7, 33, 135). Kinship itself, however, is nowhere clearly defined. This was because Western Arabia was at that time under an essentially tribal system, dominated by patriarchal concepts. Thus the doctrine of kinship embraced all the members of the tribe, in whose veins, so they believed, the same blood flowed. Despite this extension of consanguinity, solidarity existed only within a relatively restricted group, the ‘açhîra [q.v.], whose members did not exact blood vengeance on one another. This is why Muḥammâd first called on his closest clan (Kur‘ân XXVI, 214).

The same practices are still current among the Beduîns, who also call all their kin the damaasıyya, to contribute towards blood-money.

What conception does the Kur‘ân have of kinship? Certainly it reflects, to a large extent, the notions of its era: patrilineal filiation, the superiority of men over women, the solidarity of agnates and collective responsibility. It is clear that Muḥammâd allowed a slight bias in favour of uterine siblings. From a purely patriarchal point of view, these latter are not part of the family and thus have no inheritance rights. Although Muslim doctrine concerning rights of succession follows paternal kinship, it is noteworthy that, in the absence of direct heirs, a part of the goods left by the dead man go to his uterine brothers (al-Bukhârî, Sahîh, Kitâb al-Farâ‘îd, 14; Ibn Rushd, Biddâya al-mugṭalîhîd, Cairo 1335, ii, 207). Furthermore, according to one tradition "the maternal uncle is the heir of him who has no others" (Ibn Rushd, op. cit., ii, 205), while another states that "the son of the sister is part of the group" (al-Buγhârî, op. cit., 23). Finally, one should note that the prohibited degrees of marriage affect the same degrees of relationship on the father's side as on the mother's (Kur‘ân, IV, 23), and that foster-relationship creates the same prohibited degrees for marriage as does blood kinship (al-Buγhârî, Kitâb al-Nîkâh, 21). On the other hand, marriage between parallel cousins and cross cousins is permitted, and even recommended.

As a result, in the Islamic conception, kinship is bilateral. However, this position is affected very hesitantly, since in practice only agnates are considered true kin. Matters of blood-vengeance and the payment of blood-money or wergild concerned them alone. This is why the diya due for a wife is incumbent on her ‘açaba, although succession to her reverts to her children and her husband (al-Buγhârî, Farâ‘îd, 10, Diyâl, 25). In the accounts of the heroic period of the Diqâlimiyya, uterine siblings often bear the costs of a vendetta, a law which was the same point of view with regard to the wife and the maternal nephew (cf. J. Chelhod, Le droit dans le sociétè bédouine, Paris 1971).

Did the extension of kinship to cognates go against pre-Islamic customs and meet with considerable resistance from them? In the thesis brilliantly presented by W. Robertson Smith (Kinship and marriage in early Arabia) precisely the opposite point of view is advanced. According to him, the patriarchal system was a late phenomenon in Asia, practically contemporaneous with the Hijra, and it was preceded by a system of filiation through female descent. Following studies by Morgan and MacLennan, this hypothesis has gradually been abandoned. Nevertheless, it does still have a small number of supporters (M. Gaudefoy-Demombynes, Mahomet, 636; M. Watt, Muhammad at Medina, 378 f.; Lecerf in ‘A‘lî), and must therefore be considered briefly. Smith was quite correct to reject the viewpoint of genealogists who saw the tribe as a large patriarchal family; he also rightly criticised the artificial nature of their neatly-organised structure. They can also be faulted for having lost sight of the tribal heterogeneity which is indicated by the structures of the kabîlî (q.v.). It nevertheless remains true that unity of blood shows itself effectively at the higher levels of the social pyramid, such as the fakhîd and the ‘açhîra. Besides, Robertson Smith's conclusions about the old system of filiation are based essentially on philological considerations and on later survivals. It is certain, however, that it is not through concentrating on a few isolated facts that we will be able to throw light on this problem. Rather, we need an approach based on a sound study of social and family structures before we can see to what extent they are compatible with matriliny. It would seem that warrior nomadism tends towards
patrilineal filiation and endogamy, while a life of settled cultivation encourages exogamy. Thus, to a large degree, the social system existing in pre-Islamic Arabia contradicts Smith's hypothesis. If we actually examine the traditions which give credence to the notion of a matrilineal system in pre-Islamic Arabia, we can see that almost all of them apply to the Arabs of the south (from Medina, Himyar and Sabah) that is, groups which had been settled for a long period, although some, like the Ansār, had reverted to nomadism for a short time. In fact, any conclusions, even provisional ones, about these groups are no more than speculative before further documentation can be provided by archeological research in the Yemen. The northern Arabs, on the other hand, were deeply imbued with desert traditions and their social system bears the stamp of patriarchy. This was the prevailing system in Mecca itself. Kur'ānic reform took its inspiration mainly from this background, but it did make a few concessions to the customs of Medina in enlarging the concept of karāba. Principally, the latter was concerned with agnates, but nevertheless it did not completely reject cognates.

This timid overture in the direction of uterine sibling was allied to an important trend towards restriction in the realm of karāba. According to pre-Islamic beliefs, mystical kinship (through adoption, blood-ties, communal descent) created links equal to those of actual kinship. Muhammad himself had recourse to such customs in making the Muḥāḍirūn the "brothers" of the Ansār and thus each other's heirs (Kmān, VIII, 72); but he reverted to a stricter concept of kinship, limiting it almost to true blood relations (LVIII, 2, XXXIII, 3, 40, VIII, 75).

**Bibliography:** Many works deal with this topic. Apart from those cited in the article, bibliographical details can be found in J. Chelhod, *Le mariage avec la cousine parallèle dans le système arabe*, in *l'Homme*, v (1965), 113-73.

[3] AHMAD B. ʿUMAR, a mathematician. The date of his death is unknown. Among those of his works which have been lost, a commentary on the translation of Euclid was especially celebrated. The one work of his which is still extant is *K. Misāḥat al-balāb,* which is preserved in Oxford (Bodleian Lib., Ms. Or. i, no. 913) and in Cairo (*Fihrist al-kutub al-arabiyya fi l-kutub ḥanāla al-ḥadīthiyya,* v, 204); see *Fihrist,* 265, l. 25, 282, l. 3; Ibn al-Kifti, *Taʾrikh al-balāhama,* Cairo 1936, 57, l. 5.

[4] ABU ʿALI AL-ḤUSAYN B. ʿALI B. YAZID AL-Maḥmāl, a traditionist and fakih. Initially, he was a member of the abī al-raḥf, but after al-Ṣaḥḥāf's arrival in Baghdād, he joined his group. In spite of this, he was an unreserved supporter of the doctrine of predetermination, ḍabār. None of his works of criticism or ṣīḥk survive. He died in 245/860 or, according to some, in 248/862.


**Karāsā**

Karāsā, a Turkic tribe of the North Caucasus. They call themselves Karāsāy and are known as Karāsāylar in Turkish and Karāsalı, in Russian. The Karāsāy language belongs to the Kpčak branch of Turkic. According to the 1926 Russian census, ethnically there were 55,123 Karāsāy and linguistically 55,349. In the 1959 census, the numbers recorded were 81,403 and 78,877 respectively. The Karāsāy occupy the mountain valleys of the upper Kuban, Taberda, Zelenčuk, Laba and Podkumok rivers on the northern slopes of the Caucasus.

Little is known of their history. Their ancestry goes back to the Hunno-Bulgarian conglomeration which lived along the Kuban River in so-called "Black Bulgaria" during and after the overthrow of the Khazar [q.v.] realm. They were Turkicized by the Turkic tribes, the Pechenegs and Kumlaks, which took over the Khazar kingdom in the middle of the 5th/11th century. In the high Middle Ages they lived as one group with the Balkar [q.v.] along the edge of the Caucasian mountain chain and mixed with local Ibero-Caucasian peoples. They later submitted to the authority of the Golden Horde. From the 7th/13th to the 9th/15th centuries they were slowly pushed by the Kbrdars [see KARABARD] towards the high chain. At this time, as a result of Kabard pressure, the Karāsāy-Balkar separated into two groups, the Balkar going to Dih-Tau and Koğhtān-Tau. In the 9th/13th century the Karāsāy became vassals of the Kabards, and from the 10th/16th century onwards, they also came under the influence of the Crimean Khānate. Sunnī Islam, of the Ḥanāfī madhhab, was slowly introduced at this time by the Crimean Tatars, and in the 18th/19th and early 19th/19th centuries by the Ottomans. The Karāsāy and Balkars did not play an active role in the Caucasian mountain-dwellers' resistance to the Russian conquest in the middle of the 18th century.

The social structure of the Karāsāy was influenced by that of Kabard, but the feudal system was less developed. The head of the tribe was the biy (bay) or taiv-biyi, followed by the most numerous class of özên or karahəden, consisting of free men. The kul, or slaves, formed the lowest class. With the influence of Islam under Ottoman rule the kul were freed and became azadīl. The traditional economy of the Karāsāy is based on cattle breeding, agriculture and handicrafts. Their land has important coal deposits and other mineral resources.

Karāsā was not a literary language until 1924, at which time, jointly with Balkar, a Karāsāy-Balkar literary language was created which adopted the Latin script. In 1938-39 it was replaced by the Cyrillic. According to *Letopisi* periodicheskikh isdannyi S.S.S.R. and *Pecat' S.S.S.R.* v 1960 godu, there were six newspapers published in Karāsāy-Balkar in 1935; in 1960 the figure had dropped to one.

Administrative position. With the onset of the Soviet régime, the Karāsāy became part of the Mountain Autonomous Socialist Republic (Gorskaia A.S.S.R.) on 20 January 1920, which included also
the Čerkes, the Balkars, the Ossetians, the Češens and the Ingushes, and had its capital in Vladi-
kavkaz. On 22 January 1922, they were joined with the Čerkes into the Karačay-Čerkes Autonomous
Oblast. In 1944, the Karačays were deported to
Central Asia and their national territory suppressed
for alleged collaboration with the Germans during
World War II. They were rehabilitated on 9 January
1957 and between 1957 and 1958 brought back to
their original land, their deportation being termed
a result of the “personality cult” of Stalin. They
resumed their former status in the Karačay-Čerkes
Autonomous Oblast, which was reformed on 9
January 1957. The region occupies a territory of
14,200 sq. km. In 1959, the Karačay and Čerkes
made up 33.1 % of the population of the region,
while 51 % were Russian.

According to the 1926 Russian census the mother
tongue of 99.9 % of the Karačay in their native
area was Karačay; none had Russian as their first
spoken language. The figures for 1959 showed that
their native language was the mother tongue of 99
% of the Karačay, while 51 % of those who used
Russian had risen from zero to 0.5 %.

**Bibliography:** U. Aliev, *Karačaychskaya Auto-
nomnaya Oblast’ (Istoriko-etołogicheskie i Kul’turo-
onomicheskie ocherki),* Rostov, on the Don, 1927;
M. Aminoff, *Le groupe musulman de Karachais,* in
*RMM* (May 1910); B. Geiger, A. Kuipers, T.
Halski-Kun and K. Menges, *Peoples and Languages
of the Caucasus,* The Hague 1958; K. Inan,
*RMM.*

Whatever the case, we have the transition $1 > r$
according to a habitual rule in Sindhi (cf. *Kölî*
in the Pandžab and *Kökrî* in Sind).

Being protected on the west by Cape Monze, the
most southerly point of the Kirthar mountain chain,
and sheltered from the force of the open sea and the
monsoon squalls by the rocky island of Manora,
Karăcă enjoyed an ideal situation for becoming a
great port. The town itself is situated between the
lower course of the Lyari river to the west and the
Malir river to the east, both of which come down
from the Kōhistān or mountain region. Lt.-Gen.
Haig, in his book on the Indus delta, thought that
one could identify the port of Karăcă with the port
of Alexander the Great which Nearchus reached on
leaving the western mouth of the Indus and where
he waited for 15 days, with his fleet at Manora,
until a favourable wind might blow and enable him
to continue exploring the coastline (326 B.C.).

It is shortly after 1327/1725 that Karăcă begins
to become known as a port. The effective cause of its
prosperity seems to have been the gradual deterio-
ration of the port of Daybul [q.v.], which was very
probably situated on the banks of the western mouth
of the Indus. Although the historians disagree on
the exact site of Daybul, it can nevertheless be asserted
that this port was already flourishing when the
Arabs, under their youthful general Muhammad b.
al-Kāsim, disembarked there in 93/712 in order to
conquer Sind. During the 10th/16th century the
maritime trade of the region relied on the port of
Larhibunder in the Indus delta, near Thatta, the
then capital of Sind; but after 1060/1650, Larhibunder
lost all its value as a port, since navigation became
very difficult through the silting-up of the lower
Indus delta. During the 12th/18th century, the land
encroached on the sea and left the port of Daybul cut
off from access to the sea. Karăcă, situated outside
the delta region and to the west, was not in such
danger of a rapid silting-up, but it could not yet
assume its later importance because of the uncertain
political conditions prevailing in the province of
Sind, where the various tribes vied for power and
the conquest of the province of Sind did not take place till four years later, when Sir Charles
Napier used Karăcă as his port of disembarkation
in 1843. But the British at first preferred to establish
them at Haydarābād, and it was only as a
result of Capt. Richard Burton’s report, which
praised the much fresher climate of the “fishermen’s
village by the sea”, that Sir Charles Napier came
along to make Karăcă the capital, and civil and
military centre, of Sind, and an important port
suitable for trading equally with the Pandžab as
with Sind.

Sir Bartle Frere improved the port by constructing
in 1854 the Napier mole connecting the island of

KARAČayı — KARAČI

Karăcă İ. [Hılya Salioğlu]
Kāmārī with the mainland. The Manora breakwater was finished in 1873. After 1861 a railway line connected Kārāčī with the town of Kōtīrī, and then in 1878 with the Pāndjāb, thus allowing the trade of Kārāčī to double in volume between 1864 and 1884. By 1900, it had become one of the greatest export outlets of the East, and the two World Wars of 1914-18 and 1939-45 contributed greatly to its prosperity.

But it was really 1947 which marked the turning-point in the development of this great city, which still had a provincial atmosphere at the time of the creation of Pakistan, and whose population increased almost tenfold within 25 years (1947-72), presenting successive governments with problems still not completely resolved. Suburbs like Nāzīmābād and Liyākātābād on the right bank of the Lyari river did not exist before 1947. Similarly, the satellite town of Korāngī and the new industrial complex of Lāndī on the left bank of the Mālīr river have only been created in the last decade or so. A planned policy of urbanisation and industrialisation, together with the bringing of water supplies and a sewage system, was undertaken by a body called the "Karāčī Development Authority" set up in 1958 by Field-Marshal Ayyūb Khān, the head of the Pakistan Republic.

The international airport of Karāčī is considered one of the best-equipped in Asia; its runways will accommodate the most modern aircraft and its geographical situation makes it an important crossroads between Europe and the East. Pakistan International Airlines (P.I.A.) flights connect Karāčī with London via Tehran, Beirut, Rome and Frankfurt or via Geneva or via Moscow, and a regular service also exists between Karāčī and Shanghai via Dacca and Canton. Since 1955, a pipeline over 300 miles long has brought the natural gas of Sīn to Karāčī, where it is used both for industrial and private purposes.

Karāčī has owed its great strides of recent times to its trade connections with the whole of northwestern India and to its rôle as the natural outlet for the most important products of its hinterland, such as cotton, cereals, oil-yielding plants and hides. Karāčī is the great industrial centre of Pakistan, thanks to an expanding iron-smelting industry, newly-built oil refineries (at Korāngī), recent petrochemical installations, the traditional activities involving wool, timber and hides, the increasing production of cement (limestone being plentiful on the outskirts of the city), various food-processing industries (flour mills, confectionary factories, fish canning and preserving), and many other activities such as production of knitwear, soap-making and plastic objects.


(Al)-Karādāg [see Kārā dāg].

Kārādāg, also known as Karādāj, is an ancient town in the Dīkāb province of Persia; the actual site is unknown, but it was situated to the south-east of Hamadān, almost half-way between that city and Iṣfahān. It derives its second name from al-Ḳāsim b. Ḥaṣā al-Iǧdīl [q.v.], better known by his kunya of Abī Dulāf, who probably enlarged (massāra) an existing settlement and constructed a fortress there; during the wars between al-Āmin and al-Maʾmūn, this commander carved out for himself a fief in Dīkāb and secured the privilege of paying in return a tax for this concession (Iḥdar [q.v.]; add to the Bibl.: Ibn Khurādā́bah, 241; Maʃāfīṯ al-ulām, 60; Yāḵūt, s.v. al-Iḏgārānī; and correct Mardī to al-Burdī of the district surrounding (al-)Karādāg and al-Burdī, whence the name of al-Iḏgārānī by which it is known. (Al-) Karādāg became the chef-lieu of this district and the residence of the Dulūfīs [q.v.]; add to the Bibl.: M. Canard, Hāmadānīs, 311-13 and the references cited there). The line of Dulūfīs ended in 284/897; town and district then reverted to dependence on the central government and soon became an autonomous administrative district.

Nothing is known of the town beyond the information in the geographers that it was built of unfired brick, had two markets, numerous baths and a crowded population, even though it extended over two parasangs; the sources stress the absence of orchards, but mention the fertility of the surrounding countryside, where stock-raising was practised. Various poets who frequented the Dulūfī court celebrated the town, but Ibn al-Ḳāfīk found it crowded-together, dirty, cold and poverty-stricken.

Bibl.: Taḥbīr, index; Balāḏūrī, Futūb, 314; Ibn al-Ḳāfīk, 237, 239, 261; Ibn Hāwāl-Wīl-Kramers, 352; Maʃāfīṯ, index; Muqaddasī, 394; Bakrī, 1123; Maḏkiš, Bad, iv, 74; Yāḵūt, i, 420, 548, iii, 873, iv, 250, 270; Kalkashandī, Ẓūbī, iv, 372; Le Strange, 197-8; Schwarz, Iran, 577; Canard, Hāmadānīs, 311. (Ed.)

Kārādāj, also known as Karādāy or Karādī, is a town in the province of Karādāj, probably the Byzantine Melangia, one of the first places in which the Ottomans settled after coming to the Eskişehir region. The district around Kārādāj was given by Sultan Alaʾ al-Dīn Kaykobād as winter quarters to Ertuğrul's commander, possibly enlarged (massāra) and secured the privilege of paying in return a tax for this concession (Iḥdar [q.v.]; add to the Bibl.: Ibn Khurādā́bah, 241; Maʃāfīṯ al-ulām, 60; Yāḵūt, s.v. al-Iḏgārānī; and correct Mardī to al-Burdī of the district surrounding (al-)Karādāj and al-Burdī, whence the name of al-Iḏgārānī by which it is known. (Al-) Karādāj became the chef-lieu of this district and the residence of the Dulūfīs [q.v.]; add to the Bibl.: M. Canard, Hāmadānīs, 311. (Ed.)

Kārādāj, also known as Karādī, is a town in the province of Karādāj, probably the Byzantine Melangia, one of the first places in which the Ottomans settled after coming to the Eskişehir region. The district around Kārādāj was given by Sultan Alaʾ al-Dīn Kaykobād as winter quarters to Ertuğrul's commander, possibly enlarged (massāra) and secured the privilege of paying in return a tax for this concession (Iḥdar [q.v.]; add to the Bibl.: Ibn Khurādā́bah, 241; Maʃāfīṯ al-ulām, 60; Yāḵūt, s.v. al-Iḏgārānī; and correct Mardī to al-Burdī of the district surrounding (al-)Karādāj and al-Burdī, whence the name of al-Iḏgārānī by which it is known. (Al-) Karādāj became the chef-lieu of this district and the residence of the Dulūfīs [q.v.]; add to the Bibl.: M. Canard, Hāmadānīs, 311. (Ed.)
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In the 11th/12th century, however, Karadja Hisar had become a nahiyye of Eskişehir (Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Arşivi, N.D. 166 pp. 124-6). According to the census of 1830, the population of Karadja Şehir consisted of 3,725 Muslims and 575 non-Muslims (E. Z. Karal, Osmanlı imperatorluguunda ik😍 nüfus sayımı, 1831, Ankara 1943, 140).

Karadja Hisar, today bearing the name Karaçaşehir, is a village belonging to the centralkaza of the vilâyet of Eskişehir.


**Karadja Oglañ,** Turkish folk poet, the greatest and most typical representative of the aşikler. In many ways, the aşikler continued in the Ottoman period the pre-Islamic and early Islamic tradition. Sûfî Turkish musîcian-poets (ozan), who often improvised their poems, singing them to the accompaniment of a musical instrument, especially the kopuss. Aşik, a term originally applied to popular mystic poets of various dervish orders, was later taken over by wandering minstrels (saz şâ‘îrîleri), who gave up the old secular term of ozan. The influence of Sûfîsm on the aşikler was only superficial and did not substantially alter their realism. The impact of many young poets in their endeavours to renew and make more indigenous the form and content of popular poetry of the dervish orders, and wrote all his poems (numbering nearly 500) in the traditional Turkish syllabic metre (mostly in 6-5 and 4-4 patterns), and in the unsophisticated spoken Turkish of his time, coloured with occasional provincial words and expressions. These deals with nomadic life and the natural beauties of the Taurus Mountains environment. The poet’s own exuberant feelings of love and joie de vivre are also described in his unparalleled köşmas, semais, türkîs and destans. In the “National Literature” (*Millî Edebiyat*) movement of the post-1908 Constitution period, and again during the early Republican era up to the late 1930s, Karadjaoglan was the most loved folk poet, inspiring many young poets in their endeavours to renew and make more indigenous the form and content of Turkish poetry. According to local traditions, Karadjaoglan is buried on a hill in the village of Çukur near Mut in the province of Içel (Mersin), and his tomb became a frequently visited shrine in the area. In 1958 a film was made of a legendary version of his life based on a script by the novelist Yaşar Kemal (b. 1922), who later wrote a short story on the same theme (in *Ü Y Augadolu Efsanen*, Istanbul, 1967).

details on the construction and servicing of bandûs [pipes], subterranean tunnels (he makes an express allusion to those of Isâbâh, 31) for providing water in arid places. He likewise discusses the basis of the Shari'a, the legality of the construction of wells and hydraulic conduits and in what circumstances these might be prejudicial to the people.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the text, Sarton, *Introduction*, i, 718; H. Suter, *Mathematiker, Bd. 1*, 259; i, 389; J. Vernet and A. Catala, *Un ingénieur arabe du milieu du XVe siècle*: al-Karayi, in *Al-Andalus* (forthcoming).

**AL-KÂRÂFA** [see al-Kâhira].

**KARAFERYE** (in earlier sources also KARAFERYE), Ottoman name for Bêrbohia, Bêrbohia (mod. Gk., Vérria, Vêria; Slavonic, Ber), a small town in Macedonia, 60 km. WSW of Salonika, 8 km. from the left bank of the Aliakmon (Vistritza; Tk. Indje Kara Su), near the foot of the eastern slopes of the Olympean range (Tk. Aghustos Daghi) and overlooking a broad and fertile plain: "one of the most agreeable towns in Rumîli" (Leake). The Turkish epithet *kâr* [q.v.] was prefixed perhaps in order to distinguish it from Bêrbohia in northern Thrace, Tk. (Eski) Zagria (cf. Jorga, *GOR*, i, 213). According to Byzantine authors, the town was pillaged by Turks from Karas (q.v.) as early as 1331 (Hammer-Purgstall, i, 127). The district for a time belonged to the Serbian Empire of Stefan Dušan (Ostrogorsky, History, 524) and, after his death (1355), to a Serbian prince, Hlapen (Jireček, *Gesch. d. Serben*, ii, 105, 107).

The Ottoman chroniclers report that the town was taken (? by Lâlâ Shams) 28/1385 (Giese, *Anon.*, 26, 13), whence *Aškâbphâšâhöde* (§53), Neshri, etc.; cf. Sa'd al-Din, i, 92-2, with the date 776/1374-5. The Greek Short Chronicles give the precise date 8 May 1387 (cited by P. Wittek, in *BSOAS*, iv (1952), 661, n. 3); but the definitive occupation may have occurred only under Bâyezid I, who from there directed extensive raids into the Peloponnese (Giese, *Anon.*, 28-9; Hammer-Purgstall, i, 249).

According to a tradition preserved by Yâzîdîglîoğlu ʻAli [q.v.], some time after the Saîdîjk sultan of Rîm Kay-Kâ’ûs II (q.v.) had taken refuge with the Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII his two younger sons were made governors of Bêrbohia; the grandchildren of one prince embraced Christianity, and it was one of his descendants, a certain Lyalkos, who surrendered Bêrbohia to the Ottoman sultan (? Bâyezid I); thereupon he and his family were transferred to Zîkhna. And indeed Karaferye (and Zîkhna) are among the districts inhabited by Gagauz [q.v.] Turks, i.e., "followers of Kay-Kâ’ûs" (P. Wittek, *Les Gagauzes = Les gens de Kayhâus*, in *RO*, xvii (1951-52), 12-24: idem, *Yazîdîglîoğlu ʻAli on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja*, in *BSOAS*, iv (1952), 639-68; E. A. Zakhardiâdou, Ο χριστιανοί απόγοιν του θεολόγου Καλακωλή Β’ στη Βεροία, in *Macedónia*, vi (Salonika 1964), 65-74).

By the end of the 9th/15th century there were extensive rice-fields, state-run, in the meadows to the south and west of the town (M. T. Gökbelgîn, *Edirne ve Paşa Limâsi*, Istanbul 1952, 135-7; cf. *Filâha*, p. 907). In the 11th/17th century (and presumably also before) Karaferye was administered as a *hadda* of the *sânîb* of Selânîc (q.v.). Ewîya Gobî described it as unwalled and unengirnished, but with the remains of a citadel; it had 4,000 houses, in 16 Muslim and 15 Christian quarters, with two Jewish *джема’ль*. In 1885 the *hadda*, together with the nahiye

of Augustos (Naoussa), comprised 46 villages and tiftliks (Art. Seldnik, p. 347a).

In the First Balkan War (Oct.-Dec. 1912), Karaverye fell to the Greeks on 25 October, and since the Treaty of Athens (14 Nov. 1923) it has belonged to Greece.


KARAGOZ (Tk. "black eye"); the principal character in the Turkish shadow play, also the shadow play theatre itself; the shadow player is called a karagozêdi or khaydi.

The karagoz theatre is played with inanimate actors and flat, two-dimensional figures (sâret, ûzîwî), manipulated by the shadow player who, as in a puppet theatre, makes them move and talks to them. The shadow player is seen from behind a screen whilst he himself remains out of sight. The characters are presented in caricature; as well as human figures, there are also schematised representations of certain animals, plants and objects, as well as fantastic beings and some rudimentary scenery. All the figures are made from leather (the superior ones used formerly to be made with camel hide), prepared in a special way and painted in bright colours. The human figures are jointed at one point (rarely at two points) in order to permit the required movements. The size of the figures varies between 7.5 cm. and 46 cm. in height for objects, animals and scenic features, and between 21 cm. and 40 cm. for the humans.

A stick (two sticks for the figure of Karagoz and for a few other characters) 50 cm. long and as thick as a human hand has its pointed end inserted into a hole made in the figure's or object's body. The showman stands behind a screen made from muslin and one m. long by 0.60 m. high, and with the aid of the stick keeps the whole surface of the figure up against the screen and makes it move along it according to its movements in the play. He also makes the upper part of the figure's body move slightly in order to mark each character's replies, at the same time imitating the voice and accent appropriate to that character. The screen is illuminated from below by a lamp placed between the shadow player and the figures of the play. The shadow player retains the monologues and dialogues, and sings the songs; his assistant or apprentice passes the figures to him, does the sound effects and shakes a tambourine to mark the appearance of the characters on stage.

The karagoz theatre was played before a very restricted public only. It used to be staged in the cafés during Ramadan or else in the salons of private houses during circumcision festivities or during the winter evenings.

The shadow play figures can be divided into three groups: (1) Inanimate objects. These are either pieces of scenery and accessories directly connected with the play's theme, such as the shop where Karagoz functions as a grocer, the pickaxe which Ferhad uses to excavate a water channel in the mountain, etc.; or else a tree, a section of landscape, a group of figures, etc. without any direct connection with the play and called gostermelik, but shown on the screen before the actual play in order to attract the interest of spectators and fire their imagination. (2) Animals which may on occasion have a rôle in a play, such as Karagoz's ass, Ferhad's horse, etc. (3) Fantastic beings and objects, such as dragons, sorcerers, a magic poplar tree, etc. (4) Human characters, the actors in the play. Some of these appear only in a single play, when the latter is drawn from a work of popular literature, e.g., Ferhad and Şhrîn, Tahir and Zuhrê, but also in cases like that of 'Ăşgîk Hasan and his son Muslî, who only appear in the play The bloody poplar tree. Other characters may appear in all the plays, such as Karagoz and Hadji- vad, the two central characters; the Zenne ("ladies"), women of various types and ages; Celebi ("young man"); Matiz or Tuzuz-Deli-Bekir ("the strong man"), often portrayed with the characteristics of a drunkard, but occasionally in the guise of a judge or arbiter; various types of provincials and foreigners (e.g., the Frank), of Muslim minority groups (the Arab, the Laz) and of non-Muslim minority groups (the Jew, the Armenian, the Greek); persons depicted in caricature because of their physical or moral defects (e.g., Bebevi, "the drunkard", Tiryâki "the opium smoker") and so forth.

Hâdjîvâd represents the petty bourgeois, the educated man, temperate, highly opportunistic and universally respected; people often come to him for advice and help and often ask him to arrange complicated matters. His partner Karagoz combines within himself all the minor vices; he is illiterate, greedy, ill-behaved and scandalously outspoken. He calls himself a gypsy; although he is a blacksmith by trade, he is often out of work and in perpetual financial difficulties, leading to frequent quarrels with his wife and necessitating the intervention of Hâdjîvâd in order to find him a job. Hâdjîvâd appears in two introductory scenes in the finale, holding the stage then for as long as his partner, whereas his presence in the action of the play proper is brief. Karagoz, on the other hand, is present all through the proceedings; he is involved in intrigues, even in those plays originating from outside genres. Whatever the origin of the play, it is always set in a place called by the shadow players Küşkeri meydân "Küşkeri square", which derives its name from the learned Şayhî Küškî, who lived in Bursa and died there ca. 767/1366; the invention of the karagoz theatre is attributed to him in popular legend. The right-hand side of the screen (sc. the right-hand side as seen by the audience) is considered to be Karagoz's house; he always enters the scene from there, and he alone occupies this half of the screen. The left-hand side is reserved for Hâdjîvâd and all the other characters. All told, Karagoz himself takes up a good half of the whole performance.

The text of a traditional play comprises four sections: (1) The prologue. Hâdjîvâd comes in, chanting a semâî and then a ghazel, the so-called "screen ghazel", a poem couched in pseudo-philosophical terms, stressing the profound meaning of
the shadowplay and the lessons which the spectator may derive from it. Then he proclaims his desire to amuse himself by shouting for his "friend" Karagoz. The latter, disturbed by the noise, comes down into the street and beats Hadjivad. (2) The dialogue (muhdòwe) comprises either a discussion on any subject whatsoever between Hadjivad and Karagoz, whose comic effect comes from the contrast in character and the cultural levels of the two participants, or else it is the embellishment of an extrava- 
gant adventure of one of the two companions, usually Karagoz. The spectators are amused by the remarks and questions of the listener of the dialogue, and the verbose replies of the narrator; very often, the adventure turns out to be a dream or a delusion of hashish-taking.

The text of the dialogue may well be improvised, and the karagozdù (2), according to the circumstances and according to his creative powers, may prolong it as he likes. However, there are some traditional plot outlines, and it seems—on the basis of the texts which have been collected—that the artists always followed them. Some 60 texts of these dialogues have been counted, some of them clearly later versions of a basic original. In the most recent and most complete edition of karagoz texts (Cevdet Kudret, Karagoz, 5 vols., Ankara 1968-70), 53 are given.

Certain of these muhduweresi, of the type comprising a narration of extravan
gant adventures, are variations of the teklereme stories (see P. N. Boratav, Le "teker-
leme", Cahiers de la Société Asiatique, xvii, Paris 1963, 106-14, 174-5, types 51 J, 51 K, 52, 53). Tradition permits the karagoz to use the freedom of prefixing a muhduweresi of his own choice to the play of his programme, whence the fact that in many editions of texts one finds different plays accompanied by the same "dialogue", or even the same play preceded by different "dialogues" in the various versions. When the dramatic section (sc. the "play" proper) is only short, or when the shadow player wishes, for some reason or other, to extend the show, he may add a second muhduweresi after the first one; this is called an ara muhduweresi "intercalated dialogue". (3) The play proper (the fasil of which is of course the "main" category thus: (i) Karagoz is out of work; Hadjivad takes advantage of his misfortunes, whoresonk and generally disorganises Karagoz's life. (ii) Karagoz embarks, unwittingly and without foreseeing the unpleasant consequences, on various complicated adventures. Through improvised actions, he astounds and disarms his opponent, turns tragic situations into comic ones, and emerges completely unscathed. The themes of plays like The excursion to Yalova, The tavern, The lunatic asylum, Karagoz the hashish smoker, etc., are built around these themes.

Several of the plays in both these categories belong equally to the répertoire of karagoz and to those of two other types of Turkish popular theatre, the kukla or marionette theatre and the orta oyunu or traditional theatre with living actors.

The number of "plays" (fasl) so far counted is 47. Kudret has edited 36 of them, choosing one text for those attested in several versions; for three other texts he has been unable to give more than the titles. It has also been possible to draw up two lists of "older plays" and "newer plays". Out of the 47 plays enumerated, 27 are known to be "plays from the older répertoire". It was formerly the practice to stage a different play for every evening of Rama
dàn, with the exception of the evening of the 26th-27th, the "Night of Power" (see RAMADAN), when there was a break, out of respect for the especially sacred character of that evening. The conclusion is, therefore, that the traditional répertoire comprised 28 or 29 plays. It seems, too, that we should add to the total enumerated of 47 karagoz plays a large number of texts put together by "scholarly" authors, see Kudret, i, 45 and 56-9, bibliography nos. XXIV, XXX-XXXI, XXXIV-XXXVII, XL, XLI, and Aziz Nesin, "karagoz oyunu", ed. Düşün, Istanbul 1968.

Although scholars do not yet agree about the country of origin of the shadow theatre, it is generally recognised that it spread from eastern and southeast Asia towards the Near East and Europe. With regard to its appearance in the Ottoman territories, it was long believed that it had come from China through the mediation of the Mongols and via the traditional route through Central Asia and Iran. However, it has now been realised that scholars have been in error through their interpretation of a technical term: the khayal of Arabic, Persian and Turkish sources does not mean "shadow figure" (whose equivalent is Khayal-î sili, [q.v.]), but rather "figure" tout court, i.e., it is not connected with the shadow theatre at all, but with three-dimensional marionettes. Thus whilst the puppet theatre has been known from an early date amongst the Mongols and Turks of Central Asia, as also among the Iranians, the shadow theatre has only existed among them in recent centuries.

In the Near Eastern lands, the shadow theatre goes back to the 6th/12th century, see Ritter, art. Karagoz in I.A., and Metin And, Geleneksel türk tiyatrosu, Ankara 1959, 113. This is certain with regard to Egypt. Ibn Daniyal [q.v.]: 7th/13th century) has left three texts for performance in this theatre, those themes having striking affinities with the plays of the traditional karagoz répertoire. Furthermore, some actual figures of the Egyptian shadow theatre, probably of 7th/13th or 8th/14th century construction, have come down to us; these too have many features in common with the Turkish karagoz figures.

The tradition of the Turkish karagozdu purports to trace the origin of their art to the time of Sultan Orhun, and its invention to Shaykh Kushterfi. Ewliya Çelebi (11th/17th century) records a legend which would make the two main characters of the
theatre contemporaries of the Seljukks of Anatolia, and which makes the gypsy Karagoz a messenger for the Byzantine Emperor Constantine. These legends lack historical foundation. The oldest piece of evidence for the appearance of the shadow theatre in Ottoman territory comes from the 10th/16th century. The Egyptian chronicler Ibn Iyâs speaks of a shadow theatre performance at Dijzza in 923/1517 in front of Selim I after his victory over the Mamluks; the Ottoman sultan, delighted by this performance, wished to bring the shadow player to Istanbul. It is known from another source that under Ahmed I (1012-26/1603-17) an Egyptian shadow play artist came to practice his art in Istanbul. From the end of the 10th/16th century onwards, we have extensive information about the karagoz theatre, both in the travel narratives of western writers and also in Ottoman sources of various kinds; the most interesting details are given in the sûrnâmes, works describing festivities of various kinds, such as marriages, circumcisions, etc.

From the 11th/17th century, Karagoz is clearly mentioned as the chief character of the shadow theatre. In all the regions to which this theatre spread, including lands with such diverse non-Turkish populations as Greece, Tripolitania, Tunisia and Algeria, it is called by various metamorphoses of the word karagoz. Similarly, the Turkish karagoz came to Egypt from the Ottoman homeland and was in the last century a favourite form of entertainment; it also gave the name aragos to a type of Egyptian puppet.

It was probably only in the 11th/17th century that the karagoz theatre acquired its actual technique and style. Ewliya Celebi devotes a whole chapter to certain amusing dialogues of Karagoz and Hadjiydvad and of several other characters, as well as outlines of a few plays in the classical répertoire.

The karagoz theatre was an art form of the big towns in the Ottoman empire. In particular, it described the distinctive types and the manners of the motley peoples of the capital. It retained this emphasis even in the large provincial towns like Bursa and Izmir and in eastern Anatolia. Ewliya Celebi speaks of some famous shadow players of Erzerum; one wonders whether the karagoz theatre might have acquired peculiar local features in the regions from the capital.

Notes published on the karagoz at Kars by Fahrettin Kirzioglu, Kars jebrindâ karagoz oyunu, in Türk Folklor Araştırmaları, no. 112 (Nov. 1958), show this as possible, since the répertoire and the characters of the karagoz in that town display some local peculiarities.


**KARAITES, a Jewish sect which does not recognize the authority of the post-biblical traditions incorporated in the Talmud and in later rabbinic works. It is the only Jewish sect (not counting the Samaritans) which has survived for over 1200 years and is still in existence. The name (in Hebrew bârâ‘îm, bêne (or ba‘âde) Mihrâ‘î; in Arabic bâr‘îyyân, occasionally asbâb ‘Anân wa-Bîsîyânîm) is variously explained as “readers (bârâ‘) of Scripture (Mihrâ‘î)” and as “callers (to the Torah)”, from the alternate meaning of bârâ‘, “to call, to invite”, (cf. the Shî‘î “callers”, ǧûl, sing. dâ‘î).

(**x** History. Although Karaism as we know it, and as the Karaites themselves have always known it, is essentially the product of the intellectual and social ferment in the Jewish community of the Muslim empire, the influence of several historical factors can be discerned in the early period of its development. The basic factors are the dramatic performance of the ancient and uninterrupted resistance on the part of some segments of Jewry to the growing oral tradition (the Oral Law) and to the authority of its tradents and interpreters, which resulted in a number of dissident sects antedating or contemporary with the Talmudic era (Sadducees, Essenes, Qumran sectarians), all insisting on the monopoly of the Bible as the sole source of divinely inspired law. Contributing factors probably were: (1) The collapse of the messianic hopes which had been inspired by the spectacular fall of Persian and Byzantine rule and rise of the Muslim empire in the 1st/7th century, and sorrowful realization that the redemption of Zion and the end of the exile were not at hand; (2) the growing social unrest in the most populous autonomous Jewish settlement, that of ʿIrâk (Baibyloan), where the poorer classes of rural tenant-farmers and urban artisans and labourers felt themselves grievously oppressed by the official bureaucracy of the exilarch (raʿa‘ al-dîjâlî, the official representative of ʿIrâki Jewry before the caliph’s court) and of the geonom (sing. ga‘on; the presidents of the ʿIrâk talmudic academies); (3) the consolidation of the vast Muslim empire, which resulted in the opening of the sparsely populated mountainous lands to the east and north of ʿIrâk to settlement by discontented emigrants, both gentiles and Jews.

It was no doubt these malcontents who formed the nucleus of what later became Karaism. The earliest known sectarian leader, Abû ʿIsâ Obâdiyah (ʿAbd Allâh) al-Isfahâni q.v. of Isfahan, in Iran, organized an armed revolt against the government of the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik (65-86/685-705), but was quickly defeated and slain, although some of his followers asserted that he did not die but went into hiding, meaning that he would in due time reappear, like the Ƣffî hidden imâm. His successor, Yûddîn, was...
KARAITES

likewise thought to continue in hiding until his eventual reappearance [see ʿIsāwyya].

By the middle of the 2nd/8th century the schism penetrated back into ʿIrāk, particularly into the newly-built capital city of Baghdād, where it was joined by ʿĀnān b. David, a member of the highest echelon of the rabbinic aristocracy. The traditional rabbinic account (quoted by the 6th/12th century Karaite author Elijah b. Abraham) designates him as the actual founder of Karaism and gives as his motive for secession his dread of corruption at his failure to be elected to the office of exilarch. This oversimplified story would seem to be true only to the extent that ʿĀnān had lent his aristocratic and scholarly prestige to the budding schism, and what is even more important, composed the first code of schismatic law (Sefer ha-miswah), which is the earliest extant Karaite literary document. His followers, called ʿĀnāmites (ʿAnānīyyim, ʿAnānīyya), styled him exilearch, and his lineal descendants bore the title of Karaite prince (nāfiʿ); few of them, however, distinguished themselves as either leaders or scholars.

The 3rd/9th century produced several schismatic teachers, some of whom sharply criticized ʿĀnān’s views: Ismāʿīl and Mīshāwahy al-ʿUkrābī (of ʿUkrābā, in ʿIrāq), Benjamin al-Nāḥāwāndī, in Iran; the latter also use the coinage), and Malīk al-Raḥmī (of Raḥmā, in Palestine). Mūsā al-Zaʿfarrānī (of the Zaʿfarrān district in Baghdād) migrated with his followers to Tiflis, in Armenia, and became known as Abū ʿImrān al-Tiflīsī. With Daniel al-Kūmīsī (a native of Dāmghān, in the Iranian province of Kūnīsī), Karaism reached the 4th/10th century.

The names just listed indicate the fairly rapid territorial expansion of Karaism during this early period. Daniel al-Kūmīsī was the first eminent Karaite scholar known to have settled in Jerusalem, and other Karaite communities were established in Damascus, Cairo, and other smaller towns. Zealous Karaitic preachers undertook missionary journeys to seek converts among rabbinic audiences, but apparently with little success, for with the exception of ʿĀnān not a single early Karaite scholar is stated to have been a convert from rabbinism, and early Karaite writings are replete with sad complaints about the smallness and poverty of their communities. In any case, a more or less amicable modus vivendi prevailed for a long time between the schism and the rabbinic mother-synagogue, but in the first half of the 4th/10th century this peaceful situation came to an abrupt end. Saʿādīah al-Fayyūmī (882-942 A.D.), president of the rabbinic academy at ʿIrāq (in ʿIrāq), an exceedingly brilliant and influential teacher, published a series of polemical writings in which he condemned the Karaites as outright heretics who had cut themselves off completely from rabbinic Judaism. The effect of this sudden and unexpected blow upon the Karaites was cataclysmic: they deprived them of the only missionary field open to them and it extinguished all for a century their cherished hope of eventually persuading their rabbinic cousins to return to the true—that is, Karaite—faith. No wonder their reaction was most bitter, and polemics against Saʿādīah run like a scarlet thread through Karaite literature from that time on down to the 19th century.

On the other hand, the necessity to combat Saʿādīah’s scholarly criticism ushered in the golden age (4th-5th/10th-11th centuries) of Karaite scholarship, and brought about not only the consolidation of the various schismatic groups into a more or less unified sect, but also some modest but highly necessary reforms which softened to some extent the rigorous burden of Karaite practice. At the same time, ʿIrāq and Iran gradually lost their primacy as Karaite centres and were superseded by Jerusalem and Cairo, and new settlements were established in the Balkans (then under Byzantine rule; first half of the 5th/11th century), Cyprus (6th/12th century), Spain (where Karaism, under the leadership of Ibn al-Tarārīs, 5th/11th century, endured for a while but eventually disappeared entirely), Crimea (7th/13th century), and Lithuania (end of 8th/14th century). The First Crusade (1099 A.D.) put an end to all Jewish activity in Palestine and much of Syria, and the Karaite academy in Jerusalem, which had trained scholars from many countries, went out of existence. Some Karaite scholarly activity shifted to Cairo, but most of it moved to Constantinople where Greek-speaking Karaite translators turned some Arabic Karaite classics into Hebrew, thus making them accessible to later generations of Western Karaites who knew no Arabic. The liquidation of the Byzantine empire with the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in 1453 A.D. gave a new impetus to Karaite scholarship, and the Istanbul community, now Greek and Turkish-speaking, gave its spiritual heart to the Crimean and Lithuanian settlements, where a Tatar dialect was, and still is, spoken. The decline of the Ottoman Empire in the 18th and 19th centuries resulted in the rise in importance of the latter settlements, which by the end of the 18th century came under Russian rule. Soon thereafter the Russian Karaites succeeded in obtaining from the Czarist government full rights of citizenship, thus escaping the crushing restrictions which were imposed upon their rabbinic cousins. During World War II the Crimean, Polish and Lithuanian Karaites were left unmolested by the German occupational authorities, on the ground that they were ethnically not of the Jewish race. In the post-war period, however, many Karaites in Egypt and ʿIrāq, including the entire ancient community in Hīt (on the Euphrates), found themselves compelled to emigrate to Israel, where they settled in compact colonies (Raḥmā, Ashdod, etc.). No accurate statistics of the Karaite population of the world are available; an approximate figure is 12,000–13,000.

(2) Literature. No writings by pre-Ananite schismatics have been preserved, although at least one of them, Abū ʿĪsā al-Īṣāfānī (the earliest Karaite document of which fragments have survived. Benjamin al-Nāḥāwāndī also composed a code of law, written in Hebrew, of which only a portion has survived, as well as commentaries on some biblical books. Daniel al-Kūmīsī wrote a code of law and a commentary on the Bible, likewise in Hebrew, known only in fragments. The overwhelming bulk of later literature, composed by Karaite authors resident in Muslim countries (except Turkey) down to the 15th century, was written in Arabic. After the First Crusade, the Balkan Karaite translators used a clumsy Hebrew heavily interlarded with Arabic and Greek loanwords. Later Karaite authors in Turkey, Crimea, Lithuania, and Poland, down to the 20th century, wrote in a more idiomatic Hebrew, and occasionally in the spoken Karaite-Tatar dialect, which was written in Hebrew characters.
The golden age of Karaite literary activity opened with the works of Abu Yusuf Ya'qub al-Kirkisani (or al-Karkasani, of Kirkisiya [Circesium] on the Euphrates, or Karkasen near Baghda), a man of encyclopaedic learning and a keen analytic mind who wrote two voluminous works entitled Kitāb al-anmār wa'l-ma'rūbīb (code of law) and Kitāb al-riyād wa'l-bada'īs (commentary on the non-legal portions of the Pentateuch). The former also provides the earliest, most detailed, and most reliable information on the sectarian leaders and groups which eventually coalesced into the unified Karaite sect, and has probably served as the chief source for all subsequent accounts, both Jewish and Muslim. His smaller works, not yet recovered, include commentaries on Genesis, Job, and Ecclesiastes, a refutation of Muḥammad's claim to prophecy (Kitāb fi ḫaḍā Ṣuwaruḥ Muḥammad), essays (ḵawālī) on textual interpretation (ṣ̄alāʿī ṣ̄īḥār waṣ̄ṣ̄ār al-maʿānī) and on the art of translation (ṣ̄alāʿī ṣ̄ardājamī) and others. His younger contemporary, Salom b. Jeroham (Ṣulaym, or Sulaymān, b. Rūḥāyym) wrote a violent tract against Saadiah (only the Hebrew version, entitled Miḥamāt ha-Ṣhem, has been preserved) and commentaries in Arabic on several biblical books. The end of the 5th/11th century produced the foremost Karaite Bible-commentator, Japheth b. Eli (Abū ʿAll Ḥasan ibn ʿAll al-Ḵāṣrī), who was still living in 395/1004-5 and wrote a commentary on the entire Bible, in Arabic, with a very literal and often grammatically awkward Arabic rendering of each Hebrew verse. Karaite study of Hebrew grammar and lexicography, necessitated by the Karaite preoccupation with biblical exegesis, resulted in the monumental Hebrew-Arabic dictionary (Ḍīlamī al-ʿalāʾ) by David b. Abraham al-Ḵāṣrī (of Fez, in Morocco). A zealous and expert Karaite missionary, Abu ʿl-Ṣurūr Sahāl b. Mašālah, wrote a long epistle in Hebrew (in which he promises to write an Arabic version also) in answer to his rabbinic opponents with whom he came in conflict, probably in Cairo. Japheth b. Eli's son, Abū ʿAll ʿAbīdīr Levi b. ʿAbī ʿAll b. ʿAbī ʿAll (Abu ʿAll al-Ḵāṣrī), who was still living in 415/1025 and wrote a very successful, the great rabbinic poets of the 5th/11th century produced a series of brief exegetical glosses (nuḥāt) on the Bible, as well as an authoritative code of law (composed in 397/1006-7), the latter known only under the Hebrew title of Sifer ha-miṣūṭō. The 5th/11th century saw the Karaite academy in Jerusalem, presided over by Joseph b. Noah (Abū Yaʿqūb ʿUṣuf b. Nūb), in full flourish and produced a number (reputedly 70) of eminent scholars. Joseph b. Noah himself wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch and a Hebrew grammar. His pupil, Aaron b. Joseph b. Jeshua (Abū ʿl-Faḥradi Ḥārūn b. ʿl-Faḥradi), composed a grammatical-lexicographical work entitled al-Muṣḥamīlī, another grammatical work entitled al-Kāfī, and a commentary on the Pentateuch. Another pupil of Joseph b. Noah, Joseph ha-Rōʾēh (Abū ʿAll ʿAbīdīr ʿUṣuf al-Ḵāṣrī; “the Seeing”, euphemistically for “the Blind”), the foremost Karaite philosopher of the 5th/11th century, composed an adaptation of the Muʿtaṣīlī ḥālāmī entitled al-Muṣḥawī (abridged by the author under the title Kitāb al-tamīrīs or al-Kiṭāb al-Manṣūrī), and a code of law entitled Kitāb al-ʾistibār. Joseph ha-Rōʾēh's advocacy of the relaxation of the suicidal severity of the original Karaite law of incest was developed further by his pupil Joseph b. Judah (Abū ʿl-ʾUṯrādī Ṣuḥrān b. Ṣaḏāq) in a work known only in its Hebrew translation entitled Sifḥer ha ʾdārāyōt; he also composed several theologico-philosophical works. The First Crusade marked the transfer of the centre of Karaite literary activity to the Balkans, where Hebrew was the literary vehicle, with a secondary branch in Egypt, where Arabic continued to be the literary language. The two most eminent Byzantine translators, Tobiah b. Moses and Jacob b. Simeon, turned a number of Karaite Arabic classics into Hebrew. Judah Hadassi (of Edessa, the modern Urfa, in Turkey, near the Syrian border) compiled a large encyclopedia (begun in 1148 A.D.) of early Karaite learning entitled Egkoi̇l ha-bōker. Jacob b. Reuben wrote a commentary on the Bible, mainly compiled from older Arabic-writing authors, entitled Sifḥer ha-Miṣūtō. In Egypt, Karaite efforts to write Hebrew poetry produced (about the middle of the 6th/12th century) the most eminent poet of the earlier period, Moses Darī (of Darī, in Morocco, but born in Alexandria, Egypt), who imitated, not very successfully, the great rabbinic poets of the Spanish school, and left an extensive dīvān of poetic pieces, both religious and secular. Japheth (Ḥasan b. ʿAbī ʿl-Ḥasan) al-Barkamānī, who lived in the middle of the 7th/13th century, wrote in Arabic a medical work (al-Maṣāḥa al-Muḥāsimyya fi ḫisā al-sīḥa al-badāmiyya) and a polemical treatise. Israel ha-Maʿārābī (al-Maghribī), an eminent theologian and jurist in Cairo (first half of the 13th century) wrote a number of works in Arabic. Samuel b. Moses al-Maghribī completed in 837/1434 a concise code of law entitled al-Murğhīd (the last Karaite code written in Arabic), and David b. al-Ḥitt (of Htt, on the Euphrates), his younger contemporary, wrote a brief but valuable Arabic chronicle of Karaite scholars of ʿĀnān down to his own time. Some eighty years earlier a lesser poet, Moses b. Samuel of Safad, in Palestine, left a dīvān of Hebrew poems, in which the most interesting piece is a long epic poem describing his troubled career as clerk (kāṭīb) in charge of the private estates of the amir of Damascus and his forced conversion (in 755/1354) to Islam and pilgrimage to Mecca; he finally escaped to Egypt, where he seems to have returned to his ancestral faith.

In Byzantine Karaism, the 7th-8th/13th-14th centuries marked a substantial literary revival. Aaron b. Joseph (Aaron the Elder) wrote (after 951/1349) a much esteemed philosophical commentary on the Pentateuch (Sifḥer ha-miḥbār), but is equally renowned also for his redaction of the official Karaite liturgy, in which he included a number of poetic hymns, many of his own composition. Another Aaron, Aaron b. Elijah (Aaron the Younger, of Nicomedia, the modern İzmir or Izanīt, in Asia Minor; d. 770/1365), produced a complete summa of Karaite theology, in three parts, philosophical (ʾEs ḥayyīm, obviously intended as the Karaite counterpart of Maimonides' Daʿlálat al-bārīn), legal (Gan ʿEden), and exegetical (Keter Tīrāḏ). In the 9th/15th century, Elījah Baṣ̄yākī, Ḥākam (rabbi) of the Istanbul Karaite community, died in 895/1490, leaving behind him an unfinished code of law entitled Addearet Eṣīyāḇā, which was continued, but not completed, by his brother-in-law Caleb Afebdopolos (d. after 1532 A.D.), an encyclopaedic scholar in his own right. It was recognized by most Karaites as the most authoritative manual of their law and ritual. The decline of the Ottoman empire once more shifted the centre of Karaite literary activity, this time to the Crimea. But in the 8th and 14th century town of Troki (now Wilna, in Lithuania) produced its most famous Karaite son, Isaac b. Abrahām (d. 1594 A.D. [1587?]), whose tract against Christianity, entitled Ḥissāt emānāh, evoked Voltaire's praise for
its skill and acumen. The interest shown in Karaism, from the middle of the 17th century onward, by Protestant theologians (Johann Rittang, Gustav Peringer, Johann Puffendorf, Lewin Warner, Jacob Trigland and others) resulted in several works by their Karaite informants, setting forth, of course from the partisan Karaite point of view, the history of the Karaite secession from the mother-synagogue, the elements of Karaite belief, and the history of Karaite literature: 

- Abraham Firkovic (1785-1874). Armed with the official authorization of the Russian government, he travelled extensively in the Crimea, the Caucasus, Syro-Palestine and Egypt, gathering original materials for the history of the Karaites. Unfortunately, in his zeal to prove that the Karaites had left Palestine before the advent of Jesus and therefore had not part in his crucifixion, he permitted himself to tamper with dates in manuscripts and on tombstones, and thus blemished his otherwise well-founded reputation for scholarship. The mass of manuscripts he collected (sometimes, to be sure, in a rather highhanded fashion) was later acquired by the Leningrad Public Library, and forms one of the largest, though least utilized, Karaite manuscript collections in the world. His older contemporary, Mordecai Sultansky (d. 1862), composed a number of works, the best known being Zeker saddikim, valuable as a detailed specimen of the present-day official Karaite version of the sect's history and its relationship to the rabbinic mother-synagogue.

(3) Dogma and Practice. Aside from the rejection of the authority of the post-biblical tradition, there is no basic divergence between Karaite and rabbinic dogmatics. The Karaite creed, as formulated in ten articles by Elijah Bashyahel (9th/10th century), postulates the existence of God, Creator of the world and all that is in it, the divine inspiration of all the biblical prophets, the authority of the Torah and the duty of the believer to study it, the certainty of the resurrection of the dead and of the final judgment, the responsibility of each human being for his own deeds, and the eventual advent of the Messiah. An earlier Arabic creed ('Abá-kud'), formulated by Israel ha-Ma'karé (8th/14th century), still adhered to by the Egyptian Karaites, has only six articles, and omits all mention of the Messiah—a puzzling peculiarity for which no satisfactory explanation has so far been suggested. None of these articles of faith conflicts with rabbinic teachings.

In fact the Karaite rejection of postbiblical tradition and the cry "Back to the Bible!" already proved impractical as early as the time of 'Anan, who found himself compelled to deduce new laws from the biblical text by the method of analogy (Hebrew khebbéh, Arabic biyád), supposedly borrowed by him from the imám Abi Ḥanifa, whom he is said to have met in prison. Life in the social and economic milieu of the Muslim empire simply could not, as a practical matter, be governed by a code of law enacted in Palestine a thousand or more years

earlier, 'Anan's successor as the second pater synagogae, Benjamin al-Nahawandi, freely borrowed from talmudic law. In this manner the monopoly of the Bible was gradually extended into the three official basic sources of Karaite law; the scriptural text (Hebrew káthab, Arabic naṣṣ), analogy based on it, and the consensus of the successive generations of scholars (Hebrew bikkás, 'iddá [inspired by the Arabic 'iddá], later sibél ha-yérúghah, "burden of inheritance"; Arabic iżmá), the latter term covering laws which have no direct or indirect root in the Bible, but which are not contrary to it or to reason and logic, and have been accepted by the generality of scholars after exhaustive study (masar, hálak). The early Karaite leaders developed a strong centrifugal tendency, expressed in the maxim attributed to 'Anan, "Search thoroughly in the Torah, and rely not on my opinion", and recognized the right of every individual, within certain limits, to draw his own conclusions from his own study of Scripture and to abide by them. But time and experience modified this tendency, too, and produced more or less general obedience to prevalent scholarly opinion, at least in the particular country or region. In matters of philosophy of religion, the earlier Karaite scholars chose to accept the Mu'tazzí kalám almost in its entirety, and the later philosophical writers felt duty-bound to stand by their predecessors and permitted themselves only as few deviations from them as possible. There was thus in Karaism no such further progression to Neo-Platonism and Aristotelianism as occurred in rabbinic philosophy.

The intense and impatient nationalistic-messianic tendency which inspired Abí Isá's armed revolt (1st/7th century) against the Muslim authorities subsequently subsided into a no less intense but more peaceful longing for an end to the exile and for the restoration of Zion in all its glory. One result of this was the unceasing and rather toughing effort on the part of the Karaites to maintain at least a small representative community of pious individuals in Jerusalem, who by prayer, fasting, and other devotional exercises besought God to "hasten the end". Some of these early Karaites produced the materials for the ascriptive order of "Mourners for Zion" (Hebrew 'Abólá Shiyón), which included rabbinic members as well. Another consequence of this powerful messianic feeling was the rather sombre and cheerless tone of the Karaite way of life, in which the elements of joy and pleasure inherent in such ancient institutions as Sabbath and Passover were as far as possible excluded, as incompatible with the sad plight of Israel in exile. Yet at the same time the usual concomitant of messianism, mysticism, which eventually came to flourish in rabbinic intellectual circles, was roundly condemned by Karaite scholars as impious and wicked.

It is in practical theology that Karaism parts ways with rabbinic usage, and here the earmark of Karaism is greater rigour and rejection of such relaxations or extensions of biblical law as were introduced by the rabbis in order to conform with changing public opinion and changing circumstances—for example, the replacement of the lex talionis by monetary compensation, the extension of the interdict of seething a kid's flesh in its mother's milk into an extensive dietary legislation, the substitution of a fixed mathematical calendar for the visual observation of the phases of the moon, etc. Hence radical reform in the modern sense and a foothold in Karaism. The only change resembling such basic reform was the modest
liberalization by Jeshuah b. Judah (5th/11th century) of the suicidal so-called catenary (Hebrew rikkub, theory of incest, which by endless compounding of analogy upon analogy to the forbidden relatives listed in the Bible had made it increasingly difficult for Karaites to find mates whom they could lawfully marry. A few other milder reforms were vigorously resisted and were adopted only locally under the pressure of practical conditions of life—for example, the relaxation of the biblical prohibition of light on the Sabbath, to permit lighting of the synagogue on Sabbath eve and leaving fire in ovens (kindled before the onset of the Sabbath) for heating of homes and keeping food warm during the Sabbath day, matters of vital necessity during the severe winters in Poland and Russia; or the introduction of a mixed visual and mathematical calendar, in order to secure at least some uniformity of holy days in the northern climes, where observation of the new moon is often impossible. Even with all these minor reforms, Karaitic law still remains far more restrictive than rabbinic law in matters of marriage (levirate marriage is forbidden), inheritance (the husband has no right to his deceased wife's estate), diet, Sabbath rest, ritual cleanliness, dates of holidays (Pentecost is fixed invariably on a Sunday, a custom which appears to be one of the most ancient and deepest marks of Jewish sectarianism), etc. Mixed marriages between Karaites and rabbinic parties seem, curiously enough, to have been quite frequent in the 4th-5th/10th-11th centuries in Egypt and Syria, even among the upper echelons of Jewish society, and in such instances clauses were added in the marriage contract to safeguard the right of each party to observe the customs of his or her faith. Later on, however, the practice dwindled and such mixed marriages became quite rare. Polygamy was never explicitly forbidden by Karaitic law (as it was by western rabbinic law), but seems to have been quite rare even in Muslim countries, and was certainly impossible in the West, where the law of the land (recognized by both Karaites and rabbinic Jews as binding) forbade it. The codification of the Karaitic law by Aaron the Elder (7th/13th century) has been mentioned above. Originally Karaitic rigorism led to an insistence that all formal prayer must consist exclusively of biblical psalmody, and the rabbinic practice of complementing biblical prayers with prose prayers and versified hymns composed by later authors was therefore condemned. But the passage of time and the example of the elaborate and poetically rich rabbinic prayerbook made their influence felt, and Aaron's order of prayer, supplemented by later additions in prose and verse, has finally developed into the voluminous liturgical corpus that it is today. The relationship of Karaimism to the older Jewish sects, particularly the Sadducees and the Dead Sea community, on the one hand, and to Islam, particularly Shi'ism, on the other, is still very obscure. Similarities and dissimilarities can be easily cited in both respects. The nature of Karaimism as we know it, as the product of the Muslim milieu, makes it highly likely that, while it represents another link in the ancient chain of Jewish heterodoxy, it is certainly not, at least chronologically, a direct heir to its Jewish sectarian predecessors. Nor has it ever made any visible attempt at Gleichschaltung with Islam—every feature of Karaimism, from its knowledge, a genuine product of Jewish history, Jewish tradition and Jewish thought.

(a). Printing. Unlike the rabbinic Jews, who eagerly seized upon Gutenberg's invention and produced a flood of printed books from the 1470s down to the present day, the Karaites ignored the printing press until well into the 18th century. The earliest Karaitic printed book, an edition of the liturgy, was set up by rabbinic typesetters in 1528-9 A.D. at the Christian press of Daniel Bomberg in Venice. The second Karaitic book was an edition of Ba'ashyâl's Adderet Elyyâhû, printed at Istanbul in 1530-1 A.D. by Gershom, a Karaitic family of masterprinters, the Soncinos. Two smaller Karaitic books appeared in 1581-2 A.D., likewise in Istanbul, from an unnamed but presumably rabbinic press. In the 17th century only one Karaitic book was published, that in 1643 A.D. by the rabbinic press of Manasseh ben Israel (the correspondent of Oliver Cromwell) at Amsterdam.

The first Karaitic printers were the brothers Afdah (Afiah) and Shabbathai Yerâkâ, who in 1733 issued a few sample sheets of the liturgy at Istanbul, but subsequently moved to Çufut-Kale in the Crimea, where they published a few books in 1734-41, whereupon they apparently went out of business. In 1804, soon after the Crimea was annexed by Russia, a new press was organized, likewise in Çufut-Kale, and four more books were issued from it in 1804-6. The first more or less successful Karaitic printing establishment was established in 1833 at Eupatoria (Gozlow), also in the Crimea, and published a series of important old texts.

The reason for this neglect of the printing press by the Karaites can only be conjectured. Presumably it was their traditional dislike of innovations, however beneficial, and the very limited circle of prospective purchasers of books, which made printing a philanthropic undertaking rather than a minimally profitable business.
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(a). Printing. Unlike the rabbinic Jews, who eagerly seized upon Gutenberg's invention and produced a flood of printed books from the 1470s down to the present day, the Karaites ignored the printing press until well into the 18th century. The earliest Karaitic printed book, an edition of the liturgy, was set up by rabbinic typesetters in 1528-9 A.D. at the Christian press of Daniel Bomberg in Venice. The second Karaitic book was an edition of Ba'ashyâl's Adderet Elyyâhû, printed at Istanbul in 1530-1 A.D. by Gershom, a Karaitic family of masterprinters, the Soncinos. Two smaller Karaitic books appeared in 1581-2 A.D., likewise in Istanbul, from an unnamed but presumably rabbinic press. In the 17th century only one Karaitic book was published, that in 1643 A.D. by the rabbinic press of Manasseh ben Israel (the correspondent of Oliver Cromwell) at Amsterdam.

The first Karaitic printers were the brothers Afdah (Afiah) and Shabbathai Yerâkâ, who in 1733 issued a few sample sheets of the liturgy at Istanbul, but subsequently moved to Çufut-Kale in the Crimea, where they published a few books in 1734-41, whereupon they apparently went out of business. In 1804, soon after the Crimea was annexed by Russia, a new press was organized, likewise in Çufut-Kale, and four more books were issued from it in 1804-6. The first more or less successful Karaitic printing establishment was established in 1833 at Eupatoria (Gozlow), also in the Crimea, and published a series of important old texts.
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(all published), Philadelphia 1913, is somewhat antiquated. L. Nemoy, Karaite liturgy and its relation to synagogue worship, Manchester 1957, is a useful comparative study, but is based solely on Hebrew Karaite sources, leaving the Arabic sources (particularly al-Kiršîsanî’s order of the liturgy; L. Nemoy, The liturgy of al-Qirqisânî, in Studies...in honor of I. Edward Kies, New York 1971) entirely out of consideration. See also S. W. Baron, A social and religious history of the Jews, New York 1957, v, 209-245 (for further references to Karaism see index to volumes i-vii, New York 1960); Z. Ankori, Karaim in Byzantium, New York 1959; N. Wieder, The Judean scrolls and Karaism, London 1962; A. Paul, Ecrits de Qumran et sectes juives aux premiers siècles de l’Islam: recherches sur l’origine du Qaraisme, Paris 1969 (defends more or less the traditional role of Anan as the founder of Karaism and the direct connexion between Karaism and Qumran); S. Poznanski, Karasche Druce und Don-Mamme (unfinished; published in hebrew, hebraische Bibliographie, xxi-xxii (1918-20). The Arab accounts of Karaism (in the works of al-Bîrûnî, al-Shahrastânî, al-Mahtzî and others) are all based on uncritical data supplied by Karaite informants and often misunderstood and distorted, and are therefore of little if any historical value.

For many years the main Karaite centre was at Krîı-yer, where in 1731 a Karaite printing-press was established. When the Crimean Khânate fell, contacts between the Crimean communities and those in Lithuania and Poland became stronger, resulting in the gradual Europeanisation of the Crimean Kairaîtes.

In the 19th century their main centre was at Guezlev (Eupatoria), where in 1857 the Taurid Kairait Religious Board was established, and later a Karaite religious college and library. On Lithuanian territories (integrated from the end of the 18th century with the Crimea), a separate Karaite religious board was established in 1857 at Troki. When, with the end of World War I, Poland regained its independence, Troki maintained its sway over the Panevėžys community in Lithuania and extended it to Halicz, a centre formerly isolated from the others (under Austrian rule). The Troki and Crimean Kairaites resumed regular relations after World War II, while on the other hand a separate Karaite Religious Board was established in 1945 in Poland (Warsaw).

After World War I, groups of Crimean Kairaîtes went to settle in other European countries (chiefly in Paris). One outstanding leader was S. Sapszal (1873-1962), elected head of the Religious Board at Troki (1927-1944), who contributed largely to the organization of Karaite communal life.

Anthropological research carried out on Kairaîtes in Poland and Lithuania (mainly by C. Gini, 1936) revealed their resemblance to the Tchuvash, evidence supporting the recognition of the Kairaîtes of Eastern Europe as a Turkic nation converted to Karaism. Their language belongs to the Kipcâg sub-group of the Turkic family. West-Kairaîte, somewhat different from that of Crimean Kairaîte, has two dialects; the northern (Troki, Panevėžys, and Vilna), and the southern (Luck and Halicz). Both in its vocabulary and syntax it shows numerous borrowings from Persian, Arabic, Hebrew, Slavonic languages and Lithuanian. In Kairaîte folklore there are visible traces of historic relations with the Khaizers (q.v.) (Hazâr oğhlı and Haçar biyl[i] in Crimean songs) and many wholly Turkic elements, such as the initial formula bir bar edi in a lullaby, many riddles and proverbs. In their general culture there are also similar vestiges of a Khazar past (tañ, an original dough-kneading device; the dishes baçar helvaşt or Haçar kaymâq ["Khaizar helva"], served at times of mourning occasions; katlama, a seven-layered cheese cake, etc.).

For centuries the main intellectual interest of the Kairaîte has been their religion. Apart from Hebrew, their scholars also wrote in the Kairaîte language: translations of the Bible, remarkable for their omission of anthropomorphic definitions of the divine attributes, and also original works. In the cultural field, the influence of the Christian world (in Poland) and of the Muslim (in Crimea) was felt. Towards the end of the 19th century secular works also began to appear, the most prominent Kairait authors writing in Kairaîte being I. Erak (Crimea, 19th century), Z. Abrahamowicz (Halicz, 1878-1903), S. Kobeccki (Troki, 1865-1933), A. Mardkowicz (Luck, 1875-1944), J. Lobanos (Vilna, 1878-1947), and S. Firkovič (Troki, b. 1897). There were several Kairaîte periodicals, published in Russian (Karaïmskaya Zhîn; Karaïmskoe Slovo), Polish (Między Karaïmuskim and Karaïmskie Gromadnicze Myśl; "Karaïm Voice"), Vilna 1927; Karaïm Asahy, "The Kairaîte Voice", Luck, 1931-38; Owaremnach, "Development";
Several Karaites in East Europe devoted themselves to Turkic studies (S. Szaplak, A. Jazieczkowski, and others). Several Karaites in East Europe devoted themselves to Turkic studies (S. Szaplak, A. Jazieczkowski, and others). Several Karaites in East Europe devoted themselves to Turkic studies (S. Szaplak, A. Jazieczkowski, and others).


**Al-Karak,** a fortress situated to the east of the Dead Sea, in the ancient Moab and at an altitude of ca. 3,000 feet. The name comes from Aramaic karakāh "town" and is found in the form ṣarrakwāmisc in Ptolemy (v, 16, 4), on the mosaic map of Madaba and in Stephen of Byzantium. Its situation on a steep-sided spur, separated from the mountain by a narrow and artificially-deepened moat, makes it an extraordinarily strong site. It is remarkable that we do not hear of it at the time of the Muslim conquest of the lands east of the Jordan, nor in the ensuing centuries. It is only at the time of the Crusades, when in 1142 it was fortified by King Fulk’s former cup-bearer Payen, that it began to play a role, but this was now a very prominent one. The Franks of that time, being little versed in geography, sought to localise the ancient city and called it Petra deserti. Since this stronghold dominated the pilgrim route from Damascus and the caravan way between Syria and Egypt, it caused the Muslims much trouble. It was during the period 1176-87, when it was in the hands of Reynaud of Chatillon, that it constituted a particular menace for the Muslim lands; it was at this time that Reynaud sent his expedition southwards towards Arabia, and although this failed, it caused great anxiety to the Muslims, who saw in it an attack against the Holy Cities, when it was rather an action impelled by economic motives.

From 566/1170 the fortress began to suffer siege by Nūr al-Dīn and the Salāḥ al-Dīn (Saladin), who aimed at restoring the authority of the Muslims in al-Karak. They had no success until finally, as a result of starvation, the garrison surrendered in 584/1188 to Saladin’s brother al-Malik al-ʿĀdal, and it fell again within the latter’s share of territory in the division of Saladin’s possessions after his death. It then belonged to various members of the Ayyūbīd family, and even after the various Ayyūbīd principalities had gradually disappeared, amir al-Malik Umar still held it, and in al-Karak until Baybars captured him by treachery and had him executed in 661/1263.

The Mamlūk sultan al-Nasir found refuge within the fortress’s mighty walls in 708/1309 when he fled from Cairo in order to make firm his royal power. Al-Karak was at that time the chief-lieu of one of the mamlakats into which Syria and Palestine were divided. The descriptions of Arabic authors show us how powerful the fortress was at that time; the local inhabitants were still in part Christian. Al-Karak lost its importance under Ottoman rule. In 1840 it was occupied by İbrahim Paşa, who had part of the ramparts destroyed; thereafter it was re-occupied by the Ottomans, who after 1893 erected there various public buildings. As the centre of an administrative district, al-Karak had in 1973 ca. 10,000 inhabitants. It is at times difficult to distinguish, both in the town and in the adjacent fortress, the traces of the Crusaders and of subsequent Islamic constructions, both of which are built upon ancient substructures. However, it is certain that the donjon and the external wall surrounding the lower courtyard are Muslim in origin and date to the time of Baybars.

... with reference to the geographers and travellers). (D. SOURDEL)

AL-KARAKI, Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī b. Muḥsain b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-'Āmil, Ijmā'ī scholar, born probably not later than 870/1466 into a family of scholars. His nisba al-Karaki refers to Karak Nūn in Biḵāš, where he studied religious sciences, chiefy under 'Alī b. Ḥiīlā al-Dīzā'īrī. He also visited Egypt and heard some Sunni scholars there; and 900/1500 he settled in Naḵd; and in 910/1505-6 he was probably present at the court of the Šafawīd Shāh Ismā'īl in Isfahān. Along with other Ijmā'ī scholars from al-Naḵd, in 916-17/1510-11 he accepted an invitation to Harat and Mashḥad extended Shāh Ismā'īl with the purpose of enlisting their help in propagating ʿImāmīsm in the newly conquered eastern provinces of Persia. Shāh Ismā'īl is reported later to have sent him 70,000 dinārs annually to al-Naḵd for expenditure on teaching and for distribution among students. Under Shāh Tahmāsp, who succeeded Ismā'īl in 930/1524, he paid at least two extended visits to the Šafawī court. Shāh Tahmāsp recognized him officially as the Seal of the Muḥiṭahids (Khdtam al-muḥiṭahīdīn) and the Deputy of the Imām (nd^ib al-imām) and gave him full authority to direct the government in matters relating to the Šafawī court. Al-Karaki instructed the governors concerning the assessment of the land tax, ordered the removal of Sunni scholars and the appointment of Shī'ī imāms to lead the prayers and instruct the public everywhere, and had the kibla rectified in several Persian towns in accordance with his views on geodesy. He defended these latter views in a dispute with the sadr Ghīyāṭ al-Dīn al-Daghtākī. Shāh Tahmāsp, taking the side of al-Karaki, dismissed Ghīyāṭ al-Dīn in 938/1531-2, and on the recommendation of al-Karaki appointed a student of the latter, Muʿizz al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, in his place. During the interim before the arrival of Muʿizz al-Dīn at the court, al-Karaki acted as sadr and appointed his deputies and agents. This situation is perhaps reflected in a fırmaṇ of 939/1532-3 quoted in the sources in which Shāh Tahmāsp claimed the exclusive authority of appointing and deposing religious officials in the Šafawī kingdom and conferred on him as a hereditary wakf extensive land holdings in the area of al-Naḵd valued at 700 tāmāns annually. Al-Karaki died in Dhu ḫ-Ḥiḍđa 940/July 1534 in al-Naḵd.

Some of al-Karaki's commentaries on earlier legal works, like al-Mubākkīl al-Hillī's Shahrū bi-al-tālām, became popular books of instruction. His Risālat al-Ḍiṣaṣarīyya, on the rules of the ritual prayer, had commentaries written on it by several scholars during his lifetime and was translated into Persian. Other of his writings aroused controversy. In his Risāлат ḥāṣṣat al-naḍāṣdī fi taḥṣīḥ tīlī al-kharādī he upheld the legality of government grants of kharād land and thus defended himself against criticism levelled at him for accepting such grants. The treatise was refuted by his sharp-tongued opponent in al-Naḵd Ibrāhīm al-Ḵaṭṭī, who also wrote refutations of some of his other treatises, among them the Risāla fi salāt al-ḏiqlām's in which al-Karaki upheld that the congregational Friday prayer was obligatory during the absence (ghayba) of the Imām if a qualified legal scholar was present. In his Risālat naṣāḥat al-ḥaṣṣat fi taʿām al-ḡidr waʿl-pāḏāri he asserted the permissibility of cursing Abu Bakr and ʿUmar, thus defending the early Šafawī practice, though other Ijmā'ī scholars objected to this practice as a breach of tāḥiyā. With the exception of this last question, later ʿImāmī opinion generally upheld his views against his critics and gave him the honorary surname of al-Mubākkīl al-Thānī.

Sunni anti-Šafawī polemics singled him out among Ijmā'ī scholars for attack and variously accused him of being a Druze, of having concocted a new religion from the heresies of all other erring Muslim sects, of having converted Shāh Ismā'īl to his "false religion", and of having abolished the canonical prayers in Persia; but these accusations are without foundation.


KARAḴALPAḴ (Turkic "black hat"), a Turkic people of Central Asia. In the Russian annals, a people of this name (Cerneye Klobutsi) is mentioned as early as the 12th-13th century A.D.; but whether these “black hats” are identical with the modern Karaḵalpaḵ cannot be definitely ascertained. It is not until the end of the 11th/12th century that there are records of the Karaḵalpaḵ in Central Asia. According to the embassy report of Shkihīn and Toshī (1694), they were then living on the Indus, 10 days' journey below the town of Turkestan. There they are again mentioned in the 12th/18th century as neighbours of the land of the Khāns of Khiwa; in 1722 a treaty was concluded by the ambassador Vershinin between Peter the Great and the Khān of the Karaḵalpaḵ, Abu l-Muẓaffar Saʿdāt Ḥīnayat Muḥammad Bahādūr (Poiwzay Sotarmiya Zakonov, 1722, no. 4101). At that time the Karaḵalpaḵ lived not only by herding and raiding but also by agriculture—with artificial irrigation of their fields—and by fishing in the Aral Sea. They are said to have migrated to Central Asia from the Volga region. About the middle of the 12th/18th century the winter quarters of a group of Karaḵalpaḵ were on the central course of the Sīr Daryā at Khāwās (north of Ur-Tube); the prince (tura) of these Karaḵalpaḵ entered into an alliance in 1716/1755 with the Atalik of Bukhara, Muḥammad Rāhīm; 3,000 Karaḵalpaḵ families were settled at Samarkand. The Karaḵalpaḵ are said to have driven out of the lower valley of the Sīr Daryā by the Kazaḵ towards the end of the 18th/19th century; they are still mentioned in the 19th century a little farther south on the Yeli Daryā in connection with the campaid is of Muḥammad Rāhīm of Khiwa, against the land of the Kungrat (1222-6/1807-11). The Karaḵalpaḵ were then subject to the Khān of Kungrat. After the union of Kungrat with...
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Khlwa (1226/1811) the Karakalpak too had to submit to the Khan of Khiva. They made frequent attempts to throw off this yoke; in 1827 they even captured and held the town of Kungrat for a time. After the suppression of this uprising, a body of them migrated to Farghana. In 1855 the leader of the rebel Karakalpak, Ir-Nazar-bi, adopted the title of Khan, building a fortress near where the Kazak river flows into the Aral Sea.

After the Russian conquest of Khlwa in 1873, when the Khán had to cede to Russia all his possessions east of the main arm of the Amu Darya and the most north-westerly arm of its delta, the land of the Karakalpak became Russian. The area, then separated from Khiva, was first administered as a separate department (otdyel), and later as part of the "government" of Sir Daryâ. On 11 May 1925 the Karakalpak Autonomous Oblast' was formed as part of the Kazak A.S.S.R.; on 20 March 1932 its status was changed to an Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (A.S.S.R.); and on 5 December 1936 this A.S.S.R. was transferred to the Uzbek S.S.R. The capital of the Karakalpak A.S.S.R. is Nukus. The Karakalpak, who at the time of the Revolution were on the verge of being totally assimilated by the Kazak (and to a lesser extent by the Uzbek), were preserved as a distinct group by the Soviet régime. Linguistically the Karakalpak language is merely a dialect of Kazak; their tribal divisions are the same as that of the Kazak. Karakalpak was first written (i.e., established as a literary language) in 1925 using the Arabic script; in 1928 this was changed to a Latin script; and since 1940 it has been written in Cyrillic. The 1970 Soviet census lists 236,009 Karakalpaks in the U.S.S.R. Of these 230,258 (97.6 %) live in the Karakalpak A.S.S.R., 8,668 in Bukhara Oblast', 1428 in Tashkent, and 732 in Farghana Oblast' (the Farghana Karakalpaks are rapidly being assimilated by the Uzbeks).


KARAKAY. The cross-reference to this from KARULK is erroneous; see KARAKOL, KARAKUL.

KARAKOL, modern Turkish term for "police-station", "(military) patrol", a popular etymology ("black [i.e., ominous] arm [of the authorities]" or "patrol"); for Ottoman karakash, karavas, a loan-word from Mongol (attested from the 8th/14th century), see Tarama sözlükü, Ankara 1969, iv, 228 f. The Mongol word also passed into Persian as karavas, karavul. For full references and details of the diffusion of the word (as far as Swahili), see Doerfer, i, no. 276.

In the Ottoman Empire the maintenance of security and order in different quarters of Istanbul was entrusted mainly to the Janissaries [see VESİÇER], and the ortas (companies) patrolling the city were called kulek. During the military campaigns, apart from the tarhâğı (vanguard) forces, the Ottoman army used to send out small units called karavul müfrezeleri. In the same way the Ottoman navy, when at sea, sent out two mail ships as karavul sefsineri, with the purpose of taking any sudden attack on the fleet. About ten ships under the command of the tersâne hethâvnâisi (Intendant of the Admiralty) brought up the rear as ard karavul to help ships in trouble when necessary.

After the suppression of the Janissaries in 1826, public security in Istanbul became the responsibility of the ser'asher [q.v.]; an autonomous administration, the Dâbiyye Müştiiriyeti, which was founded in 1846 to take charge of police functions, was changed into a neşâeti (ministry) in 1870 and in 1909 attached to the Ministry of the Interior as a directorate with authority extending over the whole country [see PARİYÂ]. At that time, a police-station was called karakol-khâne, and later karakol. The word karakol was used also in the Turkish army and navy to designate a unit charged with security or observation duty (isimâd karakol, sîri karakol, nîşâm karakolu, etc.).


KARAKOL DHİMEYİYET, a secret society founded in Istanbul towards the end of 1918 by a group of former members of the Union and Progress Committee [see İTİBAH WE TERAŞÊI DHİMEYİYET]. Its aim was to organize guerrilla resistance bands against the Allied forces which had occupied strategic points in Turkey following the armistice of Mudros on 30 October 1918. After the organization of the Nationalist Movers in Anatolia under the leadership of Mustafâ Kemâl Pasha, the Karakol society supplied the movement with intelligence, officers and arms. The society tried to gain control over the nationalists of Anatolia, and Karâ Wâsiî, one of the founding members, became their representative in Istanbul. However, Mustafâ Kemâl succeeded in checking the activities of the Karakol society and ordered its dissolution in the spring of 1920, on the grounds that a delegate of the society had signed a pact of military assistance with the Bolsheviks on 10 January 1920 without the authorization of the nationalists. Nevertheless, the Karakol society seems to have continued its underground activities until the end of the Turkish War of Independence.


KARAKÖRUM (KARAKÖRAM), a chain of mountains in the centre of Asia lying north of and almost parallel to the Himalayas. The range extends westwards as far as 73° long.; it has not yet been definitely ascertained how far it runs eastwards. At one time the eastern limit was thought to be the pass of the Karakörum, the plateau of Dipsong and the upper part of the Shyok, but, according to the views of several famous geographers, the range runs much farther into Tibet, and the Tang-la (to the north of upper Saluên) should, they think, be re-
Karakorum

The Karakorum is the most important watershed in Central Asia, dividing the rivers which run northwards, emptying their waters into the deserts of this part of the world, and those running southwards into the Indian Ocean.

The principal pass is the col of Karakorum (5,574 m.), through which runs the important trade route between Chinese Turkestan and Kashmir. It is difficult and dangerous. In their long journey countless beasts of burden perish of exhaustion or in the avalanches. The mountains take their name from the pass, which is Karakorum; but the name is not very appropriate. It is found for the first time in a map by Elphinstone published in 1815. On this map the range in question is indicated by the name Moor Taugh (instead of Mur Tagh, "Ice Mountain") or Karakooroom Mountains.

The first traveller to write on the mountains now called Karakorum was Mirza Haydar Dughlat, a propos of his journey from Yarkand to Leh, capital of Ladakh, in 1600. The exploration proper of the Karakorum only began in 1808 when Elphinstone visited these regions. The more systematic and detailed exploration of the high mountains proper was only begun in 1892 by Sir Martin Conway's expedition, which was followed by many others (including 5 expeditions of Ph. C. and J. Visser between 1922 and 1935).

century the town lost all importance. At the present
day, the Buddhist monastery of Erdeni-Dzu is
adjacent to the site.


(W. BARTHOLD-J. A. BOYLE)

KARAKUL [see KARAKUL].

KARAKUM (Turkish "black sand"), a desert in
Russian Turkestan, between the Amu Darya, the
Üst Urt and the ranges of hills on the Caspian,
contrasted with Khlz-Kum ("red sand"), the desert
between the Sûr Darya and the Amu Darya. The
Karâkum (area ca. 300,000 sq. km.) is a still more
dreadful place and possesses even fewer fertile areas
than the Khlz-Kum. The sandy stretches north of the
Sûr as far as Lake Çalkar are called "little Karâkum";
cf. F. Machatschek, Landeskunde von Russ-
sisch-Turkestan, Stuttgart 1921, 15 ff., 285, and index.
A good deal of the Karâkum is still used by Turco-
man nomads as pasture for sheep and camels. In
the south, the Karâkum is traversed (since 1883-6) by
the railway from Khlz Suw (Russ. Krasnovodsk) to
Çalkar. Djuyu (Russ. Cardjuy) is the Karâkum canal
built out of stones from the Pyramids at Memphis,
and to Arcman on the northern slope of the Köpet
Dagh (since 1862). The Karâkum mentioned by
Djuyaynî in the Ta'rika-i Djihan Ghdjâ as popu-
lated by the Karâkon (see KARAKUL) is, in the opinion
of the editor, probably identical with the little
Karâkum (the readings of the Ms. are not certain;

Bibliography: W. 'Leimbach, Die Sowjet-
union, Stuttgart 1950, index; Th. Shabad, Geo-
graphy of the USSR, New York 1951, index; W. Barthold, Turkestan*, 415 f.

(W. BARTHOLD-B. SPieler)

KARAKUSH, BAHÀ AL-DIN B. 'ABD ALLÂH (i.e. son of an unknown father) AL-ASADI (mamûk of Asad al-Din Shîrkhû) AL-ROôMÎ AL-MALIKI AL-
NÄSÎRî, officer of Malik al-Nâşîr Yûsûf (i.e. Saladin), a eunuch, received his liberty from Shîrkûh and was appointed an amir. By the time of Shîrkûh's death (564/1170) he was already playing an influential part; it is said that it was due to him and the šâhid 'Adâ ni Hakkârî that the shâhid al-'Adîd appointed Saladin vizier. After the suppression of the revolted faction after al-'Adîd's death by his chamberlain, the eunuch Mu'tâman al-Khîlàfà, Karâkush was appointed chamberlain. In this capacity he had the surveillance of the family of the late caliph and is said to have administered his office with great strictness. To prevent the family of the caliph increasing, he separated men and women. Saladin gave him the task of building the citadel of Cairo and extending the city walls to include Cairo and Fustât; later he was asked to fortify and defend 'Akkâ. When the town fell in 587/1191 after eighteen months fighting, he was taken prisoner; Saladin ransomed him a few months later for the high sum of 20,000 dinârs. After the death of Saladin in 589/1193 he entered the service of his son al-Malik al-'Azîz 'Ugman and was appointed to represent the Sultan when the latter was out of Egypt. When the Sultan felt his end approaching (in 595/1199), he designated his son al-Malik al-Mansûr his suc-
cessor and Karâkûsh his regent. In keeping with this
wish, the young ruler appointed him sque, although Karâkûsh himself was now very old. He only held his post for a very short time as most of the amirs and the head of the chancellerie, Ibn Mam-
mâtî, declared him incapable of ruling, presumably
on account of his great age.

His supporters, who considered him the most
worthy, consulted Saladin's adviser, al-Kâdî al-
Fâdîl [q.v.], but the latter, who had retired from
political life, would not be drawn into the question.
Finally the amirs asked al-Mansûr's uncle, al-Malik al-
Afdal, to take over the regency. After this we
find only one mention of Karâkûsh, when Sultan
al-'Adîl, who had seized the throne in 596/1200, had
two of his nephews taken to the house of Karâkûsh
as prisoners. He died a year later. Contemporary
historians, like 1mâd al-Dîn al-Kâtîb al-Iṣfahânî,
bewest the highest praise upon him, as do later
writers, like al-Makrizî and Ibn Taghrîbirdî, and
describe him as the ablest man of his day. They
give him particular credit for his activity as a builder.
Besides the buildings already mentioned, his house,
his hippodrome and the bridge at Gîzeh, which he
built out of stones from the Pyramids at Memphis,
are mentioned.

In the same period a "Karâkûsh" became no-
rious as a byword for stupidity. A series of absurd
verdicts are related in a work entitled Kitâb al-
Fâghûf fi Ahkâm Karâkûsh, "the book on the
stupidity in the judgments of Karâkûsh". According
to Hâdidî Khalîfà, the above-mentioned Ibn Mam-
mâtî was the author of this book. Casanova (see Bibl.) in his elaborate study on Karâkûsh quotes
three manuscripts: (1) a Cairo manuscript which
contains a brief selection from the Kitâb al-Fâghûf;
the author is there given as Ibn Mammâtî; (2) a
Paris manuscript the author of which is given as al-
Sîyûfî, certainly wrongly, as in the introduction
Ibn Taghrîbirdî is wrongly quoted and given a
wrong praenomen, which one can hardly credit
with; (3) a Cairo manuscript which is a later
version, in which Karâkûsh is called a sulûn and
the number of his "judgments" is increased, by
Abd al-Salâm al-Lakâmî, dating from 1200/1786.
These "judgments" have nothing to do with state-
craft but are court verdicts; they are typical, well
known anecdotes, current among other nations also.
A special investigation has not yet been made of the
problem. Casanova endeavours to show that the
work is a pamphlet against Karâkûsh, whom, he
says, Ibn Mammâtî hated as an exceedingly severe
man. It is not known whether Ibn Mammâtî collected
and published these anecdotes in the life-time of
Karâkûsh. Ibn Khallîkân rightly points out that it
is impossible that a man such as is described in the
anecdotes could have held high offices of state. Nor
is anything known of a particular feud between Ibn
Mammâtî and Karâkûsh, except that Ibn Mam-
mâtî had protested in 595/1199 against the appoint-
ment of this then very old man; Karâkûsh, as do later
by the Frankish chroniclers as advanced in years
even in 585/1198 at the siege of 'Akkâ; he is said
even to have known Godfrey de Bouillon. One thing
is clear from Ibn Khallîkân's observation: the
Gafsa, Karakūsh may have offered his submission to the Almohads and that in Tripoli, the sûlādār may have done likewise (Lévêque-Provençal, Trente-sept lettres almohades, 198, and Recueil, 62), but it is equally possible that this manoeuvre took place some time later. Whatever may have been the case, Saladin, who had rejoiced at Karakūsh’s successes (cf. Abu Shama, ii/2, 547), at this time needed the support of the Almohad fleet against the Franks, and there is extant the text of a letter drawn up in his name by al-Kādī al-Fāḍil [q.v.], dated 587/1192 and addressed to al-Mansūr, asking for his intervention (apud al-Kalkashandi, Subh, vi, 526 ff., tr. and comm. in Gaudroy-Demombynes, op. cit., 279-304). Karakūsh had then to pretend to rally to him, probably on Saladin’s orders, who in the following year (28 Şa‘bān 586/30 September 1190) sent an embassy to al-Mansūr with a letter (apud Abu Shama, Rawdatayn, in RHC, Hist Or., iv, 497-505) in which he unequivocally disowned the reprehensible actions of the sûlādār and the mamīlūk (according to Abu Shama, ibid., ii, 508, the former was handed over at Tunis by Karakūsh, whilst according to Istibyār, 111, this person, here called Abū Zubār al-Fārisī, was expelled from Tripoli and sent to Marrakesh). After having stayed for some time with the governor of Tunis, Karakūsh took to flight and successfully evaded the Authority of the Almohads was not yet firmly established, and it was his mamīlūk who undertook this enterprise (most probably with Saladin’s blessing) from 586/1192 onwards. He had made various raids (cf. Abu Shama, Rawdatayn, Cairo 1936-62, i/2, 548), on Barka, Tripoli and Awjīla, and then returned to Cairo, where he was thrown into prison; but he soon began his activities once more (15 Rabi‘a 583/11 October 1187). Returning once again to Tripolitania (cf. Abu Shama, op. cit., i/2, 692) at the head of a force of Ghuzz [q.v.], he occupied the eastern and southern parts of the country as far as Fazzān, and then, with the aid of bedouins of the Banū Hilāl and Sulaym, seized Tripoli. It seems to have been at this point that he was rejoined by Taṭk al-Din’s sûlādār, a person whose role and even personal name remain obscure (Gaudroy-Demombynes, Une lettre de Saladin au calife almohade, in Mélanges Rene Basset, Paris 1925, ii, 290-1, put forward the idea that Waddan is further mentioned of another of his sons who fled there after betraying the īlikīya in his turn, Yahyā also fled to Waddān (606/1209) and besieged the former ally of the Banū Ghāniyya, who was unable to withstand him; Yahyā had him and one of his sons executed in 609/1212. Thus there came to an end the life of an adventurer who had carried on warfare for forty years as much for Saladin’s benefit as for his own. The presence at Waddān is further mentioned of another of his sons who fled there after betraying the Hafṣīd al-Mustansīr (647−75/1249−77); he was eventually put to death by the king of Kanem.


KARAKŪSH, generosity [see Supplement].

AL-KARAM, Banū [see ZVRAYIDS].
KARAMA may be considered as the masdar of karuma "to be ... in the determining lines of its own nature. In the light of this perspective of existential determinism, a recognition freely and in superabundance. More precisely, the word comes to denote the "marvels" wrought by the "friends of God", awliyd* (sing. wali), which God grants to them to bring about. These marvels most usually consist of miraculous happenings in the corporeal world, or else of predictions of the future, or else of interpretation of the secrets of hearts, etc.

The notion of karama differs from that of mu'qdisa [q.v.]. Each involves a "breaking of the natural order of things" (khulis l-il-'dda), that is, an extraordinary happening which breaks this "divine custom" (sunnat Allah) which is the normal course of events. But while mu'qdisa is a symbol of a public act, preceded by a "proclamation" (da'wa) and a "challenge" (ta'addadi), by means of which the prophet demonstrates incontrovertibly the "impotence" (sad) of his hearers to reproduce likewise the miracle thus brought about, the karama is a simple, personal favour. It should be kept secret, and is in no way the sign of a prophetic mission. There is a risk of ambiguity if one translates both terms by "miracle" (of a prophet, of a saint). If mu'qdisa is rendered, as has become common, by mu'dizdt (*tazills are unanimous in attributing this to the Prophet, and did not attribute any miraculous nature to the inimitability of the Kur'an (ed. Nyberg, 28-9), turning into a personal attack. But the conclusion is clear (ibid., 275): the karama are all tricks, and the accounts which later repeat them are only restating popular superstitions.

(2) Falsaifa (Ibn Sinā). To illustrate the position taken up by falsafa, we shall take the example of Ibn Sinā, who dealt with this question on several occasions. Ibn Sinā's cosmology undertakes to place mu'qdisa and karama in the existential order, preceded by a "proclamation" (da'wa) and a "challenge" (ta'addadi), by means of which the prophet demonstrates incontrovertibly the "impotence" (sad) of his hearers to reproduce likewise the miracle thus brought about, the karama is a simple, personal favour. It should be kept secret, and is in no way the sign of a prophetic mission. There is a risk of ambiguity if one translates both terms by "miracle" (of a prophet, of a saint). If mu'qdisa is rendered, as has become common, by mu'dizat (*tazils are unanimous in attributing this to the Prophet, and did not attribute any miraculous nature to the inimitability of the Kur'an (ed. Nyberg, 28-9), turning into a personal attack. But the conclusion is clear (ibid., 275): the karama are all tricks, and the accounts which later repeat them are only restating popular superstitions.

(1) The Mu'tazilī schools of thought. The generality of the partisans of istišā' denied the reality of karāmāt. The most prominent argument from scripture is that put forward by al-Zamakhshāri commenting on Kur'an, LXXII, 26-7, "He (sc. God) knows the Mystery, but does not reveal to anyone His Mystery, except to the one whom He designates as His messenger". This text is understood as justifying the miracles which God performs openly by "the hands" of the prophets in order to demonstrate the truth of their missions, but as setting aside all other supernatural happenings. Al-Djūbbārī says that if the awliyā' possessed this power, how would one be able to distinguish them from the prophets?

A detailed exposition of the Mu'tazilī interpretations of these "miracles of a prophet" will be found in the article mu'qdisa. Briefly, if the heresiographers (al-Isfārā'ī, al-Baghdādī, al-Shahrastānī, etc.) can be believed, al-Nazzām and al-Murdār for example regarded as doubtfully every miraculous happening traditionally attributed to the Prophet, and did not attribute any miraculous nature to the inimitability of the Kur'an (cf. A. Nader, Le système philosophique des Mu'tazīs, Beirut 1936, 318 and refs.). But this statement must be strongly qualified. Al-Khayyāt, for instance, in his Kuisā l-Intisārī, ed. Nyberg, 28-9, tr. Nader, Beirut 1957, 25-6, states that for al-Nazzām, the Kur'an is only "the proof of the Prophet's mission". Moreover, Ibn Mattawayh says that the mu'qdisāt merely confirm a teaching (sc. the kürānic revelation) which is conformable to reason, and it is this fact which justifies them. They are bound up with the missions of the prophet-messengers who are, like all mankind, responsible for their own actions. Nevertheless, the Mu'tazīs are unanimous in denying the authenticity of karāmāt, which they ig-
tion of the possibility of "prophetic miracles" leads logically to admitting the possibility of karāmāt. The explanation is common to both, the differences lying essentially not in the deeds as such, but in the superiority which raises the prophet over the saint.

(3) The Ashʿaʿrī reply. It seems that some Ashʿaʿrīs, such as al-Isfārāʿīnī and al-Ḥaṣnī, shared the severe judgment of the Muʿtaṣiṣīlīs in regard to karāmāt. The generality of the school, however, recognised their authenticity on the following grounds: (a) Rational probability. The raison d'être of a muʿḍīṣat is not the moral perfecting of a prophet, but the freely-exercised will of God, who brings about this miracle "by the hands of the prophet", a public miracle, preceded by a "proclamation" and a "challenge". It is therefore possible (ṣuʿūd) for God to create, through the intermediacy of a saint, a supernatural occurrence without either a proclamation or a challenge. (b) Existence of the occurrences. They are authenticated above all by the miraculous happenings which are mentioned in the Kurʾān and whose beneficiaries have not in any way received a prophetic message to proclaim. Thus sūra III, 37, tells of a marvel brought about for Mary, mother of Jesus, and XXVIII, 9 ff., stress the "miracle" of the story of the Seven Sleepers, in themselves "miraculous signs" (ṣūrāt) from God. Finally, XVII, 40 explains the extension of these happenings which came about at Solomon's request, whether through an ʿifrīt or through "The one who had knowledge of the Book", particularised by tradition as the vizier Asaf. (c) Karāmāt are therefore possible, but should not be confused with muʿḍīṣat. God grants the former to saints in order to honour them and to confirm them in piety and God-fearing reverence, but He brings about the second ones "by the hands of the prophet!" as a proof of his mission. The former should be kept hidden, but the second ones proclaimed before all men. Both, then, should in any case be carefully distinguished, not only from acts of trickery (biṣyal), but also from divinatory acts (ḥikāḥāt), those of permitted magic, sīrān, and those of sorcery (nārāndjāt). Al-Bākīllānī devotes a whole work, his Kitāb al-Bayyān (ed. R. McCarthy, Baghdad-Beirut 1958), to defining the kinds of "signs", some of them authentic, and the rest deceptive and illusory, and to tracing back to their subject the rules for the "discernment of spirits". It is virtually the Ashʿaʿrī thesis which Ibn Khaldūn sums up in his Muḥaddīsima (ed. Cairo N.D., 67, 332, tr. de Slane, i, 191-4, iii, 112-12, tr. Rosenthal i, 188-91, iii, 167-8).

(4) The Sūfī attitude. The existence of "saints' miracles" (karāmāt al-aqwāliyya) is affirmed. In Sunnī tasawwuf, the explanation given is in general terms very close to the Ashʿaʿrī position. There is a freely-given stress on the distinction between karāmāt and muʿḍīṣat; the saint who performs marvels cannot accordingly be recognised as a prophet, and must remain subject to the religious law laid down by the Messenger of God. However, whilst the Ashʿaʿrīs insisted on the objective difference of the two types of "signs", the Sūfī texts deal with the differences in spiritual attitudes.

The problem comes up in almost all the Sūfī manuals, e.g. in the Kitāb al-Lumaʿ of Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāḍī (ed. Nicholson, GMS, 1914, chs. 113-18, Kalābādī's Kitāb al-Taʿarrūf (ed. Arberry, Cairo 1952/1933, ch. 26), the Rūṣdī al-khawāṣṣirīya (ed. Cairo N.D. 158 ff.), al-Hujwirī's Kashf al-mahdīj (tr. Nicholson, GMS, 1911, 218-19). The "signs" (ṣūrāt) of saints resemble externally those of prophets, but whereas these last bring them about publicly (and with a "challenge" hurled forth), the saints strive to keep them secret. One of the charges made against al-Ḥallādī was just this "divulging of marvels" (ṣūrāt al-karāmāt) by means of which he could apparently aspire, in the eyes of contemporaries, to the role of prophet.

Subjectively, muʿḍīṣat are an aid to the prophet-messenger, in that they confirm his mission; karāmāt on the other hand can become a subject of disquiet for the saint, who may be afraid of being the dupe of an illusion (cf. al-Sarrāḍī, loc. cit.). Al-Kalābādī, op. cit., 44, relates that according to Abū Bakr al-Warrāk, it is not the power of working miracles which constitutes a prophet, but the mission with which God has entrusted him. Saints able to perform charismatic acts do not take any offence at this mission, once they recognise it and remain faithful to the message proclaimed. Also, when they receive the gift of working marvels, according to al-Kalābādī, 46, "they display towards God all the more humility, submission, godly fear, abasement and self-contempt, and all the more promptness in responding to God's claims over them". This humility and abasement on the saint's part are a sign of the authenticity of the karāmāt, whilst the "enemies of God" who work apparently similar deeds, become puffed up and attribute the merit to themselves alone (loc. cit.); in this respect they become the dupes of "God's plotting" (mahār Allāh), who has allowed these swindles in order the better to confound them. We find the same teaching in al-Hujwirī, who stresses the impeccability of prophets but the fallibility of saints. He adds that the karāmāt accomplished over the ages by the Muslims are precisely a muʿḍīṣat of the Prophet of Islam: the kurʿānic law, necessarily permanent, thereby acquires a proof of authenticity also permanent (Kashf al-mahdīj, tr. 222). The remainder of the text gives a series of examples of karāmāt, some kurʿānic or contemporary with the Kurʾān, others post-kurʿānic, including those of inter alios Abū Saʿīd al-Khārāzī, Ḍhū l-Ḥāram al-Miṣrī, etc.

On one side, the Sūfīs often teach that saints must not seek after this gift of marvel-working, but must even mistrust it, and that to become attached to it would make a serious obstacle on the road to union with God; on the other side, however, the biographies of the leading Sūfīs abound in marvellous acts and supernatural charismatic deeds. This dual note is for example found all through the Lāṭif al-mīnān wa l-ʿāḥlāk ofʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Ṣāfī al-Khārāzī (ed. Cairo N.D.) studied by Asīn Palacios. It should be finally noted that in general Shiʿism also admits karāmāt and distinguished them from muʿḍīṣat. The great Imāms, since they are endowed with impeccability and perfect knowledge, can work "marvels". Strict Imāmi thought accords this power to them alone, or at most, will only admit the possibility of karāmāt performed under the influence or through the intermediacy of the Imāms.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(L. GARDET)

KARĀMĀN, the name of a Turkoman leader, founder of the Anatolian dynasty of the Karāmānids or Karāmān-oghullarī [q.v.]; hence the name of the Ottoman province into which the territories of this principality were subsequently formed, with Konya as its administrative centre, see below. Karāmān was also the later Ottoman name for the town of Laranda [q.v.]. The term Karāmānîl/Karāmānî was applied to the turchophone Greek Christians of the Karāmān region, and Karāmānlîlî核桃 (Grk. Karamânlîhika) to their dialect of Turkish and their literature (written in Greek characters). Emigrants from this
ethnico-religious group (who were not Greeks, but probably descendants of the ancient Lycaonians) who were brought to Istanbul after the Ottoman conquest and gave their name to a quarter near Yedikule [see ISTANBUL, i, vii]; in the early years of this century, the Karamanlı community in Istanbul published its own newspaper, Nea Anatoli. See A. M. Scheider, Die Bevölkerung Konstantinopels in XV. Jahrhundert, in Nachr. der Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen (1949), 238 ff. (Tk. tr. in Boll., xxvii (1952), 35 ff.); S. Salaville and E. Dalleigne (eds.), Karamanlidha, Bibliographie analytique. . . . i, Years 1584-1850, ii, Years 1850-66, Athens 1958-66; S. Vryonis Jr., The decline of medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1971, index; and Turks, section on languages. Emigrants from the Karamanlı region have further given their name to some 19 other places in Turkey, see Son teşkilat-i müülkiye'de köylərimizin adları, Istanbul 1928, and Türkiye'de mesbun yerler kiita, Ankara 1946-50.

What follows relates only to the administrative province of Karaman under the Ottomans and after the definitive disappearance of the Karamanlı dynasty.

In 888/1483, the Karamanlı lands became a beylerbeylik divided into two parts: the first comprised the sandjak of Tă-i-li (q.v.) in the western part of the area adjacent to the coast (see the map in ANADOLU) and included Mut and the administrative centre Konya, whilst the second comprised the interior regions, called Khàrdî. In the middle of the 10th/16th century, the sandjak of Tă-i-li was separated from it. In the 11th/17th century, the province (eyâlet) of Karaman comprised the sandjak of Aşarar, Aşqehir, Beyşehir, Kayseri, Karaman, Konya and Nigde (q.v.). With the administrative reform of 1284/1864, the former eyâlet became the vilâyet of Konya. See Hâddîji Khalifa, Dîhân-nîmat, 614-15; Von Hammer, Staatsverfassung, i, 254 ff., ii, 256-7; Barkan, Karuniler, 39 ff.; N. and I. Beldiceanu, Le province de Qaraman au XVIe siècle, in JESHO, xi (1968), esp. 38; Tekindaş, in TD, xiii, passim, xiv, 74; I. H. Konyalı, Anadolu' da eyâletleri ile Karaman tarımları . . . , Istanbul 1967, passim; Kramer, in E.F., iv, 1963, v, 1964.

KARAMÂN MEHMET PASHA [see MEHMET PASHA, KARAMÂN]

KARAMÂNLI, family of Turkish origin, of whom several members governed Tripolitania from 1123/1711 to 1231/1835, constituting themselves into a real dynasty. Its founder was Karamanlı Ahmed Bey, of whose origins scarcely anything is known apart from the fact that he himself or his father or an ancestor came from Anatolia, probably from the town or the region of Karaman, to serve as a soldier in the oğlubey of Tripoli; certain authors put forward the view that one of his ancestors may have come to Tripolitania with the corsair Turghut (Dragut). The chronicler Ibn Ghalbûn, who lived at the time of Ahmed Bey, calls him Ahmed b. Yusuf b. Muhammed b. Muṣṭafâ.

In 1122/1710, and for several years earlier, the Ottoman province of Tripolitania had been plunged into anarchy due to rivalries that brought into opposition Janissaries, bulğlıs and Arab notables. Ahmed Karamanlı, then qâmil or governor of the region of the Manşhaya and of the Sâbîl, had succeeded at the end of 1122/1710 in restoring order there and making himself appreciated by the local population. Resolved to put an end to the disorder, and supporting the Arabs against the bulğlıs, Ahmed seized Tripoli, took the title of bey (commander of the troops) and in fact exercised control over the province (13 Dîvân-mâdâ II 1125/20 July 1711). Shortly afterwards, he had Khalîf Pasha, the governor sent by the sultan, executed, and had a large number of Turkish officers and functionaries assassinated, at the same time sending a delegation to Sultan Ahmed III in order to justify himself. Finally, the Sultan accorded him the title of beylerbey (governor), recognizing him also as chief of the province; but it was only in 1734/1722 that the Sultan bestowed on him the title of Pasha, making him his official representative.

Having little confidence in the Janissaries, Ahmed Bey created an indigenous militia and favoured the corsairs. He had to face several local revolts from 1125/1713 to 1135/1723 in the south-east of Tripolitania, in Cyrenaica and Fazzân. Following these revolts, he took under his direct control the whole province by making terror reign when necessary: he had a number of people put to death, including dignitaries and notables, and even, over a libel, the chronicler Ibn Ghalbûn, who nevertheless had written his work for his glory. While encouraging piracy, Ahmed Karamanlı avoided entangling himself with the great Western powers and concluded or renewed, notably with England and France, treaties of peace and commerce. He had the fortifications of Tripoli restored and the mosque and madrasa which bear his name constructed in Tripoli. He died (by his own committed suicide) on the night of 26th or 27th Ramadân 1157/3rd or 4th November 1745; he was approximately 60 years old.

His son Mehmed (Muhammad, 1158-65/1745-54) was proclaimed governor and recognized without difficulty by the Sultan. He maintained the country in peace and renewed the agreements with England and France, although there had at that time enjoyed a great prosperity, which led to several incidents with Venice and Naples. He died in Shawwal 1167/July 1754. His son Ali succeeded him (1167-1207/1754-93) and received the agreement of the Sultan. Until 1171/1758 he had to face several revolts, notably in the Manşhaya and the Sâbîl, revolts which were drowned in blood. However, after this, the country enjoyed a sufficiently long period of calm until 1204/1790. From the middle of the reign of Ahmed Karamanlı, Tripolitania saw its economic activity increase and became an important staging post of commerce in the Mediterranean; but a serious epidemic in 1181/ 1770, and then the plague and famine in 1198-1200/1784-6, led to a certain decline of Tripoli and its commerce. During this period, the authority of the Karamanlıs was incontestable: they had a firm grip on the central power (bey, âghâ of the Janissaries, kâhî, ra's (al bahr, kharâb, âghâ al-balad, diwan) and on the provinces where they were represented by the kâ'îl; the military forces comprised about 400 Janissaries, 200 to 300 renegades, 500 Albanians and 600 Arabs; the navy was composed of Albanians and Arabs.

The situation deteriorated with the old age of Ali Pasha; in 1790 his elder son, Hasan Bey, was assassinated and his second son, Ahmed, then became bey, but had to face the hostility of his brother Yusuf, who was supported by the Arabs. In view of this situation, the notables of Tripoli and some military leaders intervened with the Sultan and asked him to name another governor, to which Yusuf replied by having himself proclaimed governor with the support of the Nuwayr (1207/1792-3); he then undertook the siege of Tripoli (June 1793). Shortly afterwards there arrived unexpectedly Ali Bulghur, a high dignitary ousted from Algiers, who claimed to have been invested with the governorship by the Sultan: he bene-
fited from the gathering of notables and officers of Tripoli and entered the town (July 1793), while Yusuf and 'Ali Pasha retired to Tunisia. 'Ali Bulghîr having seized the island of Djarba, the bey of Tunis Hamûda then favoured the action of the Karamanîls to regain power. Finally, the vanquished 'Ali Bulghîr fled to Egypt (February 1795), while 'Ali Pasha, resident at Tunis, renounced the governorship in favour of his son Ahmad. In Shaban 1210/November 1795, profiting from the departure of Ahmad for Tadjura, Yusuf entered Tripoli and had himself proclaimed governor there; Ahmad did not persist in his claims and retired to Malta. The following year, Yusuf received from the Sultan the investiture firman; he then took severe measures to repress disorder, reinforced the fortifications and increased the corsairs' fleet.

During Bonaparte's expedition in Egypt, Yusuf Pasha refused to break off relations with France; constrained to do so, following an English threat, he hastened to conclude a treaty with France as early as 1799. In 1800 an incident occurred with the United States of America, which resulted in the severing of relations, and then in acts of hostility. The Americans were on the point of reintroducing Ahmad Bey to Cyrenaica and having him proclaimed governor, but English mediation put an end to these events; a new treaty was concluded with the Americans, while Ahmad Bey retired to Egypt (June 1805).

From 1806 to 1830, numerous revolts broke out in different regions, repressed with more or less success; in 1810, the region of Ghadamès was once more joined to Tripoli. In 1819 a Franco-English fleet arrived before Tripoli and, under threat, had the slaves and Christian prisoners freed. From 1823 to 1826 at the request of the Sultan, a Tripolitanian fleet to participate in the operations of the Ottoman fleet on the coasts of Morea and returned by the same route, but this provoked severe reactions by the Kingdoms of Sardinia and Naples (1825-6). The assassination of Major Laing, son-in-law of the English Consul Warrington, who held the French Consul Rousseau responsible, placed Yusuf Pasha in a delicate situation: he had finally to sign a new treaty with France (August 1830). In 1832, having imposed taxes on the inhabitants of the Manghiya and the Sahîl in order to recover his debts, they revolted, proclaimed a grandson of Yusuf, Mhemed (Muhammad) Bey governor, and besieged Tripoli. On the 5th August 1832, Yusuf abdicated in favour of his son 'Ali; the latter could count on the support of Cyrenaica and the good will of the French, whereas Mhemed Bey enjoyed the favour of the English. An emissary of the Sultan, Mhemed Shikhîr Efendi, tried in vain to arrange an agreement between the parties. He returned in September 1834 with a firmân of investiture for 'Ali Bey that the rebels and England refused to recognize. Meanwhile, the Ottoman Government took careful note of that what was necessary, in view of the French pressure that was being exerted on the Karamânîls and on account of the presence of the French in Algeria which constituted a serious threat, to display more energetically the suzerainty of the Sultan over Tripolitania; in February 1835 the Ottomans decided to send a fleet and troops to Tripoli under the command of Muştafa Naqîb Pasha. This fleet arrived before Tripoli on the 26th May and the disembarkation of the troops took place on the 27th; the next day, 'Ali Pasha and a certain number of Tripolitanian dignitaries were arrested, while Muştafa Naqîb Pasha had the imperial firman read, naming him governor of the province and decreeing the removal of 'Ali Pasha. Mhemed Bey committed suicide, his brother Ahmad took refuge in Malta, and all the other members of the Karamânîls family were sent to Istanbul with the exception of Yûsuf Pasha who, owing to his great age was authorized to live in Tripoli; he died there on the 4th August 1838.

Thus the dynasty of the Karamânîls came to an end. Its initial originality lay in its support for the Arabs of Tripolitania against the Turks and the bulghîrs, without however rejecting Ottoman suzerainty. Later, the Karamânîls did not escape the rivalries and internal quarrels that rendered null and void the efforts of the first members of the dynasty, and facilitated the province being taken once more into control by the Ottomans, aided in this by the implications of the "Eastern Question". Like the Husaynids in Tunisia, but to a lesser degree on account of the extent and disparity of the land, the Karamânîls were able momentarily to cut a figure as a local dynasty, but not as a national one.

The defeat of the Salduk army for the second time by the Mongol commander Baydu in 654/1256, and the beginning of a struggle between Sultan Izz al-Din Kaykawus and Rukn al-Din Kildji Arslan, his brother and rival, allowed the Turkmen peoples living along the frontier regions to enjoy greater autonomy and gain greater political importance. Karaman Beg's emergence in the Ermenek-Mut region was part of this development.

According to Shikar'i [q.v.] and to some later chronicles, inscriptions and archival records, Karâman's father was Nûr al-Din Şoff or Nûre Şâfi. Shikar'i claims that Nûre Şâfi was interested in religious matters rather than in state affairs and was a follower of Bâbâ Iyyâs; leaving the administration of his principality to his son Karâman, he led a life of seclusion. He is buried at Değirmenlik, in the Sinanlu district of Ermenek. Like the majority of the Turkmen begs, Karâman was a supporter of Izz al-Din Kaykawus. It is, therefore, probable that he took part in the battle between 'Ali Bahadur, commander of the army of Kaykawus, and Rukn al-Din Kildji Arslan near the Altnap a (Altn Apa) caravanserai to the west of Konya in 660/1262. Zayn al-Hâdîdî, one of his brothers, was killed in this battle.

The Parwâna Mu'ûn al-Dîn Sulaymân, who held administrative authority in Anatolia with the support of Rukn al-Dîn Kildji Arslan and the Mongols, put many amirs who had sided with Kaykawus to death and pacified Karâman, whom he was unable to seize, by granting him an amirate (possibly the governorship of Ermenek). He also appointed his brother Buñus as Amir Dîndür. Karâman made frequent attacks on the territory of the neighbouring Kingdoms.
of Little Armenia. In fact, according to contemporary Armenian chroniclers, in a battle fought between Karaman and the Armenian king Hethoum at the fortress of "Manlaun" (probably Mennan castle near Ermenek), his brother Buṣūsz and his brother-in-law were killed. Karaman also died after a time from the wounds he received in the same battle. The claim by the Armenian chronicler that Buṣūsz was killed in battle is not correct. Şiķāṛī, 33, claims that Karaman was buried in Ermenek. However, the text of the inscription attributed to Karamān in the village of Balkasum (Išqalall Edhem, Karamān Oghullarlî biṅdîa weṭhîk-i maḥkîhî, in TOEM, ii, 699; i. H. Konyalî, Karaman Tarîhi, Istanbul 1967, 693) makes it clear that the inscription belongs to his son Mahmûd Beg, the builder of the tomb, in which he also is buried.

Although the Saldjûk Sultan Rukun al-Dîn Kılıç Arslan was enraged at Karaman's refusal to obey his orders, he left him unmolested. When he heard of his death, however, he imprisoned his brother Buṣūsz, who was in Konya as Amîr Dîndâr. Karamān's young children were taken into custody in the castle of Gevele, near Konya. His sons were transferred to other castles after Kılıç Arslan's death (663/1265), and were later released by the Parwâna; one of them, "All Beg, was still held hostage in Kaysari. The Beglerbegi, Shâh-oglu Sâhîrî Diwânî, who had revolted against the Mongols in 675/1276, dismissed the governor of Ermenek, Bard al-Dîn Îbrîhîm, the son of Kâdi Khuteni, and appointed in his stead Karaman's son Shams al-Dîn Mehmêd Beg. Mehmêd Beg occupied Iç-îl down to the sea, and started raiding the Mongol detachments. Following the dismissal of Khâšî-oglu, the Parwâna sent the former governor Bard al-Dîn Îbrîhîm against the Karamâns, but he suffered a heavy defeat in a battle with the forces of Mehmêd Beg. Following this, Saldjûk forces under the command of the Nâsîb al-Sâlîzano Amin al-Dîn Mîkhâḍîlî and Şâhîb Fâhîr al-Dîn "All's sons failed to gain any victory over the Karamâns. At about this time, the Mamûlîk Sultan Baybars had defeated the Mongols on the Albidstân plain (10 Dhu'-Ka'da 673/15 April 1277) and entered Kaysari.

Baybars gave Karaman's son "All Beg—at his own request— anirates and "sandjaks" for himself and his elder brothers. The Karamâns, taking advantage of this situation, began hostilities under the command of Mehmêd Beg, supported by "All al-Dîn Siyâvûsh, the Saldjûkî prince, who was called "Dijîrî" ("miserly"). He was one of the sons of "Izz al-Dîn Kaykâwûs. Mehmêd Beg first came to Aşsârâyî with a fairly small army (a contemporary source gives this as 3,000); because of the few forces at his disposal, he turned towards Konya. He captured Konya (9 Dhu'-Hijâdja 675/15 May 1277), infecc- tionally defended by the Nâsîb al-Sâlîzano, and put "All al-Dîn Siyâvûsh on the Saldjûkî throne; the khutba was read in his name, and coins were struck; one of these is still extant (O. F. Sağlam, Şimâseve hadar gûrümşeney Cîmri sîkhîsî, in III. Tarîh Kon- greisî tabûlarî, Ankara 1943, 224-8). Mehmêd Beg be- came "All al-Dîn Siyâvûsh's vizier. One of the first decrees passed at the first meeting of his council was that no language other than Turkish should thenceforth be spoken in government offices and the court.

Mehmêd Beg, learning that the sons of Şâhîb Fâhîr al-Dîn "All were moving towards Konya with a large army, went to Aş Sheikh, taking "All al-Dîn Siyâvûsh with him. In the ensuing battle he defeated and killed the sons of Şâhîb. Although Şivîr-Hişâr opened its gates to him, he met with resistance at Kara Hîşâr (Afyon) and therefore returned to Konya. He declared that he would go to Erzurum to fight the Mongols, but as he could not raise the necessary troops he abandoned the plan. When he heard that a Mongol army was approaching, he returned to Iç-îl. In fact, the Mongol ruler, Abâka, sent the vizier Şâms al-Dîn Muḥammad Djuuwaynî and some Mongol commanders to Turkey at the head of a large army for the purpose of establishing peace, and applying the Mongol financial system in the country (Râbî' II 676/September 1277). Djuuwaynî came to the country of the Karamâns along with the Mongol troops. After some plunder and destruction he moved to Kaz Ova (in the Tokat region) for the approaching winter. As a precaution, a Mongol unit was left under the command of Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Khusraw. In spring, the sultan and the vizier Fâhîr al-Dîn "All marched against the Karamâns with the Saldjûk and Mongol forces under their command, and reached Mut. Mehmêd Beg, who had taken up a position near the fortress of Kurbâgha for the purpose of reconnaiss- ance, encountered a Mongol detachment and was killed together with two brothers and a cousin. Upon this unexpected success the sultan and the vizier swept down to the Mediterranean in order to put an end to the Karamâns (676/1277). Meanwhile, "All al-Dîn Siyâvûsh succeeded in gathering a considerable force in the west, to which he had escaped, but he was defeated and killed by Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Khusraw (Muβârram 676/5 May 1278). This success, far from wiping out the Karamâns, helped to strengthen their will to fight.

Following this, they were headed by Günêri Beg, who seems to have been a member of the Karamânî dynasty. The defeat of the Mongol army by the Mamûlîks at Hîms in 680/1285, and the death of Abâka following this, led to disturbances in Turkey. Karamân Oghû Günêri Beg carried out frequent acts of plunder in the Konya region, while Ashraf Oghû Sulaymân Beg started making raids from Beg Shehri on Konya and Aş Sheikh. Finding himself helpless in the face of the raids of the Türkmen begûs, Sulûmân Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Jân, w. sought help from Aḥmad, the successor of Abâka. Ahmed sent his brother Konghurst to Anatolia at the head of a large army. After plundering Aşsârâyî in a manner without prece- dent, Konghurst arrived in Karamânî territory. Great destruction was caused there by forest fires, pillage and plunder, and massacre. Large numbers of people were killed. Women and children were captured and sold as slaves. The savage destruction wrought by Konghurst in Karamânî territory created deep sorrow and anger among the Mamûlîks, and in a letter written to the Ịlkân Aḥmad, the savagery was described as something incompatible with Muslim brotherhood. The fact that Aḥmad summoned Konghurst and had him executed (682 Shawwâl/January 1284) may be related with feelings of anger at a broth- er in the faith's cruelty. In spite of this, Konghurst's acts of violence could not break down the resistance of the Karamâns. The new sultan, Ghiyâth al-Dîn Masûd, was a weak man who preferred to live in Kaysari as he did not feel safe in Konya. The invading Mongol troops were stationed in eastern parts of cen- tral Anatolia; taking advantage of this, the wife of the former sultan, Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Khusraw, had her two sons acclaimed as rulers in Konya. To gain their support, Karamân Oghû Günêri Beg and Ashraf Oghû Sulaymân Beg were given a beglerbegilik and regency respectively (684/1285). Shortly afterwards, the two children were put to death by the orders of
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Arghun Khan, but neither Sultan Masud nor the Mongols were able to establish peace and order in the western part of central Anatolia. The city may possibly have been in the hands of Badr al-Din Ibrahim Beg prior to 718/1318. We know that Turkmens in the army of Sulayman belonged to the Karamanids.

The first half of the 8th/14th century constitutes the least-known period in the history of the Karamanids, owing to the scarcity and contradictory nature of the available historical evidence, Guneri Beg was succeeded by his brother Mahmud Beg, who is known to have built a mosque in Ermene in 702/1302 and a turba for himself and his father, Karaman Beg, in the same year. According to Neghri, Mahmud Beg died in 707/1307-8 (Diyaban-numa, ed. F. R. Unal—M. A. Koymun, Ankara 1949, i, 48, 49). Although he gives no source, I. H. Uzuncaşrlı (Anađolu beyislər, Ankara 1969), refers to an inscription on a mosque dated 711/1311 mentioning Mahmud Beg. In the same year the Karamanids and Aldun (?), a powerful Turkmen Beg, defeated and killed Kazangul, a Mongol commander, in one of the passes of the Taurus Mountains. Neshri mentions that Kyakshl Beg had two sons, Yakhshl and Sulayman, and that Yakhshl succeeded to his father's title in Ermene (ibid.). The Yakhshl Beg referred to by Neghri is the Yakhshl Khan mentioned in other sources as the successor of Mahmud. Mahmud had several other sons, named Badr al-Din Ibrahim, Pasha Musa, Khalil (and perhaps Yusuf), but nothing is clearly known of their political lives, and not even the dates of their deaths. It is understood that Yakhshl Khan, who succeeded to his father's title in Ermene, overthrew Akhi Mustafà, ruler of Konya, and captured the city. It is probable that this event occurred during the early months of 714/1314, because it is suggested that the main reason for Coban Beg's being sent to Turkey was the capture of Konya by the Karamanids (Koban, Ta'rikh-i Uldiyatu, ed. Mahin Hambly, Tehran 1969, 168-70). According to the same historian Karaman Oghlu, who ruled Konya for some time, fled to Laranda during a famine which broke out in the city; he was pursued and forced to come before Coban, who pardoned him. After leaving officials in Konya and appointing his son Demir Taș (Timur Taș) as his regent in Anatolia, Coban returned to Iran. Before long Konya was recaptured by the Karamanids. According to Neghri, Yakhshl Beg died in Ermene in 727/1327-8, and was succeeded by his brother Sulayman Beg. It is presumed that Neghri's source for this was an old calendar (İstanbul'un fetihinden once pasim yarlı iki demet, ed. O. Turan, Ankara 1954, 32, 33), which mentions that Yakhshl Beg was killed. The next year, "Karaman Oghlu" Ibrahim Beg's ambassador came to Cairo, stating that his master had read the kdsba in the name of the sultan and also struck coins in his name. This statement might confirm that Yakhshl Khan was killed in the year already mentioned, and that Badr al-Din Ibrahim had replaced him, but Yakhshl Khan is referred to in other calendars as living at a later date. The date of his death accordingly remains uncertain.

Pasha Musa Beg, one of the sons of Mahmud Beg, restored Laranda, which had been destroyed by Gaykhatu, in 715/1315-16 and took up residence there. The city may possibly have been in the hands of Badr al-Din Ibrahim Beg prior to 718/1318. We know that
at this time Naqim al-Din Demir Khan b. Karıman was in the service of the Mamluks, being either the commander or one of the commanders of the Mamluk forces sent to Mecca as early as 725/1325; he died in Damascus in 734/1333-34. Three years earlier 'Ali Bahadur b. Karıman had been appointed to one of the jabîl-hânas amirates. Unfortunately we do not know the names of the fathers of these Karımanid princes.

The appointment of Demir Taş, Cübân's son, as commander of the Mongol forces in Anatolia led to the strengthening of Mamluk domination in Anatolia, and to the expansion of the territories under Mongol occupation. Demir Taş took measures to establish the long-awaited peace and order in central Anatolia, and was so popular with both villagers and townsmen that he was called "Mâhdi-i âghir zamân". His aim was to bring the Turkmen begs under his control and to become the sole ruler of Anatolia. According to Aflâkî (Manâbîb al-šurûf, ed. T. Yazar, Ankara 1964, ii, 977), Demir Taş took Konya from the Karımanids in 720/1320. It is more probable, however, that this conquest took place, as recorded in the anonymous Saylûkûnûma, 94, in 723/1323, or that he conquered the city for the second time on the latter date. As well as conquering Konya in 723, he also captured Mûsâ Beg and the Hamîd-oghlu Dûndar Beg, but is understood to have set Mûsâ Beg free, although Demir Taş wiped out the principalities of Ağfrah Oghullarî, he was more lenient to the Karımanids, and pursued a policy of friendship towards them.

When he fled to Egypt in 727/1327, his lieutenants Eretna and Sungur Âgha escaped to Laranda, where Badr al-Dîn İbrahim Beg was living. Quick to grasp this chance, the Karımanids re-took Konya, where Badr al-Dîn Ibrahim Beg was in Laranda, his son Ahmet Beg was in Konya, Yakhshî Khan was in Ermenek (?), Khalîl Beg in Bey Shehri and Mûsâ in Mecca. As Ibn Battûta visited neither Konya nor Laranda, he did not meet the Karımanids beg, and what he wrote about them is based only on hearsay, Mûsâ Beg, who stopped at Cairo on his way to and from Mecca, was entertained and even offered a larger Mamluk sultan al-Malik al-Nâsîr, but he refused the sultan's offer on the grounds that he could not live away from his people and country. While he was returning to his country under the protection of Mamlûk amîrs, partisans of the Armenian king tried to capture him, resulting in further destruction and plunder of the Cilician Armenian kingdom by the Mamluk forces.

Mûsâ Beg was probably the builder of a madrasa (the Tol Madrasa) in Ermenek in 740/1340-41; he probably died in Ramadan 745/January 1345. İ. H. Konyaî believes that the Amîr Mûsâ Madrasa, which no longer stands, was built in Laranda by "Karıman Oghlu" Mûsâ Beg (Karıman Tarîhi, 720). Yet this is highly improbable, because there was, during the reign of 'Ali al-Dîn Kaykubâd, a Saljûk governor by the name of Amîr Mûsâî in Laranda, who had a madrasa built in the city for the father of Jalâl al-Dîn al-Rûmî (Aflâkî, i, 25-8, 303). It is therefore more likely that the Saljûk Amîr Mûsâ was responsible for the madrasa in Karıman.

Badr al-Dîn Ibrahim Beg is known to have been alive in 741/1341. His ambassador to Cairo departed with the standards sent by the caliph and the sultan and the mounds for minting silver and gold coins on behalf of the sultan. It is difficult to assess why Ibrahim Beg accepted the suzerainty of the Mamlûk sultan. Historical calendars record that Khalîl Beg, one of the sons of Maḥmûd Beg, came from Bey Şehri to Konya, where Ahmad Beg was living, and fought with Yâshîb Beg (or Khân). The date of this event is given as 742/1341-2 and 743/1342-3 in calendars (Nurosmaniye no. 5080, f.4a, ed. O. Turan, 32, 33), while in two other calendars we have the dates of 761/1360 and 762/1361 (ed. Atsiz, Osmanlı Tarihine ait takvimler, Istanbul 1961, 22, 23; ed. O. Turan, 49). Of these dates, 742 or 743 is approximately correct. It is probable that Khalîl Beg killed Yâshîb Khan Beg in this battle. The fact that, like Gûnerî Beg, Yâshîb Beg was not mentioned by Shikârî, is puzzling. Khalîl Beg is understood to have built a mosque in Ermenek, zûwiyas in the villages of Ermenek, and a zûwîya in Laranda. There is a copy of a waḥfiyya dated 745/1344-45 made by him. The year of his death is not known, but it must have been between 745/1344-5 and 750/1349-50.

Fâlîr al-Dîn Ahmad Beg, the son of Badr al-Dîn İbrahim Beg, was then left as the sole ruler. Shikârî's claim that he was killed in one of the endless battles with the Mongols is acceptable, because the adjective al-gâhid appears on a burial inscription dated 750/1350. Fâlîr al-Dîn was succeeded by his brother Şams al-Dîn Beg, who died in 753/1352. According to Shikârî (p. 60), Şams al-Dîn Beg was poisoned by his brother Karımanî. The word al-gâhid occurs in his inscription (İ. H. Konyaî, op. cit., p. 460). Sulaymân Beg, one of the sons of Khalîl Beg, succeeded to the throne. Konya was then under the rule of the Eretna Dynasty, and Bey Şehri seems to have been in the possession of İsmâ'îl Âghâ, one of the Mongol amîrs. It is probable that the Karımanids lost Konya during the time of Eretna (d. 753/1352).

The various Mongol tribes settled by Demir Taş (Tîmrîr Taş) in the western parts of Central Anatolia became a continuous source of trouble for the Karımanids, a situation that endured until the tribesmen were taken back to Turkistan by Tîmrû. Although a kind, good-natured and religious ruler, Sulaymân Beg was killed in a plot organized by begs of his family (762/1361). The titles of "Sâhib al-Dawla al-Nâsîr, Sayîl al-Dawla wa'l-Dîn", which occur in the inscription of the Hâşîlî Begler Dîâmî, dated 757/1356, refer to Sulaymân Beg.

Sulaymân Beg was buried in the Akhî Mehmêd Beg or Kalamîyya zûwîya, and his tomb was built by his brother 'Alî al-Dîn Beg in 772/1370-71. According to Shikârî (p. 90), Kâsim, one of the organizers of the plot, succeeded to the throne, but later he and his supporters were killed by 'Alî al-Dîn Beg, who obtained the throne. As this Karımanî Beg is referred to merely as 'Alî al-Dîn in inscriptions, coins, waḥfiyyas, historical calendars and in reliable contemporary foreign and native chroniclers, calling him "'Alî al-Dîn 'Alî" is simply the perpetuation of an error in some historical works. 'Alî al-Dîn Beg differed from his predecessors (perhaps with the exception of Mûsâ Beg) in being an educated ruler. Yar-dînî's Şahûnûma on the Karıman dynasty, which was Shikârî's principal source, was written at his command. During the reign of 'Alî al-Dîn Beg the borders of the Karımanî state were extended in every direction, and the Karımanî rulers were no longer mere "rulers of the Anatolian mountains" (Sâhib dîbâl al-Râmî), as Mamlûk chroniclers used to call them. During this period the Mamlûks occupied the whole of Cilicia, bringing to an end the Armenian kingdom (777/1375). The Eretnas were also in a state of confusion. Taking advantage of this situation, 'Alî al-Dîn Beg captured certain Armenian castles, and took Konya in 767 or 768/1366-67 and later Ak Saray, Nîgde, Karabîşrî (Yeşil Hisar), Ak Şehri,
Ilghin, Ishaklu and even Kayseri. The latter, however, was soon recovered by the Eretnas. Following on these successes, the Babaş Beg, Devlet Shâh and other Mongol begs entered the Karamanid service. If Bey Şehri and even Seydî Şehri were taken by ‘Alâ’î al-Dîn Beg, they must have been captured following the death of Isma‘îl Aghâ (780/1379). It must, however, be noted that ‘Alâ’î al-Dîn Beg’s rule, like that of his successors, was devoid of consistent diplomatic principle. He abandoned the traditional alliance with the Mamlûk sultans, and Karamanid-Ilghin, Ishaklu and even Kayseri. The latter, however, was soon recovered by the Eretnas. Following on these successes, the Babaş Beg, Devlet Shâh and other Mongol begs entered the Karamanid service. If Bey Şehri and even Seydî Şehri were taken by ‘Alâ’î al-Dîn Beg, they must have been captured following the death of Isma‘îl Aghâ (780/1379). It must, however, be noted that ‘Alâ’î al-Dîn Beg’s rule, like that of his successors, was devoid of consistent diplomatic principle. He abandoned the traditional alliance with the Mamlûk sultans, and Karamanid-Ilghin, Ishaklu and even Kayseri. The latter, however, was soon recovered by the Eretnas. Following on these successes, the Babaş Beg, Devlet Shâh and other Mongol begs entered the Karamanid service. If Bey Şehri and even Seydî Şehri were taken by ‘Alâ’î al-Dîn Beg, they must have been captured following the death of Isma‘îl Aghâ (780/1379). It must, however, be noted that ‘Alâ’î al-Dîn Beg’s rule, like that of his successors, was devoid of consistent diplomatic principle. He abandoned the traditional alliance with the Mamlûk sultans, and Karamanid...

Tadj al-Dîn Ibrahim Beg was the last great ruler of the Karamanid state. An energetic and warlike

Tadj al-Dîn Ibrahim Beg was the last great ruler of the Karamanid state. An energetic and warlike
man like his father and grandfather, he was over-ambitious. After making an agreement with the Serbs and Hungarians, he captured Eğirdir and Ispira (837/1433), but was forced to sue for peace from Murad II, who had marched against him. Murad wanted to give the Karamanid territory to İşaa, a brother of İbrahim Beg in his service. But as he had failed to overcome İbrahim Beg on a previous occasion (830/1426-7), he made peace with his brother-in-law on the condition that the territory belonging to the Hamid Oghullar would be under Ottoman rule (838/1433). However, İbrahim Beg won a great victory against the Dulkadir Oghlu Nâşır al-Din Mehemed Beg, and took Kara Hisar, Develi, Uç Hisar, Urgub and Kayseri. This achievement had been possible through the approval and aid of the Mamluk sultan Bârsbay. İbrahim Beg continued his policy of hostility towards the Ottomans. In concert with the Hungarian attack on the Ottomans in 846/1442, he sent an army under the command of his son-in-law Turgut Oghlu Hasan Beg, effecting large-scale destruction and plunder in Ankara, Beg Pazarı, Kütahya, Kara Hisar (Afyon), Bolvadin and Hamid II, but sharp Ottoman retaliation followed. When Murad heard that the Hungarians had broken the Treaty of Szegedin, he accepted İbrahim Beg's peace offer, but the ensuing treaty contained some of the harshest terms that the Karamanids had to accept and rendered them to vassals of the Ottomans. (For the text of this treaty see: I. H. Uzuncaşırlılar, Karaman oğulları devri vesikalarından İbrahim Bey'în Karaman emaretî vakfîyeyesi, Belleten li, 1, 120-1.) In 1448 İbrahim Beg captured the fortress of Corycos, which his grandfather 'Ali al-Din Beg had failed to take. However, this conquest did not worsen commercial relations between Cyprus and the Karamanids: on the contrary, İbrahim Beg granted the Venetians special trade concessions within his country.

Of the many sons of İbrahim Beg, Pîr Ahmad, Kâsim and 'Ali al-Din were born of Celebi Mehemmed I's daughter. According to early Ottoman chroniclers, İbrahim Beg disliked these children because they had Ottoman blood in their veins and he made İshâk, son of another wife, his crown prince. Upon his father becoming seriously ill, Pîr Ahmad declared himself ruler in Konya. Realizing that he could not hold the city, İbrahim Beg fled with his son İshâk, but died on the way to the fortress of Gevele (86g/1464). His body was taken to Laranda and buried in his tomb near his Hmaret. İbrahim Beg, an active and brave ruler, was also a great builder: apart from bridges and irrigation works, he raised on the Konya plain between Konya, Aksaray and Laranda were famous and were valued not only in Turkey, but also in the Arab lands and Europe, whither many were exported. The Turkish tribes raising these horses used to be called Atçeken until one or two centuries ago. Carpets and rugs were formerly exported from Karaman lands, and of these, the Ak Saray carpets were particularly in demand in foreign markets.

Although taxes on land and animals constituted the main source of revenue in the Karamanid state, customs duties collected at the ports and gates in the south were also considerable. The Karaman horses raised on the Konya plain between Konya, Aksaray and Laranda were famous and were valued not only in Turkey, but also in the Arab lands and Europe, whither many were exported. The Turkish tribes raising these horses used to be called Atçeken until one or two centuries ago. Carpets and rugs were formerly exported from Karaman lands, and of these, the Ak Saray carpets were particularly in demand in foreign markets.

Garcin de Tassy (ii, 162) says that he competed for the prize offered by Sir Charles Trevelyan for the best Hindustani essay (see Bibli.) on the influence of the Greeks and Arabs on the Renaissance in Europe, but that his essay was not accepted for want of an English translation. He was thus interested, unlike the majority of contemporary Indian Mawlaws, in the relation of Islam to the wider questions of the world at large. He died on 3rd Rabī‘ I 1290/30th May 1873, and was buried in Rampūr (Tadżallī-ī-Nur i, 336), in the province in which he had laboured for the regeneration of Islam all his life. He was succeeded in his work by his son, Mawlāwī Háfiz Aḥmad (d. 1898), and his nephew, Mūḥammad Mūhsin. His following was so large that there was hardly a Bengal village without his disciples.

He wrote chiefly in Urdu. Rājamān ‘Ali (Tadhkīra-i ‘ulāma’) Hind, Lucknow 1894, 172-2 gives a list of 46 of his works, without claiming that it is exhaustive. One of his works, Miftah al-Dījnānat, has run through numerous editions and is accepted in India as a correct statement of Islamic principles. His writings may be divided into four classes: (1) general works, like Miftah al-Dījnānat; (2) works on the reading and interpretation of the Qur’ān, and formal prayers and ablutions; (3) works on the doctrine of spiritual preceptorship (Fi’rī Mūrīd), the cornerstone of orthodox Islam in India; in accepting this doctrine, Karamat ‘Ali stands in sharp opposition to the Wahhabī sect and merges insensibly into the Ṭasawwuf sect, which he brings into relation with the traditional religious orders; (4) polemics against Shī‘ī Allāh, Dūda Mīyān, the Wāh hābi, etc.

The common conception that Kāramāt ‘Ali was a Wahhabī is refuted by the detailed exposition of his own views as set forth in Miftah al-Dījnānat; he had not seen any Wāhābī books, but had made oral enquiries and found that they were so fanatical (diddi) that they called all who did not agree with them muṣrīk (38-9); he and his school carefully distinguished between shirk, which was the negation of Islam, and bīda’, which was only an error in doctrine (39). In his Ḥudūdī-ta’lī’ī he draws a clear distinction between a fāsik (sinner) and a hāfīz (infidel), and inveighs against those sectaries who would deny funeral prayers to those who did not pray but repeated the kalima (21); if non-Muslims conquer Islamic lands, the Lūmen’ī prayer and the two Īd (q.r.) prayers were not only lawful but obligatory (23 bā‘) he based his doctrine on the orthodox Sunni books of the Ḥanafi school (Mūkābahūf-i Rāmhāt, 37). He accepted the six orthodox books of tradition (Ṣibā‘ sitta), the commentators (tafṣīlī), the principles of ceremonial law as interpreted by the masters, and the doctrines of ṭasawwur and piri mūrīd (38, 45), even basing the mission of Sayyid Aḥmad on a hadīth from Abū Hurayra (p. 32); in every century a teacher is born to revive the faith: Sayyid Aḥmad was such a teacher for the 13th century and should be followed until another teacher arises for the 14th century (34). All this was in direct antithesis to Wahhabī teaching, and in fact appended merely to the abolition of rites and ceremonies introduced through ignorance (36), or to a revival of Islam according to the accepted orthodox schools (50). The political effects of Sayyid Aḥmad’s life brought his followers into conflict with the authorities, but the writings of the school show that there was no connection, political or doctrinal, with the sect founded by Mūḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb in Ṭabāsī.

Bibliography: The European accounts of Kāramāt ‘Ali are unsatisfactory, being based on secondary information and failing to distinguish between this school of reform and Wahhabism, and in some places there is confusion between the subject of this article and Mawlāwī Sayyid Kāramāt Aḥmad Rampūr (1796-1870), who represented the British Government at the court of Dōst Mūḥammad Khān at Kābul 1832-1835, and was superintendent (muṭawwīl) of the Hughlī Imāmābād, 1837-1876 (Nineteenth Century, May, 1905, cf. 780-2; Sir W. W. Hunter, The Indian Muslims, 114; C. E. Buckland, Dictionary of Indian Biography, 259; Nūr al-Dīn Zaydī, Tadżallī-ī Nūr, i, 39); Census of India, 1901, vol. vi. part 1 (Bengal, 174); Calcula 1902; Journ. As. Soc. of Bengal, ixii, part 3, 54-6, Calcula 1894; Garcin de Tassy, Histo. de la Littérature Hindouie et Hindoustanie, ii, 162, Paris 1870; (it is doubtful whether the Muḍgīta-i ṣagīr-i Maštā, Dīhil 1868, mentioned there, was a work by the subject of this article); Sayyid Nūr al-Dīn Zaydī, Tadżallī-ī Nūr (biographies of the famous men of Dījawnpur), Dījawnpur 1900, 125-6.

A correct appreciation of Kāramāt ‘Ali’s doctrines can only be gained by a study of his own writings, the most important of which are the following: Miftah al-Dījnānat, Calcula 1234 (frequently reprinted); Kauhāb-i dūri, Calcula 1253 (translates passages from the Qur’ān); Bay’ā’ī-ī Tābia, Calcula 1260; various practices of the religious orders; Zindī al-ṣāhi, Calcula 1264 (on reading the Qur’ān); Fayyād-i ṣamm, Calcula 1282 (a tract on the doctrines of Shāykh Aḥmad Sirhindī); Ḫudūdī-ta’lī’ī, Calcula 1282 (a polemical tract against the school of Ṣafī’ī Allāh and his son Dūda Mīyān; Nūr al-Ḥudā, Calcula 1286, on the doctrines of ṭasawwur, of the muṣjdāddīyya school, apparently the new school of Sayyid Ahmad Brēlī); Mūkābahūf-i Rāmhāt, Calcula 1286, (gives an account of the life and work of Sayyid Aḥmad Brēlī, and discusses and disowns the Wāh hābi); Zināt al-Mūjālātī, Calcula 1259; Zād al-Tābīna, Calcula 1287 (the beliefs and practices of Islam and ṭasawwur; accepts the Nakhshbandiya teaching).

(A. Yūsuf ‘Alī)

KĀRAMĪD [see KHAZAF].

KĀRAMĪṬA [see KARMATI].

KĀRANFUL, the clove. According to the Arabic dictionaries, varying names were given to this plant, including kāruful and karruful, whilst popular pronunciations included kāranful and kārunful.

It seems that before the end of the Middle Ages the clove had not yet spread beyond the Moluccas, and since the Muslims who sailed towards China left these islands on their right hand, the old Arab writers could not pin down the origin of the clove. Ibn Khurrawadhibbīn thought that it came from “Ṣalāḥīhīt”, but he also mentions the island of Ṭawkā [q.r.]. Ṣalāḥīhīt was probably the southern part of the Malayan peninsula. On the other hand, al-Masūdī says that it comes from the kingdom of the Mahārājī called Ṣābāqī situated in the islands of the Sea of Annam (Ṣaḥīf); this must be the kingdom of Šīńjavīya, of which Palembang in southeastern Sumatra was the centre. Later Arab geographers, such as al-Idrīsī and al-Kaẓwīnī, merely repeat these items of information. However, al-Kaẓwīnī also relates that the clove grows in Sumatra, in Ceylon and in the other islands of the Indonesian archipelago. Ibn Bāṭīṭa claims to have seen it in Sumatra and Java, but the description which he gives makes it suspect that he confused it with other fruits. The stories in medieval Arabic literature about cloves being obtained by...
"dumb barter" further point to uncertainty about
the origin of this spice.

The clove, sc. the dried flower-buds of the tree,
were employed in cooking as a spice, but above all,
in pharmacy. In Morocco it is also used for perfuming
milk. Arab physicians, such as Istâb b. Hunayn
and Ibn Sinâ, recommend it as a medicament for sharpening
the faculty of vision. Ibn Sinâ, and before him
Istâb al-Israîlî (Isaac Israel) further considered the
clove as good for the digestion, since it strengthened
the stomach and liver. The celebrated physician Istâb
b. İmran notes its effect on powers of procreation;
like other medical authorities, he says that it strengthens
the sexual powers, and brings about, or lessens,
according to the procedure followed, obesity. The
clove was also used by the Arabic physicians as a
specific against diabetes and other diseases. The in-
structions of various physicians concerning its use are
cited in extenso by the Spanish botanist and pharmacologist Ibn al-Bayârî in his al-Dîjamî l-
musraddad al-advisya wa l-âdkhîya. Because of its pleas-
sant smell, it was used for chewing and as an ingredi-
ent in perfumes; the Bedoons (and their womenfolk)
in Morocco use it as part of necklaces. Thus the
clove was an important item in the spice trade. From
caliphal times onwards, it was imported into the Middle East via the Red Sea, histori-
signments were conveyed to Cairo and Damascus.
In the later Middle Ages, some of these cargoes were
resold in Alexandria and Beirut to Italian merchants.
Nevertheless, the clove did not play as big a role in
the Indian trade as pepper or ginger, on the evidence
of what we know of the cargoes of Venetian, Genoese
and Florentine ships. Moreover, the clove was a very
costly spice, costing less than three times more than
pepper; 100 manic were generally sold at Alexandria
in the 9th/10th century for 70-80 ducats, though the
stems were cheaper.

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(W. BARTHOLOM.-[R. WiXMAN])

**KARÂR** [see MÜST].

**KARASî [or KARASI].** I. The name of a Turkish
chief in Asia Minor and of the dynasty arising from
him; his territory has retained this name until the
present time (sc. the ancient Mysia, the coastline
and hinterland of the Asiatic side of the Dardanelles).

**KARAPAPAKH** (Turkish, "black hat"), a
Turkish people whose language belongs to the
western Oghuz division, and differs little from Azerî
and the Turkish of Turkey. In the Georgian S.S.R.
It is often confused with Azerî, and in Turkey itself
Karapapak is no longer spoken (having been repla-
ced by Turkish). In 1828, the Karapapakh emigrated
from the region along the Debeda or Borçala river in
eastern Georgia partly to the region of Kars (where they formed about 15% of the population) and partic-
ally to the Sulduz region of Persia, south of Lake Riğđâyîya (Urmia). In 1883 they numbered 21,652, of whom
11,721 were Sunnis and 9,931 Shî'as (K. Sadowski,
Kratasy sametka o Karâshoyy, in Sbornik Materia-
lov. . . Kavkaza, iii, 347 ff.; E. ASHTOR, Histoire des prix et
des salaires dans l'Orient médial, Paris 1969, 334,
417 ff.; W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant,
i, 603 ff.)

(E. ASHTOR)

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** LA and TA, s.v.; Ibn Khurra-
dâdshîhî, 66, 70; Mas'ûdî, Murâdî, i, 341, ii, 56
(tr. Pellat, i, 139, ii, 318); Idfrîslî, Opus geographicum,
i, 54, 82, 89, 91; Kazwini, Kosmographie, i, 262, ii,
18, 53, 55; Ibn Barzûzâ, iv, 228, 240, 243; Türkof
al-akdab, ed. Renaud and Colin, Paris 1934, 153;
Ibn al-Bayârî, Böllâk 1291, iv, 7 ff. (tr. von Sont-
heimer, Stuttgart 1840-2, ii, 281 ff.); E. Wiedem-
mann, Aufsätze zur arabischen Wissenschaftsgesch-
ichte, Hildesheim 1970, ii, 254 ff. (annotated
text of Nuwawy); E. ASHTOR, Histoire des prix et
des salaires dans l'Orient médial, Paris 1969, 334,
417 ff.; W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant,
i, 603 ff.)

The Byzantine historian Ducas, who wrote 150
years after the events in question, classes Karasî
amongst those dynasties which established them-
selves in western Anatolia in the reign of the Emperor
Andronicus II (1282-1328); this clearly provides no
exact or firm chronology. On the contrary, the name's
absence from Muntaner's account of the Catalan
expedition (1304-6) and from the list of principalities
laid down by Pachymeres (d. 1312), leads one to
conclude that Karasî was established—as one would
expect—somewhat later than its sister-states further
to the south and east. Muntaner, Pachymeres him-
self and the very well-informed historian of half-a-
century later, Nicephorus Gregoras, certainly testify
to the presence of Turks who were infiltrating into
the region from the beginning of the century, but
only the second authority, whose pieces of informa-
tion are of various dates, is familiar with the name of
the dynasty (the equation of the Lamisai of Pachy-
mere with the Kalamês, father of Karasî, of Gregoras,
put forward by Mordtmann is improbable, because
of the geographical order followed in Pachymeres' list,
which would place the Lamisai in southern or central
Anatolia; the list also omits Sârûkhân).

Whatever the solution may be, the most important
thing is to determine the origin of the Turks settled
in Mysia. Later authors include the dynasty amongst
the Turcoman ones of Anatolia, but this blanket
designation in fact covers several possible distincts.
On the basis of a funerary inscription, in which a
person with the name Karasî claims descent from the
Dânishmendids [q.v.], an attempt has been made to
connect the famous 6th/7th century central
Anatolian dynasty with the petty principality of the
8th/9th one; but this inscription is at Tokat, in the
former Dânishmendid territory, and not in Karasî-
li, homonymy does not imply identity, and the
genealogical pretensions of the party concerned
point more to the undeniable fame of the Dânish-
mendids. It is true that ca. 600/1200 we hear of the
Dânishmendids on the western fringes of Anatolia,
but there is nothing to allow us to suppose any more
links with the new Turcoman formations at the end of
the 7th/8th and beginning of the 8th/9th cen-
turies than those links of other ancient families.
Moreover, if there was apparently, in the case of the
Turks of Karasi, infiltration from the east, as in the neighbouring principalities, it is also clear that one element amongst them is of an entirely different origin. Thus it is known that, at the time of the collapse of independent Seljuk Anatolia in the face of the Mongols, certain Turks and Turcomans fled with Sultan ʿizz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs into Byzantine territory and were finally established in the Dobruţa [q.v.], where, mixed with other people coming from South Russia, they were more or less Christianised. During the troubles of the opening years of the 8th/14th century, some of these, either called in by the contending parties or else acting on their own initiative, banded together under a certain Ḫâlîl and returned to Thrace and Mysia, in the end constructing some kind of bridge across the Dardenelles. With the recovering of contact with other Muslim Turks, those of Mysia at least became absorbed once more into the fold of Islam; some memories of these happenings can still be discerned in the legend of their great saint and mystic Sarf Saltuk.

We are on much firmer ground with the information of Ibn Baṭṭūta and of al-Umari, who both bring us up to ca. 1330. There must at that time have been two principalities in the hands of two brothers (the discussion on this relationship arose from the inadequacies of old editions of al-Umari), Demir Khan and Yâkhsî Khan, of Ayvalîk, Bur-

kadd* 2 of Erdek in 1846 provided another outlet, on the gulf of Karasl, centred on the plain of Bahkesir, and comprised the fra#d*s of Ayvalîk, Bur-

less retained the boundaries of the former principality, today can largely establish its precise limits. After Munedidiim Bash! in the 12th/18th century and we

for its name to be perpetuated there.

Perhaps as a vassal ruler—until around the time of Orkhan's death, and intervened in the Turco-

Khan (which is also a title, "the good khan") could well be (despite the bias of the sources) equated with Adjlan Beg son of ICarasi; he is said to have had two sons, who quarreled. One of these two, Dursun, together with his vizier yadidji Ilbegi, called in the help of Orkhan, promising him part of the province of Bergama, always remained in the hands of the Byzantines or their Genoese vassals.

Until now, except in error, no coin, inscription or seal/ of the rulers of Karasi has been recorded, although al-Umari mentions coinage of theirs, on the strength of information derived from a well-in-

formed Genoese merchant. It may well be that the multitude of small coins found here and there contain some Karasi ones, but this is for the moment pure hypothesis.

The historical significance of the principality of Karasi lies in the fact, deliberately obscured by the Ottoman historians, that it paved the way for the crossing of the Dardenelles, attributed by those historians exclusively to Murâd. Al-Umari already mentions the naval raids made by the rulers of Karas, and in this regard, their seamen were tutors of the Ottomans. Several Karasî chiefs rallied to the Otto-

man side and then (and probably in 1342) the latter at Balikesr (of which al-Umari records the ancient name Aktras) and the latter at Bergama. Al-Umari also gives the name of the dynasty's founder, their father Karasî, and not that of Kalamâs (Kalam-ṭâb or ʿAlam-shâb?), which is nevertheless not that of the real founder. Ibn Baṭṭūta further attributes to Demir Ḫân's father (not named by him) the foundation (sü); of Bergama, which in a traveller's time had no real mosque of its own. The two names are con-

firmed by Cantacuzenos. The Ottoman sources, on the other hand, all of them more or less connected with ʿAshkpašazâde and none of them really concerned with Karasî until the time of Ottoman intervention in its affairs, call the prince who died 1375/1335 ʿAdîlân Beg son of Karasî; he is said to have had two sons, whom one, Dursun, together with his vizier Ḥâdîjî Ilbegi, called in the help of Orkhan, promising him part of his territory; then, when Dursun had been killed by his brother, Orkhan annexed the whole principality. The chronology of the Ottoman sources is for this period vague and tends to simplify events. One might infer that ʿAdîlân was Karasî's title, for the unnamed son, allegedly of bad reputation, might well be (despite the bias of the sources) equated with the Demir Ḫân of Ibn Baṭṭūta, who also describes him in unfavourable terms. In this context, Yâkhsî Ḫân (which is also a title, "the good Ḫân") could well be Dursun. Furthermore, it is certain that the Ottomans' annexation of the Karasî territory was not so immediate as the sources allege, since a further prince called Sulaymân retained certain places— perhaps as a vassal ruler—until around the time of Orkhan's death, and intervened in the Turco-Byzantine struggles of this period. However, the principality did then disappear, and unlike its neigh-

bours, absorbed by the Ottoman state at a later period, was not subsequently revived by Timûr. It had nevertheless left sufficient mark on the region for its name to be perpetuated there.

Because the Ottoman province of Karasî more or less retained the boundaries of the former principality, Mûnedîdîm Bâshî in the 12th/18th century and we
today can largely establish its precise limits. After the absorption of certain Byzantine towns which had remained unconquered longer than the open country-side, it embraced a rectangle of territory bounded on the north by the western half of the Marmara Sea and the Dardenelles straits, on the west by the Aegean, on the south by the valley of the Bekir Çay, and on the east by the Simav Su and Susurû. The island of Mytilene or Lesbos (Midili [q.v.]), which lay opposite the province of Bergama, always remained in the hands of the Byzantines or their Genoese vassals.
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(C. Cafier)

2. An administrative division carried the name of Karasî for more than five centuries after the end of the dynasty (see above) and its annexation by the Ottomans. However, the sanâgâs of Karasî did not correspond exactly to the old area which was under the rule of the Karasî Oghulârî. The region of Canak-kalâ's and the Dardenelles was detached as a separate district, an indication of the Ottomans' pressing interest in the control of the Straits. The sanâgâs of Karasî, centred on the plain of Balikesr, had therefore only one opening to the sea, on the gulf of Edremît and Ayvaîk. Its attachment to the ḥaddî of Erdek in 1846 provided another outlet, on the Marmara, which was gradually enlarged at the expense of the province of Bursa. From 1913, the vilayet of Karasî took the name of the vilayet of Balikesr, and comprised the ḥaddîs of Ayvaîk, Bur-
The text from the document is as follows:

"... such as Byzantium, the Genoese and the Ottomans held the southern shoreline up to the Yayla range, while the khans of...

Principles of dynamics, going back to Aristotle, became the principle of displacement operations; Karastun, sc. in brief, of the equilibrium of a lever, basing himself on Thabit b. Qurra in effect determines here the condition that of the Banu Musa, that of Kusta b. Luka and that of Thabit b. Qurra. As late as 1911, three manuscripts existed of this last work, those of the Library of the Jesuit Fathers in Beirut and of the India Office; today, only the latter manuscript exists (Arabic No. 767, vii, fols. 198-208). This translation differs in certain respects from the manuscript surviving today. In particular, the meaning of proposition 4 (proposition 6 of the Liber karastonis) completely escaped the translator. Ibn Kurra's work has also been translated into German in 1911 by E. Wiedemann; this is a good translation, although the order of the propositions is not clearly indicated and the German orientalist was mistaken concerning the number of propositions in the work. A French translation, differing substantially from the two others, has been made by K. Jaouiche (to be published shortly).

Ibn Kurra further mentioned the karastun in his more popular work Fi ẓīfat istiwaḍ al-waqṭ wa ʾkbīlāšīkhi ("Concerning the equilibrium and disequilibrium of weights"). This book is intended for workmen who had no mathematical knowledge and is more about the balance with two pans than the lever proper; it has only come down to us in the version transmitted by al-Khazin and in his K. Mīzān al-hikma, ed. Haydarabad 1359/1940, 338.


(K. Jaouiche)

Karasun (see Al-Furat). Karasu-Bazar (Byz. Mavron Kastron; So- vatrin, Belogorsk), an important commercial centre in the Crimea, particularly under the Giray [gər] dynasty of the Krim Tatars (826/1423-1197/1783). Situated on the well-watered meadows of the northern slopes of the Yayla Mountains, Karašubazar (Turk. "Blackwater market") took its name from the Karašu river, a source of the Salghir. From Byzantine times, the Crimea was subjected to a recurring geo-political pattern of importance for all Crimean towns: imperial powers such as Byzantium, the Genoese and the Ottomans held the southern shoreline up to the Yayla range, while the khāns of
nomadic states (Khazars, Pechenegs, Kumans, the Golden Horde (Batnids [q.v.]) and the Kmrn Tatars [q.v.]) controlled the Crimean steppe (and often the steppe of the mainland) and dwelt in theswelt the attractive towns between steppe and mountain such as Baghčes- saray [q.v.], Akmedşidj [q.v.] (Russ. Simferopol), and Karasubažar.

Politically, Karasubažar was important as the seat of power of the senior Crimean tribe of Shirin, whose leaders controlled the district from the Karası to the Strait of Kerč. Seldom was a khan powerful enough to rule without the support of the Şhrın begs, who had easy access to the Ottoman governors at Kaffa (Russ. Feodosia), the centre of Ottoman power in the Crimea and a city so prosperous in the 1oth/17th century that it was called "little Istanbul". Generally the Şhrın begs and the Ottomans exercised power on the side of conservatism and against the centralizing tendencies of the khan.

The valley of Karasubažar was enclosed on all the north side by hills and to the north-west imposing white limestone cliffs (ab baya) towered above the town. At these sacred cliffs the Kmrn Tatar tribal leaders (mirzds) customarily met to coordinate important Crimean affairs such as the choosing of a rival khan or preparing for war. Because of the hills, the town was easy to defend and Don Cossack raids, a factor of decisive importance for a trade centre close to the steppe. Moreover, a Krm Tatar vizier, Sefer Gızâl, had built in 1655-1654-55 a fortress-like covered bazaar with its own water supply, mosque, bath and iron gates in which merchants could safely store their merchandise and defend it. Karasubažar was chiefly an entrepot and manufacturing centre for Tatar pastoral and handicraft products. It lay on the main east-west caravan route 45km. east of Akmedşidj and 60km.west of Kaffa via Eskı Krm. It probably served also as a way station for slaves in transit to the huge slave market in Kaffa.

According to A. L. Yakobson (Sredne-vekovy y Krym ("Crimea in the Middle Ages"), Moscow 1964), Crimean towns in proximity to the Genoese coastal towns enjoyed high prosperity until the Ottoman conquest of 1880/1475. They then experienced a period of readjustment in the 16th/17th century, but enjoyed great prosperity in the 17th/18th century. At first the artisan classes consisted mainly of long-established Karaitе [q.v.] Jews, Armenians, Italians and Greeks. This situation changed gradually in the 17th/18th century as Krm Tatars joined the craft guilds. Travellers in the 16th/18th century (e.g. M. Guthrie, A Tour Performed in the Years 1705-96 . . . , London 1802, and Yakobson, 139 fl.), make a distinction between Krm Tatars who had become cultivators and craftsmen and the Nogay elements who continued their pastoral life. The chief products of the Karası region were fruit and vegetables, grain, mostly millet and wheat, Moroccan leather made from the hides of Tauric goats, woolen products and some wine. Dyestuffs, such as madder, sumac, saffron etc. grew wild and there were also close at hand forests of oak, beech, linden and poplar. The town boasted a goodly number of craft guilds including armourers, coppersmiths, tinkers, dyers, felt processors, weavers and others.

Ewliya Çelebi (Seyyidatnâme vii, 644-9) in the mid-11th/17th century observed in the town 8 wooden bridges, a number of water mills, 28 mosques, 5 madrasas, 8 Krmn sarays, 140 shops, 10 coffee houses and 40 taverns (meyykhâne). Apart from the less elegant houses of the poorer Christians and Jews, he estimated that the town possessed 5,500 two-storey houses with tiled roofs (at 6 persons per house about 33-35,000 inhabitants). These figures contrast sharply with the estimated 15,000 inhabitants, 12 mosques, 2 Christian churches and a synagogue recorded by Demidoff in the 13th/19th century (M. Anatole de Demidoff, Voyage dans la Russie méridionale et la Crimée, Paris 1854, 394).

By the late 11th/17th century, Don Cossack raids had become a common occurrence, but the town prospered even after 1550/1557 when Karasubažar served as a temporary capital after the burning of Baghčes- saray and thus invited an attack by the invading Russian and Kalmuk [q.v.] troops of General Münnich. The town was damaged but the raid was beaten of by Ottoman artillery. In 1875/1771 during the Russo-Turkish war (1182/1768-1184/1774) the town was partially destroyed by Russian troops. After the Russian annexation in 1597/1783, thousands of Krm Tatars fled to the Caucasus and to Istanbul. Periodically new exoduses occurred as Russia oppressed the Crimea further.

The decline in Tatar population and the influx of cheap manufactured goods made serious inroads upon the prosperity of Karasubažar in the 19th/20th century. Henceforth the town shared the fate of the Krm Tatars as a whole. The first stirrings of Tatar nationalism and Turanism were ideas swept in by theosophists under the tutelage of Isma’il Gasprall [q.v.]. This movement led to the publication of newspapers, the founding of modern schools, and the formation of political parties, prior to World War I.

After the Russian Revolution, between 1917/1929 and 1930/1941, the Krm Tatars were killed or deported by the thousands as national consciousness and the traditional social cohesion of Tatars came into direct conflict with Stalin’s plans for the Sovietization of the Crimea. Thereafter, caught between Hitler’s concept of Untermenschen and hatred for Soviet injustices, the Krm Tatar remnant was partly executed and partly deported to Siberia in 1933/1944 by the USSR after the German army was expelled (E. Kirimal, Der National Kampf der Krimtürken, Emsdetten 1952, passim).

Bibliography: In addition to the sources mentioned, cf. the bibliography to the articles Baghčesaray, Giray and Krm, and the article Karasubažar in IA, vi, 335-36 (Mirza Bala); see also the study and bibliography of A. W. Fisher, The Russian Annexation of the Crimea 1772-1783, Cambridge 1970, particularly with reference to the Treaty of Karasubažar of 1772 (pp. 44-51). (C. M. Kortepepet)

KARATA (self designation, Kirtle, pl. Kirtlei; Russ. Karatai, Karatin(ist), Kirdis; Avar Kalalal; other Kirdi Kalal) along with Andi [q.v.], Akhwâsh, Bagul, Botlilh, Camalal, Godoberi and Tindi forms the Andi division of the Avar-Andi-Dido group of the Ibero-Caucasian languages; the Karata-speaking peoples.

According to an estimate of 1886 (Dagestanskaia Oblas‘) there were 7,217 Karata at that time; in 1926 there were 5,305 and in 1933 (estimate by Grande) 7,000. The Karata inhabit the northern part of Achkvâl district, in the valley and on the right bank of the Andi Kosu, and two outlying areas in Andalall and Vedeno districts, an isolated territory of high, rugged mountains in the western part of the Daghî- sotan A.S.S.R., in several villages: Arzhip, Tokita, Mağta, Raçabalda and Cabakoro.

Islam was introduced through the Avar country, probably at the end of the 5th/11th century. The
KARATA — KARATIGIN

Karatige are Sunni of the Shafici rite. According to the testament of Andunik, nutsal Gruler of Avaristan [KhSaev, Obshhestvennaia Stroy Daghestana v XIX Veke, 135], in 890/1485 the Karata country was one of the seven territories owned by the rulers of Avaristan and, enjoyed at this period a semi-independence. At a later period it was annexed by the Avar Khanate, and Karatigin also became involved in the last fighting in Farghana before the final subjection of this country by the

Formed one of the frontier lands of Islam and was

Su), one of the rivers which form the Amu Darya,
[52x-16]c

middle course of the Wakhsh or Surkhab (Turk. Kizil kubi,

The traditional economy was based on herding (sheep and goats) with a transhumance system, agriculture and home industries. The Karata women were well known for their weaving of woolen cloth.

The karata language has three dialects: Karata proper, Anelgh and Tokita. The Avar language is genetically closely related to Karata, which is a proper, An£ikh and Tokita. The Avar language is described by Ptolemy.

As has been so far ascertained, only the embassy sent by Shah Rukh to China (822-31/1419-22) used on its return journey the road between Farghana and Balkh described by Ptolemy.

Like all the highlands on the upper course of the Amu Daryä, Karatigin also was under its own rulers down to quite modern times; in the pre-Mongol period only one amir of Rägh, Dja'far b. Shämänkü (Garbätz, ed. M. Názim, 36), is mentioned. Under Timür and later the name of the country Kayir Tigin (or Tügin) is found (in the edition of Şaraf al-Dîn 'Ali Yazdi's Zafar-nâma by Mawlawi M. İhâddâ, i, 258, 188, erroneously Tim Tügin). When and how the present form arose is unknown. In the manuscripts of the Bâbûr-nâma (ed. Beveridge, f. 33b and f. 63b, Karatigin, f. 69a and f. 81, Kayirtîgîn), and of the Ta'rikh-i Râşûl (tr. Ross, esp. 241) both forms are found. Karatigin is popularly explained as a Turkish word for "blackthorn" (cf. W. Radloff, Wörterbuch, St. Petersburg, ii, 135, Ottoman Kara diken) or as the name of the two first Kirgiz titers of the name, Kirghiz, Manypa (in Karatgin o stranakh po verkhovam Amu Dary, St. Petersburg, 241, following Arendarenko). As is narrated in the Baby al-Asrdr of Mahmûd b. Wall (India Office Ms., Ethé, Cat. no. 575, f. 277v, in Râjdâb 1045 (Dec. 1635-Jan. 1636) 12,000 families of Kirghiz, then still pagans, went through Karatigin to Hishār. At the present day the Kirghiz (Kara Kirghiz) form part of the population of Karatigin and with the Tadjik (and a small number of Odzhebs).

In the 19th century, the princes of Karatigin, like the princes of Badakhshân [q.v.], claimed descent from Alexander the Great. Karatigin was then under the suzerainty of the Killer Khan of Khokand; their subjection is said to have taken place under Muhammad 'Ali Khan (1238-58/1822-42) in 1250/1834 (V. F. Nikolkin, Kratkaya istoriya Kok. Khokand, Kazan 1886, 134 f.). Already under 'Ali Khan (beginning of the 19th century) we find men from Karatigin forming a considerable part of the standing army founded by this Khan (Ta'rikh-i Shahrub, ed. N. N. Pantusov, Kazan 1885, 42 f.). A campaign from Khokand against Karatigin in 1275/1858 under Mulla Khan (1858-62) is also mentioned (Nalivkin, op. cit., 190); the ruler of Karatigin was at this time Muzaâfar Khan (later also called Muzaâfar Shâh). In 1869 Karatigin was occupied by the troops of the amir of Bukhârâ and Muzaâfar Khan taken as prisoner to Bukhârâ; the conflict was only settled by the verdict of the Russian governor-general, (K. P. von Kaufmann), and Muzaâfar Khan again restored to his principality. After his death, Karatigin was definitely incorporated in Bukhârâ as a district of 10,792 sq. km. with (about 1890) 60,000 inhabitants (mostly Tadjiks, the others Kirghiz). Karatigin also became involved in the last fighting in Farghana before the final subjection of this country by the
Russians (1874-76). The frontier between Farghana and Karatigin (on the heights east of the valley of Kik Karamuk Su) was defined by a treaty concluded between M. D. Skobelev and another brother of the Beg, Soff Khan on Sept. 9 (new style), 1876.

It was not till 1878 that Karatigin was for the first time visited by a European (V. Oshaggin). In the following decade a mountain road, one of the best in Central Asia, was built through Karatigin on the right bank of the Wakhsh, which made Karatigin much more accessible. Oshaggin and later travellers (especially A. Regel, 1861-62) describe Karatigin as a fertile country with numerous villages and orchards, and as one of the most prosperous provinces in the kingdom of the amir of Bukhara. It was said (Logofet, 322) that in Karatigin all the inhabitants without exception made a living by agriculture (including gardening), and that there were no landless proletariat there. Anyone who neglected his piece of land for three years lost any right to it. On the other hand Rickmers (p. 340) says that many peasants went from Karatigin to Farghana, worked there as day-labourers and servants and brought their savings home. The only town is Garm; as regards the number of inhabitants, estimates are very contradictory: according to Oshaggin 2,300 houses, to Masalskii 4,000 people, to Logofet 15,000. Information regarding administration, taxes, etc. is given in particular by A. Semenov (journey of 1898).


AL-KARAWIYYIN (MASJID), a celebrated mosque and Islamic university at Fas, in Morocco.

i.—Archaeological Study

The architectural history of the mosque, already sketched in the last H. Terrasse, in the article Fas [q.v.], heading "Monuments", is sufficiently well-known. It has been revised by the same author in a comprehensive work: La Mosquee al-Karawiyyin a Fas, avec une etude de G. Deverdun, sur les inscriptions historiques de la mosquee, Paris 1968. Three stages can be distinguished there (Pl. 1).

A. The first edifice was built, on the left bank of the Wadi Fas, in 245/859 and was the work of a pious woman, Fatima bint Muhammad al-Fihri, who came from Kayrawan to Fas with her family. She very probably received the authorization to build from the Amr Al Ya’b by Idris, grandson of Idris II. The first oratory measured on the inside 46.50 m. from east to west and 17.20 m. from north to south and included a prayer hall with four parallel bays in the kibla wall. The mihrab was on the site of the present great chandelier, the minaret in the place of which is today that of the "sahn". It was later in the centre of the mosque. The Idrisid bays are larger than those of later extensions (4.10 m. as against 3.70 m.) and contain 12 archways: 5 on the west of the axial nave and 6 on the east. There has been no success in finding the motive for this abnormally high arrangement; perhaps it should be connected with the alteration suggested by the inscription of 263/877 (G. Deverdun, Une nouvelle inscription idrisite, in Menehges d’histoire et d’archeologie de l’Occident musulman, ii, Hommage a G. Marquis, Algiers 1957), and whose author would be the amr Dadjid, a grandson of Idris I. The eastern and western boundaries of the initial oratory are marked in the present monument by a line of cruciform pillars which separate it from the extension of the 6th/12th century. The court (sahn) extended in front of the prayer hall. It was of meagre dimensions. So it is established, by its overall lay-out and its exterior, that this first mosque resembles the sanctuaries which were erected in the 3rd/11th century in the Magrib al-Aksa and of which al-Bakri gives us information.

B. The population of Fas having greatly increased, the Karawiyyin was enlarged in 345/956, a century after its foundation. In 309/921, it had already become the khutba mosque of the Kayrawan’s quarter, whose name it has preserved. This was the work of the Zanata amir Ahmad b. Abi ’l-Sa’di who acknowledged his holding the land as a vassal of the Umayyad caliph of Cordova. The buildings, etc. is given in particular by A. Semenov (journey of 1898).
obtained from the amīr ʿAlī b. Yūsuf, the great builder of the dynasty, the authorization to enlarge once more the famous oratory. The funds were gathered together, thanks to the correct resumption of the mosque’s revenues, which had been fraudulently diverted by some administrators, and doubtless with the help of the state treasury. About 528/1134 the work was begun. As early as 531/1136 two new cupolas received their final inscription, but the construction was not completed until 537/1143. As for the new minbar, it was not finished until 538/1144. It may then be concluded that the work lasted fifteen years, at the end of which the mosque was augmented in the direction of the kibla by three supplementary bays, which, as in all the rest of the building, preserve the arch as a thoroughly-exaggerated curve providing a new and magnificent miḥrāb. The arcades of the enlargement, for the twenty-one naves, take on once more exactly the dimensions of those of the Ḥaḍid oratory, such as it had been transformed by the Zanāta prince. It was traditional in the mosques of the west to mark the pre-eminence of the axial nave which leads towards the miḥrāb. The Almoravids wanted to mark it exactly on the outside, and they built a raised principal nave that dominates the roofs of the bays with a doublesloped tiled roof. This high nave is richly decorated, abounding in a luxurious series of five cupolas. The first, on a square plan, is situated in front of the miḥrāb; then a huge dome covers the two other bays corresponding to the enlargement. Some very beautiful Kūfic inscriptions attribute the work to the reign of the amīr ʿAlī b. Yūsuf. “The seven ancient bays of the axial nave were reshaped and decorated: today there are still five cupolas to be found which predate the Almoravid extension are covered by two domes with stalactites forming a flanged cupola; another dome with stalactites has taken the place of the cupola of al-Muẓaffar; on the three remaining bays a flanged ʿAlawite cupola is situated between two doubly-sloped roofs” (H. Terrasse). Finally, at the same time there was erected behind the miḥrāb a mosque of the dead (diqām al-dānaʿa), the first without doubt in Morocco of this genre of edifice, and the most beautiful. This annex, like the median bays of the prayer hall, presents an elegant cupola with stalactites, sheltered beneath a roof in a pavilion, in accordance with the Andalusian method. Also, to reconcile the pious desire to pray over the dead in the mosque itself and the necessity of not polluting the oratory by the presence of a corpse, the mosque of the dead connects with the mosque of the living by three doors, each bearing a twin arcade. If the work of the Almoravids was conceived with the greatest respect for the ancient parts of the building, one must recognize there the desire to magnificently ornament the Karawiyyīn in the manner of the great mosques of the Empire, those of Tlemcen (Tilimsān) and Marrākāsh in particular. The ornamental richness that they brought together in the axial nave testifies to the expertise of the artists of the time and to the opulence of the Hispano-Moorish art of the 6th/12th century. But all these decorations were to be covered again in plaster, towards 1150, for fear that the Almohad conquerors would get rid of them, as happened at Tlemcen and Marrākāsh where this precaution against the rigour of the partisans of God’s Unity was not taken in time.

For the study in detail of the Almoravid decoration, the epigraphy of the bronzes, the minbar etc., one should consult the work of Terrasse, mentioned at the beginning; this has served as a basis in the preparation of this article.

Later, the dynasty of the Almohads [see AL-MUWAHIDĪN], doubtless satisfied by the arrangements made to erase the name of the abhorred and cursed ʿAllī, brought to the mosque some utilitarian arrangements and above all an admirable reconstruction of great splendour.

The dynasty of the Maṛfīnids [q.v.] respected the work of the past, built the present ʿanāna [q.v.], enriched the liturgical furniture, added several splendid mountings on the bells taken from the Christians and proceeded to undertake numerous restorations. Finally, what was an illustrious feat, they created the Library. The Saʿdīds [q.v.] had two fountain-pavilions constructed which survive today in the ṣāhn, in imitation of those which still exist in the Court of the Lions at the Alhambra of Granada. No concern for utility explains their construction (pl. xv of the art. FAS).

The ʿAlawīs were not sparing in their care for the venerable mosque. It is under their reign that the exceptional competence of H. Terrasse allowed the rediscovery, with their original freshness and sometimes colour, of the richness of the Almoravid décor that was believed to have been destroyed for ever and which had remained choked with plaster for eight centuries.

Al-Karawiyyīn is thus not only the great sanctuary of the town of Fāṣ, but an eminent witness of the Hispano-Moorish art in architecture as in the decorative arts.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the sources given at the beginning of the article and to those that are found in the art. FAS, one should add that the two essential Arabic texts for the history of the mosque in the Middle Ages are the Rawd al-kīraš of Ibn Abī Zahr and the Zahrit al-Āṣ of al-Dījazmāṭ. The comprehensive plan of the mosque and its annexes was sketched and published by E. Pauty, *Le plan de l’Université Karawiyyn à Fès*, in *Hesperis*, ill.4 (1923) (pl. I). The mosque of the dead has been studied by B. Moslow, *Les Mosquées de Fès et du Nord marocain*, P.I.H.E.M.T., xix, Paris 1938; whilst G. Marcais, *L’Architecture musulmane d’Occident*, Paris 1954, 387–8, has given what is essential on the Saʿdīd portions of the ṣāhn.

For the Arabic inscriptions, see the *RCEA*, iv, No. 1478; vi, No. 2099; viii, Nos. 3031 and 3061; ix, No. 3545; xv, No. 5626; xvi, Nos. 6080 and 6081. See also the critical article of ʿAbd al-Ḥādī al-Taʾzī, ʿAbd al-Ḥādī al-Taʾzī, *al-Karawiyyn, in Dījazmāṭ al-Karawiyyīn, al-Kitāb al-dhahabi*, Muhammadiyya 1379/1959.

**ii. Organization of the Teaching**

At exactly what date can one speak of higher education of the Karawiyyīn? It is really difficult to answer this question with precision. Muhammad al-Manūlī, *Taʾrīkh al-Karawiyyn, in Dījazmāṭ al-Karawiyyīn, al-Kitāb al-dhahabi*, Muhammadiyya 1379/1959, thinks that it is in the reign of the Almoravids that the University really became attached to the mosque; but the Karawiyyīn was not the only place of worship where there was teaching.

From the beginning of the 6th/12th century until our own time, the glory of the Karawiyyīn was its body of scholars (ʿulamāʿ). It attracted a host of students from all the regions of Morocco, North Africa, Andalusia and even the Sahara, and the Moroccan dynasties and the people of Fāṣ were actively concerned with housing them, in order to be
able to provide instruction; the Marinids in particular erected the charming madrasas [q.v.] which still excite the admiration of visitors. The university attained its apogee in the 8th/14th century, but, later, the masters, in devoting their efforts to reconciling the requirements of custom and those of the religious law, could not prevent the decline of the intellectual and teaching methods, above all after the definitive rupture with Spain, and, consequently, with Europe. When, under the Sa‘dids, Fez lost its rank of capital in favour of Marrākāsh, al-Karawiyyīn remained turned in on itself and set in its traditional teaching. It continued to exist, without damage but without progress, by virtue of the Islamic institutions which took centuries to disappear. In reading Leo Africanus, as also Marmol, references are to be found that lack neither interest nor pungency. Finally, some reforms were imposed under the dynasty of the ‘Alawīds. In 1203/1788 the Sultan Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh decided to limit the authors, programmes and hours. The essence of this regulation is to be found in the work of Ibn Zaydān, al-Durar al-fāshira bi-ma‘ālîthir al-mulāh al-‘Alawiyyīn bi-Fās al-sāhira, Rabat 1356/1937, 60-t. But fifteen years later, if one believes a Spaniard who travelled under the name of ‘All Bey al-‘Abbād, things were going no better. Nevertheless, it is reported that the Sultan Mawlay Sulaymān (1207-38/1793-1822) used often to visit the classes, question the students and reward the best replies. Mawlay ‘Abd al-Rahmān, nephew of the above, devoted himself to new reforms and, by a šahār dated Mubarram 1261/January 1845, reorganized the teaching of the Karawiyīn (see Ibn Zaydān, op. cit., 73-82). In the present state of our knowledge, we have few means of attempting to evaluate the results attained by this new regulation of the studies, inspired by a sound and clear teaching method.

The general organization of the university before 1912 is described in R. Le Tourneau, Fās au moyen le Protectorat, Casablanca 1949 (book vi). It aimed at giving to the faithful as perfect a knowledge as possible of the truths of belief and of the line of conduct to adopt in the light of these truths. Dogmatism and conformity were the dominating factors in the teaching, which no longer embraced the universality of human knowledge, as before; it was reduced to the strictly religious disciplines. Among the branches of learning professed, certain had gradually disappeared; such was the case of Qur’ānic exegesis (tafsīr), of which the classes must have ceased in the reign of the Sultan Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh, of astronomy (ta’dīḍ), dialectic (kalām), mysticism (laṣīr), which disappeared in 1906, lexicography (lugha), philology (taṣrīf), geography (diğādsīyā), medicine (tibb), divination (qiṣāyla).

The university was not organized in the European manner, nor even in that of Cairo or Tunis. It was placed under the control of the chief bāḥī of Fās, a kind of rector, but without a proper specialised administration. The scholastic year was unknown. No registration was imposed; the teaching was free; the duration of studies was not fixed, but custom demanded that classes be pursued for five years at least. No examination ratified the studies, a simple certificate (iqtisā [q.v.]) being handed by the professor to every student who had given proof of application and of a certain ability. Three weeks of leave were accorded on the occasion of the great Muslim festivals, and a month on the occasion of the Spring festival during which the Sultan of the taḥa (plur. of ūlā, student) was chosen (see E. Doutté, La Khutba bur-lesque de la fête des Tolba au Maroc, in Recueil de mémoires et de textes publiés en l’honneur du XIV° Congrès des Orientalistes, Algiers 1905).

It is impossible to know the number of students at the end of the 19th century—a thousand perhaps, but certainly less at the beginning of the following century. They were divided into two categories: the Fāsīs by origin and the strangers at Fās (dā‘īyyīyīn), who lived, especially the poor ones, in the madrasas. The two groups mixed together little.

Nomination to the rank of professor (mudarris) depended on the Sultan following an empirical process which seems to have been always accepted by all. The salaries were only small, but, each year, the government made some gifts in kind; it was well understood that in return one had to demonstrate loyalty towards it. The professors enjoyed the most complete freedom, although tradition demanded that they give at least one lesson a day. The first-class professors, numbering 17 in 1904, enjoyed great renown and were called the "Great Scholars" (al-‘ulamā‘ al-ḥikār). It cannot be said that the masters of the Karawiyīn formed a genuine body, except for granting investiture to a new sultan, along with other personages, or for replying to the consultations that the sovereign sometimes demanded of them. Fās held its doctors in high esteem, but there is no doubt that they were no longer as illustrious as their illustrious predecessors had been. In their social milieu, their influence, however, remained considerable.

After the establishment of the French Protectorate in 1912, the Sultan Mawlay Yūsuf signed, on 23 Dju- madād II 1332/19 May 1914, a šahār which created a council of improvement charged with looking again for means to improve the studies and their administration, as well as to study the situation of the teaching personnel. Some years later (1918), the university had been entrusted to a Council of Direction and reattached to the Ministry of Justice. In 1346/1927, the professors were submitted to progress and received a fixed salary corresponding to the class in which they were ranked (for further details, see Ibn Zaydān, op. cit., 135-8).

After many plans, often keenly contested by the conservative milieux of Morocco and especially of Fās, an important reform was introduced to the Karawiyīn by two šahārs of the future King Muhāmmad V, the first dated 12th Dhu ‘l-Ka‘āda 1349/1st April 1931, the second 15th Mubarram 1352/10th May 1933. The teaching was divided into three cycles: elementary, secondary and final or higher. The last comprised two sections: the first was reserved for the Religious Law, the sources of this law, hadīth and tafsīr; the second entirely modern, was devoted to literature, Arabic language, history and geography. The hours were imposed on the professors as on the students; some examinations were organized and the vacations regularized. The masters received professional recognition, general supervision was reinforced, discipline enjoined, etc. (see Ibn Zaydān, op. cit., 146-60). The old university, now rejuvenated, became a State institution in 1947.

After independence, al-Karawiyīn was thoroughly reorganized by the royal decree No. 1.62.249 of 12th Ramaḍān 1382/6th February 1963. Now a public establishment, endowed with a civil corporate nature, the university was placed under the control of the Ministry of National Education. It is before all charged with (1) assuring the education of specialists in the Islamic disciplines and the Arabic language; and (2) promoting academic research in the fields of the sharī‘a and the Arabic language*. It comprises: (1) the Faculty of the Sharī‘a (Muslim law) which was opened
in Fès in October 1960; (2) the Faculty of Arabic Studies, whose centre is at Marrakesh; (3) the Faculty of Theology (Usul al-din) created at Tádám, and (4) some institutes attached to it, of which the most important is the dár al-hadîth, at Rabat, which produces scholars in the Islamic sciences. Each faculty is directed by a dean, assisted by a deputy, both of them appointed by the Directorate of Higher Education of the Ministry. The university at present (1972) comprises about a thousand students and each year grants an ever-increasing number of degrees (110 in 1970). Each academic year also produces a generation of educated young people who find a place less and less easily in modern Morocco. The Moroccan Government is not unaware of the problem, for which there is no easy and satisfactory solution.

Today, the university no longer functions at the foot of the pillars of the ancient mosque; it has been transferred to an old French barracks where the students no longer lead the mediaeval life of yester-year. Meanwhile the professors, even the less aged, continue to teach in a traditional spirit and, consequently, to form young people who do not move in the same atmosphere as their companions in modern education.


**KARAY, REFIK KHALİD** (modern Turkish essayist and novelist (d. 1888/1965). He was born in Beylerbeyi on the Bosphorus, Istanbul. His father, Mehmed Kâlid of the Karakaylîsh Ogullari (later shortened to Karay by Refik Kâlid), was chief treasurer at the Ministry of Finance. Trained at the Galatasaray lycée (1900-6), which he left before graduating, Karay became a clerk in a department of the Ministry of Finance and at the same time attended the school of law (Mehteb-i Hukuk) until the restoration of the Constitution in 1908; he then abandoned both job and study and became a journalist. After contributing to various papers, he founded in 1909 his own shortlived *Son Hauwdîth*. In the same year he joined the new literary group Feğri-i Ali (Dawn of the Future), formed for a brief period by the young generation of poets and writers, which was no more than the closing phase of the *Terek-i Fûnum* movement.

His real personality as a writer took shape in 1910 when he began to contribute, under the pen-name Kirpi (“hedghog”), to the humorous magazines *Kalem* and *Diem*, of which he soon became a leader writer. His powerful satirical essays, mixed with subtle humour, were written in a masterly style and were directed against the leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress, the party in power, and these immediately established his unchallenged reputation. Following the assassination of Grand Vizier Sâlih Pasha in June 1913, Refîk Kâlid, although he did not belong to any party and was not a militant, was arrested together with several hundred opposi-
tion “suspects” and banished to Sinop, on the Black
Sea. Talcat Pasha himself, who had been the target
of one of his ruthless satirical articles, included his
name in the list of people “to be punished” (R. H.
spent the following five years in exile in Sinop, Çorum,
Ankara and Bilecik, during which time he
remained silent except for a few essays and short
stories which were published, under the pen-name
*ayde*, in the Istanbul daily *Payam*, and later, under
his own name, in *Gökalp*, *Akbaba*, *Minelbab*
and *Memleket Hikayeleri*. On his return from exile
towards the end of World War I, he contributed to the
newspapers *Zaman* and *Sabah* (of which he became later a leader writer). When in 1918 the war was lost and the Unionist
leaders fled the country, Refik Khalid’s satires against
them and the committee became more vitriolic. He
joined the Liberal Union Party (*Hürriyet ve ilhâl Fırkası*)
and became increasingly involved in the
anti-Nationalist politics and activities of the Istanbul
governments of the 1919-22 period. His many articles
and satirical essays, in which he tried to discredit the
resistance movement in Anatolia led by Muştafa Kemal Paşa, depicting it as a resurgence of Unionist
ambitions, and his efforts to disrupt the telegraphic
communications of the Nationalists while he was
general-director of Posts and Telegraph during the
colony of Unionist governor in Edirne, made him
persona non grata in the eyes of the Ankara
government. His arrest and trial was one of the
conditions put forward by the Nationalists for any
compromise with the sultan’s government in October
Following the victory of the Nationalists in Anatolia
in September 1922 and soon after the arrival in
Istanbul of Reşit Pasha (Bele), as their special
representative, the writer and journalist 4 All Kemal,
a close friend and collaborator of Refik Khalid, a
leading opponent of the Nationalists and former
minister of the Interior, was kidnapped and murdered
in Izmit on the way to his trial in Ankara (F. R. Atay,
*Çankaya*, Istanbul 1969, 341-42). On learning this,
Refik Khalid joined a group of leading members of
the Liberal Union Party, who had collaborated with
the army of occupation in Istanbul, and took refuge in
the British Embassy. He was taken later to Taşkale
barracks with other refugees, but managed to slip away from there and left Istanbul on a French ship on 9 November 1922. (Later he was included among the 150 “undesirables” (*yözelli köleler*) excepted from the amnesty provisions of the Lau-
sanne Treaty of 1923). He went to Dişliiyeva in the
Lebanon where he wrote his political memoirs; their
serialization in the Istanbul daily *Akşam* in 1924
century modernists (*Tanzimî School*). He avidly read
everything the *Therouâl’s* Fünân, his immediate pre-
decessors, published in the last years of the century. He
admired their technique but rejected their French-
inspired themes and characters and their artificial
and precious style (excepting, however, some writings
of Khalîd Diyâr, Mehemd Ra’ûf and Hüseyn Dîkâhid).
Thus he started his epoch-making career from
scratch. Apart from one or two forerunners at the end
of the 19th century, he pioneered realism in the novel
and short story and switched his attention from the
over-exploited capital (Istanbul) to the Anatolian
countryside; he specialized in subtle social and
political satire without having recourse to gross and
obscene language. He advocated and practised the
use of spoken Turkish as a literary medium as early as
1909, i.e., before Ömer (Umar) Seyf ed-Din and his as-
sociates inaugurated the movement of Yenî Lisân (New
Language) which aimed at the simplification of written
Turkish. Refik Khalid’s published works, numbering
37, can be divided into the following categories:

1. Humorous and satirical essays, on
incidents of everyday life, topical events or political
personalities, which reveal his real personality. These
have been put together in the following volumes:
*Kirpinin dedikleri* (“What the Hedgehog said”),
containing essays published between 1909-19, second
enlarged edition, Istanbul 1936 (1936); *Tandikham* (*My Acquaintances*),
Istanbul 1335 (1935), in Roman script 1941; *Sahin
dandanma, inanma, kanma* (“Don’t be deceived, don’t
believe, don’t be taken in”), Istanbul 1335 (1935), in
Roman script 1941; *Ako Pashanîn Khârifalari* (*Me-
moirs of Aggo Pasha the Parrot*), Istanbul 1338
(1922), in Roman script 1939; *Ayyezân* (*In
Pursuit of the Moon*), Istanbul 1339 (1923); *Çapangâ-
kuš sâl-at* (“The Cuckoo Clock”), Istanbul 1341
(1925), in Roman script 1940; *Bir avuç saÎma* (*A
Handful of Nonsense*), Aleppo 1932.

2. Short Stories. Refik Khalid’s short stories
have been collected in *Memleket Hikayeleri* (*Stories
from the Country*), Istanbul 1335 (1935), in Roman
script 1939 (French tr. Belkis Tavad, *Contes turcs*,
Istanbul n.d.), sometimes considered as his master-
piece. Except for a few stories which belong to his
early period (1909-12), these stories were written
during his five-year exile in Anatolia where he was
able to study closely the types and customs of vil-
lagers and provincial townspeople. An invaluable
documentary on everyday life of pre-World War I
Central Anatolia, these stories are told with a rare
vividness of natural style unprecedented in modern
Turkish literature. He observes and describes land-
scape, provincial towns and local types—peasants,
shopkeepers, notables, teachers, köşjas and civil
servants—with powerful realism, without always
seeking to penetrate the soul of his characters. His
*Gurbet Hikayeleri* (*Stories of Exile*), Istanbul 1940,
contain mainly sketches using much autobiographical
material, a feature of his later works.

3. Novels. Refik Khalid wrote only one novel
between 1909 and 1929, *Istanbul’un İ’t Yüzi* (*The
inside Story of Istanbul*), Istanbul 1336 (1920), in
Roman script as *Istanbul’un Bir Yüzi* (*One Face of
Istanbul*), Istanbul 1939, perhaps his best. Written
in the form of a diary of a woman of humble origin,
bring up in the mansion (konak) of a Hamidian pagha,
this novel is a series of masterly sketches of Istanbul
“society” between 1900-20, where the last
vestiges of the old regime, the noble and imperial
protagonists of the all-powerful committee of Union and Progress and the degenerate nouveau-riche of the war
years
are depicted with scintillating and merciless sarcasm. After 1930 and particularly after his return from exile in 1938, he serialized in newspapers and magazines a great number of popular novels (19 of which were published in book form and some also filmed) of mediocre literary value, written mainly for the purpose of making a living, as he himself admitted (Mustafa Baydar, Edebiyatısalırmıs ne DISyorlar?, Istanbul 1960, 108). But some of these novels, particularly Sürûn ("The Key"), Istanbul 1947, and Bu Bizim Hayatımız ("This is our Life"), Istanbul 1950, are worth mentioning for many important autobiographical data and period descriptions. Among his non-political and non-satirical essays the volume Üç Nesil Üç Hayat ("Three generations, Three ways of Life"), Istanbul 1943, contains lively sketches of everyday life in Istanbul from the 1860s onwards. A considerable number of his essays and articles published in his very popular humorous magazine Aydede (from January 1922, 90 issues, and again in 1948-49, 125 issues) have not been collected in book form.

(4) Plays. Refik Khâlid wrote two plays: Tiryâkî Hasan Pasha, a historical play about the famous defender of the fortress of Kaniza in Hungary in 1601. The play, which had a great success at the time (1900), has not been published. He wrote his second play, a one-act comedy, while in Syria: Deli ("The Madman"), Aleppo 1931, in Roman script, Istanbul 1939. It is a story of a mental patient restored to health who, on experiencing the effects of the radical social reforms of the 20th, goes irrevocably mad again. Kemal Atatürk, stated on reading the play that "it did not satirize the reforms but emphasized them" and on his suggestion, Refik Khâlid (together with Nihat Pasha, Istanbul from the 1860s onwards. A considerable number of his essays and articles published in his very popular humorous magazine Aydede (from January 1922, 90 issues, and again in 1948-49, 125 issues) have not been collected in book form.

The Caliph al-Mutawakkil in 236/850-1 destroyed the tomb and its annexes and had the ground levelled and sown; he prohibited under threat of heavy penalties visiting the holy places (al-Tabarti, iii, 1407;HAND Allâh al-Mustawfî, Nûzhat al-Kulâb, ed. Le Strange, 32). Ibn Hawkâl (ed. de Goeje, 166), however, mentions about 366/977 a large maqâm with a domed chamber, entered by a door on each side, over the tomb of Husayn, which in his time was already much visited by pilgrims. Dabîb b. Muhammad al-Hasadî of 'Ayn al-Tamr, supreme chief of a number of tribes, devastated Maqâm al-Hâ'ir (Karbala) along with other sanctuaries, for which a punitive expedition was sent against 'Ayn al-Tamr in 369/979-80 before which he had fled into the desert (Ibn Miskawayh, Tâdîrîb al-Umam, ed. Amelroz in The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate, ii, 335, 414). In the same year, the Shî'î Büyûd 'Adud al-Dawla (q.v.) took the two sanctuaries of Maqâm 'Ali (= al-Nađaf) and Maqâm al-Husayn (M. Hâ'îrî) under his special protection (Ibn al-Athîr, viii, 516; HAND Allâh al-Mustawfî, loc. cit.).

Hasan b. al-Fadî, who died in 414/1023-4, built a wall round the holy tomb at Maqâm al-Husayn (Ibn Taghribirdî, Nûdûm, ed. Popper, ii, 123, 141), as he also did at Maqâm 'Ali (Ibn al-Athîr, ix, 154).

Ibn Râbi'î 1407/Aug.-Sept. 1016, a great conflagration broke out caused by the upsetting of two wax candles, which reduced the main building (al-bubba) and the open halls (al-arwîba) to ashes (Ibn al-Athîr, ix, 209).

When the Sâlqâk Sultan Malik Shah came to Baghdad in 479/1086-7, he did not neglect to visit the two Maqâms of 'Ali and al-Husayn (Ibn al-Athîr, x, 103). The two sanctuaries at this time were known as al-Maâhâdan (al-Bundarî-al-Isfahânî, Zûdîb al-nûmra, ed. Houtsma, in Recueil des textes ..., ii, 77) on the analogy of the duals al-Îrâkân, al-Bâsrâtân, al-Hîrâtân, al-Mîrân, etc.

The Îlkhân Ghâzîân in 702/1303 visited Karbâlâ' and gave lavish gifts to the sanctuary. He or his father Arghân is credited with bringing water to the district by leading a canal from the Frât (the modern Nahr al-Husayniyya) (A. Nödeke, Das Heiligtum al-Husains zu Kurbelâ', Berlin 1900, 40).

Ibn Batûtâ, ii, 99, visited Karbâlâ' in 727/1326-7 from al-Êilha and describes it as a small town which lies among palm groves and gets its water from the Frât. In the centre is the sacred tomb; beside it is a large madrasa and the famous hostel (al-zamîya) in which the pilgrims are entertained. Admission to the tomb could only be obtained by permission of the gate-keeper. The pilgrims kiss the silver sarcophagus, above which hang gold and silver lamps. The doors are hung with silken curtains. The inhabitants are divided into the Awlaîd Râjîlî and Awlaîd Fâyîz,
whose continual feuds are detrimental to the town, although they are all Shi'is.

About the same date, Hamd Allah al-Mustawfi (op. cit.) gives the circumference of the town as 2,400 paces; he mentions there also the tomb of Hurr Riyā (b. Yazid), who was the first to fall fighting for Husayn at Karbala.

The Safawid Shāh Ismā'īl I (d. 930/1524) made a pilgrimage to al-Nadīf and Mashhad Husayn.

Sultān Sulaymān the Magnificent visited the two sanctuaries in 941/1534-5, repaired the canal at Mashhad al-Husayn (al-Husayniyya) and transformed the fields which had been buried in sand into gardens again. The Manārat al-'Abd (q.v.), formerly called Engušht-i Yār, was built in 982/1574-5. Murād III in 991/1583 ordered the Wāli of Baghdaḍ, 'All Pāsha b. Alwand, to build or more correctly, restore, a sanctuary over the grave of Husayn. Soon after the capture of Baghdaḍ in 1032/1623, Abbas the Great won the Maṣḥads for the Persian empire. Nādir Shāh visited Karbala in 1156/1743; while he is credited with gilding the dome in Matschhad 'All, he is also said to have confiscated endowments intended for the priests of Karbala.

The great prosperity of the place of pilgrimage and its large number of inhabitants is emphasised on the occasion of the pilgrimage of 'Abd al-Karim, a favourite of Nādir Shāh. Rādīyya Sultān Bēgüm, a daughter of Shāh Husayn (1105-34/1694-1722), presented 20,000 mādirūs for improvements at the mosque of Husayn.

The founder of the Kāḏārī dynasty, Aḡmā Muḥammad Kān, towards the end of the 13th/18th century, presented the gold covering for the dome and the mausoleum of the sanctuary of Husayn (Jacob, in A. Nöldeke, op. cit., 65, 4).

In Dhu l-Hijjah 1215/April 1801, in the absence of the pilgrims who had gone to al-Nadīf, 12,000 Wahhābis under Šaykh Saʿādī entered Karbala, slew over 3,000 inhabitants there and looted the houses and bazaars. In particular they carried off the gilt copper plates and other treasures of the sanctuary and destroyed the shrine. But after this catastrophe contributions poured in for the sanctuary from the whole Shi'ite world.

After a temporary occupation of Karbala by the Persians, Nadīb Pāsha in 1259/1843 succeeded by Aḥmad Khan, towards the end of the 12th/18th century, won the Maṣḥads for the Persian empire. Nadir Shāh entered Karbala 3 in 1288/1871 began the building of government offices, which remained incomplete, and extended the adjoining market place (documents on the history of Mashhad Husayn are given in A. Nöldeke, op. cit., 51-66).

In 1965 Karbalā had 81,500 inhabitants (1970 estimate, 107,500), a number swollen to well over 200,000 during Muḥarram with its influx of pilgrims. Karbala has always been a particularly rich town, not only because of its possession of the shrine but also because it has been a starting-point for Persian pilgrim caravans to Nadīf and Mecca and a "desert port" for trade with the interior of Arabia. The old town with its tortuous streets is now surrounded by modern suburbs. About half of the resident population is Persian, and there is a strong mixture of Indian and Pakistani Muslims; there have long been Indian connections through the shrine’s benefiting from the former use of Oudh’s harbours. Shīʿite Arabs, the most important tribes amongst them are the B. Sa’īd, Salahma, al-Wuzūm, al-Ṭahāmā and al-Naṣiriyya. The Dede family has been especially prominent; it was rewarded with extensive estates by Sultan Selim I for constructing the Nahār al-Husayniyya.

The name Karbalā strictly speaking only applies to the eastern part of the palm gardens which surround the town in a semi-circle on its east side (Musil, The Middle Euphrates, 41). The town itself is called al-Mashhad or Mashhad al-Husayn.

The sanctuary of the third Imām lies in a court yard (saḥn) 354 x 270 feet in area, which is surrounded by liwāws and cells. Its walls are decorated with a continuous ornamental band which is said to contain the whole Kurʿān written in white on a blue ground. The building itself is 156 x 138 feet in area. The rectangular main building entered by the "golden outer hall" (picture in Grothe, Geog. Charakterbilder, pl. lxxviii, fig. 136) is surrounded by a valued corridor (now called mašām; A. Nöldeke, op. cit., 20, l. 3) in which the pilgrims go round the sanctuary (saʿād) (Wellhausen, Reste arab. Heidentums, 109-12). In the middle of the central domed chamber is the shrine (sandāba) of Husayn about 6 feet high and 12 long surrounded by silver masqarabiyya work, at the foot of which stands a second smaller shrine, that of his son and companion-in-arms 'All Akbar (Mas'ūdi, Kišāb al-Tanbīh, ed. de Goeje, BGA, viii, 703).

"The general impression made by the interior must be called fairy-like, when in the dusk—even in the daytime it is dim inside—the light of innumerable lamps and candles around the silver shrine, reflected a thousand and again a thousand times from the innumerable small crystal facets, produces a charming effect beyond the dreams of imagination. In the roof of the dome the light loses its strength, only here and there a few crystal surfaces gleam like the stars in the sky" (A. Nöldeke, op. cit., 25-6).

The sanctuary is adorned on the Kibla face with magnificent and costly ornamentation. Two manāras flank the entrance. A third, the Manārat al-'Abd, rises before the buildings on the east side of the Saḥn; south of it the face of the buildings surrounding the court recedes about 50 feet; on this spot is a round wall mosque. Adjoining the Saḥn on the south side is a large madrasa the courtyard of which measures about 84 feet square with a mosque of its own and several mīrābs (on the present condition of the sanctuary: cf. A. Nöldeke, op. cit., 5-26, on its history 35-50 and on its architectural history, 51-66).

About 600 yards N E of the sanctuary of Husayn is the mausoleum of his half-brother 'Abbas. On the road which runs westward out of the town is the site of the tent of Husayn (ḵaymagdā). The building erected there (plan in Nöldeke, pl. vii; photograph in Grothe, pl. lxxxiv, fig. 145) has the plan of a tent and on both sides of the entrance there are stone copies of camel saddles.

On the desert plateau (ḵammād) west of the town stretch the graves of the devout Shi'īs. North of the gardens of Karbala lie the suburbs, gardens and fields of al-Bkēr, to the north-west those of Kurra, and to the south those of al-Ghādhrīyā (Yākūt, iii, 768). Among places in the vicinity, Yākūt mentions al-‘Akr (iii, 695) and al-Nawāyīb (iv, 816).

A branch line diverging north of al-Ḫīla connects Karbalā with the Baghdaḍ-al-Ḫasra railway. The sanctuary of Husayn still has the reputation of securing entrance to Paradise for those buried there, hence many aged pilgrims often protest in failing health go there to die in the holy spot.

Bibliography: al-Ṭabarī, indices; Ibn al-Aʿṣir, indices; al-Īṣākhārī, BGA, i, 85; Ibn Ḥaw-
KARBALA — KARIM KHAN ZAND

He is the author of the following works:

1. A pastoral in which is recorded the names of his masters and also the ghadan given by certain of them, such as al-Kühn and al-Durra-madd.


3. A treatise on the need for modernising the army, Kaff fi al-ghumma fi bā'yin anna karb al-nisā'īn wadīd 'al-dādāl 'al-umma (lith. Fez 1303/1885).

He died at Fez, where he was buried outside the Bab al-Futūb, near the tomb of Yūsuf al-Fāsī.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 217 and n. 1; M. al-Kattānī, Fihris al-fāharīs; A. Ibn Śūdā, Dālī, i, 149, ii, 288, 324, 471.

KARIM KHAN ZAND (MUHAMMAD B. KARIM), (ca. 1164/93-ca. 1751-70), the founder of the Zand dynasty and the de facto ruler of the greater part of Persia. Having no claim to the title of shah, he instead, assumed, that of wākil, "regent, lieutenant".

Brought up during exile of the Zand tribe imposed by Nādir Ṣāḥib Afgān, on the latter's death he succeeded in conducting the Zands from their exile in northern Khūrāsān to the village of Pīrīya, modern Pārī, 30 km. south east of Kermān. When Kārīm, originally a lateral branch of the Lakk [g.v.], had had their settlements prior to their deportation.

In the course of clashes with neighbouring chieftains, he displayed great military skill. In alliance with the Bakhtiyāri 'Ali Mardān Khan [g.v.], he seized Ṣaḥān; there, in 1164/1751, they placed on the throne a Safawid boy of eight, whom they styled Ismā'īl III. In his service Kārīm held the offices of commander-in-chief, and 'Alī Mardān that of guardian of the sovereign, wākil. Fearing 'Alī Mardān's duplicity, Kārīm captured Ṣaḥān, took Ismā'īl III under his own guardianship, assumed the title of wākil and put 'Alī Mardān Khan to flight.

When the latter's attempt to win support for a new Safawid puppet failed and the Bakhtiyāri chief was assassinated by a Zand commander, Kārīm found himself obliged to defend Ṣaḥān and Shīrāz against the rival claimants, including the Kāджār Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān, the Afgān Fath 'Allī, and the Afgān Āzād Khān. At the end of a fierce struggle for the vacant throne, during which Muḥammad Ḥasan was assassinated by his own tribesmen in 1172/1759, Fath 'Allī and Āzād Khān had no option but to join forces in 1176/1765 and in 1179/1765; Kārīm, already more popular than the other contestants, emerged as the undisputed ruler over the whole of Persia except Khūrāsān, which he purposely left in the hands of Nādir Ṣāḥib's descendants. Although subsequently he had repeatedly to suppress local revolts, such as those of the Kāb tribes in Khūsūstān, the Līrāvī nomads in Kūh-i Gīlīya, of Taḵī Durrānī in Kīrmān, Naṣīr Lārī in Fārs, Mr Muḥānā in the Persian Gulf region, and Ḥusayn Khūl Kāḏārī in Astārābād and Māzandarān, on the whole his rule brought a policy of sorely needed peace to Persia. When Ismā'īl III, who had deserted Kārīm in 1165/1752, returned in 1172/1759, he formally deposed him as incompetent, holding him, however, in honoured captivity with a large pension in Abāda [g.v.]. Kārīm did not regain the title of wākil, using it thereafter in the sense of wākil al-raṣā'il ("regent for the people") rather than that of wākil al-dawla. Under Kārīm his capital in Shīrāz, enriching it with magnificent buildings, some of which stand to this day. Through prudent husbandry he developed commerce, handi-
crafts and agriculture, encouraged foreign trade, and granted some commercial privileges to European companies in the Persian Gulf, mainly in order to utilize their power to enforce order and security on the coasts. His sole expedition beyond the Persian frontiers was the capture of Basra in 1190/1776, which was a challenge to the commercial supremacy of this Ottoman port rather than an attempt to destroy Ottoman rule in Mesopotamia. Karim's last years were darkened by the loss of a young son, the death of a beloved wife, and a series of illnesses (colds, tuberculosis, etc.). He died in his death in 13 Safar 1193/2 March, 1779. He was buried in Shiraz, whence the hostile Kadjars transferred his remains to Tehran and later to Namaf. Karim's rule was a paternal monarchy, based on tribal traditions common among the Lakk and Lur nomads. His bodily strength, his skill in arms, his sense of humour, his concern for his people's welfare, and his anxiety to secure prosperity for the inhabitants of Shiraz, have provided materials for a series of folk tales, specimens of which can be found in Tadgirdat U-Abrār, Fārs-Nāma-yi Nāsiri, Rauḍat al-Safā-yi Nāsiri; cf. also J. Malcolm, History of Persia.


(A. H. Zarrinkoob)

KĀRIMĪ, name of a group of Muslim merchants operating from the major centres of trade in the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk empires, above all in spices. No satisfactory etymology has yet been given of the word Kārīmī, Kārim or Kārīm. Quatremère follows al-Kalḳashandi’s statements and maintains that the name derives from Kānim, a territory in Western Sudan, which was altered into Kārīm. Al-Kalḳashandi commented that the word occurred as such in the disūns and had no meaning in Arabic, and Ibn Mājdīd (q.v.) does indeed mention the ancient (ṣādim) pepper route from the Bilād al-Kānim (Western Sudan). Littmann proposes an Aramaic origin, deriving it from the word Kuararīma, a spice imported into Ethiopia by the Kārimī.

It is certain that the Kārimī were in the first place merchants of the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea, so that Littmann’s idea that the word Kārīmī may be connected with the name of some kind of merchandise is suggestive. From al-Maqrīzī’s description of the Cairene markets it is clear that the amber (= kārim or kahramān) market was very active. Yellow amber is still named Kārim in Egypt, and the origin of the term Kārīmī may thus be explained. Blochet also advances this derivation. G. Wiet remarks that the source of yellow amber is to be sought in the Baltic region and not in the merchandise of the Indian Ocean. Wiedemann, who did not occupy himself with the Kārimīs, cites Nuwasyr, who mentions the import of amber from the Byzantine empire, i.e. through Byzantine markets. Fischel, Goitein, Ashlor, Naura, R. de Miglio, Darrag, Sublet and Cahen on the other hand concentrated more on the development of the Kārimī corperation than on the origin of the term.

It is evident from the Arabic documents that the word Kārīm was also used to design a fleet, especially a merchant fleet. The Geniza documents point to a similar meaning of the term.

In any case, the term Kārīm occurs for the first time in a text transmitted by al-Kalḳashandi. It relates that the Fātimids established a special fleet (five, later of three ships) to protect the Kārīmī ships on their journeys between Aydīshāb and Sawākīn against the pirates of the neighbouring islands, especially the Dahlah group. The command was committed to the wālī of Kūs (q.v.), sometimes however to an emir in direct contact with the government in Cairo. Saladin lent growing support to the Kārīmī trade, which yielded high revenue from the taxes imposed. Al-Maqrīzī reports that Saladin demanded beforehand the taxes for four years when the Kārimī merchants (Tdjudīřār al-Kārimī) came from Aden in 577/1181. It is worthwhile to note that al-Maqrīzī speaks of “merchants” and not simply of “Kārīm”, in the sense of a trade or a fleet.

One year later (578/1182) the Kārīmī encountered their most serious crisis, with the attempt of the Crusaders to establish themselves into the Red Sea. This constituted a very great danger to Islam, for the Crusaders would thus threaten the sacred territory of the Hīḍāzā, but Saladin’s greatest concern was the danger to the Egyptian monopoly of the transit traffic in the Red Sea. However, Saladin’s victory over Renaud de Châtillon enabled him to keep the Frankish powers and merchants away from this most important trade route between the West and the Far East, and promoted the expansion of the Kārīmī merchants.

In 579/1183 Saladin’s nephew and deputy in Egypt, Taḵt al-Dīn ʿUmar, built the famous funduq al-Kārīm in al-Fustāṭ, the port district of Cairo. At this period both Jewish and Coptic merchants had more or less to abandon their major enterprises in the Red Sea. They were replaced by Muslim merchants, principally the Kārīmīs.

Lack of sources makes it difficult to write the history of the Kārīmī during the Ayyūbid period after the death of Saladin. The Mamlūk sultans, however, maintained the commercial policy of their predecessors and thus promoted the expansion of the Kārīmī enterprises.

The transition from Ayyūbid to Mamlūk government in Egypt was full of interior and exterior problems: the crusade of Saint Louis and the advance
of the Mongols on the one side, and on the other the revolts of the Arab tribes settled in Egypt. During this critical period the Karimī and other wholesale merchants thought it wise to reduce imports into Egypt, especially when al-Malik al-Mu'izzar Kuţuz [q.v.], to help finance his campaigns, imposed such drastic levies on the merchants of Egypt that they lost one third of their wealth. Baybars I [q.v.] abolished these measures, and ordered his wali in Kūţ and Ayyūhāb to treat the merchants well, so that ships sailed without delay from Yemen ports to Ayyūhāb. Ibn Wāsīl [q.v.] reports that no one took action against them and that their property did not suffer any losses at all.

The activities of the Karimī started a new chapter in the history of the development of the Egyptian capital and of commercial financing. If the capital of a wholesale merchant, Muslim or Karimī in Egypt is estimated before the Karimī period at 10,000 to 30,000 dinārs, the fortune of a Karimī-merchant amounted to one million dinārs or more. Because of his financial capacity, the reputation of the Karimī Naṣr al-Dīn Muḥ. b. Musallam al-Bālīsī (d. 776/1375), whose fortune was calculated to amount to ten million dinārs, went beyond the boundaries of the merchant circles of Egypt. Muslim merchants from India, who carried on trade in Egypt, Mecca and Aden, confirmed that no Indian possessed such a huge fortune, except one (Indian) unbeliever,—and he was associated with Naṣr al-Dīn. Tādž al-Dīn al-Karimī, known as al-Damāmīnī (d. 731/1331) left 100,000 dinārs, a more credible figure than the one reported about al-Bālīsī. Describing the enormous wealth of the Saha, the unbelieving Indian merchants from Dawlatābād [q.v.], Ibn Baṭṭūṭa remarks (iv, 49): “They resembled the Karimī-merchants in Egypt”. Elsewhere (iv, 259) he compares the Sati of China with the Karimīs.

The Karimīs earned higher profits than the third of the purchase-price allowed by Muslim law. Besides bartering, they paid both in cash and by cheque. Indeed, through their network of markets and transactions, the Karimīs operated as a kind of banking institution, the most important clients of which were sultans and amirs whom they assisted not only with credits but also by supplying troops and arms. The Mamlūk sultan was not the only ruler to borrow money from the Karimīs. The king of the Yemen also was given credits when he found himself in financial difficulties. Even Mansā Mūsā, the king of Māli who owned the gold-mines in western Sudan, borrowed money from a Karimī-merchant before he left Mecca to return home.

The Karimī commercial houses were primarily family-owned firms, each generation inheriting the experience, assets and clients of the preceding one, and the younger members being sent away for training to the various markets of the huge enterprise. Freemen as well as slaves represented the firms, studied the markets, brought in clients, imported and exported merchandise. One Karimī is reported to have sent his slaves as representatives to the markets of the Indian Ocean and in the western Sudan in order to trade and carry through transactions in his name. Of the Karimī Naṣr al-Dīn Muḥ. b. Musallam, whose father, grandfather and paternal uncle had also been merchants, it is reported that none of his slaves died while they were trading on his behalf in India, the Yemen, Ethiopia, Mālī and Bilād al-Takrūr, so that his affairs had not sustained any loss on that account.

During the reign of sultan al-Nāṣṭr Muḥ. b. Kalā-
to Egypt in 786/1384, had made costly gifts to sultan Barqûk and the leading emirs. He was attacked by Shihâb al-Dîn al-Fârîqî, an influential Yemeni merchant resident in Egypt (possibly the head of the Yemeni Kârimîs and brother of the contemporary Yemeni vizier al-Asghaf). Al-Kharrûbî then produced a letter addressed to him by the Yemeni king, in which was cited a letter by al-Fârîqî, alleging that corruption was rife in Egypt since there was no effective ruler; al-Fârîqî had therefore suggested to the Yemeni king that he should send no more tribute, because the ruling Egyptian sultan was one of the basest and most contemptible of the Mamlûks. Barqûk ordered that al-Fârîqî should be imprisoned, have his tongue cut out, and his property confiscated; al-Kharrûbî on the other hand was presented with a costly robe of honour and granted the title Kabîr al-Tudjûdâr. This passage tells us something about the conditions required to obtain this title: it was a symbol of the most privileged position among the merchants, acquired by loyalty, unimpeachable religious and political behaviour and wealth.

Government policy was to favour the Kârimî merchants. The násîr al-bahâr wa’l-kârim, inspector of spices and Kârimî-merchandise, was responsible for the interests of the Kârimis in the Red Sea and Egypt and collected customs and taxes from them. This function was so esteemed that it was sometimes assigned to the vizier or the násîr al-kâdîss. The final decision however was with the sultan since the dues levied on Kârimî merchandise accrued to his treasury. Under al-Mu’ayyad Shâyi’kî, the importance of this function is demonstrated in a diploma of appointment, the text of which has been transmitted by Ibn Hâjîd al-Hamûdî [q.v.] and in which the post is offered to the Shâfi’i fâhîk Kamâl al-Dîn al-Bârizî. Since Upper-Egypt was during a long period the ordinary trade-route for the import of oriental merchandise, another letter of appointment emphasized that the chief wâlî of Upper Egypt, Wâlî Wûdûd al-Šâfî’d, should pay special attention to the commercial aspects of his post, as being “the gate to the Yemen and Hîdjarî”. A third letter of appointment mentions the great importance of Kârimî activities in Upper Egypt: it is the chief wâlî’s duty to treat them well and to promote their interests.

In 832/1429 Barsbây [q.v.] introduced his monopoly of pepper and a rigid supervision of the market. He bought pepper in Djudda on his own account and even forbade the merchants to deal in it before he had concluded his own affairs. He also curtailed the pepper and spice trade with the Franks in Alexandria by fixing prices. The Franks were hard hit since they had to acquire the pepper at a price which was about 50 dinãrs above the market-price. They were forced to limit their purchases and often had to return home without having sold their merchandise. The Egyptian merchants also sustained losses. When the Kârimî-merchants tried to trade clandestinely with the Franks, Barsbây threatened in 833/1430 to bar them completely from trade. Two years later he forced them not to trade at all without his permission. In 838/1435 he curtailed the spice-trade in Djudda and fixed the prices for the trade with the Occident. The ensuing difficulties between Egypt and the western traders were further increased by the Catalan and Turkish pirates. Çâmikû [841/1438-756/1453] restricted the period of residence of the Frankish merchants in Egyptian ports to six months at most.

The deteriorating situation of the Kârimî-merchants during the 9th/15th century was however due not only to the policy of the Mamlûk sultans, but also to increasing economic crisis in Egypt, and to the policies of the Yemeni king al-Mâjîr âl-Âhad, who tried to extend his power over the Hijâz and to oust Egypt from its privileged position there, while in the Yemen he established a reign of terror. The Kârimîs fled to India or Djudda, leaving part of their fortunes behind in Aden. Also the merchants and ships’ captains from China sustained losses. When despatching a gift in 839/1435, the emperor of China made a strong protest against the measures of the Rasûlid ruler. The Egyptian government meanwhile not only tried to lure the merchants and captains from Aden to Djudda, but to establish a state-monopoly.

On the northern frontiers of the Mamlûk domains the political situation remained tense during the 9th/15th century and necessitated continuous Egyptian expeditions, which burdened the state-finances. By increasing the prices of monopoly merchandise, Kâthbây [q.v.] financed sixteen military expeditions, which cost altogether 8 million dinãrs, besides the soldiers’ pay. Since the rural economy was not able to cover these expenses, they had to be borne by imposts on trade, which caused a set-back to the Kârimî-merchants. From then on they started losing their lucrative business. Many of them entered the sultan’s service, and became the wholesale merchants of Egypt par excellence. Others emigrated to India, especially to Kâlikât [q.v.] and Cambaya, and many turned to monetary transactions, less profitable to themselves but causing many difficulties to the State. They exported so many copper coins, that the sultan in 832/1429 strictly forbade their export to Djudda. The prohibition, however, had to be repeated in 839/1437. How difficult the merchants’ position was during Barsbây’s administration is clearly indicated in a contemporary’s note that a merchant had to contract a loan in order to cover his expenses while he possessed a stock of merchandise valued at 10,000 dinãrs.

The Red Sea merchants, in contradistinction to their colleagues in Cairo, tried openly and expressly to assert their rights with the sultan. Even Shah-Rûkh, the Timûrid ruler, became involved in this quarrel. He denounced the collection of taxes in Djudda which were not in accordance with the shari’a, and called the fubâkhî and fûtûlî- experts in Cairo “the riding animals of their master’s wilfulness”. Shah-Rûkh tried to intensify the tension between the Mamlûk sultan and the oriental merchants, but did not succeed in forcing the sultan to abandon his monopolizing policy or to collect taxes solely according to jurânic prescriptions. The short-lived penetration of the Chinese fleet to the East African coast and the Gulf of Aden in the first decades of the 9th/15th century could not avail the Kârimîs against the arbitrary behaviour of the sultans, nor could the establishment at this period of close relations between Ethiopia and Europe alter the policy of the sultan of Egypt towards the Kârimîs. Nûr al-Dîn ‘All al-Tawrîsh, the sultan of Egypt, endowed his fatwa with many of the prerogatives of a Kârimî Muslim of Persian origin, who sold arms and European cloth in Ethiopia, was arrested on the charge of high treason. He was accused of having gone to Europe via the Maghrib by order of the Negus in order to incite Alphonsus of Aragon against the Muslims. He was convicted and executed in Cairo in 832/1429. Ibn Hâjîâl al-‘Âskalânî and his pupil al-Sâkhâwî questioned the legality of this verdict and were of the opinion that al-Tawrîsh had promoted the cause of Islam in Ethiopia where he was said to have been in high esteem because of his activities. The envoy’s of Negus Yeshâk did indeed reach the court of Alphonsus V (C. de la Roncière, La découverte de l’Afrique au
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According to Ibn Taghribîrî, the Karimis did not appear on the Egyptian market in 859/1455, and after 880/1474 they are no more mentioned in contemporary sources. So far as we know, the last two Karimis in Egypt, All b. Mu. b. Yâsuf Kâlyûbî and All b. Badr al-Dîn Hasan b. 'Ulayba, died in 897/1491-92.
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According to Ibn Taghribîrî, the Karimis did not appear on the Egyptian market in 859/1455, and after 880/1474 they are no more mentioned in contemporary sources. So far as we know, the last two Karimis in Egypt, All b. Mu. b. Yâsuf Kâlyûbî and All b. Badr al-Dîn Hasan b. 'Ulayba, died in 897/1491-92.
The Revolt of Wandad-Hurmuzd.

We know scarcely anything of the Karinid princes before the revolt of Wandad-Hurmuzd in 165/781, and we must have recourse to the history of Tabaristan and of other local princes for some incidental references. According to the local historians (Ibn Isfandiyar, 98), a new dynasty was created about 45/665 in the Shawk Mountain situated in the south-east of Tabaristan (Ibn al-Fakhth, 305) with Firrûm as centre (Hudud al-Salam, 135-6); it is very difficult to recognize in these different names mountains that form the eastern chain of the Elburz, for they have changed in name or their names may be easily confused, even when one does not come across several names for one and the same mountain (Rabino di Borgomale, Mzandaran and Astarâbâd, 2). Always according to the local historians (Ibn Isfandiyar, 98-9, 237; Zahâr al-Din, 206-7, 323-4), the inhabitants of Kûh-i Karin helped Surkhâb son of Bâw to regain his throne from the usurper Aghur-Walâgh (the Zar-mihrid?), who had assassinated his father ca. 59/670-80 and had maintained himself for 8 years. Surkhâb was crowned Pâdshâh at Firrûm, which would suggest a return to the Karinid patrimony, but the suzerainty remained with the son of Farrughšâh Gilângâhî, Gil Gâwrârâh, who took the title of King of the Mountains (Farshwâdgar gâhrî; Ibn Isfandiyar, 97; Zahâr al-Din, 42).

It was not until 917/216 that Yaâdî b. al-Muḥallâb, strengthened by his success at Gûrûn, tried to annex Tabaristan also to the Umayyad empire, but he fell in his turn in an ambush (like Maṣâkâla b. Hubâyra in 54/674, Muhammad b. al-Āshâa in 55/675), and had to content himself with imposing a tribute sufficiently heavy for him to turn back against Dîrûdjan, which had revolted in his absence (al-Tabari, ii, 1320-1, 1327-9; al-Baladhuri, 336-8 etc.). Nevertheless, the inhabitants of Tabaristan revolted fresh under Hâshim (105-25/724-43) (al-Ya’qûbî, Taʾrîkh, ii, 381), then under Marwân ii (al-Baladhuri, 338; Ibn al-Fakhth, 308). The ʿAbbâsids were meanwhile recognized in the course of their rebellion (al-Tabari, ii, 2016; Ibn al-Fakhth, 275-7), and al-Mansûr himself succeeded in imposing on the local princes the payment of the tribute they had paid to the Sâsâni, following their complicity in the revolt of Sunbâhî in 137/755 (Ibn Isfandiyar, 118). The conquest of Tabaristan was achieved in the course of the years 142-3/759-60 and resulted in its annexation to the ʿAbbâsîd empire, which led to the installation of military garrisons in the mountainous regions, notably at Firrûm and at Khurramâbâd (Ibn Isfandiyar, 122-3). The Bâwandids profited from the disappearance of the Dâbâyids by taking the title of Padâsawshâr-gâhrî (Ibn Isfandiyar, 120), indicating by it their pre-eminent position in Kûhîstân. The local princes appear to have adapted themselves poorly to ʿAbbâsîd tutelage, and they revolted in 165/781, when the governor of Tabaristan tried to apply an increase in the taxes ratified by the jurist Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, arguing that Tabaristan had surrendered by force (Ibn Isfandiyar, 125). The inhabitants of Um-mildar-Kûh (to the South of Amûl) were some time the internal affairs of these principalties (Balîfamî, iii, 492-3; al-Tabari, i, 2659-60). But even these slight disputes (compared with the tribute paid to the Sâsâni; Ibn Isfandiyar, 118) were not to be discharged regularly or in full, judging by the evolution of the proportionate forces maintained by the central power and the local princes (al-Baladhuri, 337-8), for numerous expeditions were launched against these regions to restore the caliphal authority.

KARINIS, a local dynasty of Tabaristan, who reigned over a part of the mountainous regions from the age of Khusraw (Chosroes) I (531-79 A.D.) until 225/840.

Origins. The Karinids claimed descent from Kûrîn son of Sûhrâb, whose ancestor was none other than the legendary blacksmith Kâwâh [q.v.]. According to the Arab and Persian chronicles, Sûhrâb was the most powerful among the great men of the Sâsâni Empire at the time of Kâwâh I (488-531 A.D.), but the conflict of sources with which A. Christensen concerned himself in Le Rigne de Kâwâh I et le communisme mandate, 94-5, led him to ask himself whether Sûhrâb and his elder son Zarmîhr are not in reality one and the same person. The Karinids traced the origin of their power to the age of Khusraw I, who allegedly rewarded Zarmîhr and Kûrîn son of Sûhrâb for the help they brought him to repel an attack of the Turks (Ibn Isfandiyar, 93-5; Zahâr al-Din, 37). In fact, it is probably a case of a legend invented for the glory of Kûrîn, confused further with a name of the chief of the great noble family of Kûrîn (Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sasanides, 98-9). Kûrîn son of Sûhrâb received as a legend invented for the glory of Kûrîn, confused further with a name of the chief of the great noble family of Kûrîn (Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sasanides, 98-9). Kûrîn son of Sûhrâb received as a local dynasty of Tabaristan, Kûrîn son of Sûhrâb received as a local dynasty of Tabaristan, Kûrîn...
KARINIDS

Hurmuzd assured himself of the alliance of the other local princes (Sharwin the Bawandid in the Sharwin Mountains, Shahrwān Bawandī in the Bawandī Mountains, Masmūghān Walsāsh (the Zarmihrids?) at Miyāndūrūd near Sāryā, Wandād-Safān the Kārinīd in the Wandād-Safān Mountains to the west of Tabaristān), and proclaimed a revolt, which began with a massacre of the Muslims (Ibn Isf., 122-3). Exploiting the lie of the land, Wandād-Hurmuzd held the mountainous regions for several years (1255/785-5) and inflicted numerous defeats on the caliphal armies. Al-Mahdī had to organize four expeditions, each of growing importance, at the head of which he placed generals of ever-greater renown (Sālim al-Farghānī, the Amīr Fīrāšah, 'Umar b. al-ʿAllā'ī in 167/785, Taym b. Sinān, but in vain. He had to send the heir to the throne, al-Hādī, in person, accompanied by the general Yazīd b. Mazyād, to obtain the surrender of Wandād-Hurmuzd (Ibn Isf., 44-5 126-3; Zāhīr al-Dīn, 155-5; al-Tabārī, iii, 517-8, 551, 703; Ibn al-Fakhr, 304). The latter was imprisoned in Baghādād (al-Yaʿqūbī, Taṭrīkh, ii, 487), and his brother Wandād-Safān had sought his own destruction in executing a client of the caliph, Bahram b. Fīrāz, recently converted to Islam. Wandād-Hurmuzd was meanwhile freed after having promised to give up his brother to the caliph, but once in his mountains, he did nothing about it (Ibn Isf., 130-2; Zāhīr al-Dīn, 160). His hostility to Islam persisted as before (Ibn Isf., 140), and he profited by acquiring 1,000 giārīb of demesne lands in the environs of Sāryā that had been put up for sale (Ibn Isf., 131; Ibn Rusta, 150, tr. 173). Wandād-Safān continued his opposition to ‘Abbāsīd penetration by having executed ‘Alīyar b. Hārdūn, sent by the caliph in 127/831 to carry out again the cadastral survey (Ibn Isf., 141-2). These multiple acts of insubordination forced Ḥūrān al-Raṣḥīd, at the time of his move to Rayy in 189/805, to summon Wandād-Hurmuzd and to reaffirm solemnly the sovereignty of the caliphate and to exact guarantees of submission: Wandād-Hurmuzd had to join in paying tribute, to send troops in event of war, and at the same time was constrained to “set aside all the titles that he had used, including that of the caliph (the Maʾmūn lands) and to send his son Kārin as hostage to the court. In exchange, he was reinstated as “Ispahbadh of Kurāshān” (Ibn al-Fakhr, 304; al-Tabārī, iii, 705; al-Yaʿqūbī, Taṭrīkh, ii, 514; Ibn Isfandiyār, 44, 142-3). Despite the fame of the revolt of his grandson Mazyār, it seems to us that the personality and movement of Wandād-Hurmuzd merit more consideration on the part of historians, for he effected a coalition that only Ḥasan b. Zayd was able to recreate in 250/864, and opposed with success the attempts to repress his revolt, whereas Mazyār collapsed without fighting in 225/840.

Kārin was sent back to his father in 192/808 (al-Yaʿqūbī, ii, 520; Ibn Isf., 143). In the course of the struggle between al-ʿAllā’ī and al-Maʾmūn, “All b. Ṭāṣ b. Māḥān in 195/811 offered some presents to the “princes of Daylam, the mountains of Tabaristan and the neighbouring regions” and made them promise that he would cut the route from Khurāsān to Baghādād (which was dominated by the mountains of Tabaristan) and that he would hinder the arrival of reinforcements for Tāhir b. al-Husayn, commander of the troops of al-Maʾmūn. The local princes promised their help (al-Tabārī, iii, 820), but “All b. Ṭāṣ b. Māḥān then killed Mazyār in his mountains. According to the local historians, Wandād-Hurmuzd died in the time of al-Maʾmūn (198-218/813-33) after having reigned 50 years. His son Kārin succeeded him for 40 years (Ibn Isf., 144-5; Zāhīr al-Dīn, 321), but this information is certainly false, for, if one adds the 30 years of ʿAll b. Ṭāṣ b. Māḥān’s reign, we get 70 years, which is impossible. Apart from these sources attribute to Mazyār, one cannot see how these two princes could have reigned 40-30 years, when there were 27 years between the accession of al-Maʾmūn (in 198/813) and the execution of Mazyār (in 225/840). Besides, Ibn Isfandiyār (145-7) recounts the participation of Kārin in the campaign of al-Maʾmūn against the Byzantines (the first dating from 215/830), whilst this information contradicts himself in saying that Mazyār profited from this campaign to eliminate his adversaries.

The fact remains that Kārin lost his possessions bit by bit, following the attempts of his rival Shahrīyār to nibble them away. Then, when he succeeded his father, Mazyār found himself at the head of a diminished principality (Ibn Isfandiyār, 146). He even lost his possessions completely following a battle against Shahrīyār, who annexed his domains. Mazyār took refuge with his cousin Wandād-Ummīd, son of Wandād-Safān, but the latter was constrained to give him up to the Bawandid (Ibn Isfandiyār, 146-7). Whilst, according to Ibn Isfandiyār, Mazyār escaped from prison and made his way to Baghādād and to the caliph al-Maʾmūn (ibid., al-Tabārī (iii, 1019) attributes to the governor of Tabaristan, Ṭāḥīb al-Allābī b. Khurāshāb, the victory over Shahrīyār the Bawandid and the sending of Mazyār to al-Maʾmūn in 201/816-7 (then at Marw, since the Caliph did not return to Baghādād until 204/819; cf. Ibn al-ʿAthir, vi, 253; Balʿamī, ii, 518). Whatever may be the case, Mazyār had to become a convert to Islam and received the name of Abuʾl-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Kārin, with the title of “mawld of the Commander of the Faithful” (al-Tabārī, Taṭrīkh, ii, 150; al-Tabārī, iii, 1298; Ibn Isf., 147). He was afterwards named, in 207/822-3, co-governor of Tabaristān, Rūyān and Dunbawand with Mūsā b. Hafs, and charged specially with the control of the mountainous regions that he knew best (al-Tabārī, iii, 1066, 1096; Ibn Isf., 148). On his return to Tabaristān, Mazyār appears to have begun by eliminating the other local princes, both his own kinsmen, notably his brother Kūhyār (al-Tabārī, iii, 1295; al-Balāḏūrī, 339) and his nephew, Kārin, son of Shahrīyār (al-Tabārī, iii, 1283), as well as his rivals, the Bawandīs: ca. 210/ 825-6, he invaded the Sharwin Mountains, defeated Shāpur, son of Shahrīyār, and even had him executed on learning that he would become a convert to Islam and a “mawld of the Commander of the Faithful” like himself (al-Tabārī, iii, 1095; Ibn Isfandiyār, 148). He annexed the Sharwin Mountains and added the title of Malḵ al-Dībāl to his already pompous titulature: “Gīl-Gīlān, Ispahbadh of Kurāshān, Padishkhwargarshāh” (al-Yaʿqūbī, Buldān, 276, tr. 81), which is identical to that of Farruḵḥān Gīlānshāh at the time of the Arab conquest (cf. Balʿamī, iii, 493). These titles do not indicate any claim to Khurasān, in contradiction to what several historians have thought (Ażẓi, 186; Minovī, 24; Minorsky, in EI, art. Māzāyār), otherwise al-Maʾmūn would not have used this titulature in his correspondence with Mazyār (al-Tabārī, iii, 1298 gives the variant Ispahbadh/ Ispahbaḏlān).

This policy of concentrating power for his own sole profit is at the origin of the “treason” of his own kinsmen in 225/840, who saw in it the only means of their being restored as princes (al-Tabārī, iii, 1283, 1291, 1295).

Mūsā b. Hafs died in 211/826-7 and was replaced by his son Muḥammad (Ibn al-ʿAthīr, vi, 286), but
Mazyar seems not to have had a high opinion of him (Ibn Isf., 148). He sought to extend his control over the plains of Tabaristan with brutal methods, which alienated the Muslim population of the towns against him after already attracting the hostility of the local Zoroastrian landowners (Ibn Isf., 148-9). Complaints were then addressed to the Caliph, but Mazyar refused to go to Baghdad for fear of being removed from office on this occasion. On the insistence of al-Ma'mun, he sent the ādān of Amul and Ruyān to inform the Caliph of his actions. The ādān of Amul claimed that Mazyar had abjured the faith, but the Caliph did not believe this accusation (cf. al-Tabari, iii, 1270-1). Despite his ever more independent bearing (he called himself “ally” and no longer “client” of the Caliph; cf. al-Ya'qūbī, Ta'rīkh, ii, 582), al-Ma'mūn named him later as sole governor of Tabaristan (Ibn Isf., 150-1), and al-Mu'tasim confirmed him in his post in 218/833. Having also become a veritable petty king, with an administration modelled on the central power and a considerable personal strength (cf. al-Tabari, iii, 1292), he reached a new degree of insubordination in refusing to send his kharājī to the Tahirids of Khurāsān, to whom he was administratively subject. The Caliph agreed to spare him (probably against the advice of 'Abd Allāh b. Tāhir), and his agents received the kharājī from Mazyar at Hamadān and sent it on to the Tahirid agents (al-Tabari, iii, 1268).

According to a version of al-Tabari (iii, 1269), “Mazyar was also in correspondence with Bābak; he encouraged him (in his revolt) and proposed to help him”, but this sentence is perhaps truncated like the sentence on the stirring-up of the peasants (also 1269), whose correct reconstruction (1278-9) gives a completely different meaning. Let us note that there is no question anywhere else of any complicity of Mazyar with Bābak, although the rumours and accusations hurled against al-Afših are very numerous. Towards the beginning of 223/end of 837, there was planned an expedition of al-Afših against Mazyar, but only because of his tyranny and his insubordination (al-Tabari, iii, 1269-71; al-Baladhuri, 339; Ibn Isf., 159; Zahār al-Dīn, 167). The thesis of a vast “anti-Arab plot” fomented by Bābak, al-Afših, Mazyar and the Byzantine Emperor Theophilius at this period is only a fabrication made up by the historians (M. Minovi, 26; M. Azizi, 212, 304, etc.).

Feeling himself threatened also, Mazyar ordered the cadastral survey to be carried out again and the kharājī to be levied before the end of the month of Tir/August 838, and his agents surveyed in two months what had usually been surveyed in twelve months and in three sessions (al-Tabari, iii, 1270-2). Besides, the tension between Mazyar and the Tahirids worsened the more 'Abd Allāh b. Tāhir succeeded in setting the Caliph against this “tyrannical and insubordinate prince-governor”, the one who led him to rebel, revolt, refuse the kharājī and impose his ascendancy over the mountains of Tabaristan and its adjacent parts (al-Tabari, iii, 1269). Certain sources even assert that this insubordination was encouraged by al-Afših, who urged Mazyar to revolt (al-Tabari, 1269, 1305, etc.). It is undeniable that one meets with this accusation against the rival of the Tahirids, who had become ambitious after his victory over Bābak in 222/837 and over Theophilius in 223/838, it is not certain that it corresponds to reality, for as al-Ya’qūbī suggests (Ta’rīkh, ii, 583), Mazyar addressed himself in these terms to Mazyar: “...By God, your falsehood will not save you from death. Don’t perpetrate a falsehood to end your life”, then Mazyar regained his composure and protested that he was ready to fight. By God, he has not written to me or entered into correspondence with me.” The position of al-Afših is made clear by the sources: having heard of the conflict that set Mazyar in opposition against the Tahirids, he “hoped that this conflict would be at the root of the dismissal of ‘Abd Allāh b. Tāhir from the government of Khurāsān” (al-Tabari, iii, 1269), for “he believed that, if Mazyar revolted, he would hold out for a long time against ‘Abd Allāh b. Tāhir and would resist until all the Tahirids were driven out of the country, as al-Mu'tasim wasxr: it is possible that he wished to go to Turkestan, to which alerted the inhabitants of Sāriyā, Amul, Ruyān and western Tabaristan (al-Tabari, iii, 1274, 1278, 1283). He had the ramparts of Āmūl, Sāriyā and Tamšīla demolished, which alarmed ‘Abd Allāh b. Tāhir (Ibn Isf., 150-2; al-Tabari, iii, 1274-5). However, the inhabitants of Amul solicited the intervention of al-Mu'tasim, who decided finally to put an end to this prince-governor who had revolted (Ibn Isf., 153-4).

Tabaristan was surrounded on all sides by five armies sent by ‘Abd Allāh b. Tāhir (to the east and south-east) and al-Mu'tasim. Mazyar believed himself secure, for he had recalled his brother Kūhār, whom he had entrusted the defence of the Kārin Mountains (al-Tabari, iii, 1295), and his nephew Kārin b. Shahrīyār, charged with defending the Shārwin Mountains and the eastern chain as far as the Diūr-dān (al-Tabari, iii, 1283). As for the rest of the routes of entry into Tabaristan, his confidants Sarḵhastān and al-Durra had to prevent the entrance of troops, the first from Diūr-dān, the second from al-Rayy (al-Tabari, iii, 1295-6).

Seeing himself surrounded, Mazyar tried to disencumber himself of the prisoners by rousing al-ḥarakāt al-makhkārīn min bayn al-dāhākīn, but his manoeuvre miscarried (al-Tabari, iii, 1278-80 and not 1269, which has inspired more than one commentary of it as a social, agrarian, Mazdakite movement etc.). The collapse of Mazyar was quick; some soldiers of Sarḵhastān brought in some soldiers of al-Ḥasan b. al-Husayn with whom they had fraternized, and not Tamšīla was taken by surprise (al-Tabari, iii, 1278-80). Kārin b. Shahrīyār, when al-Afših addressed himself in these terms to Mazyar: “...By God, your falsehood will not save you from death. Don’t perpetrate a falsehood to end your life”, Two
brothers, Muhammad and Djacfar b. Rustam, rallied the soldiers of Ruyan and some fortresses of Kalân and Shâlân against their commandant, the brother of al-Durrî, who had surrendered to Muhammad b. Ibrâhîm (al-Ṭabarî, iii, 1299). Having learnt of these successes and the execution of Sarkhâstanî and al-Durrî, who had both tried to take flight, the inhabitants of Sâriya and of Marraw rebelled the same day, as did the inhabitants of al-Damlrî, Cairo 1356/1937, i, 233). Finally, with a third group the two animals blended into a famous
denoting primarily the Rhinocerotidae of karg.

It should be remembered that the more or less extravagant accounts about China, the east Indies and this Asiatic animal which were already known in Persia had been channelled through India or heard from the mouths of merchants. It was highly praised for the special virtues of its nasal spur, which was believed to be a horn. In fact, it is only an excrescence of the skin made of compressed hair and without any bony support. It was, therefore, in simple good faith that one of the ancient Greek doctors, Ctesias, who described the "white donkey", the unicorn (see PŁ), became the propagator of a fable which he had told to him. He had been in the service of Artaxerxes, the Emperor Domitian depicted them on his coins. An excellent picture of one is preserved in the celebrated Palestina mosaic. In Islam, with the arrival of the 'Abbasid dynasty, the term karkadan seems to have become synonymous with harîgh.

Because they live in the same habitat, the rhinoceros is often found in literature associated with the elephant (see PŁ). They are both known for their weight and prodigious strength, but the elephant, long subjugated to the use of man in the Indies and Persia, was familiar to all, while the fierce and sensitive one-horned beast (nahîd al-barn, from the Greek μονόκερος) was almost unknown in the Near East. In fact, it became the source of a group of fabulous legends which resulted in the myth of the Unicorn, not only in Islam but also in Christianity. Popular credulity soon served to place it among the fantastic animals, and the Emperor Domitian executed by the Daylami guards of Mazyar for his "treason" (al-Ṭabarî, iii, 1293-4). Tabaristân was then thereafter administered by the Tâhirîs (Ibn al-Hâkî, ii, 381, tr. 370). Bibliography: Sources: Apart from the chronicles of Ya'kûbî, Balâdhurî, and Tâbarî—whose information is taken up by the Kitâb al-Uyard: Historia Chalifatus al-Motacim, Leiden 1849—Miskawayh, Bâlâmî, Ibn al-Athîr, etc., one should note above all: Ibn Isfandiyar, Anltrie (summarized 1300 years after Photius, patriarch of Constantinople) in which he mentioned the "white donkey", the unicorn of the Indies (bāχîd karm), the name is taken up again by Aristotle (Hist. Anim., i, 118) and translated bîsîr hindî by al-Dâlahi (Hayaâmî, vii, 123).

From the description given by Ctesias arose the perpetual confusion on the part of most subsequent authors, whether Muslims or not, between two animals: the single-horned rhinoceros and the swift Antelope Cervicapre with straight spiralling horns. This animal took pride of place in Hindu mythology. The confusion was carried over into Arabic by cosmographers, naturalists and lexicographers with the terms harîgh and karkadan. With certain writers these terms denoted only the rhinoceros, and then with others only the Cervicapre (so al-Kawâlid and Abû Hüyâyân al-Tawhîdî—see the margin of al-Damlrî, Cairo 1356/1937, i, 233). Finally, with a third group the two animals blended into a famous
quadruped figure like that already presented in Greek by the Latin zoologist Aelian (De natura animalium, XVI, 20) under the hellenized Indian name of kṣatākṣōn or kṣatākṣōn. The Persian kargaddan can be recognized in this word, and some philologists would see the Sanskrit kariśājan (in the sense of “master of the wilderness”). By contrast the same Aelian speaks in another chapter (XVII, 44) of a pūνδεκαξ, “horned nose”, a formidable enemy of the elephant which he impales on his horn, but Aelian makes no comparison with the previously described “monoceros”. Later, Pline the Elder and then Julius Solinus (Polykístería, tr. A. Golden, 1387) augmented the unicorn’s monstrosity by giving him a horse’s body, elephant’s feet, swine’s tail, a deer’s head and a long slender horn, with a terrifying appearance, in the middle of the forehead.

In the end, the animal became the terror of man and every beast in his vicinity fled “a hundred parasangs away”. Such an animal had been supposedly produced by the crossing of an elephant with a mare, and it was the only horned soliped. It was famed for the speed of its running. According to the sources, the fertile female of the species carried its young from three to seven years, and the young acquired all its teeth in the first year so that it could push its head from its mother’s womb and browse on the foliage in passing. As soon as it was born, it ran away swiftly to escape the licking of its mother’s tongue which bristled with prickles, and this formidable lancing was one of the “Chinese tortures” inflicted on condemned men.

The karkaddan could live 700 years, but was not able to reproduce until the age of 50. Its impenetrable leathery skin was used by the Chinese to cover their breastplates, yet the monster was moved by the cooing of a turtle dove, whose company it sought. Similarly, it would dart to the side of a young virgin in the jungle, and is found in every region of India; the horns which come from these beasts are very beautiful. In the horn there may happen to be the picture of a man, a peacock, a fish or even other pictures. The Chinese make belts of these and the price of them in China reaches 2,000-3,000 dinars or more according to the beauty of the picture.” The Chronicle further adds that there were imported into China “ivory, incense, copper ingots, sea shell ... and this vičkān which I have described and which is the rhinoceros”.

The reason for the fame in China of the rhinoceros horn, itself called kargišāhr, kṣiti, kharatū, and khusū (see Ibn al-Afsfān, Nihkhab al-dakhkā'il, in Machriq, xi (1908), 764 f.), which is given here, is not the only one. Indeed, the alchemists and magicians of antiquity in Ethiopia as well as in the Indies had noticed a chemical reaction, in that this organic matter swollen when brought into contact with certain poisonous substances. This property immediately aroused the interest of eminent persons. Those who were ceaselessly exposed to intrigues and plots saw in this the “touchstone” to reveal poisoned drinks and dishes. The Chinese and Abyssinian princes then became accustomed to fashioning bowls, goblets and even the handles of knives from it, imagining that they would thus protect themselves from the treacherous intentions of their enemies. To plunge again into the realm of the fabulous, it was but a short step for the therapists from the idea of a poison test to that of an aphrodisiac and from there they did not hesitate to attribute exceptional properties to the horn, whole or pulverized. From east to west it was presented as a panacea which was sought after at great expense.

The one who possessed this sovereign remedy was protected from the evil eye and spells; he escaped all accidents, including his horse falling; mere contact with its horn instantly cured colic and sciatica, and enabled physicians to substitute products, introducing not only unicornum verum but also unicornum falsum to the drug market. For most of the time, both of them were in fact no more than the long tooth on the spur of the narwhal (Monodon monoceros) parish al-bafyr, the tusks of the walrus (fīl al-bahar, faqis) or even those of the mammoth exhumed from the Siberian soil. All this ivory would arrive from the far north by the fur-traders’ route; Bulghār [q.v.] was one of the chief exchange centres. The true rhinoceros horn actually reached China by caravans from the kingdom of Assam (Kāmartisa), or by Muslim coasters which obtained it from the ports of the Irrawadi delta, from the gulf of Siam (Kirdaṣdi), in Cambodia, Cchampa (Annam), Malaya [see Bahr al-Hind] and in the Red Sea from Ethiopia. Considering the fact that the traffic was so intense, if there had not been some falsification in the rhinoceros horn trade, this not very prolific animal would certainly have totally disappeared from all the countries which knew it for many centuries, as is the case in Borneo. A census of 1937 showed that only 70 were recorded in the whole of Malaya.

In the west, confusion persisted until the 12th/13th century about the identity of the one-horned beast/unicorn and this confusion had been reinforced by the way the Septuagint translators in their transla-
tion of the Bible into Greek had translated the Hebrew term *re'em*. The term occurs seven times in the Bible, three in the Psalms of David, and designates a fierce and dangerous desert animal they rendered as *monohoros*, after hesitation, without any other precise details. The Latin Vulgate took over the name as *unicornus* and so established the unicorn in vulgar Latin.

Meanwhile, there were some clear minds on the Arab side who could present all those extravagant ideas about the position of the *karkaddan-harîsh*; they were certain that they recognized in this term the true pachyderm, the Asian species as well as the African. Among these was the geographer al-Ya’qîbî (Buldân, tr. G. Wiet, Cairo 1937, 191). Of course, al-Dîjâfî himself does not allow himself to tell stories about the animal, and he denounces the ridiculous credulity of the scholars of his time on this subject (Hayyându, vii, 124); but he was not able to draw the parallel between the *kimâr hindî* of Aristotle and the *karkaddan-harîsh*. His suggestion about the route followed by the horn-traders is particularly imaginative (op. cit., vii, 129). According to him, it arrived by caravans in Bâdîgh and left again by sea from Bâṣra for China. Unfortunately, he does not say from where it came, and so it is not clear whether he is drawn from India or Abyssinia or the false horn from Lapland.

Two centuries later the naturalist and Christian doctor ‘Ubayd Allâb b. Dîjâfî Ibn Bukištîshû [see suvrirîf], a polyglot like his ancestors, removed all ambiguity by affirming that "... the *karkand* is the animal which the Arabs call *barîsh* and the Armenians *rimirîm ..." (in *Ṭbd al-dîjamân*, ms. Dîr al-kutub, Cairo). It must be made clear that the Biblical *rimirîm* has no connexion with the white gazelle (*Gazella leptoceros*) to which the Arabs later gave this name [see *GAZÂL*]. With these far-sighted authors can be included other "debunkers" of the fabulous one-horned beast, invented by some traveler-explorers who had encountered the rhinoceros in the course of their wanderings in Asia. Among the Christians there was Marco Polo, who saw the pachyderm in Sumatra in 1291 and who gave an accurate description of it, though slightly permeated with disappointment (Description du Monde, French version by L. Hambis, Paris 1955, 243). Ca. 40 years later the Muslims had the evidence of the Moroccan Ibn Bâṭûṭa [q.v.], who had had the opportunity of observing the beast three times in the Punjab in 1341/1333 (Riba, Cairo 1346/1928, ii, 4). He was impressed by the size of its head and quotes the local saying that "the *karkaddan* is all head!" Mounted on an elephant, he even had to take part in a hunt, together with the Sultan of that place, and he was able to see the rhinoceros brought down and the trophy with its horn displayed in the prince's encampment. But the traveler does not say whether or not he tasted the flesh of the animal, as did the writer of the Chronicle...

As the legends surrounding the *karkaddan* were gradually forgotten, the question of the permissibility of eating its flesh no longer met with any objection, for the animal was recognized as an herbivore. But in the Middle Ages, in an atmosphere charged with the miraculous, certain strict legal writers were able to envisage a prohibition on its consumption if it could be shown that the beast resulted from the cross-breeding of a mare and an elephant. The question has been resolved in time with more exact knowledge of the pachydermata. In our own time, in Islam as elsewhere, the rhinoceros is no longer regarded as a curiosity except in a zoo, and there are only but a few small Muslim tribes in black Africa who hunt it as meat.


**Iconography.** In the plastic arts of Islam, the rhinoceros has not aroused the interest accorded to many other better-known animals, especially the elephant [see §11]. Without the legends and the wonderment provoked by its nasal exsiccence the *karkaddan* would have remained completely unknown to Muslim artists in Arab countries, and so it is rather in the works of Persian, Moghul and Indian artists that attempts to depict the formidable pachyderm are to be found.

Arab painting itself seems to have been limited to imaginary interpretations of the fabled one-horned beast without defining it in any greater detail than the unicorn was defined in Christian iconography. It can be found depicted in the most varied of guises—antelope, equida, bovida, feline and, above all, as a true camel; this last is perhaps due to a linguistic type of confusion arising from the similarity of spelling in Pahlavi of *gurg* (= "wolf") and *karg* (= "rhinoceros"). The "Histories" of Gughtâş and Isfandiyâr, as well as the accounts of Iskandar and Bahrâm [q.v.], give examples of word plays between *sutsur* (= "large"), *butsur* (= "big"), *gurg* (= "wolf"), *tarq* (= "helmet"), *tagarg* (= "hailstone"), *marg* (= "death") and *karg* (= "rhinoceros") which are perhaps due to a linguistics type of confusion. Further, these four creatures are believed to have succeeded in the exploit of killing a *karg* (= *karkaddan*), an exploit to be compared with one of the twelve tasks of Hercules (see W. Ley, op. cit., 19). The rhinoceros can be discovered in very rare *ṭfrâkî* manuscripts of the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries included among the monsters and the fantastic animals. These are illustrated and describe various types of beast and cosmography like those of al-Karîmî (*Aḏābī*, in ms. B.N. Paris, no. 2775, 682/1283; ms. Bayer. Staatsbibl. Munich, C, Ar. 454, 678/1280; ms. Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, no. 5451, ca. 782/1380; of Ibn Bukhîštîshû [Manâfîs] al-hayâwân, ms. Pierpont Morgan Libri, New York, no. 500, ca. 694/1295; of the anonymous Na‘î al-hayâwân (ms. Brit. Mus., no. OR. 2784); of Ibn Durâyhim, al-Mawṣîli (Manâfîs al-hayâwân, ms. Eusclial, Madrid, no. Ar. 898, dated 755/1354; see E. de Lorey, Le Bestiaire de l'Eccrusial, in Gazette des Beaux Arts, xiv (1935), 1-21; of al-Dîjâfî (al-hayâwân, ms. unich. Bibl. Ambros., Milan, no. Ar. A.F.D. 140; see C. J. Lamm and O. Lödgren, Ambro- sian fragments of an illuminated manuscript containing the Zoology of al-Ghîshî, in Unv. Ars., Uppsala 1940); and of Ibn Ḫânim al-Mawṣîli (Kashf al-asrâr, ms. unich., Sûleymaniye, Istanbul, Kara Ismail 565).

With the initiative of the non-Arabic styles from the second half of the 7th/11th century, and with the Persian schools which followed them up to the
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12th/18th century, pictorial art took on a much more realistic approach in its treatment of animal subjects. In it the rhinoceros again became simply a large game animal, a trophy which every prince would like in his bag and which he tracked from high up on his elephant, rounding them up in great droves like the Sasanid monarchs. The Bābur Nāma [q.v.] in its Persian translation of the 10th/16th century by ‘Abd Rahim Khān (ms. Brit. Mus., no. Or. 3774, fol. 352; see pl.), pl. XXIII, and S. I. Tulajev, Miniatures from a 16th century manuscript: Bābur Nāmah, in Marg, xi (1958), 45-8), offers a typical example of a return to the more accurate forms of the animal (see Eletr M. Riaz, Birds and animals in Mughal painting, in Bull. Coll. Arts, Baghdad Univ., i (1939), 12-18). The miraculous element has remained and it is a very commonplace animal, worthy of popular imagery, in what can be made out to be the rhinoceros in certain miniatures of the 10th/16th century, like the one which H. R. d’Allemagne has reproduced on the frontispiece of his fine work on Persia (Du Khorassan au pays des Bachtiaris, Paris 1931). He has taken it from a Persian manuscript (Collect. Vervey), and it represents the animals coming in a delegation up to the mullah Dījamī [q.v.] to complain of their ill treatment at the hands of the winds which blew the elephant which has rather the profile of a bear. But it is interesting that the miniaturist has dressed it with the same elaborate ornaments as its noble neighbour, wishing thus to put them both on an equal footing and giving the impression that the karkaddan too was in the service of man. Also distinctly ingenue are the animal figures illustrating a copy of the Cosmography of Shāhīz Abū Ahmad Mihrī (Kāndūn al-dunyā, wa‘āḍārū bi-kāndūn, ms. Bibl. Musée Topkapı Sarayi, Istanbul, Revan 1385, 570[1565]) as are those of a copy of al-Kazwīnī’s ʿAḍār al-dīn, ms. Bayer. Staatsbibl., Munich, no. C. Ar. 463, of the 12th/18th century), both designed for the intellectual curiosity of a very wide public.

Apart from the miniatures, the rhinoceros appears in the animal compositions of great woolen Indian carpets woven in the 18th century and intended seemingly to decorate the mosques and palaces of the great Mughals. The technique is Persian, but the motif is typically Indian, like the fragment preserved with arable beds on the larger island. There are numerous banks it is possible to reach the south and south-east of the islands only by the "holes" (bahrīa—light depressions of 3-4 metres surrounded for several feet by shallows) and by the "wādīs". These under-water wādīs are vast depressions hollowed out in the middle of the sandbanks; they can be from 5-12 m. deep and as much as 20-30 m. wide. These wādīs never occur just on the coast and are all south of the islands or on the southern slope of a bank; they have been formed by swell currents and are maintained by the interplay of the ebb and the flow. An incoming wave is partially absorbed by the sand and it goes out again in "a little river in the shape of a hair". This then develops into a large wādī of which one or the other branch merges into a hole where the current carries away the silt.

The islands are of great height and the highest points of these little pieces of land, which hardly rise from the sea, scarcely exceed 13 m. But the "land" of the Kerkenians is not restricted to the 36 km. on which their archipelago is stretched, from the marabout of Sidī Yūsuf (Mellita) to Bord Inf al-Rahlk or to the little island of Roumedia. Their "land" also includes the many banks which surround the archipelago where they have "sown" their fisheries. Their maritime life is largely governed by the underwater geography.

The archipelago is supported by an immense underwater shelf which extends from Ras Kapoudia (La Chebba) in the north to the Maharet parallel in the south. It is partially separated from the "Channel of Kerkenah" where the depth of the water is almost 20 m. Otherwise, to find depths of 10 m. it is necessary to go up to 40 miles north of the archipelago. The depth of the water around these islands varies from zero to 5 m. with long, inshore stretches of one metre. Al-Bakrī (Descrip. de l’Afr. Sept., 51) remarked: "In the sea around Sfax there is an island called Karkina, which occupies the centre of El-Casir. It is situated ten miles from Sfax beyond a sea which is dead and not very deep, and the surface of which is never rough." El-Casir here denotes the broad sandbanks, and because of these numerous banks it is possible to reach the south and south-east of the islands only by the "holes".”

**Bibliography:** Apart from the references cited in the text, see Collection Les Trésors de l’Asie, ed. Skira, Geneva 1962, with (a) E. Ettinghausen, La peinture orientale, persane et indienne; (b) M. Bussagli, La peinture de l’Asie centrale; and (c) D. Barrett and B. Gray, La peinture indienne.

(F. Viré)
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stock and for watering the ground and most of these
give brackish water. Before the sinking of an artisan
golden well in 1953, the Kerkenians used cisterns for their
drinking water.

History. The Greek authors scarcely mention
Cercina (Herodotus, Hist., IV, 195; Agathemerus,
Hydropotamia, V.21,22; Diodorus Siculus, Bibl. Hist.,
V.12,4; Plutarch, Parallel Lives, Dion, 25, Marius, 40;
that at the time of the second Punic War the consul
Cn. Serv. Germanus landed at Cercina (217 B.C.) after
he had ravaged Menynx (Djerba), and spared it only
on the payment of a ransom of 10 talents of silver.

There are numerous details in Latin writers. In 195
B.C. while trying to flee towards Antioch from Syria
to escape from the Romans, Hannibal took refuge at
Cercina. But fearing lest he be followed by the boat-
owners from the port, he had tents pitched for him-
self and his retinue, using yards and sails. He offered
his hosts a sumptuous feast and leaving them to enjoy
their libations seized the opportunity to flee (T. Livy,
Hist. Rom., bk. XXXIII, ch. 48). In 88 B.C. Marius and
his son took refuge there in a fishing boat. At the time
of the civil wars between Pompey and Caesar, Sallust
resolved the order to take revenge with his vessels on
the island of Cercina for "the republicans had laid up
some provisions there". (Bell. Afr., VIII, 2, 3 and
XXXIV, 1-3). Towards the beginning of the Christian
era, as a punishment for his culpable relationship
with the daughter of Augustus, C. Sempr. Gracchus
was sentenced to be deported there for fourteen years
and he was executed in the year 15 (Tacitus, Ann., I,
53 and IV, 3). Under Diocletian the archipelago paid
allegiance to Byzantium under the supervision of official-
s living in Hadrumete (Sousse). There were two
cities there; Cercina on the larger island and Cercinits
on the little island of Mellita, of which there still
some remains on the northern coast. A type of Chris-
tianity seems to have developed there (Notic. episc.
Byz., 47), for ruins of Christian sanctuaries have been
brought to light.

No more mention is made of the archipelago until
the 5th/11th century. In 491/908 it was in the hands of
the Zirids (that is to say, greater Karkan, for
Mellita was used for pasture by the Sfaxians who
sent their animals there (Yakut, IV, 66-7). For the
period from 1158 he had to face a revolutionary move-
ment. The Kerkenians could not resist; their
subservience in a limited economic pattern
and at village level there was a strong social cohesion.
Kankan life. As islanders the Kerkenians seek
their subsistence and find their livelihood primarily
from the sea. Isolated by the shallows which encircle
the archipelago, these sea-folk try to take full advan-
tage of them by erecting barrages to catch fish and
establish fishing grounds (gâbh farna) there. The palm
tree is very extensive on the archipelago, and its
branches mark the paths in the fishing grounds and
serve as hurdles in the fishing traps. They hang up
their nets (drina) on the projecting points of
the trunk. As lagoon fishermen, they also know how to
take advantage of the natural habits of the fish like
the flying mullet. To kill it they use the water falling
from a simple channel (ammadât al-baw) which is
discharged into the sea in the direction of the flow.
Overpopulation necessarily drove the workers more
and more to the sea. A man by purchase or by hiring
would lay claim to an area for fishing, such as the
very smallest part of a sandbank, where it was possi-
bile to establish a fishing ground, set bait for the
octopus or gather sponges.

The shallows extend very far out to sea. To travel
among them the Kerkenians have devised a boat, the
lât, which is broad and without a keel and therefore
well adapted to the contours of the sea-bed. They use
it for going to sell their fishing produce on the coast
and for going even far as Greece to deliver and trade
of Ahû Fâris, there were in 1423 fresh sightings of the
men of Aragon. The Kerkenians could not resist; their
population was decimated and a great number were
taken prisoner—3,450 to judge from the Fragment,
Hist. Siculae, (cols. 1995-6). In 1520 the archipelago
became the bone of contention between the Turks and
the Spaniards, and Peter of Navarre led an unfor-
tunate expedition there against an island which he
found almost empty, "with a few poor Berber ham-
lets" (Marmol, l’Afrique, 5-7:8). For a time it became
a vassal to the Spanish, but it was taken again by the
Turks in 1560. It had to suffer a new Spanish inva-
sion in 1576 in which 1,000 Kerkenians were taken
captive, and 15,000 sheep were carried off. Other
raids occurred in 1596 and 1611.

The people who remained in the seven villages
mentioned by the Relación anónima de los mercos y
servicios de D. Alvaro Basan (1576) "live on the pro-
duce of the palms and by fishing, raising numerous
sheep, weaving wool and growing vines, figs and
olives".

The Karkan islands were gradually repopulated.
One account from the beginning of the 19th century
mentions ten villages on the larger island and the
small town of Mellita on the smaller one. The suc-
cessive influx of inhabitants was founded on certain
origins. Many came from eastern Tunisia, a few mara-
bout families must have been of southern Moroccan
origin, others came from little Siret (Djerba, Zuwa-
gha), but the houses, clothing customs and language
all point especially to a sub-Saharan influence. The
case of Mellita must be examined separately, because
this island was only recently populated by people
from bâd el-arâb, from semi-nomadic regions of the
Sahelian or the Sfaxian hinterland. While the inhabit-
ants of greater Karkan pronounce their words like
city dwellers, those of Mellita have a bedouin type of
speech.

The population of the archipelago scarcely exceeds
13,000 inhabitants, but more than 25,000 live on the
mainland. Kerkenian emigration is beginning to de-
velop since Karkan is no longer isolated. Indeed, for
a long time now, the inhabitants were forced by isolation
to be self-sufficient within a limited economic pattern
and at village level there was a strong social cohesion.
Karkan life. As islanders the Kerkenians seek
their subsistence and find their livelihood primarily
from the sea. Isolated by the shallows which encircle
the archipelago, these sea-folk try to take full advan-
tage of them by erecting barrages to catch fish and
establish fishing grounds (gâbh farna) there. The palm
tree is very extensive on the archipelago, and its
branches mark the paths in the fishing grounds and
serve as hurdles in the fishing traps. They hang up
their nets (drina) on the projecting points of
the trunk. As lagoon fishermen, they also know how to
take advantage of the natural habits of the fish like
the flying mullet. To kill it they use the water falling
from a simple channel (ammadât al-baw) which is
discharged into the sea in the direction of the flow.
Overpopulation necessarily drove the workers more
and more to the sea. A man by purchase or by hiring
would lay claim to an area for fishing, such as the
very smallest part of a sandbank, where it was possi-
bile to establish a fishing ground, set bait for the
octopus or gather sponges.

The shallows extend very far out to sea. To travel
among them the Kerkenians have devised a boat, the
lât, which is broad and without a keel and therefore
well adapted to the contours of the sea-bed. They use
it for going to sell their fishing produce on the coast
and for going even far as Greece to deliver and trade
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in dried octopus. Renowned as sailors, they have tackled the business of transporting goods from port to port along the coasts and they have crossed the sea as far as the Orient on board their two-sailed santel, which is well suited to them.

The coastal trading with the stops made on land gives them the opportunity to learn new techniques here and there and to bring back working materials, together with a useful replenishment of supplies. They obtain esparto (baulla mahbiba) in this way, and to gather it they have to cross Sahelian hinterland or the gulf of the lesser Syrte.

The Kerkenian sea is not really sufficient to guarantee a food supply, so they have to look for complementary activities in the limited agriculture the archipelago permits or as craftsmen. They use everything from the palm-tree: the fibres of the trunk, the tigelies, the palm branches and the stem. Taking advantage of the magnificent retting bed for the esparto offered by the shallows, they undertake there the twisting of alfa for ropes or for plaiting baskets and camel panniers.

The day comes when the islander's ease of adjustment to difficult circumstances, his connexions with the coast, his success in his studies—Karkana benefits from an exceptional percentage of children attending school—gives him the chance to emigrate, and then he will leave the archipelago, but not without leaving some of his family there. Doing seasonal activities or employment in the fishing or shipping companies, being a minor civil servant in the large towns, holding important management posts—almost 30,000 Kerkenians live in this way in Sfax, Sousse, La Goulette, Tunis, outside the archipelago to which faithfully they love to return: "yâ karfrna, yâ karfrdra", "You Karkana, you always bring back your children to yourself".

Bibliography: A very rich bibliography has appeared in A. Louis, Les îles Kerkhona (Tunisie), étude d'ethnographie tunisienne et de géographie humaine, Tunis 1961-3, 3 vols.; see also A. Louis, Documents ethnographiques et linguistiques sur les îles Kerkhena, Textes en arabe dialectal avec trad., commentaire et glossaire, Algiers 1961-2.


AL-KARKH [see BISBARAY].

AL-KARKH, a loan word from Aramaic karka meaning "fortified city", "city" (Fraenkel, Fremdwörter, xx; Pauly-Wissowa, iv, 2122, 2124; Supplément, i, 275, 285). In Islamic times, the word is associated with various towns. With the Aramaic culture before the Islamic conquest, such towns are distinguished from one another by adding the name of their geographic location, e.g., Karkh Baghdād, Karkh Sāmarrā (cf. Yākūt, Muṣṭafarīk, 368-70; Muṣ'īram, iv, 252-7).

In Baghdād, al-Karkh refers to a specific area (Bāb al-Karkh) and more generally to the whole of the west side below the Round City of Caliph al-Mansūr, the founder of Islamic Baghdad (cf. 1ṣtafāk, 84; also Ibn Hawkal. ed. Kramers, 241-2). According to Ya'qūbī, whose account reflects conditions of the 2nd/8th century, the limits of al-Karkh in length were Kašr Waddāb (north) and the Tuesday Market (south). The limits in width were the flef of al-Rabī' (west) and the Tigris (Buldān, 246; see Le Strange, Baghdad, Maps III, IV and VII).

As the Aramaic name shows, the al-Karkh quarter was already in existence before the foundation of Baghdād by al-Mansūr (145/762), as a small independent township said to have been founded by the Sassanid Šāpūr II (309-379 A.D.), and which like the other earlier settlements on the site of the future capital of the caliphs was no doubt mainly inhabited by Aramaic Christians.

Before the building of the city of al-Mansūr, the old market of the west side (Sūk Baghdād) was situated at al-Karkh, and there is reason to believe that the Karkh markets continued to service the large population of that area when the Round City was built (Tabari, ii, 910, 914). Towards the end of his reign, in 157/774 al-Mansūr decided to redevelop the commercial districts to the south of the Round City and re-locate certain markets that had been situated there. To this end government funds were allocated to various entrepreneurs to build their own establishments in al-Karkh. The government on its part also widened the network of roads leading in and out of the suburb (Kaštīl al-Baghdādi, Cairo, i, 79-82; Tabari, Annales, iii, 323-4; Ya'qūbī, Buldān, 241).

Al-Karkh was watered by the Nahr 'Isā, the most northerly large canal of the Euphrates in Irāk, as well as by its branches, the Šarāt and the Karkhāyā. The latter is the "Karkhānī Canal" which left the Nahr 'Isā below the small town of al-Mubahwall near the village of al-Barāṯā (see Yākūt, i, 665) and supplied the southern part of the western half of Baghdād, i.e., the mercantile quarter and its neighbourhood, with its branch channels, which in places ran underground. Numerous bridges carried the busy traffic over it. On the Karkhāyā and its canal system see Ibn Serapion, ed. Le Strange in JRAM (1895), 17-26, 286-8, 292-3; Suhārī, ʿAḏḏāʾīb, ed. von Mīlāk, 123-4; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi, Cairo, i, 79-82; Yākūt, ii, 252; Streek, Babylonien, 85-90; Le Strange, Baghdad, 52-56, 63-80; Herzfeld in Sarre-Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise, ii, 170. What made al-Karkh commercially advantageous was this intricate network of canals, the most important of which was the Šarāt, a waterway large enough to allow for the passage of deep boats, and which connected the Euphrates and the Tigris, the major river systems of Irāk.

The suburb, which had its own Friday mosque, was probably considered a municipal entity unto itself, one of several urban aggregations which made up the general metropolitan environment (J. Lasner, in JESHO, x, 53-63). Detailed descriptions of the various locations in al-Karkh are preserved by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi, Ya'qūbī, and the unedited Masḥīḥd Ms. of Ibn al-Fakhlī, K. al-Buldān. The most systematic
presentation is that of Suhrab, AʿdHb = Ibn Sera-
pion, which is arranged according to ... during
which the river receives its name of Karkha; in this
region around Bisutun it is swelled by the Shadiu,

Under the Buyids, who had ʿAlid sympathies, the 
already frequent encounters and frictions between 
the Sunnis and Shiʿis of the capital became more and 
more serious. Bloody street fighting between the two 
hostile sects, often accompanied by pillaging and 
incendiarity, was the order of the day. Al-Karkh 
was usually in the very centre of this civil strife; 
itself inhabitants always at daggers drawn with 
the Sunnis of the adjoining quarters (Bāb al-Asrār, etc.). Djalāl al-Dawla (416-35/1024-44), under whom 
the situation had become usually serious, was even 
on one occasion, in 422/1031, reduced to take refuge 
with his Shiʿi co-religionists in al-Karkh. In 443/1053 
a considerable part of this area was laid in ashes 
as a result of these feuds. A great fire had previously 
devastated al-Karkh under the Caliph al-Wathik (227/ 
842-232/847), but the destruction was very soon made 
good. Al-Khatib al-Baghdādī (5th/11th century) ob-
erves that much of the canal system had become 
silted up in his time and no trace of them can be 
found today. By the modern period, this once great 
urban area had been reduced to a truncated section 
along the river bank.

In course of time, numerous mosques and tombs 
arose in the area of al-Karkh in the wider sense, 
by which the whole southern half of Bagh-dād west of 
the Tigris was often meant. The most celebrated is 
the tomb-mosque of the local saint Muʿāṣir b. al-Fay-
zurān al-Karkhī (d. 200/816) and the alleged tomb 
of Nihawand of a certain number of watercourses:

Unlike Karkh, Baghdad which was entirely a com-
mercial district, and was the only area of Bagh-
dād that was entirely devoid of a military colony, 
Karkh Sāmarrā was a military cantonment housing some 
of the caliph's Turkish guard under the command of 

Moreover, the Turkish forces were isolated from 
the general populace. They were permitted to 
marry only women chosen for them, and no com-
mercial establishments other than a distributive out-
let for foodstuffs was to be found there. With the 
decline of Sāmarrā many areas were abandoned, but 
al-Karkh continued to be occupied.
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Caliphathe, Oxford 1900, indices; idem, Lands of the 
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Massignon, Mission en Mesopotamie, Paris 1912, 
i, 49, 99, 108; F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, Archäolo-
geische Reise im Euphrat und Tigrisgebiet, ii, Berlin 

KARKHA (KARKHA), a river in Luristan and 
Khwāzistān, whose source lies in the region of Nīhā-
wand. Its upper and middle course is strictly a 
tributary of the mountain system of the Zagros, 
where the valleys run in the same direction as the 
chains, the watercourses passing at times from one to 
the other by short transverse gorges. From which 
results the uncertainty over nomenclature, the rivers 
changing name with the divided regions that they 
traverse. The Karkha is made up of the union in the region of Nīhāwand of a certain number of watercourses: Čaşm-i Kāṭim, Sura Kunč, Kar Sara, Āb-i Kulan 
and Sirwān Rūd. On the first part of its course in 
a north-west direction the river bears the name of 
Gamasāb or Gamasāyāb (corrupted toGarasayāb).

Then begins the crossing of some of the folds of 
the Zagros in a general south-west direction, during 
which the river receives its name of Karkha; in this 
region around Bisutūn it is swelled by the Şābdīn,
which itself receives the Kangarshah, then by the Kara §u from Kirmanshahan and finally by the Karind. Then striking the chain of the Kabîr Kûh, the river turns towards the south-east, taking the name of Ábî Şaymara and receiving its first important tributary from the left bank, the Kashgan, swelled itself by the Maydan, the Khorramâbâd and the Kûlûk. On the right bank it is joined by the Lay- lum and the Ábî Zâl.

After the confluence with this last, the river, having become the Karkha again, begins its lower course towards the south, its powerful alluvia contributing, with those of the Kârûn, to the obstruction of the Tigris’s course. All this region constitutes a genuine delta formed by the confluence of the Karkha, the Kârûn and the Ábî Diz. As soon as the Karkha reaches the region of Pâl-I Kul, the canals begin which link it to the Ábî Diz and its tributaries, such as the Nahr Tabal Kûhl and the Nahr Daghdari. The ruins of Susa lie on one of its eastern branches, which later takes the name of Sha’ar. The Karkha ends in the region situated to the south of Nahr Hâshîm, where it receives the Sha’tâl-Al-Dîâmûz, but one of its branches, thrown back towards the north-west by the thrust of the alluvia of the Kârûn, continues as far as the region of Sinângîrd and the marshes of the Hor al-Hawza (al-Æuyawa).

In antiquity, the river, called El-Câospas, a tributary of the Tigris on the left bank, whose waters were so pure that they alone had the honour of being drank at the table of the kings of Persia. The Arab geographers refer to it without giving it a particular name, except, on occasion, that of “river of Susiana” (nahr al-Sas). Ibn Khurraídahîbîh locates its source in the district of Dînawar and makes it a tributary of the Dûdjîl (Kûrdîn). Al-Ya’kûbî, while recapitulating this last source, makes the river rise in the region of Hamadîn and gives it the name of Hinduwân. Ibn Rusta speaks of a great river running at the foot of Mt. Bîhistûn (Bisûtûn), with an important source driving five mills. On the two banks in the region of Nîhâwand a black sealing-clay of excellent quality was extracted, according to Ibn al-Fâkhî. On the map of Al-Îsçâd-ibn al-Hawkal, the Nahr al-Ábî Diz marked as waterfalls, the town of Susa and finishing near a watercourse (or canal), the Nahr Tûr; in the riverbed lies the tomb of the Prophet Daniel, an object of veneration and procession on the part of the People of the Book, particularly during the periods of dryness. Al-Muqaddasî, also speaking of the tomb, refers, with regard to the town of Basînna, to a river called Tigris (Dîjhîl), which is without doubt the Karkha; the river in question ran within a bowshot of the town and drove seven mills up on some boats. As for the “Hûdûd al-Álam”, it tells us that the river of Shûh rises in the “environ of Karkha on one of the spurs of the mountains of al-Dîjâbîl” and then runs towards the regions of Shûhâr (Tustar) and Shûhî (Susa) which it irrigates; however, before reaching the boundaries of the land of Basînna (Basînna), this irrigation exhausts completely the waters of the river.

As a final note the bridge situated between al-Šaymara (Šâymerè) and al-Îrâbân (cf. Yâkûtî, iii, 439, Schwarz, op. cit., iv, 472), considered as a masterpiece of construction, may well correspond to the Puli Khusraw on the Karkha.


(P. SCHWARZ-A. MIQUEL)

AL-KARKHI [see AL-KARKH]

KARKISIYA (also KARKISYA), a town in al-Dîjâzar on the left bank of the Euphrates, close to the confluence of the Khbûr, a little above 35° N. Lat. Karkisiya is simply an Arabic reproduction of the Graeco-Roman name (τὸ) Κηρκίσιον, (τὸ) Κηρκίσιον πόλις or Κηρκίσιον (Κηρκίσιος in the Notit. episcop., ed. Parthey, 87). Circesium, Syriac Kerkusio, Latin = castrum Circense, “the castle with the circus”; cf. Noldeke, op. cit. (see Bibl.), p. 3. Hamza al-İsfâhânî in Ḥa[dî]bînî, iv, 65, ii, 21 ff., still knew the etymology of the place-name (Karkesiya, arabicised from Kirkisiya, from kirkis = Ar. kalba, hippodrome). The name Circesium for the place at the mouth of the Khbûr in any case first appeared, when a Roman military station was built there. This perhaps may have been even before Diocletian. It was, however, this Emperor who first made the place of great importance by making it a powerful fortress on the extreme frontier of the Roman Empire in Southern Mesopotamia. From this it seems quite impossible that Circesium could have been a latinisation of the Aramaic Karka = town [see AL-KARKH], as Moritz, Palmyrene, 37, supposed; for the opposite view, see Streck, in ZA, xxvii, 259.

In the fourth century A.D. Circesium passed into the hands of the Persians by the shameful treaty made by the Emperor Jovian (363). The Arabs next captured it in the conquest of al-Dîjâzar. The occupation by the Muslims, which took place, apparently without fighting, under the commander Ḥabîb b. Maslama who was sent by Ṭyâbî b. Ḥann, probably happened in the year 19/640, not 16/537, as many sources say. Cf. al-Baladîhîrî, Futûkh, 176, and also 171, 175, 179; al-Ṭabîrî, i, 2478; Ibn al-Ábîrî, ii, 409 ff.; Yâkûtî, Muṣ’ilâmî, iv, 65 ff.; Weil, Gesch. der Chalîfên, i, 82; Caetani, Annali dell’ Islam, ii, 402, ii, 732, 755 f., 799. Karkisiya became the capital of the district of Khbûr in the province of Diyâr Bakr. On account of its very characteristic situation, Karkisiya is mentioned by all the Arab geographers in their descriptions of the river-courses and roads, but no detailed account of it is given. The place probably did not attain any great size in the Islamic period either. The high percentage of Jews (500 families) found by Benjamin of Tudela in the second half of the 12th century there is remarkable; see his travels ed. and tr. Grünhut and Adler (Jerusalem 1903, Frankfurt a/M. 1904), i, 49, 21 f. and ii, 47.

In the history of the wars of mediaeval Islam, we find Karkisiya often mentioned. When ‘Abd al-Malik was engaged in his campaigns against the caliph Abdallah b. al-Zubayr, he had to devote his attention to...
KARKISIYA — KARKUR

Karkisiya in 71/690, where the Kays! Zufar b. Al-Ijarith was ruling independently and had successfully resisting the governor of Hims, who had been sent against him. After a siege of some length, Zufar had to submit to the caliph’s army; cf. Ibn al-Athir, iv, 275 f.; Weil, Gesch. der Chalifen, i, 431; J. Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz, Berlin 1903, 115-6, 119-120, 126; Canard, Hamadnides, 138. In the wars fought in the 5th/10th century on Mesopotamian soil in the Hamadnides area, we find Karkisiya playing a part along with al-Raba, a day’s journey down the Euphrates from it; cf. Canard, op. cit., 492, 545-7. The rulers of Egypt repeatedly extended their power as far as Karkisiya, for example the Tulfudid Abu Ahmad, from whom, however, the Caliph al-Mu’tamid’s vigorous brother al-Muwaqqaf was able to retake it in 268/881; see Wüstenfeld, Die Statthalter von Ägypten zur Zeit der Chalifen, in Abh. GGW (1876), xxxi, part 3, 20. Several centuries later the Egyptian Sultan Baybars again advanced his frontier up to the Khubb, when he took Karkisiya from the Mongols in 663/1264; cf. Weil, Gesch. der Chalifen, iv, 96.

At the present day, the site of Karkisiya is marked by a miserable village of 30-40 houses and hovels of clay and an extensive ruined site adjoining it. It is now called Busayra (Beséra; sometimes written Bugeyra); older travelers’ names for it are probably a corruption of Abū Seray, as, along with other authors, Moritz, op. cit., 37, thinks; it has been less probably taken as a derivative from Basr, the older name—recorded by Abū l-Fidā’ī for 732/1331—of the present Dayr al-Zor, as believed by Herzfeld. According to Herzfeld, the old name Karkisiya still survives locally in the form Karkisīa.

Busayra lies on an irregularly-shaped tongue of land formed by the Khubb at its junction with the Euphrates and is about half an hour’s journey distant from its mouth. Communication with the hinterland is broken by a ditch so that we have a well-marked peninsula. The plan of the old fortress can still be easily recognised; it forms a rectangle, the longer side of which runs along the Khubb, while the shorter faces the Euphrates from which it is now about 1,000 yards distant. Four more or less well preserved towers and a fort-like building (praetorium, serai) can still be seen, from which Moritz (op. cit., 37) thinks; it has been explained from the desire to bury more deeply a dead man whose spirit might be tempted to come out and avenge itself or, less plausibly, as a kind of homage to the dead; but this casting of stones can also be explained rather as a rite for the expulsion of evil (a dangerous place, the infection of death, certain sacred neighbourhoods, or all these things together—and gets rid of it by throwing it or depositing it with the stone on a place suitable for absorbing it; the accumulation of these expiatory pebbles forms the sacred piles of stone often becomes one of the obligatory rites of the pilgrimage and the rite losing its primitive character has been sometimes taken for a true offering-rite. The piles of stones are often built at the place where a man has been killed and buried; this has been explained from the desire to bury more deeply a dead man whose spirit might be tempted to come out and avenge itself or, less plausibly, as a kind of homage to the dead; but this casting of stones can also be explained rather as a rite for the expulsion of evil (a dangerous place, the infection of death, proximity of disturbing magical forces). It appears, therefore, that we always find rites of purification as the origin here (see Djemal Effendi, op. cit.), and the sources give other examples (see T. Fabi, La divination arabe, 188-93).

Pre-Islamic Arabia knew the rite of casting stones and sacred heaps of stones. The rites of the Badgī have preserved evidence of this, but several varying interpretations have been made [see DJAMRA, HADJDJ, RAGU], and the sources give other examples (see T. Fabi, La divination arabe, 188-93).

Islam found the cult of piles of stones in all or almost all the lands that it conquered and although orthodox looked askance at it, it had to accommodate itself, as to so many other popular practices, which owed their origin to paganism in the remote past. Piles of stones are especially numerous in certain regions [see RAGU], but nowhere has their cult been so developed and is so vigorous as in North Africa, especially in the south of Morocco, where it has been especially studied by E. Dousté (Marrahech, Paris 1905, 58-108; Magie et religion dans l’Afrique du Nord, Algiers 1908, ch. x; see also E. Westermarck, The Moorish conception of holiness (Baraka), Helsingfors 1916, 26 ff.). There, one may say, there is not a pass, or ravine or cross-roads which has not its little pyramids of stones or its great karkūr to which every passer-by adds his pebble, not a rustic sanctuary but has its sacred piles of stones.


KARKūR, more exactly karkūr (the word is only known in Maghribi colloquial Arabic, cf. Berber acharbur), “a heap of stones”, and more especially “a sacred heap of stones”. The cult of heaps of stones is extremely ancient and distributed all over the world. It seems to come not from an act of litholatry in the strict sense but from a rite of transference or expulsion of evil; the individual, picking up a stone, causes the evil of whatever kind that afflicts him to pass onto it—as the case may be, fatigue, physical or moral suffering, sin, the dangerous power that attaches itself to a man in certain sacred neighbourhoods, or all these things together—and gets rid of it by throwing it or depositing it with the stone on a place suitable for absorbing it; the accumulation of these expiatory pebbles forms the sacred piles of stone often becomes one of the obligatory rites of the pilgrimage and the rite losing its primitive character has been sometimes taken for a true offering-rite. The piles of stones are often built at the place where a man has been killed and buried; this has been explained from the desire to bury more deeply a dead man whose spirit might be tempted to come out and avenge itself or, less plausibly, as a kind of homage to the dead; but this casting of stones can also be explained rather as a rite for the expulsion of evil (a dangerous place, the infection of death, proximity of disturbing magical forces). It appears, therefore, that we always find rites of purification as the origin here (see Djemal Effendi, op. cit.), and the sources give other examples (see T. Fabi, La divination arabe, 188-93).

Islam found the cult of piles of stones in all or almost all the lands that it conquered and although orthodox looked askance at it, it had to accommodate itself, as to so many other popular practices, which owed their origin to paganism in the remote past. Piles of stones are especially numerous in certain regions [see RAGU], but nowhere has their cult been so developed and is so vigorous as in North Africa, especially in the south of Morocco, where it has been especially studied by E. Dousté (Marrahech, Paris 1905, 58-108; Magie et religion dans l’Afrique du Nord, Algiers 1908, ch. x; see also E. Westermarck, The Moorish conception of holiness (Baraka), Helsingfors 1916, 26 ff.). There, one may say, there is not a pass, or ravine or cross-roads which has not its little pyramids of stones or its great karkūr to which every passer-by adds his pebble, not a rustic sanctuary but has its sacred piles of stones.
Sometimes the karkür itself, as in other cases a spring, a tree or a rock, has given rise to a sanctuary which has become a marabout fashion. It is also very common to find under the aegis of a saint several of these cults combined—strange sanctuaries which perpetuate the ancient rites of paganism, still vigorous after twelve centuries of Islam.

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

**KARLŁ-ILI,** also KARLO-ILI, "the land [see Il] of Carlo," Ottoman name for a district of north-west Greece (Acarania and most of Aetolia), as corresponding approximately to the territories of Carlo Tocco I (1381-1430).

Carlo's father, Leonardo, had been created count of Cephallonia in 1357; he had extended his original dominions of Cephallonia, Zante and Ithaca to embrace the island of Leucas (Leucadia, Santa Maura; Turkish: Aya Mavra), and, on the mainland, Venitsa, (1562). Laying claim to the Despotate of Epirus, in 1417 Carlo made himself master of the regions of Arta (Ambracia, Larta; Turkish: Narda) and Ioannina (Turkish: Yanya [q.v.]). At his death his territories extended to the south to the Gulf of Patras (Lepanto, Turkish Aynabakhi [q.v.], remaining in Venetian hands); he had also acquired a foothold in the Morea with the port of Clarentza. When he died at Ioannina in 1430, leaving no legitimate heir, Menmon, one of his five bastard sons, appealed to Murād II against Carlo's nephew Carlo II (1430-48). As soon as Thessaloniki (Selanik [q.v.]), which had joined the revolt, was taken, (1430-48), the guardians of his son Leonardo, a minor, appealed to Venice for protection. The sultan thereupon took Arta (1449), and in 1460 Angelokastron was lost, leaving to Leonardo on the mainland only Venitsa. In 1479 Venice, annoyed at Leonardo's approaches to the king of Naples, did not include Leonardo in the treaty concluding the war of 1463-79. Mehemmed II was already planning his descent on southern Italy, and for this purpose Leonardo's island principality in an alleged slight to an Ottoman sandjakbegi (probably a member of the Tocco family). Upon the approach of the fleet under Gedik Ahmed Paşa [q.v.], then sandjakbegi of Valona (Turkish: Awlonya [q.v.]), Leonardo fled, and Ahmed Paşa occupied Venitsa, Santa Maura, Cephallonia and Zante. In 1481 Cephallonia and Zante were recovered by the Tocchi, only to be lost to Venice; Venice retained Zante (until 1797); she had to cede Cephallonia to Bāyezid II in 1485 but recovered it in 1500.

The earliest references to "Karliili" in Ottoman sources are confused. The statement in the *Aşkıpşahazade* (§ 56) that in 781/1385 Timurtash Paşa raided "as far as Karli-ili" has been condemned as a misreading (for the "land of Kraljevica", i.e., Frilep; see, most recently, Irène Beldiceanu-Stehren, *Recherches sur les actes...*, Munich 1967, 197-8), though H. Inalcik suggests that this is the "land of Carlo Thopia" (see *Arnavutlu*, col. 635b). *Aşkıpşahazade* seems again to be in error when, in describing (§ 130) Mehemmed II's campaign of 864/1460 in the Morea, he calls certain fortresses there (Mistra, Leonardi, ... *Astro*) "Karli-ili", a statement repeated by Neşri, Ibn Kemal, Sa'd al-Din, etc.; nevertheless, southern Aetolia was evidently occupied by the Ottomans in the course of this campaign: see Hopf, *Gesch. Griechenlands*, ii, 136, and cf. Sphrantzes, *ed. Grecuro, 124 (a subaşı in Angelokastron in autumn 1460).

When Karliili was formally constituted a sandjak (with Angelokastron as its chefi-lieu) is not clear. It is not named by Promontorio de Campis (ca. 1475, ed. Babinger) among the 17 sandjaks of Rümeli; but the dżiya returns for 894/1489 mention "liwa-i Karlo" (Begleri, i [1964], 101), and a sandjak-begi ("mir-i liwa-i Karli") is named for 909/1503 (M. T. Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa Lüdiyler*, Istanbul 1932, 481). For slightly later appearances of Karliili in lists of the sandjaks of Rümeli, see Ivt. Fak. Mecm., xv (1953-4), 303; *Bell*, xx (1956), 253, 260, and n. 170; and cf. *IA*, art. *Romelli* (H. Inalcik), 771-2. For the number of households, overwhelmingly Christian, about this time, see *JESHO*, i (1937-8), 32.

The "Beşlerbegilik of the Sea" [see Bâzâlî-l-bayr-i safrî], created for Khayr al-Din (Barbosa) [q.v.] in 949/1543, comprised at first, besides Gelibolu, only Rodos, Eghriboz and Midilli [q.v.] (see Ramberti, in A. H. Lybyer, *The government of the Ottoman Empire...*, Cambridge, Mass. 1913 (repr. New York 1960), 256, 259, and cf. for Ramberti's reliability, 314); Karliili was added later, perhaps in 957/1551, when Turkh Reşî [q.v.], entering Ottoman service, was appointed its sandjakbegi (see *Asim Samih Itur, Sultan-i Türkler*, ii, Istanbul 1937, 189 and 194, discussing Pêşevi [i, 346-7] and Hâdîdî Khâlîfa, *Tuhfât al-kibdr* [Istanbul 1329, 67-8]); it certainly figures among the sandjaks of this eyalet in the 11th/12th century, e.g., *apud* 'Aynî-i 'All, ca. 1018/1609 (*JA*, ser. 6, xxv (1870), 266); Kocî Beg, ca. 1050/1640 (*ed. A. K. Aksüt, Istanbul 1939, 110); and Hâdîdî Khâlîfa, *ca. 1050/1656 (Tuhfât al-kibdr, 147): his inclusion of Karliili in "Rümeli" in the Dîhnânmî is an anomaly: he was perhaps here using a list of the 10th/16th century, see *IA*, art. *Romelli*, col. 772b).

Hâdîdî Khâlîfa (J. von Hammer, *Romeli un Bosna*, Vienna 1812, 127-9) names seven hâdâh's: *Preveza* (an error?); Aya Maavra, Vonitsa, Angelokastron, Xerómeron, Válvitos and vrâkhirion. Evliyâ Celebi travelled through the region in 1081/1670. His itinerary is not easy to follow. He names six hâdâh's (omitting Preveza) (vii, 626). The eastern boundary of the sandjak (p. 623) is the Yllan Çayî = R. Phildharis/Evivos. He describes further the territories of "Zebân" (Zapandi), "Bhûr" (Bokhörü, Hypokhorion), Mesolonghi, Anatolikî = Eitolikon, and "Kalîve" (Kalivla).

Aya Maavra and Vonitsa, falling to Morosini in 1595/1684, were ceded to Venice by the Treaty of Karlovitz (Karâoçâ [q.v.], 1110/1699) (see further, for the history of the Ionian Islands, *Vedi adalar*). At the end of the 18th century, Karliili came under the sway of 'All Pasha Tepependeni [q.v.]. In the very first weeks of the War of Greek Independence (1821-9), Mesolonghi and Vrâkhirî had joined the revolt, and the district was the scene of much fighting. The northern frontier of the new kingdom, as finally drawn (1832), left all Karliili to Greece.

**Bibliography:** W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant*, London 1908 (repr. 1964), index, s.v. Tocco; Fr. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Qarly-eli vornehmlich aus Osmanischen Quellen*, in *Eiz* *muḥayn* *N. Aḏirmu*, i, Athens 1933, 140-9 (= Aufsätze und Abhandlungen...*, i, Munich 1962, 370-7) (on members of the Tocco family in Ottoman service); Piri Reçî, in *Kitab-i Bahriye*, Istanbul 1935, 317-24; Evliyâ Celebi, *Sezîhna mâmê*., viii, Istanbul 1928, 620-37; I. G. Giannopoulou,
The first notice is of A.D. 1308, when it was known as Karon. In the later middle ages under Hungarian rule—its castle (kula) was, as the seventeenth-century Ottoman traveller Ewliya Celebi pointed out, the work of the kings of Hungary—Karlofca came under Ottoman rule in Şahbâan 927/ July 1521, in the course of the campaign which culminated in the conquest of Belgrade. Its reduction was the work of the Bosnian ghãdzis under the future beglerbegi of Belgrade, Yâhya Pasha-zade Kütük Bâli Beg (F. Tauer, ed.), Histoire de la campagne du Sultan Suleyman Ier contre Belgrade en 1521, Prague 1922, p. 152; cf. Feuchtwang, 508-10).

In Ottoman sources, the encountered forms of the name are: in a late 10th/16th century defter-i mufassal, Karloviç/Karlović (? = Hung. Karlofca); in the mid-17th/17th century, Kârlıva; by the early 17th/18th century (Râghid), Kârlovci (this last form perhaps reflecting the by then current Austrian (i.e. German) usage of Karlowitz).

Under Ottoman rule, Karlofca came initially under the authority of the beglerbegi of Belgrade; later, after the conquest of Budin and the formation of that eyâlet (1641), Karlofca became and remained subject to that place. Within the sandjak of Sirem it formed a nîyâba of the kadâ of Varadin (Peterwardein). In the later 10th/16th century, according to a defter-i mufassal from the reign of Selim II (B. McGowan, ed.), Defter-i Lüne-i Sirem, unpubl. (Columbia Ph.D. thesis, 1967, 241-9 [= text, ff. 65b-68r]), Karlofca possessed the largest Christian population in the sandjak. Within the five quarters of the town was a civilian population of 487 households, all Christian. By the time Ewliya Celebi visited Karlofca the population was partly Christian and partly Muslim. The collection of the kadâ and bâhid-i bâzâr taxes was in the hands of Ottoman officials from Budin; the kadâ contained a garrison of about fifty officers and men.

Karlofca’s subsequent fate, and its sole claim to historical significance, were both determined by the course of the war of 1094-1110/1683-99 between the Ottoman Empire and Austria and her allies—Poland, Venice, and, belatedly, Russia—of the Sacra Liga. After the Ottoman defeat at Mohács (1687), Karlofca passed under Austrian rule. Its historical significance—however, lies in its almost fortuitous selection as the site for the diplomatic gathering generally known as the Congress of Carlowicz which assembled there in October 1698 and by the end of January 1699 had brought laboriously to birth a series of agreements regulating the territorial and other adjustments consequent upon the war.

Within the limits of this article no extensive treatment of the Congress of Carlowicz can be attempted. Lacking as we do not only a corpus of documents for the congress and for its essential diplomatic “pre-history”, but even a satisfactory edition of the Turkish and Latin Italian texts of the treaties themselves, recent attempts to place the Ottoman side of the congress proceedings on a more secure basis must be regarded as (in some ways) provisional. Some general remarks concerning the significance of the settlement may however be made. Congress diplomacy, which had evolved rapidly in Europe after the end of the Thirty Years’ War (1648) was for the first time applied to a settlement involving an Islamic state. Thus was brought about the simultaneous culmination and incipient erosion of the Islamic concepts of dâr al-İslâm and dâr al-ḥarb which had determined in large measure the settlement of, e.g. previous conflicts between the Ottomans and the Austrian Hapsburgs. With the unwilling Ottoman acceptance of (a) diplomatic mediation (lawasassid) by the representatives at the Porte of England (Lord Paget) and the United Provinces (Colyer) and (b) the provisions in the treaties of (a) the demarcated frontier, the assumptions which had hitherto determined the Ottoman state’s relations with the lands of dâr al-ḥarb were no longer tenable, and the military and diplomatic balance for the first time tipped steeply against them.

The Ottoman negotiators at Carlowicz—the na’ls ul-hâkim Râmi Mehmed Efendi and the chief dragoman Alexander Mavrocordato—were well aware of this long before the congress opened; indeed, there is much to recommend the view that the real transformation of Ottoman attitudes took place in a series of secret negotiations between ‘Amuqja-zade Husayn Köprülü, the Ottoman grand vizier, and the Austrian chancellor, Kinsky, with Mavrocordato and Paget serving as intermediaries, during the latter part of 1697 and the early months of 1698. The basis for the settlement which was then worked out was that of sīl possidetis/sâlah bâzâr, i.e. that each side should hold what it possessed at the conclusion of hostilities. Ottoman diplomatic objectives, which went some way beyond the strict application of this principle, were to be achieved only in part at the congress, despite skilful diplomacy by Râmi Mehmed Efendi and Mavrocordato. The Ottomans failed to obtain the evacuation by Austria of Transylvania and its restoration to the rather ambiguous status which it had enjoyed before 1683, but were able to maintain their authority over the strategic salient of Temes-vár (Timişoara) as far as the Mureş and Tisa rivers. They were also able to hold the immediate hinterland of Belgrade in Sirmium and to retain a foothold in Slavonia and Croatia. Conversely, against Poland the Ottomans were obliged to relinquish the strong fortress of Kâmanîcë, which had never surrendered, and thus lost control of Podolia in exchange for Turkish abandonment of claims to Moldavia. No permanent settlement with Russia was reached at Carlowicz: a truce for two years was regularised at Istanbul in 1121/1701. The latter stages of the congress were mostly taken up with the imposition of terms on Venice, the weakest of the Sacra Liga powers, who was in the end forced to give up her conquests north of the Morea.

No conclusive assessment of the Carlowicz settlement should yet be attempted. Diplomatically it was...
perhaps less of a defeat for the Ottoman Empire than has been commonly accepted, and the Ottomans were able to withdraw from a retrograde war with their pride, if not their territories, intact. Within governing circles of the Empire the settlement nonetheless was to generate considerable opposition, particularly from military elements, and it is probably in these internal repercussions, leading up to the Edirne Incident of 1115/1703, as much as in the actual territorial adjustments, that its significance lies.

The Generall Historic of the Turks, iii, London 1700, ad finem, for the first English edition of the treaties. For important Ottoman works still in MS. form, cf. the references given in the article by I. Parmaksizoglu, S. V. Karlofa, in IA. The account by J. von Hammer, Gor, vi (Pest, 1828), 636-78, is based in part on these, and is still useful on that account. The studies on the Congress of Carlowicz by Popovic (1893) and Munson (1940) are now superseded; the results of recent research by R. A. Abou-El-Haj are to be found in his unpublished dissertation, (Princeton 1963) and in articles in JAOS, lxxxviii/4 (1967) and lxxxix/3 (1963), and Islam, li/1 (1974). (C. J. Heywood)

**KARLUK**

early Arabic form Kharkhuk, Persian Khurulkh (whence frequent confusion in the sources with the Khalalj [q.v.], Chinese Ko-lo-lu (northwestern Middle Chinese *Kàr-ì-lùjuk), a Turkish tribal group in Central Asia. They were originally a small federation of three tribes (whence the name given to them in the Uyghur Shine-usu inscription of 760 of Ue Karlik; the *Hûdâd al-*âlam, 98, on the other hand, mentions seven tribes of the Karlik), and comparatively unimportant. Their paramount chief never bore the title of *khaghan* or *khan*, but in the 7th and 8th centuries had that of *äbelber* (perhaps *possessor of a land or people*), one of only moderate rank (see A. Bombaci, On the ancient Turkish title *Elîbâr*, in Proceedings of the IXth meeting of the Permanent International Altaic Conference, Naples 1970, 24, 57-8), and Kâshghari does not mention them amongst the twenty Turkish tribes listed in the introduction of the *Dawân iklâd al-tur* (tr. Atalay, i, 38). Kâshghari does, however, mention the Karlik in connection with certain Turkish words or phrases, and defines them as a nomadic tribe, distinct from the Oghuz, but, like them, counted as Turkmen (tr. i, 473, cf. Barthold, Four studies on the history of Central Asia, iii, A history of the Turkmen people, 78).

Our first information on the Karlik comes from Chinese sources, which mention them as having been subjugated by the Western Tu-chietch or Turks ca. 640-50. At this time they were a pastoralist people located on the upper reaches of the Irtysh River and north of the Tien Shan. In the early years of the 8th century they passed under the control of the Eastern Tu-chietch empire, and the Okhon inscriptions mention the rebellion of the Karlik against the Khaghan in 711-14 (see Sir Gerard Clason and E. Tryjarski, The inscription at *Ike Khusholu*, in RO, xxxiv/1 (1971), 27-8, 29). The Karlik took part with the Basmill and Uyghur in the general upheaval which brought about the disintegration of the Eastern Tu-chietch empire (743-5), but were in turn defeated by the Uyghur and compelled to move westwards to wards Transoxiana (on all these events, see E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Tures) Occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1913, cf. also R. Knolles, *The Generall Historic of the Turks*, iii, London 1700, ad finem, for the first English edition of the treaties). For important Ottoman works still in MS. form, cf. the references given in the article by I. Parmaksizoglu, S. V. Karlofa, in IA. The account by J. von Hammer, Gor, vi (Pest, 1828), 636-78, is based in part on these, and is still useful on that account. The studies on the Congress of Carlowicz by Popovic (1893) and Munson (1940) are now superseded; the results of recent research by R. A. Abou-El-Haj are to be found in his unpublished dissertation, (Princeton 1963) and in articles in JAOS, lxxxviii/4 (1967) and lxxxix/3 (1963), and Islam, li/1 (1974). (C. J. Heywood)

These Karlik on the northern fringes of Transoxiana were long a refuge for political and religious dissidents and refugees fleeing before the Arab advance into Central Asia (pp. 92, 93). Their paramount chief now appears in Muslim sources with the title of *yabghu* (Arabic form *gâbbâya*, probably reflecting a western Turkish dialectal pronunciation of the word), adopted equally by the chief of the Oghuz (see *Oguz*). There were also Karlik who had penetrated southwestwards into the upper Oxus basin and Turkhâristân, where Arabic sources mention them in connection with the Arab campaigns against the epigoni of the Hephthalites in this region; the prince of the Karlik here also bore the title of *yabghu*.
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where these Khans were under the suzerainty of the
Karluk Khan [q.v.] (Dawwan-Boyle, t, 74-5; Barthold, Four studies ... i. History of the Semirechyt, 103-4). Karluk tribal contingents joined the army of Chingiz-Khan in 616/1219 and took part in the invasion of Transoxiana, but after the Mongol period, the name of the Karluk becomes less frequent in the history of Central Asia, without ever disappearing completely. Thus the Tahâ‘i Ra‘idât of Mirâ‘ Muhammad Haydar Dughât, tr. Elias and Ross, 309, mentions a commander (sirâdâr) of the Karluk tribe in Transoxiana involved in warfare of the early 9th/15th century. At the present time, various Turkish groups of northeastern Afghanistan, in the regions of Badakhshan and Kattagân, call themselves Kaluq or Karluq; see g. Jarring, On the distribution of Turk tribes in Afghanistan, an attempt at a preliminary classification, in Lunds Universitets Arsskrift, N.F. xxxvi4 (Lund-Leipzig 1939), 72-3 and index.

Bibliography: In addition to works cited above, see Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion6, index; idem, Histoire des Turs d'Asie Centrale, chs. iii-v; Bosworth, The Turks in the Islamic lands up to the mid-11th century, in PhTF, iii, Wiesbaden 1970; IA art. Karluhallar (Rahmeti Arab). The information of the Islamic geographers is utilized in Minorsky's copious commentary to the section on the Karluq in Hudâd al-‘alam, 97-8, 286-97.

(C. E. Bosworth)

KARM (A.), the vine. Toone who knows the official attitude of Islam towards wine [see KHAMR], the vitality of the cultivation of the vine in the majority of mediaeval Muslim countries may appear paradoxical. Nevertheless, it is incontestable, and is explained by the force of tradition which is even more solid than the laws. Indeed, where the vine has long been established, by the multiple uses of the grape (fresh fruit, dried raisin, vinegar, pharmaceutical uses, the lees as fertilizer, etc.), by the survival of non-Muslim communities, and also by the laxity of many Muslims themselves. This vitality is attested in particular, perhaps due to the written tradition, by the very considerable and exceptional place that Muslim agronomists accord to the vine in comparison with the other species studied, from the easterner Ibn Wašhiyya or the Calendar of Cordova to the Andalusians of the 5th/11th and the 6th/12th centuries, to whom we owe the essential part of that which will be summarized below. Their knowledge resulted from the combination of the data of the ancient authors, rediscovered and assimilated (with, in Spain, Junius = Columella added to the sources known in the Orient) with the intensive day-to-day experience constantly renewed.

To summarize this knowledge is difficult, since one of the principal characteristics of the cultivation methods described is precisely the meticulousness of their application and the multiplicity of the methods followed. Nevertheless, it appears generally that the vines cultivated, more numerous than in our days and transported by the Arabs from one end of their conquered lands to the other, did not remain stabilized and were the object of experiments of selection and acclimatization that we know particularly with regard to Spain (between the plain and the mountain, for example), but that were also tested in the East, where Ibn al-Fakhir (DG4, 125) and the Persian agronomists of the Mongol period in particular preserve for us the names of various kinds of vines. The vegetative cycle of each vine-plant being different, the agronomists, applying the principle of the complementary nature of a defect and a quality (such as adaptation to dryness or humidity, etc.) mainly made use of the diversities of the climates and soils of the Mediterranean zone and the Near East.

Some systems of cultivation predominate in the Andalusian treatises: (a) The low vine, planted in holes or trenches (recommended, but little practised) about 1.40 m. apart, supported or in low clumps, thinned out very little in order to protect the grape against the sun; a method of cultivation reserved for warm sites; (b) The climbing vine, classical in the Mediterranean region, where the creeper was used as support for the fruit trees with shallow roots, whose height had to be controlled so that they did not injure the vine; in contradiction to the ancients, the Andalusians rejected the intercalary cultivation that exhausts the vine, and especially the association of the vine and the fig-tree. The best soils were alluvial, humid, but not saturated, according to the westerners, and also sandy according to Ibn Wašhiyya, but one might also make use of the rich soils for the species that derive nourishment easily; the principle of complementarity took the place of the modern idea of forced cultivation. The choice of sites was adapted to the vines' wants; slopes and hillsides for the low vines, valleys and plains for the climbing ones, mountains in order to test the quality of a vine-plant; it was barred from the marshlands, sources of the vine's diseases. The preparatory work was a deep tillage with the spade, with trenches larger than the furrows of tillage in the earth of mediocre quality and holes for the good localities with a depth of at least 2 cubits (almost a metre) for protection against the sun. The surface work of the end of the first year was a loosening with the pruning knife to spare the roots, those near the surface being cut back to strengthen the deepest.

Reproduction in the nurseries was done in the form of taking cuttings, layering (tâkbâta) and sowing in a manner conforming to the practices of our days. The stratification was systematic. As for the shoots, cuttings and layered branches, it is often pointed out that they should not be planted together in the same hole, which proves that it was done. Most authors agree in recommending planting in spring, although the early species might be planted in autumn (hesitations that one would still encounter today); the Egyptian fiscal treatises speak of planting in February or March. The vinestocks, once tested for three years in very poor soil, they were transplanted in the vineyard chosen to receive them.

Well spread out fertilization was especially necessary in the planting and pruning, above all when vines were made to follow another vegetable insufficiency treated with animal manure, usual in the Middle Ages; it was reduced to a powder, and, according to an Aristotelian principle, the ashes of the stems of the plant itself were preferred; this preference for dry fertilizer is a particularly modern aspect of Andalusian viticulture. Irrigation depended on the climate, the soil and the plant chosen; watering by hand was frequently carried out in order to proportion better the quantity of water needed to obtain really syrupy and not-too-full grapes.

Among the measures taken to increase the vine's productivity, pruning (sabr) was the principle practised in winter with the iron pruning knife (mindâj) already described by Columella; the aim was to draw the sap towards the wood in order to test the quality of a cutting, already known to the ancients, was the subject of descriptions and experiments infinitely more varied among the Muslim agronomists. Everything was taken into consideration, form and colour of the
grape, the syrupiness of the juice, the early or late quality of the vine-plant, the degree of alcohol, etc. In order to improve the species for the achievement of precise needs, fantastic means were sometimes adopted (e.g., grafting the vine on the olive-tree). On the technical level it was grafting by terebration (lajat'ama according to Ibn Ḥadīḍādī cited by Ibn al-ʿAwrām).

Like today, the protection of the vine against diseases and bad weather distressed the vine-grower, who was impotent before the scourge. More than the Romans, the Andalusians feared the proximity of the sea and, with good reason, drizzle. The symptoms of diseases, very exactly described by Ibn Wābāḥiyya, correspond to anthracosa, rust and jaundice; the remedy prescribed drew its inspiration from the curative panacea, namely a mixture of oil, wine and water applied to the stock of the exposed level; Ibn Ḥadīḍādī added straw there, which moreover protected against frosts.

Without our being able to furnish for all the Muslim countries the same precise details as for Spain and ʿIrāk, we can assert, thanks especially to the geographers' information, the presence almost everywhere of the vine, at least until the nomad invasions of the later Middle Ages, and often later: in Arabia, Mesopotamia, Iran, Central Asia, Syria, Egypt; in the Mongol period, Muzaffar al-ʿAṣbāwī al-ʿAnfūsī was still to see in Turkish Asia Minor the vines inherited from the Armenians and Greeks. The princely courts never had difficulty in providing wine, and the poets who used the vine on the Syrian coast. There is no doubt, however, that the vine declined at the end of the Middle Ages, and often later: in Arabia, Iraq, we can assert, thanks especially to the abundant because of the later Middle Ages, and often later: in Arabia, Iraq, we can assert, thanks especially to the ʿAbdān the vineyard on the Syrian coast. There is no doubt, however, that the vine declined at the end of the Middle Ages, and often later: in Arabia, Iraq, we can assert, thanks especially to the

Bibliography: Ibn Wābāḥiyya, al-ʻIlāh al-nabatiyya (uned., see IBN WAHSIYYA; the Egyptian tarian sources analysed by Miller-Wadarc, in Islam (1953); on Andalusian agronomy see FILAHA, ii; the vine is dealt with by Ibn Wāfīdī, Spanish tr. and ed. Millas-Vallicrosa, in al-Andalus, viii (1943), 281-332; Ibn Basālī, Spanish tr. by idem, in al-Andalus, xiii (1948), 397-430; Abu ʿl-Khayr al-Iṣbīlī, MS. Paris B.N. 7464, fols. 64 ff.; Ibn al-ʿAwrām, ed. Bīanqui (medicbro edn.), Madrid 1802, French tr. Clement-Millet, Paris 1864-7, chs. ii (fertilization), vii (tillage), ix (pruning), xiv (diseases), xvi (preservation), (See Lucie Bolens, Les méthodes agricoles au Moyen Age d'après les traités d'agronomie andalous, Genève 1974.) and pharmacological and botanical works, such as the Calendrier de Cerdagne, new ed. and French tr. Ch. Pellat, Leiden 1961. See also passim the principal Arab geographers, Ibn Ḥubayr, etc. Among the modern works, see the general ones on the principal countries, such as, for Spain, that of Lévi-Provençal, for the Maghrib those of Brunschvig and ʿĪdrīsī, for Iran that of Spuler, and the chapter of Petra- showery in Cambridge History of Iran, v. For non-Hispanic Muslim agronomy, see C. Cahen, in JESHO, 1971.

(Le Bôlens and C. Cahen)
known as Abū Ghānim Nāṣr, to his followers among the Banū Kalb. They sacked Buṣra and Abī Ḥanīfa again attacked Damascus, pillaged Tabarisiyya and the suburbs of Hit. In Ramadān 293/July 906 Nāṣr was killed by some of his supporters who wanted to gain amnesty from the government. Zikrawayh now sent another messenger to his remaining supporters announcing to them that the day of triumph and of his personal appearance was near. Joined by Zikrawayh’s supporters in the sawdāw, they entered al-Kūfa in a surprise attack, but were driven out again. In Dhū ’l-Hijjah 293/Oct. 906, Zikrawayh came forth from his hiding place in al-Sawwān near al-Kādisiyya. They defeated an ‘Abbasid army and overwhelmed the caravans of Khurāsānian and western Persian pilgrims on their return from Mecca killing most of the pilgrims. In Rabi‘ I 294/Jan. 907 Zikrawayh was wounded and captured in a battle and died a few days later. Many of his supporters were rounded up and executed. The Karmāṭī revolts in Syria came to an end. Some of Zikrawayh’s followers in the Sawdāw denied his death and expected his return. In 295/907–8 a dā‘ī, Abū Ḥātim al-Zutṭī, was active among the Karmāṭīs in the Sawdāw. He forbade them to eat certain vegetables and to slaughter animals. His followers were therefore named Bakliyya (q.v.), a nickname which was subsequently applied to the Karmāṭīs in the Sawdāw in general. Most of the Karmāṭīs there clung to their earlier belief that Muhammad b. Iṣmā‘īl was alive and would return as the Mahdi. In al-Bābrayn, Abū Sa‘īd al-Dīnābādī (q.v.), sent by Ḥamdān and Abī Ḍabān, had begun his career in 273/886–7 long before the schism. After the murder of Abī Ḍabān he sided with the rebels against ʿUbayd Allāh and killed Abū Zakariyyā. His father, with whom he had previously cooperated. Abū Zakariyyā had been sent before him, probably by Ibn Hawshab, the dā‘ī in the Yaman (the nisba al-Zumāmī seems to refer to Zamam, a market town in Lā‘a where Ibn Hawshab first resided), and like Ibn Hawshab remained loyal to the Fatimids. According to the dā‘ī Abī al-Dībār, Abū Sa‘īd, after killing Abū Zakariyyā, claimed to represent the Mahdi. Muhammad b. Abī Ḍabān b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya, who would appear in the year 300/912–3. In the Yaman the two dā‘īs, Ibn Hawshab [see MANSūR AL-YAMAN] and Abī Allāh b. al-Fāḍil, working separately in the region of Dībār Maswar and in the Bilād Yāḥī‘, at first remained faithful to ʿUbayd Allāh, though the loyalty of Ibn al-Fāḍil was not above suspicion and his relations with Ibn Hawshab, the senior dā‘ī, were at times strained. As both endeavoured to expand their territories, Ibn al-Fāḍil proved more successful. After reoccupying Sā‘īd, in Ramadān 297/May 912 he repudiated his allegiance to the Fatimid caliph, abolished the ghāfī‘a, and claimed to be the Mahdi. Rejecting the reproaches of Ibn Hawshab he demanded the latter’s submission and besieged him on the Dībār Maswar for eight months. The siege ended in failure, though Ibn Hawshab was forced to surrender one of his sons to Ibn al-Fāḍil as a hostage. Ibn al-Fāḍil then turned Sā‘īd over to the Ya‘fūrid Asād b. Abī Ya‘fūr, who recognized his suzerainty, and returned to his residence in al-Mudhakhrī. After his death in Rabi‘ II 303/Oct. 915 his son al-Fā‘ī‘a (?) succeeded him and killed many of his associates. Asād b. Abī Ya‘fūr revolted and took al-Mudhakhrī after a long siege in Rajab 304/Jan. 917. Four months later he ordered the execution of al-Fā‘ī‘a and other Karmāṭī leaders and sent their heads to Bagdad, thus extinguishing the movement of Ibn al-Fāḍil.

In the area of al-Rayy, the Iṣmā‘īlī community, known locally after its first dā‘ī ʿAla‘ al-Hallajī as Khulafayya, was well established before the split. Circumstantial evidence indicates that it did not recognize the imāmate of ʿUbayd Allāh and continued to expect the return of Muhammad b. Iṣmā‘īl as the Kā‘im. The dā‘ī Ghiyāth, after engaging in disputations with the Sunnis, was forced to flee to Khurāsān, probably during the last decade of the 3rd century/903–13. There he al-Fāḍil, who had returned to al-Rayy, lost the support of his followers and disappeared soon afterwards.

Information about the early Iṣmā‘īlī movement in Khurāsān and Transoxania is extremely fragmentary. Anti-Iṣmā‘īlī sources state that the first two dā‘īs there were sent successively by ʿUbayd Allāh after his rise to power in the Maghrib in 297/909 and were active in Naysābūr. Yet there is evidence that Iṣmā‘īlī activity was important in eastern Persia from an early date. The fact that the Imāmī al-Ḥaḍir b. Shāḥbāz in Naysābūr found it necessary to write a refutation of the Kā‘imīta may indicate their presence there before 260/874. At the time of the split al-Ṭālīkhān was a centre of Iṣmā‘īlī propaganda from where dā‘īs were sent all over the region. The first notice of the Imāmī author Sa‘īd b. Abī Allāh al-Kummi writing ca. 290/903 indicates that at this time ʿUbayd Allāh’s doctrine, which traced the imāmate after Dā‘ī al-Ṣādik through his son Abī Allāh, rather than Iṣmā‘īlī, had numerous adherents in Khurāsān. On the other hand, Ghiyāth, the dā‘ī of al-Rayy upholding Karmāṭī doctrine, during his stay in Khurāsān made a journey to the east and had a notice of the Imāmī author Sa‘īd b. Abī Allāh al-Kummi writing ca. 290/903 indicates that at this time ʿUbayd Allāh’s doctrine, which traced the imāmate 

From ca. 300/912 to the accession of the Fāṭimid caliph al-Mu‘izz (314/925). In the first decade of the 4th century/912–23 the Karmāṭī movement appears to have regained its ideological unity which prepared it for the great outburst of activity during the following decade. An important role in this process was played by the Kūš al-makhṣul of the Transoxanian dā‘ī al-Naṣṣī (q.v.), who introduced a Neoplatonic cosmology into Iṣmā‘īlī gnosis and reaffirmed the imāmate of Muhammad b. Iṣmā‘īl, who was to return as the Mahdi. The book evidently soon gained wide acceptance in Karmāṭī circles. Equally important was the activity of Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (q.v.), a disciple of Ghiyāth, who took over the leadership of the dā‘ī in al-Rayy during this decade, dislodging the descendants of Khalaf. Abī Ḥātim displayed great energy, sending dā‘īs to Tabaristān, ʿIsāfān, ʿAḥbarbāyjān, and Dīfūrī and carrying on a correspondence with Abī Tāhir, the leader of the Karmāṭīs in al-Bābrayn. He seems to have claimed to be the lieutenant (khalīfah) of the absent imām having superior authority to all other dā‘īs, a rank that was also later held by the dā‘ī of al-Rayy. Abīd b. Abī Allāh, governing of al-Rayy 307–11/919–24, the Daylamī leader Abī Bār b. Shīrāz, and Mardwīdī, the founder of the Ziyārid dynasty, came at least temporarily under his influence. The succession of Abī Ḥātim’s dā‘ī among the Daylam is also indicated by the conversion of Siwāṣaṣṣ (killed ca. 316/928), Dūstānīd king of Daylam, in Alamūt.
In al-Bahrayn, the Karmatis, after the murder of Abū Sa'īd in 300/913, remained peaceful until 311/923. In this year they began under the leadership of Abū Sa'īd's son Abū Tāhir al-Djamānī [q.v.] a series of devastating campaigns into southern 'Irāk during which they sacked al-Baṣra and al-Kūfa repeatedly and raided pilgrims' caravans. Like Abū Hātim, Abū Tāhir at this time was predicting the appearance of the Mahdi for the near future, interpreting the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in 356/968 as a sign for the end of the era of Islam and the advent of the final religious era. In 312/925 some thirty Ismā'īlīs, whose dā'ī kept up a correspondence with Abū Tāhir, were arrested in the mosque of Bārāthā [q.v.] in Baghdad. With them were found white clay seals bearing the inscription: "Muhammad b. Ismā'īl, the imām, the Mahdi, the friend of God". In 315-6/927-9 Abū Tāhir led a new campaign threatening Bārāthā itself, which he apparently expected to take. While he pushed as far as al-Raḥba, the Karmatis of the sawād of al-Kūfa, joined by the Arab tribes of the Banū Džuḥūl, Rifa'ā and ʾIdjī, rose under their dā'īs, among them ʾĪsā b. Muṣā, a nephew of ʾAbdān. They ravaged the area of al-Wāṣīt and entered al-Kūfa by force, but were soon subdued by an ʾAbbasid army. Those escaping joined Abū Tāhir as he returned to al-Baḥrā. They stayed. When they were known as the ʾAḏgāmiyyūn. Abū Tāhir's activity reached its climax in his conquest of Mecca during the pilgrimage season in 317/928. The Karmats committed a barbarous slaughter among the pilgrims and inhabitants and carried off the Black Stone of the Ka'ba, thus palpably demonstrating the end of the era of Islam. In Ramadān 319/Sept.-Oct. 931, Abū Tāhir handed the rule over to a young Persian from Ifṣāhān in whom he recognized the expected Mahdi. However, events took a different turn from what had commonly been expected for the advent of the Mahdi. The date was evidently chosen to coincide with the passing of 1,500 years after Zoroaster (= end of the year 1242 of the era of Alexander) for which prophecies attributed to Zoroaster and Djamāsp predicted the restoration of the reign of the Magians. The young Persian was said to be a Magian and a descendant of the Persian kings. Ifṣāhān, his home town, had long been associated by the astrologers with the rise of a Persian dynasty which would overthrow the Arab caliphate. The chief priest of the Magians, Ifṣāndiyār b. Adharbād, was executed a few years later by the caliph al-Rādi for his complicity with Abū Tāhir. The Persian ordered the cursing of all the prophets and among them Abū Yaʾḳūb al-Sidjīstānī [q.v.], who in his Kitāb al-nuṣrā defended most of al-Nasafī's views, including their antinomian implications. Despite such internal dissension the daʿwa soon regained strength, though engaging more in literary than in revolutionary activity. ʾĪsā b. Muṣā, who had been captured by the government troops suppressing the Karmātī revolt in the Sawād in 316/928, escaped from prison in 320/932 and remained in Bagdad writing philosophically-tinged books which he ascribed to ʿAbdān. This was also the practice of other dā'īs in ʿIrāk in this period, like the brothers Abū Muhammad and Abū Bakr b. Ḥmmād in al-Mawsīl and ʿAll b. Wāṣīf, who resided in al-Raḳkā and later in al-Mawsīl. The sons of Ḥmmād in al-Mawsīl and Ibn Naftī in Baghdād, according to Ibn Nadīm, high-ranking dā'ī subordinate to Abū Yaʾḳūb, the khalīfā of the imām residing in al-Rayy. This Abū Yaʾḳūb was the successor of Abū Hātim (d. 322/934) and may well be identical with Abū Yaʾḳūb al-Sidjīstānī who at this time did not recognize the Fatimid imāmate, as is evident from his Kitāb al-nuṣrā. The Ismāʿīlī missionary activity in the northwestern Persia remained successful in this period. The Sallārīd al-Mazrubānī b. Muḥammad, ruler of Adharbāyjān (330/941-346/957), and his brother Waḥṣīdān, ruler of al-Tarm, were both converts. On his accession al-Mazrubānī took ʿAll b. Djamār, an Ismāʿīlī dāʾī, as his vizier and permitted him to preach the doctrine openly. A coin of Waḥṣīdān minted in 343/954-5 attests his adherence to Karmatī Ismāʿīlism. There is no tangible evidence that the Fatimid Ismāʿīlī daʿwa during this period made any progress in winning over the dissident communities in the east. The story related by the anti-Ismāʿīlī polemicist Ibn Riżām that the dāʾī al-Nasaf, who during the last years before his execution in 332/943 was active at the Šāmānīd court in Transoxania, imposed a fine on the ruler Naṣr b. Abīhād, whom he had converted, to be sent to the Fatimid caliph al-Kāʾim, must be viewed with reserve.

The Karmats in al-Baḥrāyin also returned to their former beliefs, claiming that they were acting on the orders of the hidden Mahdi. Abū Tāhir carried out raids on a minor scale to southern ʿIrāk and the coast of Fārs and continued to obstruct the pilgrimage. After the failure of earlier negotiations, he reached an agreement with the ʿAbbasīd government in 327/939 under which he promised to protect the pilgrimage in return for an annual tribute and a protection fee to be paid by the pilgrims. The aggressiveness of the Karmats now subsided. After the death of Abū Tāhir in 322/934 his surviving brothers, ruling jointly, continued his peaceful policy. In 339/951 they finally returned the Black Stone of the Kaʿba for a high sum paid by the ʿAbbasīd government, after having rejected earlier offers, including one by the Fāṭimīs. See also the ʿAbdānīs.

After the accession of the Fāṭimīd al-Muʿizzī (341/953). The fourth Fāṭimīd caliph, al-Muʿizz, from his early in reign made determined
efforts to regain the support of the dissident Ismā'īlī communities in the east for the Fatimid cause. For this end he revised the Fatimid Ismā'īlī doctrine so as to accommodate some of their tenets. Thus he reaffirmed the central Ka'armatī belief that Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl was the Kā'īm, whose acts, he maintained however, were to be carried out by his lieutenants (Mawla'allī), the Fātimid imāms, who were his descendants. These efforts were to a good extent successful, though few specific details are known. Abū Ya'qūb al-Siqūṣī, now the chief representative of Ismā'īlī Neoplatonism, was won over and in his works written after the accession of al-Mu'izz fully supported the Fātimid imāmate. Al-Mu'izz utilized the introduction of the Neoplatonic cosmology into Fātimid Ismā'īlī doctrine, including the works of his earlier representatives, al-Nasafī and Abū Hātim al-Rāzī. Others of the dissidents, however, resisted his efforts. Ibn Hawkal, writing ca. 369/978, refers to the numerous Ismā'īlī community in Ḍūḥār-bayḍān as Ḍālīyya, indicating their Ka'armatī persuasion. The šarīf Abū Ṭūl Mubūsin shortly after 372/983 states that the school of Ṭṣā b. Mūṣā in Baghdād conserving the doctrinal heritage of ʿAbdān continued to exist in his time. Most notable, however, was the failure of Abū Ṭūl to win the allegiance of the Ka'armatīs of al-Bayrān. 

The encyclopaedia of the Iḥšāsun al-Safīʿ [q.v.], composed in al-Baṣra about the middle of the 4th century/960 by a group of secretaries and scholars, should be regarded as an attempt to reunite the non-Fātimid Ismā'īlīs on a common doctrinal basis countering the ideological offensive of the Fātimid. While adopting the Neoplatonic cosmology, the authors avoided touching on the points which had previously provoked controversy among the ḍā'īs. They put their teaching under the auspices of the hidden seventh imām whose reappearance in glory they predicted for the future. They expressly affirm that the descendants of the seventh imām had “fallen from his rank”, thus repudiating the Fatimid claim to the imāmate. Written in al-Baṣra, at this time practically a dominion of the Ka'armatīs of al-Bayrān, the encyclopaedia must have had at least their passive approval if it was not actually encouraged or commissioned by them.

The latent antagonism between the Ka'armatīs of al-Bayrān and the Fātimids erupted into an open clash after the Fātimid conquest of Egypt in 358/969. The Ka'armatīs had before demonstrated their interest in the Syrian political scene by establishing friendly relations with the Ḥanādānīs and the Ikhsāṣīs. In Rabiʿ II 353/Dec. 964 they had pillaged Tabāriyya. In 357/968 al-Ḥasan al-Aṣām [q.v.] invaded Syria at the head of the Ka'armatī army, took Damascus and, after defeating the Ikhsāṣīs al-Ḥasan b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ṭuḥdī, sacked al-Ra'mla. That the campaign had not been undertaken on behalf of the Fātimids is proved by coins minted in al-Ra'mla immediately after the withdrawal of al-Aṣām, on which the suzerainty of the ʿAbbāsīd caliph together with the Ka'armatī rulers of al-Bayrān is recognized. In Dhu'l-Ḥijjah 358/Oct.-Nov. 969, three months after the Fātimid army had occupied Egypt, a Ka'armatī army under al-Aṣām's cousins Kīrṣā and Salāḥī again attacked and defeated al-Ḥasan b. 'Ubayd Allāh at al-Ra'mla, but then a peace was concluded under which Ṭuḥdī promised to pay annual tribute. As the main body of the Ka'armatī army withdrew, a small force was left and was defeated together with al-Ḥasan b. 'Ubayd Allāh by the Fātimid army conquering al-Ra'mla in 359/970. In 360/971 al-Aṣām, aided by the Buyid ʿizā al-Dawla and the Ḥanādānī Abū Ṭuḥdī with arms and men, retook Damascus and al-Ra'mla, expelling the Fātimid army, and everywhere proclaimed the ʿAbbāsīd suzerainty. He then besieged Cairo, but after a minor setback in Rabiʿ I 361/Dec. 971 he withdrew and returned to al-Aṣām, probably because important internal decisions were pending there. By Ramadān 361/June 972 he reoccupied al-Ra'mla, defeating a strong Fātimid army. After the arrival of the Fātimid al-Mu'izz in Cairo (Ramadān 362/June 973), he proceeded to attack Egypt by sea and by land while an ʿAlīd ally invaded Upper Egypt. After a defeat before Cairo in Rajab 363/April 974, al-Aṣām returned to al-Aṣām and then concluded a truce promising obedience in order to secure the release of his secretary Abū ʿI'man al-Munadīdī who was captured by the Fātimid army in Damascus. The truce, under which al-Mu'izz agreed to pay the tribute formerly paid by the Ikhsāṣīs, was kept until the death of al-Mu'izz in Rabiʿ II 365/Dec. 975, but immediately after the accession of al-Azīz a Ka'armatī army under Dji'far, Kīrṣā, and Salāḥī, cousins of al-Aṣām, joined the rebel Alfāṭikīn (Alṭeṭkīn) in Damascus and then occupied al-Ra'mla. Before the advancing Fātimid army under Dji'far, they fell back to Ḍūḥār. Strengthened by the arrival of al-Aṣām, Alṭeṭkīn and the Ka'armatīs besieged Dji'far first in Zaytūn al-Ra'mla and then in ʿAškālān for about 17 months, finally permitting him to withdraw to Egypt. They were defeated by a massive Fātimid army under al-Azīz near al-Ra'mla in Mubarram 268/Sept. 978. The Ka'armatīs under Dji'far, who had taken over the command after the death of al-Aṣām in Rajab 366/March 977, left for al-Aṣām and agreed to a peace under which al-Azīz paid a sizable annual tribute to them.

After the death of the Buyid ʿĀṣūd al-dawla (372/983) the Ka'armatīs of al-Bayrān sought to reassert their hold over southern ʿIrāk. In 373/983-4 they attacked al-ʿIrāq and had to be bought off by a tribute. In 375/985 a Ka'armatī army under Isfāk and Dji'far occupied al-Kūf. As the Buyid government tried to reach a peaceful settlement, they began to confiscate crops and money in the country. The government, forced to act, inflicted two humiliating defeats on the awesome enemy near al-Dārāmīyān. The Ka'armatīs were forced to withdraw and were permanently deprived of their influence in ʿIrāk. In 379/988 al-ʿĀṣāf, chief of the Banī ʿAlī-Muṭṭafik of ʿUkayl, defeated the Ka'armatīs severely, laid siege to al-Aṣām and pillaged Ka'armatī al-Qūf, carrying off the booty to al-ʿIrāq. The Ka'armatīs lost their privilege of escorting and taxing the pilgrims' caravans, claimed now by al-Āṣāf and other tribal chiefs, and were reduced to a purely local, self-contained power. Little is known about their later history. In 382/992 they renewed their nominal allegiance to the Fātimid al-Azīz, presumably in return for a resumption of the Fātimid tribute, which had been cut off after the victory of al-ʿĀṣāf. These ties cannot have lasted long. During the reign of al-Ḥākim (386/996-411/1021) their relations with the Fātimid caliphate were hostile. Nothing is known about their relations with the later Fātimids. In religious doctrine they remained permanently apart from the Fātimid Ismā'īlī ʿaṣāra. Outside al-Bayrān, Ka'armatī communities after the decline of the Ka'armatī state were rapidly absorbed into Fātimid Ismā'īlism or disintegrated. No information definitely concerning such communities after 378/988 is available, though reports about a wealthy sectarian leader named al-Shabbās (d. 444/
The Karmati state in al-Bahrāyn. Karmati religious propaganda, though promising the replacement of the injustices and oppression of established Islamic society with a rule of justice and equity, did not elaborate a specific social programme. Some early experiments with communal ownership of property remained ephemeral. Historical factors and a concern for the welfare of Karmati subjects combined to produce a state in al-Bahrāyn whose order and justice evoked the admiration of non-Karmati observers like Ibn Hawkāl, al-Mukaddasī and Nasir-i Khusrav.

Abū Saʿīd al-Ḍajjānābī conferred in major decisions with a ruling council known as al-ʿĪqāmīyya, which comprised the most important officials of the government. Most prominent among them was al-Ḥasan b. Sanbar (or Ṣanbar), the head of a powerful family from al-Kaffa who had become an early supporter and father-in-law of Abū Saʿīd. After the latter's death, his seven sons joined the ruling council. In accordance with the will of Abū Saʿīd's eldest son, Saʿīd, at first succeeded to the leadership and was replaced by the youngest son, Abū Tāhīr, when the latter reached maturity in 310/922-3. Abū Tāhīr ruled with the aid of his brothers and a council of seven viziers, most prominent among whom was Sanbar, the son of al-Ḥasan b. Sanbar. After Abū Tāhīr's death the leadership was held collectively by his surviving brothers, known as al-ṣāda al-ruʿaṣāʾ. The sons of Abū Tāhīr, though highly regarded and property owners, remained excluded from the rule. In 358/969 Sābūr, the eldest son of Abū Tāhīr, died, and the rule in succession to his father, was arrested by his uncles and died, probably murdered. Partisan strife within the ruling family persisted after the incident and in 360/972 the caliph al-Muṭṭaḍī is reported to have endeavoured diplomatically to restore concord. Numismatic evidence suggests that at least after the death of Saʿīd in 361/972 grandsons of Abū Saʿīd came to be admitted to the ruling council, though a position of pre-eminence was retained by Abū Yaʿṣūb Yūsuf, now the only surviving son of Abū Saʿīd. When Yūsuf died in 366/977, six of Abū Saʿīd's grandsons succeeded to power, perhaps representing the descendants of the six sons of Abū Saʿīd other than Abū Tāhīr, whose descendants seem to have been permanently excluded. When Nasir-i Khusrav visited al-ʿĀṣāb in 443/1051, the ruling council continued to consist of six descendants of Abū Saʿīd, presumably co-opted, and six viziers, now apparently all descendants of Ibn Sanbar (Ṣanāʾīra). Descendants of Abū Saʿīd called tāda were still known in al-ʿĀṣāb in the early 7th/13th century.

In the time of Ibn Ḥawkāl, the income from the fruit and grain estates in al-Bahrāyn was assigned to the members of the Karmati community (muḍmīn). This arrangement probably dates back to the time of Abū Saʿīd. The revenues received from the customs collected on the island of Uwāl on all ships passing through the Persian Gulf were distributed among the male and female descendants of Abū Saʿīd (ca. 400). All other revenues from taxes and fees, the tribute of ʿUmān, the protection fees paid by the pilgrims and governments, booty from military campaigns was disposed of by the ruling sons of Abū Saʿīd in agreement with Sanbar. Whatever was not used for purposes of government was divided up annually. One fifth was put into the treasury of the Mahdī, three fifths were distributed among the male descendants of Abū Saʿīd according to a fixed ratio, and one fifth was given to Sanbar for distribution among the members of his family (ca. 20). In Būyīd times there was a Karmati customs house at the gate of al-Baṣra besides the one of the Būyīd government. Permanent representatives of the Karmatis resided in al-Kūfah and al-Dīshāfira, a town in the desert near al-Baṣra which they had occupied. They were granted extensive land holdings in the region of Saḵy al-Furāṭ by ʿĪzāz al-Dawla and in the area of al-Wāṣīf by ʿAḥūd al-Dawla. During the reign of ʿAḥūd al-Dawla and the beginning of the reign of Ṣaṁṣām al-Dawla a permanent representative of the Karmatis, Abū Bakr b. Šabḥyā, resided in Baghdaḏ and wielded considerable political influence.

The able-bodied Karmati sectarians living in al-ʿĀṣāb were well trained militarily and constituted the backbone of the Karmati army. In addition Arab tribal auxiliary troops regularly joined the Karmati campaigns. They belonged chiefly to the Banū Kilāb, who gradually seem to have been fully integrated into the Karmati community, and the Banū ʿUkayl. In the last phase of the Karmati state the ʿĀmīr b. Rabīʿa of ʿUkayl were charged with the external defence of al-ʿĀṣāb and were paid for their services by a share of the crops of the Karmati farms.

In the time of Nasir-i Khusrav, 30,000 purchased negro slaves were employed by the council on the farms. No taxes or tithes were paid by the inhabitants of al-ʿĀṣāb. Anyone impoverished or indebted could obtain a loan until his affairs were re-established. No interest was taken on loans, and all local business transactions were carried out with token money of lead. Any artisan newly arriving in al-ʿĀṣāb was given a loan for the purchase of tools and material needed to establish himself. Repairs of houses were carried out by the slaves of the rulers free of charge. There were mills maintained by the government where grain was ground for the inhabitants without cost. Since the time of Abū Saʿīd prayers, fasting and other Muslim rites had been abolished. A foreign merchant had, however, been allowed to build a mosque for the use of Muslim visitors. People strictly abstained from drinking wine. Fine fabrics were woven and exported to al-Baṣra and elsewhere.

Bibliography: Besides the chronicles relevant for the period the following sources are important: al-Nawbaṭāl, ʿIrāq al-ṣaḥāfa, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1931, 61-4; Saʿīd b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kumānl, al-Mahālāt wa ʿl-firaḥ, ed. Muḥammad Ḏjawād Maṣǧūr, Tehran 1963, 83-8; Masʿūdī, Tanbih,
Karmatî — Karnal


Karmisîn [see KIRMANSHAH].

Karmûna [today Carmona], town in Spain situated 40 km. to the North-East of Seville and numbering 42,738 inhabitants. The ancient Roman Carmona was conquered by Môsâ b. Nu^ayrî in 93712 (Ibn al-Shâbîbât and others say that it was occupied by Târîkh b. Zîyâd), and Karmûna was the name given to a madina and a hâra adjacent to those of Ithhîliya and Kûrtûba. Of ancient construction, Karmûna was endowed with strong walls, and its fortress was almost impregnable. According to al-Kîmîyârî (Râsîl-i-matn, text 150-9, tr. 190), it possessed an arsenal, public baths and a great number of quarries of lime and clay, as well as garnets "which sparkled there in the night as though they were lamps" (Fâgnan, Extraits, 62). The mountains of Karmûna being populated by Berbers, the territory felt the effects of the great rebellions which affected the south of the al-Anfîlîs, notably that of the Yemenis who supported the pro-"Abîsâdî al-Alâî b. Mughîlit and who, in 1493/753, besieged Abd ar-Rahmân I in the town for two months. In 228/844 Karmûna was the refuge of the Seljuks fleeing the Mâqûsî (q.v.), and, during the years of the agitation of the Muwâlladîs, Berbers and Arabs of Seville against the Amîr 'Abîd Allâh (end of the 3rd/9th century), it was one of the centres of the insurrection, and fell in 300/913 and 301/914 to the power of Muhammad b. Hâdîdâhil, who held it until the bâdîb Badr was able to subdue in 305/917. Even before the fall of the Caliphate, it was governed by the Berber Banû Bîrzâl, who made it into a practically independent principality in 414/1023-4. During the war against al-Mu^ta'dîd, Karmûna was for some time, probably in 459/1067-8, in the hands of al-Mâ'mûn of Toledo, who restored it by error to the petty kingdom of Seville. Occupied by the Almoravids in Rabî' I 484/May 1094, it passed to the power of the Almohads in 542/1147. For a certain time (555-6/1160-1) it was dominated by Ibn Hamûshî. After its fields had been ravaged by the Christians in the time of Alphonso VIII, it was conquered and repopulated by Fernand III of Castille during the summer of 645/1247.


(J. Bosch-Vilà)

Karnál, town and district of the province of the Pandjâb.

1. The town is situated a few miles W. of the Djâmânî R. in 29°41' N. 76°59' E. and 73 miles (117 km.) north of Dilm. It was in British times the administrative centre of a district of the Pandjâb, but historically and ethnologically it belongs to Hindùstân rather than the Pandjâb. It is now in the Ambiala division of the Hariana province of the Indian Republic. In 1961 its population was 72,109.
The language commonly used by the inhabitants is a dialect of Western Hindi. It is no doubt a place of great antiquity, and the name is traditionally derived from Karna of the Mahābhārata (Karnālāy = Abode of Karna). But it was not of great importance in early times, and it is not mentioned in the accounts of the invasions of India by Mārmūd Ghażna and Mū'izz al-Dīn. Its prosperity seems to have commenced with the construction of the canal from the Diamnā by Fūrūz Shāh Tughlūk (see Shams-i-Sirāj, Tarikh-i Fūrūz Shāh, in Elliot and Dowson, India, iii, 300). The country became productive and rich, and being on the direct road to Dihlī from the north became an object of attention to invaders and rebels. Thus in 980/1573, while Akbar was engaged in Gujārāt, Karnal, Pānpāt, and Sūnpāt were plundered by Ibrāhīm Husayn Mīrzā. Dīhāngīr halted at Karnal in 1013/1604 during his pursuit of his rebellious son, Khusraw (Elliot and Dowson, vi, 296, also Beveridge's tr., Jāhanger's Memoirs, 1). In 1120/1708 during the reign of Bahādur Shāh, Karnal was attacked and plundered by the Sikh rebels (Elliot and Dowson, vii, 419). But the most noteworthy event in its history was the great victory of Nādir Shāh over Muhammad Shāh in 1152/1739 which was fought just outside the walls of the town. The imperial army was kept in the battle encamped on the banks of the canal, where it was re-enforced by the 30,000 cavalry of Būrān al-Mulk, Nāṣim of Awadh (Oudh). But Nādir Shāh's army was better disciplined and provided with abundant artillery, and the defeat of Muhammad Shāh's forces was sudden and complete. After the break-up of the Moghul empire following this invasion (and those of Ahmad Shāh Durrānī and the Mahrattas), Karnal and the surrounding district were for a space until driven out by a British force under Skinner in 1803, after Lake's defeat of Gurdit Singh, the Sikh chief of Ladwa, then held it for a space again before the Sikhs. Gādiapat Singh of Dīlūn possessed it in 1763 after the battle of Sirhind, but Nādir Khān recovered it in 1775. After this the Sikhs and Mahrattas contend for its possession with varying results. The intrepid adventurer, George Thomas, drove out the Sikhs in 1798, but only held it for a short time. Gurdit Singh, the Sikh chief of Lādwa, then besieged and captured it for a space, under Rājā Lāhī of the Manjharī, a chief of the Ghorewāha and Juriwar clans. Some of these clans have sections which still retain the Hindu religion. The conversion to Islam is generally asserted to have taken place in the reign of Fūrūz Shāh Tughlūk.


**KARNĀTAK**, properly the Kanarese (Kannādā) speaking district of southern India, Sanskrit karnāṭaka; the word seems to be derived from Dravidian roots meaning "black country", i.e. the country with the "black cotton soil" which characterizes the south Deccan plateau. The region is approximately that of the modern Mysore (Mysuru) state; but it was already applied in mediaeval times to part of the Telugu-speaking region as well, as in the time of the Vidīyānagara (q.v.) kingdom. After the Deccan confederacy had defeated the Vidīyānagara forces at the battle of Tālkōfa in 972/1564-5 the Muslims took over the Vidīyānagara Karnāṭak lands, and used the term to apply not only to the plateau lands but also to the coastal lands on the east coast below the Ghāfs; with European involvement in south India in the 18th century the term came to be erroneously applied, as "Carnatic", to the coastal region alone. In this sense it figures in the title of the nawwāb of the Carnatic, more correctly called nawwāb of Arkāt.
The town of Arkat (24°54' N., 79°20' E.) became a hereditary holding in the family of Sa'dat Allah Khan in the early 18th century; Sa'dat Allah was a Nawâdî (a Muslim tribe of southern India reputed to be of Hāshimite descent, driven from 'Irāk by al-Hādīdādī in the 2nd/8th century) who had commanded Arangwâzîb's forces in the operations against Mysore. His nephew, Dost 'Ali Khan (1145-1372/1730-40), is usually recognised as the first nawâdîb, nominally a dependent of the first Nizâm of Haydarābâd but in practice exercising considerable independence. The town and its surrounding district changed hands many times between Haydarābâd, English, French and Haydar 'Ali's armies, still held by the latter when the nawâdîb Muhammad All, an ally of the British, assigned the revenues of the "Carnatic," nominally to be especially abhorrent. Ibn Karram also held that God has been eternally qualified by the names attributed to Him and, whom he later discovered to be unreliable, Ibn Karram was accordingly jailed by the governor for eight years until he was released in 251/865 (some sources state that he had already been briefly imprisoned during his first stay in Nishāpūr by 'Ali b. 'Abd Allah, Muhammad's predecessor as governor). He then left Nishāpūr and ended his days in Jerusalem, where he died in Safar 255/January-February 869, being buried near the Bāb Arbâb or Jericho Gate (see Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ulama, al-Uns al-gailāl, Cairo 1283/1866, i, 263).

(2). Doctrines. Ibn Karrâm's theological ideas were set forth in his 'Adhâb al-bâhr (Punishment of the grave), referring to the questioning of the corpse in its grave by the twelve Transmitters on the authority of Ahmad b. 'Ali b. 'Uthmân in Marw, and in Balkh, Abd Allah traditions on the authority of Ahmad b. 'Ali b. 'Uthmân (targhib).

Ansdb, Ascetic in Nishapur, Ibrahim b. Yusuf al-Makiyam is given in his obituary notice in Ibn al-Athir, vii, 53-4; and Safadi, ed. Cureton, 79-85, tr. Haarbriicker, i, 263-7. Baghdâdî personally disputed with an adherent of the Karrâmîya, 'Ibrâhîm b. Muhâdîr, before the Sâmanî commander-in-chief in Khurâsân, Muhammad b. 'Ibrâhîm b. Sîmûdîr, in 370/980-1, and exposed, so he claims, his abysmal errors. Another of Ibn Karrâm's works, the Kilâb al-Sirr, is known only from two citations by Ibn al-Dâ'î, a later author. A salient feature of Ibn Karrâm's doctrines was, according to his orthodox opponents, that of literalism and anthropomorphism, so that many heresiologists counted his sect amongst the Mudjâssima or Mushabbiha (though Ashârî, Muhâdîl al-islāmiyyân, Cairo 1369/1950, i, 205, made it a sub-sect of the Mursîla [q.v.]). Ibn Karrâm considered that God was a substance (dwârah), thus approaching, in Baghdâdî's view, the beliefs of the Christians, and that He had a body (ısîm) finite in certain directions when He comes into contact (mumâsa) with the throne, thus interpreting the much-discussed kur'ânic verse XX, 5, al-Rahmân ʾâlā 'l-lârgh istawâ, "the Merciful One has sat down firmly on the throne"; some of his adherents later substituted the more ambiguous term mulkî ("contiguity") for mumâsa. Ibn Karrâm was also exercised by the questions of the eternity of the world and the kur'ânic act of creation, which he reconciled by subtle reasoning. In accordance with the difference between substance and accident, God is subject to certain accidents, such as willing, speaking, perceiving, coming into contact etc., over which He has power, but not over the world and the created object in it, which come into existence not by His power and will but by the divine fiat kus! Baghdâdî holds this limitation of God's power over created objects which originate in His essence to be an innovation of Ibn Karrâm's and to be especially abhorrent. Ibn Karrâm also held that God has been eternally qualified by the names attributed to Him.
from His acts, i.e. that He has been eternally a creator and sustainer of mankind because of an innate, even if unexercised, power of creation (khâlîkîyya) and of sustaining (râsiyya).

Concerning God's justice, Ibn Karrâm held the moderate view that He does not permit the killing of children or of infidels who might come to embrace Islam at maturity or at some later point in their life. He also adopted a moderate view over the Imâmâth, allowing that 'All and Mu'âwiyah could exist side by side as imâms requiring the obedience of their partisans, even though 'All was imâm in conformity with the Sunna and Mu'âwiyah an usurper. He regarded faith (imân) as constituted simply by a single utterance of the doubt 'ghâdâa', enduring for ever and only rendered null and void by apostasy; a person thus declaring his faith remains a mu'tamin even if he is an unbeliever in Muhammad's apostleship or is a hypocrite (mûnâfik). Nor were those holding heretical views (ahl al-ahwâz?) to suffer punishment in hell eternally.

Finally, Ibn Karrâm held distinctive views on certain legal points, most of these being in the direction of greater flexibility. He taught that the zaydî could be validly performed in dirty garments and with a dirty body, and he did not require the lesser ablution for contact with unclean objects, anqâs; furthermore, he regarded the washing of the dead and prayer over them as only a custom (sunna) and not an obligation (fard) like enshrouding and burial.

The ascetic and pietistic strain was very strong in Ibn Kârâm's teaching and practice, and did much to win over adherents in Khurasân; it remained, indeed, a prominent characteristic of the Karâmîyya all through the sect's existence. That emphasis on tâbâkhûf, self-mortification, and tawâkhûl, utter dependence on God for all aspects of life, derived from his master Ahmad b. al-Îjarb (176/792-234/849), and that of the nucleus of the later strong Kârâmîyya community there; after his death, his tomb became a retreat-centre for his disciples, the forerunner of a special hermitage of the sect, and their mausoleum was to be found in Guzgan, as well as for the ascetic life, and that they formed a sub-sect, the Hâkâniyya (see Yâkût, Buldân, ii, 393, s.v. al-Khâniqâ). The Kârâmîyya were, like other Islamic sects, to a certain extent fissiparous, without however these sub-sects departing significantly from the central teaching of Ibn Kârâm. Baghdâtî, 202, tr. 18, enumerates three sub-sects, the Hâkâniyya, the Târâ'îfiyya (read thus, rather than Târâ'îkiyya) and the İshâkîyya, but says that they do not regard each other as heretical.

Shahrâstânî, 79-80, tr. i, 119, says that there were twelve sub-sects, and names six of them as the İshâkîyya again, the İshâkîyya, the Nûnîyya, the Zâbîrîyya, the Wâhîbîyya and the Hâyâsîyya. Finally, Fâhhr al-Dîn al-Râzî in his Istîhâlî fîrâk al-mu'âlîmîn wa'l-mu'tassîn, Cairo 1375/1956, 67, numbers the sub-sects at seven. The founders of some of these groups are amongst the later scholars of the Karâmîyya, such as Ahmad b. 'Abdûs al-Târâ'îfî (d. 349/958) and Mu'mâmmad b. al-Hâyâm (d. 407/1016-17), who is described by Shahrâstânî, 80 ff., tr. i, 120 ff., as the musâkallîm of the sect, elaborating its theology and its technical vocabulary. The İshâkîyya presumably relate to Abu Ya'kûb İshâk b. Ma'mâhîdî (d. 383/993), whose family became the mainstay of the Kârâmî cause in Nishâpur (see below).

It is not easy to give a just appraisal of the significance of the Karâmîyya in the development of Islamic religious thought, but the movement was clearly an important one. It is regrettable that we know only of the sect through the eyes of its opponents; the sole surviving Karâmî work appears to be an anonymous collection of ethical and mystical traditions, British Museum Q 804, which Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, Paris 1954, 267-8, tentatively attributed to the Karâmî leader of Nishâpur, Abu Bakr Muhammad b. İshâk b. Ma'mâhîdî (d. 421/1030). Many Sunni divines, including Hanbâll and Zâhirî, were strongly opposed to the sect, and the Shâfi'i b. Abû Dâ'fîr Muhammad b. Muhammad b. İshâk compiled a polemical work on the errors of its leader, the Fadâ'ilî Ibn Kârâm. However, the geographer Makdisî, who in the course of his travels had many contacts with Kârâmî groups, came down firmly on placing them within the bounds of orthodoxy, calling them "an ascetic and God-fearing folk" who derived from Abu Hanîfa (Ahsan al-tâlîsîm, 365).

It seems that we should consider the Karâmîyya as a Sunni group engaged in defending a central position against the Mu'tazîlî on one side and the Ahl al-Haḍîth on the other; a later authority like Makrîzî considered them to be essentially opponents of the Mu'tazîlî (Khifat, ii, 357). Massignon, op. cit., 263-4, speaks of Ibn Kârâm as one of the great thinkers in Muslim scholasticism, who supplied a new and profound examination of the theological questions raised by Mu'tazîlîsm, one which was not purely theoretical but which took root in the light of mystical and moral experience. Notable is Ibn Kârâm's introduction of a new philosophical-theological terminology, e.g., bayâfîyya, "the quality of God" and bayhâfîyya, "the ubiquity of God", stigmatized by Baghdâtî as 'ibârî saltîfâ, "ridiculous expressions" but which nevertheless show Ibn Kârâm's inventiveness and his awareness of need here. Certainly, the sect flourished for some three centuries, and it was suggested by an older generation of orientalists, including Van Vloten and Ribera y Tarragó, that the khânâkâhs and madrasas of the Karâmîyya which sprang up in widely-separated parts of the Islamic world (see below) were centres for instruction and evangelism as well as for the ascetic life, and that they formed a model and stimulus for the Ash'arî, Hanîfî and Hanbâll madrasa-building movement of the 5th/11th century; this link remains, however, unproven [see also Khânâkân].

(3) Subsequent history. During the course of the 4th/10th century, the Karâmîyya spread over many parts of the central and eastern Islamic world. In Jerusalem, they had a numerous representation, with their own khânâkâhs and sessions for âhâfîs; and in Fustât or Old Cairo they had a special quarter of their own; but the sect was unrepresented in the Maghrib (Makdisî, 179, 182, 202, 238). It was Khurasân, Transoxania and the eastern Iranian fringes which became the most enduring stronghold of the sect, and their khânâkâhs were to be found in Gâzgân, Khuttal, Farghânâ, Marw and Sâmarqand (Makdisî, 323). In Harât, the main âsapîyya or factional strife (probably with some social as well as religious basis) was at this time between the Karâmîyya and the 'Âmilîyya.

We know most about the Karâmîyya in Nishâpur, where they were a strong and bellicose faction under
the leadership of the Banu Mafcmashadh (see above). Here as elsewhere, the hold of the Karramiyya on the populace doubtless stemmed from the exemplary asceticism of their leaders' lives and their evangelistic teaching activity; Abū Ya' ḥūb Isḥāb b. Mafcm-
shadh is said to have converted large numbers of dhimmis and Zoroastrians by his trenchant preaching. Supported by the secular power, in the shape of patronage from the founder of the Ghaznavid dynasty Sebiktlgin and then from his son Sultan Mahmūd, the Karramiyya enjoyed a temporary ascendency over their opponents in Nishapūr, comprising the Ashšāfī 'Ulamā', the 'Alids and, as appears from the biography of the famous Shaykh Abū Sa'd al-Mayhānī, the Sūfīs. They felt from power, however, after 402/1012-12, when Mahmūd withdrew his patronage, but they nevertheless continued to be an appreciable element in the city. The local historian of Baybāk, Ibn Funduq, and Ibn al- Ḥāibre recorded civil strife in Nishapūr and Baybāk during 488/1095 or 489/1096 between the local Karramiyya on one side and the Hanafis and Shāfīs on the other, and this ended in Nishapūr with the killing of the Karrāmī leader Mafcmashadh and the razing of their madrasa (see on all these events Barthold, Turkestān down to the Mongol invasion, 285-90; C. E. Bosworth, The rise of the Karramiyyah, in MWW, 1 (1966), 5-14; Idem, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040, Edinburgh 1963, 185-9; R. W. Bulliet, The patricians of Nishapūr, a study in medieval Islamic social history, Cambridge, Mass. 1972, index).

The last stronghold of the Karramiyya was in Ghūr, the mountainous region of central Afghanistan, one of the last long converted, ruled by a governor of the Ghūrids, Dājārdjād, the Ghūrid sultans Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muhammad (d. 599/1202-3) and his brother Muḥizz al-Dīn Muhammad (d. 602/1205-6) who were originally adherents of the Karramiyya, in conformity with the beliefs of the masses of their subjects, but transferred their allegiance to the Shāfīī law school. Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn's favour to the great Shāfīī scholar 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Razzāq (d.n.), who disputed in the Ghūrid capital Fīrūzkūh with the popular Karrāmī divine Ibn Kudwa, caused a popular uprising there, compelling Razzāq to return to Harāt. Razzāq's polemics with the Karramiyya are important evidence for this last phase of the sect's existence, and contain much information on Karrāmī theology. After the Mongol invasions, we hear nothing of the sect, which must have been submerged in the general holocaust in Kurāshān; when later authors like Ibn Taymiyya write against the Karramiyya, they are merely drawing on material in the older authorities (see Bosworth, The early Islamic History of Ghūr, in Central Asiatic Journal, vi (1961), 128-33, and A. Marcq and G. Wiet, Le minaret de Djam, la décadence de la capitale des sultans ghūrides, Paris 1959, 49-50).

Bibliography: largely given in the article. The most complete and sympathetic account of Ibn Karrām's thought is given in Massignon's Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, 260-8, 318-19; see also A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim creed, Cambridge 1932, index; H. Lautou, Essai sur les doctrines... d'Ibn Taymiyya, Cairo 1939, 81, 159; A. S. Tritton, Muslim theology, London 1947, index; W. M. Watt, Islamic philos-

KARRAMIYYA — KARS

the importance of Kars in 19th/20th century


(K. E. Bosworth)

KARRI [see KERR].

KARS, a garrison town and administrative centre in Eastern Turkey, situated on 40°57' N. and 43°06' E, chef-lieu of the ii (province) of the same name, which is bounded by the U.S.S.R. and the iis of Artvin, Erzurum and Ağrı and contains the içes (districts) of Posof, Hanak, Çıldır, Ardahan, Göle, Susuz, Arpaçay, Selim, Digor, Sankamis, Kağızman, Fuzluca and Aralik, with that of Kars itself. In 1960 the population of the provinces of Kars was 543,000; in 1965 (provisional), 606,521, of which 20% was urban and 80% agricultural or rural (Kars II yIliligi 1967, Ankara n.d.).

The etymologies suggested tentatively by Barthold (EI)—Georgian—and by Kirzioğlu (İ.)—Turkish—for Kars cannot be sustained. In medieval Armenian sources the forms Karuc (Karmir) or Karuc berd are encountered (A. K. Sanjian, Colophons of Ar-

onian Manuscripts, Cambridge 1932, index; N. Adontz, Armenia in the period of Justinian, Lisbon 1970, 206). A 16th-century identification of "Chars" with the Chorsa of Ptolomy should perhaps be noted (G. T. Minadoli, Historia de bello inter Turcas et Persas, in P. Bizanos, Rerum persicarum historia, Frankfurt 1605, 316; cf., however, C. Müller (ed.), Claudii Ptolomaei geographical, Paris 1883-1907, ii, 941 and n.). Byzantine usage (Tō Kāpç) is supplied by Constantine Porphyrogeni-
tus, De administrando imperio, ch. xlv; Muslim forms are Kars in Ibn al- Ḥāibre (ed. Tornberg, x, 27; xii, 169, 295, 300, 306), Karş or Kars in Yākūt (ed. Wustenfeld, iv, 57), Ghars in al-Fārīqī (quoted in V. Mi-

From Umayyad times the region of Kars lay on the frontiers of the Muslim world. The decline of Arab power after the middle of the 2nd/8th century gave more independence to Armenia under the Bagratid dynasty and early in the 3rd/9th century the Armenian prince Smbat (held hostage at Samarra from 190/506 to 210/825 and called Abu 'l-ʿAbbās al-Kārisī by the Muslims) ruled over Kars as a vassal of the ' Abbāsīds (J. Laurent, Arménie entre Byzance et Islam, Paris 1919, 290-1 and n.; cf. the De administr.

imperio, ii (Commentary), ed. R. H. Jenkins, London 1962, 158). In 222/837 Isbāk, the amir of Tiflis, halted in the vicinity of Kars an army sent by the Byzantine emperor Theophilus as part of an unsuccessful attempt to detach Armenia from Muslim suzerainty (Laurent, op. cit., 211-2).

The importance of Kars in the 4th/10th century derived in part from its situation on the important trade route Ânî-Kars-Kâllišalā (= Erzurum) - Trebi-

zond (Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian history, London 1953, 90-1) and in Duvayni, Ta ḫīh-ı Dzhāhān-Gūshā (ed. Mīra Muhammad), ii, 161. Ottoman usage favoured the form Kârş.
KARS

It served as the capital of the Armenian kingdom of Vanand, which was erected by the ruler of Anl, Ashot III, for his younger brother Mushegh, and his successors (cf. EJ, AnI).

By 1022 the kingdom of Vanand was surrounded on three sides by Byzantine territory (Honigmann, Osotgrens, 173); its last ruler, Gapik (1028-64), continued to hold his position even after Anl had been incorporated into the Byzantine Empire (1044). In face of the Saljuk threat—in 446/1054-5 Tughril Beg had destroyed the forces of Gapik and besieged Kars for three days (Honigmann, op. cit., 181)—he was induced to renounce his rights voluntarily in favour of the Emperor Constantine X Doukas, receiving in return a town in the Cilician Taurus.

The early history of Kars as a Muslim town is confused. In 456/1064 its inhabitants appear to have submitted voluntarily to Alp Arslan (Ibn al-Athir, x, 272); ten years later, however, in 1074, King Giorgi II of Georgia received Kars from one of his vassals. In ca. 472-3/1080 he was attacked by a Turkish force under the amir Abmad, who "shortly before" had conquered Kars; subsequently, for much of the 11th/12th century, Kars lay within the Saljukid amirate (cf. Minorsky, Studies, 84, n. 1). In 548/1153 Kars was occupied and destroyed by the Khtsars, but in the same year it was retaken by the Saljukid Malik 'Iziz al-Din (cf. the Arabic inscription, commemorating the reconstruction of the citadel in that year, discovered by the Ottomans in the course of their own rebuilding in 987/1579). The text is provided by Ewliya Celebi, Seyyidname, ii (Istanbul, 1314), 330. During the mid-6th/12th century Kars also lay within the sphere of influence of the Shaddadid amirs of Anl: in Shahin 556/August 1161 troops furnished by "the lord of Ghars and Surmari" assisted in an attempt by the Shaddadid amir Faqdin b. Minuchir to regain his capital from the Georgian king Giorgi III (Minorsky, op. cit., 88-91, quoting al-Farikhi).

Kars remained in Muslim hands until 603/1206-7, when it was taken by the Georgians (Ibn al-Athir, xii, 169). It was besieged in vain by the Nizamshah (Ibn al-Din in Hakamshah, ii, 633-637; 636/1239 it was occupied by the nuyun Cormaghun and incorporated into the Mongol Empire. Hethum, king of Little Armenia, who visited Kars ca. 649/1251, found there the Mongol camp, from which Baydu governed the territories under his command. According to Hamd Allah al-Kazwin (Nasihat al-Kullah, ed. Le Strange, 93), at a later period Kars besieged, with Anl, to the Ilghizhan province of Georgia (Gürdjidstân va Abghazar): it was described at this time as one of the chief towns of Georgia (Le Strange, 181).

In 759/1358 Kars passed to the Daláyirds; and in 782/1380 to the Karakoyunlu. In 788/1386 the region of Kars, at that time under the local ruler Pir Huseyn b. Sahat, was devastated by Tmîr and turned into a wilderness (cf. Sanjjan, op. cit., 152), while Kars itself, it is said, was levelled to the ground (cf. Zafar-nama, ed. Tauer, index). The years 796/1394, 805/1400 and 805/1403 again saw Tmîr pass by Kars en route for summer pasture in the Bingil area of Çetdir, but soon after his death the Timùrid province of Anl, within which Kars was situated, reverted to Kar Koyunlu control. The local ruler Pir Huseyn b. Sahat is said by Armenian sources to have rebuilt and restored Kars in 813/1412; later, in 871/1467, Kars passed into the hands of the Ak-Koyunlu ruler Ulun Hasan.

Kars suffered much from the strife which accompanied the rise to power of the Safawids: for example, in 920/1514, when the Ottoman sultan Selim I encamped close by Kars on his return from the victorious Çaldûrân campaign, the town was said to be once more in a ruinous condition.

By 940/1534 Kars was in Ottoman hands, and in 955/1548 the sultan Suleymân I ordered work to be done on the fortifications. It was not until the renewal of the Ottoman-Safawid conflict in the late 16th/17th century, however, that Kars fully came into its own as a fortress of the Empire (1044). In face of the Safawid incursions into north-eastern Anatolia, and a base forward of Erzum from which the difficult task of keeping open the road to Tiflis and holding the new Caucasian conquests could be supported.

In the opening campaign (Djumâdâ II 986/August 1578) of the long Ottoman-Safawid struggle for the Caucasus, Kars was the scene of the first engagement —"una fiera scaramuzza"—between Ottoman forces under Lâlâ Mustafa Paşa, and those of the Safawids (Cesare Campana, Compendio storico, delle guerre . . . tra Christiani, & Turchi . . ., Venice 1597, f. 20). On 2 Djumâdâ I 'l-Akher 987/27 July 1579 an Ottoman army under Lâlâ Mustafa Paşa encamped at Kars, and proceeded rapidly, in the face of acute difficulties caused by a lack of suitable workmen and by the dense fogs and bitter cold which set in after 2 Radjab, 25 August (Minadoi, op. cit., 537), to fortify the town for use as a base from which to relieve Tiflis (Campa-

Under Ottoman rule Kars was raised (988/1580) to be the administrative centre of an eyalet of six or seven sandikâhs. Ewliya Celebi, who visited Kars in 1057/1647, variously lists (op. cit., i, 185, 192; ii, 329) the sandikâhs and their revenues (for other statistical accounts of the revenues and divisions of the eyalet of Kars, dating from the mid 17th/17th century, and giving alternative readings, see P. Rycaut, Preseni State of the Ottoman Empire, London 1670, 54, and J. von Hammer, Osm. Staatsverfassung, ii, 259). The town and its principal monuments at this time are described by Ewliya Celebi, op. cit., ii, 349-353, which can be supplemented by J.-M. Thierry, A propos de quelques monuments chrétiens du vilayet de Kars, in Revue des Etudes arménienes, n.s. iii (1966), 73-90, and by the several works of K. M. Fahrettin (= F. Kürzeholu). According to Ewliya Celebi, the Ottoman forces in Kars, together with those of Vân and Akbişhe, were renowned for their courage and bravery as borderers (op. cit., ii, 331), and in the Ottoman chronicles of the 11th/17th century Kars figures prominently and frequently in the accounts of the wars with the Safawids during this time.

European travellers to Kars were few before the 19th century. G. F. Gemelli-Carreri, who was there in May 1694, described Kars as a "large, but not populous city", with two walls of earth and a good garrison, which sent out forty horse every night to patrol the border with Safawid territory (A collection of voyages . . ., iv, London 1704, 109).

During the campaigns of Nadir Shah, Kars was besieged several times (1735 twice; 1744) (L. Lockhart, Nadir Shah, London 1938, passim; cf. also the despatches of Stanhope Aspinwall, London, Public Record Office, S. P. 97/32). By the end of the 18th century the eyalet of Kars had become one of the poorest in the Ottoman Empire, and was one of several provinces unable to provide sufficient revenue.

As part of the administrative reforms of the *Ta’ restart* period, the cedet of Kars was reduced to the status of a sannah in the wilayet of Erzurum (cf. *Sal-name* for 1922), but the military and strategic importance of the fortress itself was underlined once more by the Russian expansion southward through the Caucasus during the early 19th century. Kars was besieged successfully by Russian forces three times: in 1828, 1855 and 1877 (details and bibliography in W. E. D. Allen and P. Muratoff, *Caucasian Battlefields*, Cambridge 1953). Kars at this time took on also a considerable, if specious, significance for both British diplomacy and English public opinion, which regarded it as the "traditional bulwark against Russian expansion southwards" (B. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans 1870-1880*, Oxford 1937, 316), and for the Russians themselves, as a war objective (*ibid.*, 623-4).

By the terms of the abortive Treaty of San Stefano (3 March 1878) and article 56 of the Treaty of Berlin (13 July 1878), the sandjaks of Kars and Ardahan, and the port of Batum, were ceded to Russia.

The number and composition of the inhabitants of town and province of Kars were seriously affected by the Russo-Turkish wars of the 19th century and by the events of World War I. As early as 1828 the majority of the original Armenian population were said to have deserted Kars after the Russian evacuation, while in the years after 1877 a steady migration of Muslims into Ottoman territory was counterbalanced by the settlement of Armenians and Russians in Kars itself and by massive colonization of the evicted rural districts (the statistics in *Brohhaus-Yetem Enislik, Slovar'* (1895) svv. Kars', Karskaya Oblast', were adapted by Barthold for the *EI1* version of this article).

Kars was the scene of fierce fighting in World War I. By the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (3 March 1918) it was returned to the Ottoman Empire, but in fact remained in the hands of the Armenian nationalists until Turkish troops entered the town on 25 April 1918. Under the terms of the Mudros armistice (30 October 1918) the Turkish armies were obliged to withdraw to the west of the 1914 Russo-Turkish frontier. The Turks of Kars, however, established (6 November 1918) a provisional government under Fahrettin Pirioğlu (Fahrettin Pirioğlu), which claimed suzerainty over the province of Kars and the surrounding Turkish-speaking or Muslim districts as far as Batum and Gumrü (Aleksandropol’). After a period of confused fighting against Armenian, Georgian and British units, the Turkish regime in Kars was overthrown by a British expedition from Batum (19 April 1919) and some of its leaders were deported to Malta. During May 1919 Kars reverted to Armenian control, while the local Turkish leaders who survived took the hills and began to look to the Kemalists for aid. With the British withdrawal from Transcaucasia, and the Turco-Soviet rapprochement (1920), the independent Transcaucasian republics were quickly liquidated, and with the rapid collapse of Armenia the Turkish XViith Army Unit under Kazım Karabekir Pasha recaptured Kars on 30 October 1920. The *hadis of Chahar Posof* (23 February 1921) and Ardahan (7 March 1921)—all nowadays within the *ii* of Kars—also soon came under Turkish control.

By the Treaties of Gumrü (Aleksandropol’) with the Armenian Republic (2 December 1920), of Moscow (March 1921) with the Soviet régime, and of Kars (13 October 1921) with the Soviet Armenian, Georgian and Adzharian republics, the present boundary between Turkey and the U.S.S.R. was established. By this time, after seven years of warfare and enforced migration, the non-Muslim population had disappeared, and the province and town of Kars had taken on their present ethnic characteristics.

**Bibliography:** (in addition to the works mentioned in the text), *Naqīm, Taṣrīḥ, Istanbul 1147*, passim; J. von Hammer, *Geschichte* (repr. Graz 1964), i, 269, ii, 420, iv, 75, 358, 477, 619, v, 82, viii, 57. For recent Turkish works and the productions of local historiography see K. M. Fahrettin, *Kars Tarihî*, i (Istanbul 1953) and the same author’s article *Kars (Tarih)* in *IA*. The numerous Russian and western works which deal with the military history of Kars in the 19th century are given by W. E. D. Allen and P. Muratoff in their work cited above. Cf. also for the events of 1914-21, H. Bayur, *İnkılab Tarihi*, Ankara 1943-67, and K. Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Istanbul 1960. (W. BARTHOLOD-C. J. HEYWOOD)
KART (possibly kurt), the name of a dynasty which ruled Herāt from 643/1245 to 791/1389. It was founded by Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad I Kart, who was descended from the Shamsābānī house of Ghūr, the family to which the brothers Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad and Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sām belonged. As Herāt recovered from the devastating raids of the armies of Čingīz Khān, Shams al-Dīn gradually gained power, and by 643/1245 had established himself as ruler of the state, and used the title of Malik, borne by his descendants. In 649/1251 the Great Kān Mōŋgik, when reorganizing the administration of his empire, confirmed Shams-al-Dīn Kart as governor of Herāt, Balḵ and the country lying between those provinces and the Indian frontier. During the latter part of Shams-al-Dīn’s reign his son Rūkn al-Dīn acted as his coadjudtor, but predeceased him, dying in 682/1282, and when Shams al-Dīn himself died in 684/1285, he was succeeded by Rūkn al-Dīn’s son, Fakhr al-Dīn. As the power of the Mongol Il-Khāns of Persia declined, that of the Kart Malikīs of Herāt increased, and they governed for the first time nearly the same territory as modern Afghanistan, which was protected by them against Mongol devastations. Fakhr al-Dīn befriended the powerful amir Coban, who had been regent of Persia during the minority of Ābū Sa’īd, the fourteenth Il-Khān. When Ābī Sa’īd died, the amir Coban sought asylum with Ghiyāth al-Dīn, who received him, but in 727/1327 treacherously put both himself and his son Dīlay khan to death. Ghiyāth al-Dīn himself died in 728/1328 and his two elder sons, Shams al-Dīn II and Ḥafiz, who succeeded him in turn, died in 729/1329 and 731/1331. The historian ʿAlī detained him on various pretexts while he followed the lot of its administrative capital and its ruler and his eldest son, Pīr Muḥammad, after a few days’ siege. Some of its leading citizens were deported to Shahr-i Šabz and its defences were dismantled, but the Malik and his two sons, the younger of whom had been induced to surrender the strong fort of Ishkāla, were pardoned, and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Pīr ʿAllī was permitted to retain Herāt as a vassal of Timūr until 791/1389, when the dynasty was extinguished.


KARTADIJANNĀ, a name by which three places are known: Carthage, Cartélia (Kartādijannāt al-Dzāizirā) and Carthagena. This synonymy seems to be the cause of numerous confusions between the ancient Ħamān and the Kartādijannāt al-khalfa (and not al-khuladā as Yākūt interprets it). These confusions have been studied by J. Vallvé, Carthage et Carthagène au VIII° siècle. The name of the town, seat of a bishopric, must be the translation of Cartag-Spartaria, alluding to the abundance of esparto grass in the region.

According to al-Himyārī (Rauz al-miḥfar, no. 139, who copies al-Idrisī), “Carthagena is the port of Murcia. It is an ancient town, which dates from antiquity. It possesses an anchorage where large and small ships can anchor. Provisions abound there and are sold there permanently at a cheap rate. In its dependencies is a district by the name of al-Fudūn: there are few places where the soil is of such good quality, and it is reported that a single fall of rain is sufficient to assure the harvest, and the grain which grows there is excellent. By land it is 40 miles from the town of Carthagena to Murcia. It is near this town of Carthagena that ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Mūsā b. Nuṣayr defeated Tūṭmīr b. ʿAbdūs, who has given his name to the kāra of Tūṭmīr.” The text of the treaty between ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and Tūṭmīr is the only one of Muslim Spain which has been preserved in extenso and of which we have several versions.

The town, in so far as it was one, does not seem to have enjoyed much importance, despite the enthusiasm of the description which Abuʾl-Ḥasan al-Kartādijanni gives of it in the 12th-13th centuries (cf. his Kaṣīda maḥṣūra; a summary analysis in E. Garcia Gómez, Observaciones sobre la Qasida . . ., in al-And., 1933/5, 81-103) and the Arab sources—geographical as much as historical—are exceptionally laconic. A part of the gjund of Egypt was installed there by Abūl-Ḥaṭṭār (q.v.) in the district of Tūṭmīr (q.v.), of which we may have a reflection in the Crónica del Moro Rasis which placed it under the government of ʿAbd al-Malik b. Kaṭān. It is in this region that ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Šīk_IR (in 143/763, following the orders of the ʿAbbasīd al-Mahdī), in his attempt to overthrow the Umayyads, at the time of the alliance of Ibn al-ʿArabī (q.v.) with Charlemagne. Subsequently, the confrontation for power between the descendants of ʿAbd al-Rahmān made this place the domain of Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Balānis. When the continual feuds between Muḥarīs and Yemenis wearied of the ascendency of the Murcian-Carthagena region was the apple of discord that made Yūsuf b. Tāshuifin (q.v.) resolve to dethrone the petty kings. The province was subdued by Ibn ʿĀṣīra (q.v.).
It then passed into the power of Ibn Hamushk and of Ibn Mardanî [q.v.] and, after its submission to the Almohads, it followed the general decadence and became part of the domains of Sayyif al-Ádíl when he rose up in the Levant. It then belonged to Ibn Hûd and finally to Zâyûn b. Mardanî who, after the loss of Valencia in 635/1238, took refuge in Murcia, from where he was pursued by Bâhâ al-Dawût, the last great public (display) of his myriad talents. The latter surrendered to the future Alphonsus the Wise, but there was an uprising there in 1246 and the last indomitable rebels were not exterminated until 1274.

Carthagena, judged too coastal in situation and exposed to the attacks of the corsairs and Turks, does not seem to have had so many Moriscos [q.v.] as one would reasonably suppose, by contrast with Murcia where there must have been a heavy enough immigration of Granadans deported to Castille, at least those from the region of Cuenca. The port of Carthagena was one of the points of which the expulsion of the Moriscos was effected in 1612.


(Ρ. Χαλμέτα)

**KARÔKH,** a town in the region of Bâdghîs [q.v.] of modern northwestern Afghanistân and, according to Ibn Hawkal (4th/10th century), the biggest town of the region after the capital Harât. It had a Friday mosque and was famed for its fruits, especially apricots and raisins. Its particular claim to fame in mediaeval times was as an enduring centre of the Khawaridjî on the eastern Iranian fringes. In 259/873 the Šâffârîdî amîr Ya'bûkî b. al-Layyî had to cope with a serious rebellion of the eastern Khawaridjî centred on Kârûkh under their "commander of the faithful" 'Abd al-RâhÎm al-Mutawakkîl (b. 'Ilâhî; over a century later, according to Mâkulâshî, Karûkh was still a Khawaridjî centre. A modern village with the same name survives at Karukh.


**KARÔN**, the Biblical Korah (Num. XVII), is mentioned three times in the Korân (XXVIII, 70-82, XXIX, 39-58, and the latter verses, he appears with Hâmîn as a minister of Fitâ'awîn, and all three of them behave proudly towards Moses, stigmatising him as a magician and impostor. In the first passage (XXVIII, 70-82), Kârûn is one of Moses' people, but treats them in an insolent fashion because of the immense riches which have been given to him, as he believes, because of the knowledge which is in him (Sâli 'dînm 'indî). He makes a great public display of his wealth, and is swallowed up by the earth with his palace (dâr), an example of those who prefer the fleeting wealth of this world to the recompense of Allâh in the next world awarded to those who believe and do good works.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV

This tale, which alludes vaguely to the rebellion of Korah and, more explicitly, to his punishment (Num. XVI, 31-3, XXVI, 10), is probably an echo of some moralising story. The commentators and the writers on the *kișâs al-anbiyâd* have added to it a lengthy legend, in part derived from rabbinical literature (see Jewish encyclopedia, vi, 356 ff.; Sale's notes to his Kûr'ân tr.; and al-'Idhâbî, *Kûsâ*, Cairo 1314, 120 ff.). In this legend, the latter accumulated a vast horde of gold and silver, but at the request of Moses, was punished by God for his arrogance, his pride and the evil behaviour which his recently-acquired riches had led him into". According to al-Ṭabarî, Zotenben, i, 382-4, he was originally a goldsmith, and according to al-Kišâ, op. cit., 229, Moses' sister was Kûrîn's wife, and it was she who learnt about alchemy in order to teach her husband (according to the commentators, he was Moses' nephew). (2) In Egypt, his name is associated with various lakes. Thus what is left of Lake Moeris in the Fayûm bears his name (Birkat Kârûn; see Guides Bleus, *Égypte*, 1956, 241-2, where a popular etymology Birkat al-Kârûn "Lake of the Horns" is erroneously given), and a Madinat Kârûn has recently been begun in the neighbourhood. Also, beside the Birkat al-Álî the south of Cairo, near the Mosque of Ibn Tûlûn, there was formerly a Birkat Kârûn which had evidently associations of supernatural legend. Al-Mâkri describes it (Khîtâb, Bulûk 1325, iii, 261-2) and tells that Kârûf [q.v.] who built beside it a house was said to have been driven from it by djinn. It figures also in the Story of Djudhar the Fisherman in Zotenben's (cf. *Nat. et Extr.,* xxvii, i, 169 ff.) Egyptian Recension of "The 1001 Nights" (Nights 606-24) as a place where spirits take refuge from magicians. Von Hammer suggested ("Der Tausend und Einen Nacht noch nicht übersetzte Märchen", tr. Zinnerling, ii, 32; tr. Trébutien, i, 291) that Kârûn had here become confused with the Egyptian Charon.


(D. B. Macdonald*)

**KARÔN**, the largest river in southern Persia. It rises in the north-eastern Bakhûtâr mountain system or, to be more accurate, on one of the ranges named Kâhidî Rang, one of the highest mountains in south-western
Persia (estimated at 13,000 feet). The actual source of the river, according to Sawyer (Bibl., op. cit., 486, with a picture), is about 10 miles above the place called Ser-i Chehme-i Kurang "main source of the Kurang (Kuran)". The Zayända-Rúd likewise rises on the Zarda-Kúh and flows eastwards towards Isfahán. As the source of the Kárún is only about 100 miles from Isfahán, Sháh ‘Abbás I thought of leading the Kárún into the Zayända-Rúd by a tunnel through the mountains. Although almost finished at his death, the work was not continued by his successors; the remains of it may still be seen (cf. Layard, Bibl., op. cit., 50 f.).

The upper part of the river's course extends from its source to its exit from the mountains at Shústár, and the middle course from Shústár to al-Ahwáz or Naṣériyya, where it breaks through the spurs of the Díabál Hamrín; its lower course runs through the alluvial plain formed by the Kárún system. As a result of its very meandering course, the river covers about 500 miles from its source to its mouth in the Shájt al-‘Arab, although a straight line between the two points is only about 150 miles. In its upper course the Kárún makes two great loops in about 32° N. Lat.

A little above Shústár, the Kárún divides into two navigable arms which unite again about thirty miles away at the village of Eshkáz-‘Ir (known in the mediæval literature as ‘Askár Mukram) and thus form an island. The western arm is the main stream, the Kárún proper; it is now called Áb-i Shútayt (Shútayt = little river) and further down also Áb-i Buzurg Shústár (= great water of Shústár). The eastern arm is artificial in origin, and is now called Áb-i Gargar; the Arab geographers of the Middle Ages know it by the name of Masrúkán (Masgrułák, Masgrunn), which probably explained as a corruption of the Persian Ardashr-‘Kán (= "Ardashr's trench"). The form ArdaghbraIán is noteworthy: it occurs in a Syriac chronicle edited by Guidi in the Actes du 8° Congres des Orientalistes, Leiden 1891, 32 (and cf. thereon Ndolde in SB Ah. Wien, cxxviii (1893), Abb. i, 42). The first Sasanian king is said to have been the maker of this water-course. The Persian geographers of the 9th/10th century call the western branch, which carries the bulk of the water, Chádár Dániška ("four-sixths"), the eastern Dá Dániška ("two-sixths") (cf. Le Strange, 236). These names are still known locally, according to Layard (op. cit., 27). In the 4th/10th century, according to Arabic sources, the Masrúkán canal did not enter the main stream, the Kárún proper, at ‘Askár Mukram, but ran parallel to it and reached the Persian Gulf by a course of its own.

The Kárún delta begins a little above the village of Sábla. Three channels break off from the main arm, which continues its course till its junction with the Shájt al-‘Arab at Muḫtammará; these all run South-east to the Persian Gulf and finally end their course in estuaries (khawr, khór), which are at times swamps. Their names are: (1) The Shájt (or Rúd) al-‘Kádimi (= "the old stream"), which leaves the Kárún about an hour's journey above Sábla and broadens out into the Khór Músh (also called Khór Moi Alláh). This is probably the oldest course of the Kárún; (2) The Shájt "al-Amáyá" (= as it is usually written on maps) or al-‘Ámá (= the blind stream), probably so called because its bed is usually choked with mud. It is also called Shájt Kóbán (Gobán) from the district which lies on its right bank; Portuguese writers of the 17th century reproduced the name as Río de Gabão (cf. Tomaschek, 75 f.). This second arm begins at Sábla and finally expands into the Khór Sílidj (Selige in Kinneir, 292); it is perhaps the second oldest arm of the Kárún; (3) The Shájt Bamişh (Bamimishr, Behe misuse), which leaves the Kárún about 6 miles below Sábla and expands into the Khór Bamimishr before entering the sea. This third branch of the Kárún is considerably wider and holds more water than the other two. According to the Persian Gulf Pilot, 284, it is 54 miles long (40 as the crow flies). This may now be regarded as the natural mouth of the Kárún.

The two western branches of the Kárún, the Shájt al-Á’má and the Bamişh, form two long islands with the Shájt al-‘Arab, which runs parallel to them, the main Kárún in the north and the Persian Gulf in the south. The eastern one, bordered by the Shájt al-Á’má (Kóbán) and the Bamişh, is called Kóbán (Gobán, Gobbán); the western, between the Bamişh and the Shájt al-‘Arab, is now usually called Dzairarat ‘Abbábdán, a name it already had in the Middle Ages, from the town of ‘Abbábdán (q.v.), which probably originally lay at the mouth of the delta. The latter island is also called Dzairarat al-Khír after the prophet al-Khír (q.v.), highly revered in Muslim popular belief especially in Irák as a patron of water, who had or still has a sanctuary near ‘Abbábdán ("Chodder Abbadan" in Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung, ii, Copenhagen 1776, 206), which is mentioned as early as the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries by al-Dimáškí (Nákhat al-Dáhhr, ed. Mehren, 97, 18) and Ibn Baţţúta (ii, 19). Alongside ‘Abbábdán, the most important place in the Middle Ages seems to have been al-Mubrizá (Mubrizí) and the island seems occasionally to be called after it. For Mubrizí see Yáḵt, i, 502, 712, iii, 598, iv, 709; al-Dimáškí, 97; al-Kázání, Aẖár al-Bišád, ed. Wiistenfeld, 280. The Persians gave this island the name Miýán Rúdán (= "between the rivers", "Mesopotamia"); see, e.g., Yáḵt, iv, 708, and Le Strange, 48).

As has been noted, the Kárún at an earlier period probably entered the sea through the Shájt al-Á’má, apart from the riverbed represented by the Shájt al-Kádimi, which is perhaps the oldest bed. According to the mediæval Arab geographers, the different branches and tributaries of the Dzúdíya, which is divided at a place called Híšn al-Mahdil, whether the Nahr Sídri (= Lotus-river), which also enters there, must be considered the main arm of the Kárún from al-Ahwáz onwards is doubtful: cf. Le Strange, 237; Schwarz, op. cit., 306. The reunited Kárún, called Nahr Híšn al-Mahdil (see Schwarz, op. cit.), then enters its estuary (Fâydh Dzúdíya), which ends at Sulamánnán on the coast (for Híšn al-Mahdil and Sulamánnán cf. Le Strange, 48, 243, and in JRAAS (1895), 302; Schwarz, op. cit., 306, 329-330, 400). Híšn al-Mahdil perhaps lay in the neighbourhood of the present Sábla; Sulamánnán is perhaps to be located somewhere in the region of the Khór Sílidj; the end of the course of the Kárún in the Middle Ages would thus practically coincide with the modern Shájt al-Á’má. In the Middle Ages there must have been several other separate smaller mouths of the river. In these topographic investigations it should not be forgotten that southern Irák and Khúzístán, the delta of the great rivers, have undergone far-reaching changes in their hydrographic structure in the course of thousands of years. In ancient times the Persian Gulf extended much farther into the present mainland, so that the Kárún, Karkhá, Euphrates and Tigris all had separate mouths; cf. Andreas in Pauly-Wissowa i, 1394, 2812. During the Middle Ages and in modern times the coastline has steadily advanced southwards.
The bed of the Karun from Sābla to Muhammara seems to be the work of human hands. In the 4th/10th century the Būyid ʿAḍud al-Dawla [q.v.] constructed a canal, which was called ʿAḍud after him, to secure direct communication between the Tigris and Karun (from al-Ḥasra to al-Ahwāz). As in those days the Karun apparently flowed into the Persian Gulf through the Shāṭṭ al-Aʿmān, in its main lines the ʿAḍud probably corresponded with the present course of the Karun between Sābla and Muhammara. It is very doubtful that that work was something entirely new; more probably he undertook the restoration of an older channel which had fallen into neglect. A century earlier we have evidence from the Arab geographers of the existence of a canal called Nahrah al-Djādīd (= New Canal) which led from Ḥīn al-Mahdī (near Sābla?) to the Tigris and may well have coincided with the ʿAḍud. From a still earlier period we have the Bayān canal, the course of which may wholly or in part have coincided with the ʿAḍud or Nahr al-Djādīd. Whether there was in ancient times—about the period of Alexander—an artificial channel connecting the Karun and Tigris and following the same direction cannot be ascertained with certainty; on this question, see Andreas in Pauly-Wissowa, i, 1394. In modern times, the name Ḥāffār (= “digger”, usually spelled Ḥafar in books of travel and in maps) has come into use for the stretch of the Karun between Sābla and Muhammara, and the name suggests that here too we have the work of human hands, not a natural bed. At the present day, however, this name is limited to the short stretch, only about an hour’s journey long, from the beginning of the Shāṭṭ Banīghr (the mouth proper of the Karun at the present day) to Muhammara. It should also be noted that in the second half of the 12th/18th century, Sulaymān, the powerful shaykh of the tribe of Kaʿb (on him see below), destroyed the connexion between the Karun and the Shāṭṭ al-ʿArab by placing a dam (band) across the Ḥāffār at Sābla and leading the water into the Shāṭṭ al-Aʿmān. The district of Kōbān thereby soon became very prosperous. But during Karun Kōbān’s [q.v.] second Invasión, the dam of the Ḥāffār was destroyed (cf. Kinneir, op. cit., 90). On the communication between the Karun and Tigris by the ʿAḍud, Nahr al-Djādīd, Bayān and Ḥāffār canals see Kinneir, 90, 293-294; Layard, 55-56; Tomaschek, 76-77; Ainsworth, 1, 174, 184; Persian Gulf Pilot, 296; Le Strange, 48, and JRAS (1895), 308-9; Schwarz, 309, 311, 390.

While still in the mountains, the Karun receives a number of abundant tributaries, for example, above Sūsan the Ab-i Bāzūft on the right and the Ab-i Bars (Bors) on the left. A little above Camani Yorqah the Tālak joins it. The most important tributary is the river of Dīzfūl, the Dīzfūl-Rūd or Ab-i Dīz. It and its tributaries, the Shāwūr, were at one time (and in part still are) connected with the Karakha and the Karun by canals. On the Dīzfūl-Rūd and Shāwūr, see Hamed Allāh Mustawfl, Nusha, 215, ii; 218, 13, 15; Le Strange, 233, 239, and JRAS (1895), 312; Schwarz, 303-305; Ritter, ix, 193 f.; Layard, 56 f.; see also von Bode, ii, 193; Loftus, 329, 342, 346; J. Dieulafoy, passim; Sawyer, 490 f.

The Karun is not only connected with the Tigris and Karakha in the west, but in the east it is linked up with the Dījarrah of the Arūd or Ab-i Kurdistān (the Tāb of the Arab geographers; see Le Strange, 270; Schwarz, 5 f.). At Sābla a canal navigable by boats leaves the Shāṭṭ al-Aʿmān and runs to Dawrak (Dōrāk-Fallāḥiyya [see DAWRAK]) on the Dījarrah.

The more important towns on the Karun in mediaeval as in modern times lay on its central course between Shustar and al-Ahwāz. At the two termini of this stretch stood the two capitals of the mediaeval province of Khūrizistān, al-Ahwāz and Tustar (Shustar). Al-Ahwāz [q.v.], formerly the capital proper of this district, is situated at the important point where the Karun, breaking through its last barrier, the Dījābal Shāmīn range, enters the plain. For Tustar see Susan, and in the site (particularly the bifurcation which begins there) Graadt van Roggen, 174 f.

The lower course of the Karun from al-Ahwāz to Muhammara has no places of great importance on its banks. Muhammara, at the junction of the Karun and the Shāṭṭ al-ʿArab, is, however, a place of unusual importance. It was at the beginning of this century the best harbour in Persia, easily accessible at any time.

In the mountainous upper course there are no longer any towns of importance. In late antiquity and in the Middle Ages the most prominent were Sūsan (also called ʿArūd or ʿArūb and Dījābalīk) on the right bank, and Tādādīl [q.v.] or Māl-Amīr opposite. Along the upper course in parts runs a road protected by many fortes, mostly in ruins. The Karūn in general is historically one of the most interesting rivers in Persia owing to the numerous ruins from ancient times which are everywhere found on its banks.

In the military history of the Middle Ages the Karūn basin only occasionally occurs as the scene of fighting; cf. Schwarz, 299-300. During World War I possession of this territory became very important on account of its oil-fields; cf. Schweer, 140-4.

As early as the Sassanians, powerful dams (ghadkh-ravān) with the necessary sluices had been erected at various places to enable the water thus dammed to be led by numerous small canals to fields on a higher level, especially on the central stretch of the Karūn. Throughout the Middle Ages this irrigation system was kept in excellent repair and transformed the land it watered into flourishing gardens. Since then, however, most of these works have fallen more and more into ruin as a result of neglect, and great stretches of once fertile country have become desert again. The most celebrated was the gigantic dam at Shustar, which was regarded in the east as one of the wonders of the world. Its erection is ascribed to the Sassanian king Shāpur I (241-272 A.D.). On this great system of dam and sluices here, which after considerable restoration is still partly in use to-day, see Ritter, ix, 186 f.; Nöldke, Geschichte der Araber und Perser zur Zeit der Sassaniden, Leiden 1879, 33; Justi, in Gr.I.Ph., ii, Strassbourg 1896 f., 318; Le Strange, 235; Schwarz, Iran, 296. At Wālīs, a few hours’ journey below Band-i Kīr, the ruins of a great dam may still be seen (cf. Herzfeld, 76). In al-Ahwāz, at the rapids there, considerable remains of a triple ancient system of dams still exist. Band-i Kīr (= “Bitumen-dam”) took its name from the ancient dam coated with bitumen.

The Kūrūn is the only river of Persia that admits of navigation. Communication is maintained with the Persian Gulf through the Shāṭṭ al-ʿArab and the Shāṭṭ Banīghr. There is evidence that as early as the Umayyad period there was regular traffic up the river as far as al-Ahwāz (cf. Schwarz, 300). The Karūn was into the 20th century navigable as far as Shustar. The only obstacles were the rapids caused by the gypsum rocks below al-Ahwāz (see the very full description by Wells, 156 f.), which made unloading
and reshipment necessary. Movement along the river has since expanded. The valley possesses rich oil fields in modern times. In 1888 the Karūn was opened to international navigation.


**KĀRĀN, a word ostensibly of Iranian origin, later arabized, whence Eng. "caravan," Fr. "caravane," Ger. "Karawane," etc. Its early form kār-bān, meaning "supervising work," probably evolved from the Pahlavi period. The Pahlavi form may have been kār-pūnde, in which case it would be a noun made up of kār meaning "army" or "war" plus the suffix -pūn, signifying a group of travelling merchants. Convoy provisions, goods and animals also were called kār-bān. However, this may well be a popular etymology for a word of uncertain origin. The more widespread meaning dates from the early Islamic period (M. Muʿīn, *A Persian dictionary*, iii, 2817; caravans are described in the works of the 5th/11th century poets Ferdowsī and Farruhbīd [qq.v.]). Caravans demonstrate the distribution and direction of trade routes, although the latter existed before the caravan system was developed. Journeys of various kinds were undertaken in caravan-like "convoys." In the pre-Islamic period the Arabs had for long used the word fārē (v), and later the more usual word kāfīlā, as the equivalent of kārūn; the word kāfīlā was current at the beginning of the 7th century A.D. for gatherings of travelers (cf. Ibn Hīšām, *Sīra*, Cairo 1396, i, 253, 312). In Turkish, the word arık-bahī or arık-bahī'm, meaning caravan, is attested from the 8th century A.D. (Clauson, *Etymological Dictionary*, 216-7).

Caravans were composed of horses, mules, donkeys, and especially camels. Camel-caravans were used over open plains and deserts, while in the mountainous regions mules, donkeys, and more rarely horses were used. In some regions, however, the nature of the caravan was quite different: in India, caravans made up of 100-200 carts each pulled by 10-12 oxen were used for the bulk transport of grain (J.-B. Tavernier, *The six voyages . . .*, London 1678, ii, 28 ff.; Peter Mundy, *Travels . . .*, ii, pp. xxxvii, 45, 249, 250, 281, 283).}

**HISTORICAL SURVEY**

Camel caravans became widespread because of the greater load that the animal could carry (on the domestication of the camel, see BADW). The size of the load a camel can carry varies according to the climate: in hot countries such as India the camel can carry only a small load of 600-650 ibs, whereas those employed between Tabriz and Istanbul and accustomed to the cold, could carry 1000 lbs (Tavernier, i, 49-50).

The oldest feature in the history of the western Asiatic caravan trade is the so-called "Silk Route". This route connecting China and Central Asia was extended to Farghāna and thence to southern and western Asia, and provided a means of transporting the products of distant countries by means of large caravans of hundreds of camels. In the Islamic middle ages, Baghādād was the point of departure for routes to east and west, the principal itineraries being: (1) From Baghādād northwards along the Tigrīs to Mosūl - Ḥatra - Harrān - or Sinjūr - Nisibis - Rakha - Manbij - Aleppo - Ḥama - Bābābak - Damascus - Ramla - Cairo - Alexandria, and thence by ship to North Africa; (2) From Baghādād the route along the west bank of the Euphrates, which it crossed at Hit, and thence to Damascus, was the shortest route across the desert; and (3) The eastbound route went from Baghādād to Hamadān, thence to Rāyī - Nīshāpūr - Marw - Bukhārā and Samarqand, and so to the western terminal of the silk route at Farghāna, by which China could be reached. One route ran from Khūwa in Khūzistān to the mouth of the Volga, and thence up the Volga to the Baltic countries; another passed north of the Caspian Sea to the northern ports of the Black Sea. The organization and marching arrangements of a caravan may be illustrated by the account of one consisting of about 600 camels and 400 mules which made the journey from Dīyārbakr to Mawšīl in 1838. The camels, tied together in groups of fifteen or twenty, walked in single file; their owners rode small donkeys or horses, travelling in front, while the servants walked. The camels would not move un-
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less led by the donkey. When the caravan came to a site where it was to spend the night, the leader of the caravan would move on ahead and point out the camping-place. The cargo was unloaded and the large bales were arranged to form a rectangular enclosure, within which each traveller prepared his own sleeping quarters. Then the camels and mules were untied and driven out to graze, but the horses were tethered. As it grew dark, the camels were rounded up and tethered in line within the enclosure (Lettres du Marchal de Molhe sur l'Orient, Paris 1872, 229-30).

From early times, commercial journeys had been made at set periods, so that several important cities grew up at the terminals of regular routes: most notably, Mecca's existence depended entirely upon the caravan-trade. Once a year, a caravan was organised to set out in a specific direction, such a caravan comprising some 2500 camels, as well as horses and mules. At this period, a caravan of 2000 camels was regarded as medium-sized, while a caravan of 450 camels and 100 mules and donkeys, operating between Baghdad and Aleppo, was considered small. The camels in a caravan might be used as mounts, but generally were beasts of burden. The distances covered each day varied according to the climate. On average, it travelled 6, 8, 10 or 12 hours each day, each day's journey being made in two stages: from 3 or 4 in the morning until 10, and in the afternoon from 2 or 3 o'clock until 8. Since a single camel can carry a load equivalent to that of three, four, or even five horses, it was a much cheaper mode of transport. In the Mediterranean region, caravan journeys were closely linked to maritime traffic: during the winter months, when transport by sea was impossible, three caravans, setting out from Sijilmása on the northern Saharan fringe, would travel to Cairo via Kayrawán, Tripoli and Barka. Such caravans operated also in the summer months, covering the distance between Tunis and Cairo in two or three months. Caravans covering long distances were known as "seasonal" (mausim) caravans, in India "monsoon" caravans (S. D. Goitein, Studies in Islamic history and institutions, Leiden 1968, 303). Caravans operated in the summer months in Anatolia, in the Balkans and in Ardhabaydjan: thus caravans arrived at Izmir between February and June and in October (Tavernier, i, 46-7); but Anatolia and the Balkans lie outside the desert regions—caravans would arrive in Egypt and in other countries of North Africa in September-October, and even in April, May and June. During the summer, it was quite impossible to cross the desert between Baghdad and Aleppo. In ca. 1640, caravan traffic out of Hormuz operated between December and March. In north-west Africa, caravans arriving south of Oran (Algeria) in November were of importance in this century (F. Braudel, The Mediterranean ..., Eng. tr. London 1972, i, 259-60).

CARAVAN ROUTES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CARAVAN TRADE

There were along the caravan routes fixed points at which the caravans halted for the night, and in desert regions there were furthermore water cisterns at intervals of 15 km. These halting-places were regarded as "guest-houses", and were often organized by the pious as waqf-foundations, the usual designation for them being ribāṭ (mawsim). The establishment of such ribāṭs dates from the 4th/10th century and reached its peak under the Great Seljūḳs. In various works composed in the 6th/12th century, the word ribāṭ is used as a synonym for "caravansersai" and spread to Central Asia as a result of the Mongol invasions. The caravanserai reached its highest development in Seljūḳ Anatolia, especially in the 7th/13th century; caravanserai or khāns were built at intervals of 30-40 km. along the north-south and east-west routes as international trade increased. Their strong walls and towers provided security; and their facilities might include sleeping--quarters, kitchens, store-houses, baths, mosques even hospitals for the sick (O. Turan, Selçuk heroanarsarayları, in Bell., X3/X 39 (1946), 477-95). In this period, the central authorities appointed to each caravan an official entitled Amir-i Kārībānsādār, under whom was an escort commanded by a rāḥdār or tutkavül.

Whatever the object of the caravan, whether trade or the fulfilment of the pilgrimage, its rate of travel varied from period to period. A pilgrimage caravan of 30-40,000 camels could travel from Cairo to Mecca in forty days, helped on its way by its military escort. In the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries, in spite of the Portuguese development of the Cape maritime route, trans-Saharan trade developed considerably, although there was some modification of the traditional routes (Braudel, op. cit., i, 181-2). In the 11th/17th century the route between Persia and Izmir was particularly popular, although it took 100 days: the journey to Isfahan via Mawsil and Hamadān took 38 days; the busiest route to Persia, that from Aleppo via Birejdik, Diyārbakr and Tabrīz, took 42 days, and 66 days to Isfahan. Towards the middle of the 11th/17th century, however, the importance of the caravan trade between Persia, India and the Ottoman Empire diminished, as a result of the formation of English and Dutch trading companies operating by sea; the only major commodity left for overland transport was silk. The spice trade continued, but the old spice routes were abandoned (N. Steensgaard, Carrahe, caravans and companies, Odense 1973, 174, 192).

With the development of other means of communication, the composition of the caravans changed and the number of animals decreased. Yet although the number of animals employed in a single caravan might decrease, the number of caravans organized each year might increase. Commercial caravans travelled between Baghdad and Baṣra four times a year in the 10th/16th century and small caravans travelled regularly between Syria and southern Irāq: there were three caravans a year between Damascus and Baghdad. The Baghdad caravan went to Damascus once a year and to Aleppo twice. This situation continued unchanged until the end of the 12th/18th century. In Anatolia, caravans were organized on a smaller scale; because of the broken terrain, mules and donkeys were used in some regions instead of camels, as was the case in northern Irāq.

ORGANIZATION

Security was a vital consideration. Caravans usually had an armed escort, sometimes of professional soldiers, and at every halting-point would be joined by new groups of travellers. During the night a continuous look-out had to be kept against raids by bandits, and at intervals the sentinels would call to one another khaṭārādūr and a drum was beaten (P. Mundy, Travels, ii, 41-2; Thévenot, part 3, 19). A leader responsible for organizing the whole caravan was known as the kārdān-baḡī (in Persia and India, kārdān-baḥg or kārdān-bāšā). The establishment of such kārdāns dates from the 4th/10th century and it was under the general supervision of the main leader, who determined the route to be followed, the
halting-places, and the order of the constituent groups in the caravan, and who was responsible for the general security. To travel in a caravan was slower but safer, since special, additional guards, supplied by the government, were available in desolate areas.

In the mid-11th/17th century, the leader of the caravan was sometimes elected by the merchants. If a merchant had six camels, one of the six beasts, and if he had three, one of the three, carried his essential gear. For every horse or camel in the caravan its owner paid a fixed fee to the leader; thus, if the caravan was a large one, the leader might make a great deal of money, part of which he paid to the guards and part of which he spent on necessities along the way. At places where customs duty was collected, 4 kurush was taken for every camel-load and 2 kurush for a horse-load (Taverney, part 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 45, 46; Travels of Mira Ş Abu Taeb Khan in Asia, Africa and Europe during the years 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802 and 1803, London 1814, i, 112-15).

In desert areas, where water was scarce or unobtainable, paid scouts called takshif were employed to find water. When the wind obscured the track, the takshif had to go on ahead to find the way, so that occasionally he was the first to die (Ibn Battuta, lv, 381-3; cf. Leo Africanus, The history and description of Africa, London 1898, i, 173-4). In some places, such as the Western interior, guides and part of which he spent on necessities along

Caravan leaders in the Sahara had links with the Berber tribes; here four main routes connected north and east Africa: (1) the route by Sidjilmasa and WALATA to Senegal and the upper Niger; (2) the Ghadames-Ghat route to Hausaland and Air; (3) the Tripoli-Fezzan-Kasar route to Bornu and Lake Chad; and (4) the route from Taghaza to Timbuktu, perished of thirst (E. W. Bovill, The golden trade of the Moors, London 1926, 52, 235, 236). The traditional caravans continued to operate in Africa into this century: thus in 1908 a caravan of 20,000 camels set out from Air to travel via Ghadames and Ghat (Bovill, op. cit., 236, 238).

Records of the late 19th century give detailed accounts of caravan travel in the desert. In Tripoli (North Africa), after several merchants who wished to organize a caravan had reached agreement among themselves and obtained permission from the provincial authorities, they would, by the intermediary of a shaykh, known to be competent and trustworthy, conclude agreements with the shaykh through whose tribal lands they would pass. If the shaykh accepted the proposal, he would come to the provincial capital, and the next was called peshek, who knew the routes and the places where water was to be found. In the capital all details of the wages to be paid, etc., were settled, committed to writing, and confirmed by the provincial authorities; a mansur or formal document incorporating these conditions was given to the shaykh who was to act as conductor of the caravan; he was empowered to take all measures to protect the lives and goods of the participants and to determine any legal or criminal questions that might arise. The promoters of the caravan would cause public proclamation to be made. Not all who responded were necessarily professional merchants; private individuals might take part as a speculation, informing the shaykh that they needed camels (three for the goods that they hoped to sell at a profit, one to ride on, one for water, and one for food). On the basis of this information, the shaykh would arrange the disposition of the caravan (Müsevvel-zade Derviş, Osmanlı Imparatorluğu ait vesikalar, in İstanbul Dergisi, n.s. 10-12 (İstanbul 1940), 393-4). The shaykh of the caravan and the leaders of the armed guards were each given a burnous according to rank. Such a caravan travelling to Central Africa, where coinage was unknown, would carry goods for barter.

CARAVAN TRADE BETWEEN THE 9TH/15TH AND 19TH CENTURIES

In the Ottoman Empire, an extensive caravan network satisfied all the requirements of transport and communications. Towards the end of the 9th/15th century the most important caravan route across Anatolia was that between Bursa and Tabriz; it began with a northern and a southern branch (Kastamonu-Bolu; Ankara-Corum) and then traversed Amasya, Tokat, Erzindjan, Erzurum and the Aras valley. This was principally a silk route (H. Inakik, in Bel., xxiv/93 (Ankara 1960), 45-96). A document of 1670 gives the following information about the composition of a caravan travelling from Baghdad to Aleppo: its 120 merchants had baggage amounting to 94(1/4) yûks, one yûk being the two bales slung across a beast of burden (Başbakankan Arşiv Genel Müdürülüğü, MM 7499). There were also smaller caravans operating between cities; termed makhâris (“for hire”), they would transport merchants and travellers for a fare. In Istanbul in the time of Murâd IV, 3,000 people were engaged in this business (Ewliya Celebi, Seyhâhatname, i, 520; H. Ongan, Ana karavan s numarası sırsı siciili, Ankara 1958, 64; see, for the makhâris operating between Damascus and Baghdad, Mustafá Dîya, Rehnumâ-ylı Bagdad, Damascus 1314, 4-5). Most of the people comprising a caravan were merchants engaged in trade with foreign countries, but travellers would also join a caravan in Xer, to enjoy its security: in the late 11th/17th century it was impossible for small groups of travellers to move about in the Ottoman Empire otherwise, because of the threats from Arab tribesmen and bandits (C. Le Bruyn, Travels, London 1718, ii, 329; Bašbakankan Arşivi, MD no. 115, pp. 285, 306). Caravan operations were carried on also in the European territories of the Ottoman Empire, numerous khâms surviving in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania and elsewhere (cf. Hamdija Kresevljakovic, Hanovi i Karavansaraji u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo 1957). Regular journeys were made between Istanbul and Belgrade by what was known as the “Belgrade caravan”; it continued to function into the 19th century (for a document of 1803, see Bašbakankan Arşivi, Cevdet tasnifi, liktisâr no. 209; also S. Dimitrijevic, Les caravans de Dubrovinck dans la Serbie du sud au XVIIe siècle, Belgrade 1958).

Mule caravans operating in Anatolia had their own special characteristics. The leading animal, which kept some way ahead of the others and carried a smaller load, was called peshek, the next was called djindar, and the next again peshek. All the animals carried small bells around their necks, which could be heard an hour's distance away. The驼s were made at kâms either to deliver the goods carried or to transfer them to other animals. Cameleers and muleteers formed a trade-guild (see C. Cahit Güzelye,
Gaziantep'teki kervancılar, in Gaziantep Kütüür Dergisi, v/79 (Gaziantep 1962), 79, 80, 94.

Whereas caravans travelled in Persia by night, in the Ottoman Empire travelling was done by day, for protection against bandits. A leader of a caravan could determine the hour by the position of the stars. He was followed by a bayrahçak "standard-bearer", who had a standard wrapped around a staff which he would wave at times of danger in order to warn the muleteers protecting the caravan. The Baghdad–Aleppo caravan also included coffee-makers, a launkía who transmitted the leader's orders, a muşâhdhin, and various tradesfolk—shoemakers, barbers, farriers and carpenters. The group of people at the rear was termed hamla (J. B. L. J. Rousseau, Voyage de Bagdad à Alep (1808), Paris 1899; cf. Tavernier, Voyages, 47, 60).

According to Peter Mundy (ii, 45), a caravan travelling from Surat to Agra in India in 1630 contained 250-300 carts and about 1800 people; the number increased as it proceeded, since inhabitants of famine-stricken regions would join it in order to escape starvation. There were no khâns in India, but in the cities there were public buildings termed sârads. According to Peter Mundy again (ii, p.xxxvii), the last caravan of the season contained 268 camels and 109 carts.

PILGRIM CARAVANS

Caravans of pilgrims travelling to the Holy Cities were under the supervision of the Amir al-hadjdî (Ewliya Çelebi, x, 424-5, 435, etc.). It was the regular practice to make money payments to the Bedouin chiefs through whose territories the caravan passed (Tavernier, 62-3). In Ottoman times, the provisioning, watering and protection of the pilgrim-caravans was a major enterprise of the Cairo caravan (consisted of 4,000 people). The Cairo caravan was in two sections; 10,000 people from North Africa formed the rearward journey, but came back first. For descriptions of the pilgrim caravan, see H. Maundrell, A journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem in 1697, Beirut 1963, 171-3; F. Hesselequist, Voyages and travels in the Levant in the years 1749, 1759, 1782, London 1785, pp. 17-22; E. L. Lengyel, Die Manners and customs... chs. 24, 25; J. L. Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia, London 1829, 247-8; and see MAHMAL.

DECLINE

The caravan trade declined as a result of the great changes in the technology of transport which occurred in the 19th century. In some regions, caravan journeys were discontinued after the introduction of steamships. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 brought a swift decline, yet caravans continued to have accelerated the decline: (1) the requisitioning of animals by governments and local authorities; (2) attacks from bandits; and (3) lack of bridges and the foul road conditions after rain.


KARWASHA, originally the name of the argot of the Maghribis practising the trades of sorcerer and treasure-seeker in Egypt, today applied to the Dakhîna (sing. Dakhîna) of Sudanese origin installed in the Village of the Sudanese close to Madâmîd in Upper Egypt and in the women's role. They are street manufacturers, amulets at the markets. These are carried under the armpit wrapped in a square red case. They are effective, it is said, against the evil eye or diseases, to attract customers into a shop, to obtain the favours of a woman, to keep or regain the love of a husband and to speak "without fear" in front of the judge, the mayor or any other magistrate. The Dakhîna make use of a secret language among themselves (rufayndî, in the spoken Arabic of Upper Egypt rufînâ) which is called karwasha (from the verb karwash to speak" or again balhama from the verb balhâm "to speak in an incomprehensible fashion"). A part of the vocabulary is of Maghribi origin: miskâh "good", bizâf "much", sîhâ "cigarette". They sometimes even affect the Moroccan accent: “fîshima "head" and not diyâq. The grammar is that of the spoken language of the region of Luxor. The man is called diyyâbî pl. diyyâblî (of Spanish origin: diabolo "devil"). Buddha: "I want!". Es-budd-âh "what do you want?". Dîyâl (after a vowel dîyl, used for forming a possessive genitive, is in current use: el-yusufa dîyl-u "his wife", el-habûbâr dîyl-ha "her husband", es-suwa dîyl el-muhsa "the door of the house"). Bi-dîyl has become a preposition; diyyâna es-sîhâ bi-dîyl en-nâra "light the cigarette with the match"; nûd bi-dîyl-i "leave me"; diyyâm el-nilî min es-diyâblî lî bi-dîyl-âh "take the money from...
the man who is with you." The prefix ka of the verb tends to disappear: lamma ka-ykun ... watering place of Mutayr long before 1338/1919, when Turayfīb b. Bandar b. Shufayr of the Dushan clan, Muwaha second.

Connection with Cirta is rejected by Noldeke, who [q.v.]; moreover, Polybius (37, 3, n) has sýprocv. (e.g., Sodom "to bring". This small vocabulary is important town. Mecca (XLVII, 14), Medina (II, 5), and the coastal town (VII, 163: al-fyaryatayn [q.v.]) has been or will be destroyed by Allah for its in-

Arab philologists derive the word from the roots h-r-y or h-r-a, "to collect", "to store", or "to head for some place", and "to collect people for hospitality", "to investigate a country in order to choose a residence" and "to head for some place".


KARYA AL-SUFLA, a village in northeastern Arabia (27° 29' N, 47° 52' E), about 200 m. above sea-level and having a population of about 1000 (1958 estimate). It is popularly known as Kurayya, after its larger twin village, Karya, or Karya al-Ulîyâ [q.v.], 19 km. to the west-north-west. The settlement of the site as a hígira of Ikhwan [q.v.] was contemporaneous with the immigration of Fatimids in 1338/1050 of Karya al-Ulîyâ. The colonists were Mutâyar tribesmen led by Hâyîf al-Fugm, chief of the Dhauwâ'awn section of that tribe's I'lla division. For notes on events connected with the founding of both villages and for a bibliography, see Karya al-Ulîyâ. (J. Mandaville)

KARYA AL-ULÎYÂ, a village in northeastern Arabia. Situated at 27° 33' N, 47° 42' E about 170 m. above sea-level and having a population of 2,200 (1963 estimate), it was founded as a hígira, or colony of the Wahhâbi Ikhwan [q.v.] by members of the ruling clan of the Mu'tâyir tribe. From about 1930, it has been a minor Bedouin market centre. It is often called simply Karya, the full name being used to differentiate it from neighbouring Karya al-Sufla [q.v.]. The two are sometimes referred to together as Karayâ (a town masculine plural). The establishment of Karya was a major incident in the 1919-20 boundary dispute between 'Abd al-'Azîz b. 'Abd al-Ra'mân Âl Su'îd, known as Ibn Su'îd, and the ruling house of Kuwait; it led to the bloody battle of al-Dîjârâ' (Mubâram 1339/October 1920), when the Ikhwan attacked the forces of Sâlim b. Mubârak Âl 'Abdi al-Dîjârâ', 30 km. west of Kuwait town.

Karya al-Ulîyâ was a well-known place of Mutâyar long before 1338/1050, when Yu'ayyûb b. Bandar b. Shu'ayr of the Dughân clan, Muwaha sec-
tion, of that tribe founded a kāṣīra there with the approval of Ibn Su‘ūd. Relations between Najd and Kuwayt had already been strained in 1337/1919 by news of Sālim’s plans to build a fort at Dawbat Bilbūl, 110 km. east of Karya on the Gulf coast. Ibn Shūkayr’s building activities at Karya, probably encouraged by Ibn Su‘ūd as a counter-measure, led to protests from Kuwayt and finally the dispatch of a 400-man Kuwayti force, which was routed by Muṣṭayr at the wells of Hamāma, south of Karya, in Shawrān 1338/May 1920. Ibn Su‘ūd, whose Ikhwān led by Faysāl b. Sulṭān al-Dawāsh had attacked before arrival of a letter from their sovereign urging restraint, agreed to return loot taken from Kuwayti tribes but maintained his territorial claim. The Ikhwān marched on al-Dhilā and as negotiations and British mediation broke down and after an abortive move toward Karya by Kuwaytī forces reinforced by Shammār tribesmen. Both Karyas in 1928–29 were important military bases of Muṣṭayr in raids against Kuwayt and ‘Irāq; they were also dissident centres during the concurrent Ikhwān rebellion against Ibn Su‘ūd. After the collapse of the aggressive Ikhwān movement in early 1930, Karya remained as a market for Bedouins and as a customs station on the main motor track between Kuwayt and al-Riyād. A large motor port for which the Saudi Arabian Government ordered to be built there in 1355/1936–37 was in good repair in 1974. The track gradually fell out of use, but the village continued to serve Bedouins on a route into the wells, pastures, and settlements of al-Summān [q.v.]. The village is administered by an ‘āmīr who reports to the governor of the Saudi Arabian Eastern Province in al-Dammānī.

Karya al-Kubrā, a town in South Arabia in the Wādī Baybān and the main town of the area called Baybān al-Kaṣāb [q.v.]. As the population has grown and the inhabited area extended, the town itself has come to be known as Baybān al-Kaṣāb or Baybān al-Kaṣāb, and it is now usually mapped under one of these names. At the end of the 19th century the town had 12 citadels and 400 houses and was surrounded by palm-groves. Cotton was, and is, an important crop and is used for the manufacture of high-grade cloth in great demand in the area. Indigo has long been extensively cultivated and is used in local dyehouses to produce the dark-blue cloth popular in South Arabia, and is sold for use on the body. The town had a large Jewish quarter, its habitants, as elsewhere in Southern Arabia, specializing in working silver and leather. These people have now gone, emigrating between 1948 and the independence of Southern Yemen. The soil in and around the town is fertile and, in addition to cotton and indigo, it produces barley, red millet, summer millet, grapes, dates and vegetables. Since the end of the Second World War wells have been bored and agricultural development generally has been fostered. Educational facilities have been expanded and health centres opened in the town and the area generally.

Bibliography: C. Landberg, Arabica, v, Leiden 1898, 30–34; A. Grohmann, Südara rabien als Wirt-
journalism and the literature of political satire, Teodor Kasab played an important part in the development of Turkish theatre in the 1870s, through his skilful adaptations of French plays and his numerous articles in which he discussed the principles and techniques of the developing modern Turkish theatre. He is the author of the following adaptations: (1) Pinti Hamid ("Hamid the Miser"), Istanbul 1290/1873, a successful adaptation, superior to Ahmed Vefik Pasha's better known Astarja, of Molire's L'Avarre (1668). Although Pinti Hamid is a well known popular character who symbolizes stinginess, the prince Hamid Efendi (the future 'Abd al-Hamid II), suspicious as he was and known to be rather close, tried unsuccessfully to stop the performance of the play at the last minute (for details see the letter of Kasab's son Diogenes to Ismail il Habib Sevik quoted in the latter's Tasmaliman bari, i, Istanbul 1940, 218). (2) Izkilimi Memo ("Memo the Suspicious"), Istanbul 1291/1874, from Molire's Sganarelle ou le cocu imaginaire (1660), in Roman script Izkilimi Memo, Istanbul 1965, ed. Cevdet Kudret with an introduction on Teodor Kasab; (3) Para Messelyes, Istanbul 1292/1875, translated from Alexandre Dumas fils' La question d'argent (1857); (4) Lükressya Bongiysya, Istanbul 1292/1875, from Victor Hugo's Lucrece Borgia (1853). He also translated many novels, the best known among them being Monte Cristo, Istanbul 1291/1875, from Alexandre Dumas père's Le Comte de Monte Cristo (1845), the popularity of which inspired Ahmed Midhat's famous novel Hasan Mellâh (1292/1875).

Teodor Kasab contributed considerably to the liberal and reformist movement of the Young Ottomans and advocated a larger use of the techniques and concepts of the traditional Turkish theatre, such as Karagöz and Orta ıyımu, in modern plays. Both in his articles and his plays, Kasab used colloquial speech and avoided a flowery style.


KASAB ( aç), noun of unity kaşaba, any plant with a long and hollow stem like the reed (Arundo donax), to which the term is especially applied (see Muukassas, xi, 40). The bamboo is called khaysûran, but kasab is a component of certain expressions denoting in particular the sugar cane (kasab al-sukkar, etc.) [see following article] and the sweet flag (or just kasab al-bardi [see PAPYRUS]), the bamboo is called khayzurdn, to which the term is especially applied (see Yaksab al-bardi, [see PAPYRUS]).

The reed had various uses: for making hurdles and wattles; lattice-work mats, pens [see KALAM] and children's toys (e.g. see Ibn Bassām, Dabhêra, i, 165). It is further known that it was used in many places for making light huts; at Başra, when it was first laid out as a military camp, even the mosque and the governor's residence were made from reeds, which were rolled up before departure in an expedition and used again on return (Ibn al-Fakheri, 188; al-Baladhuri, Futuḥ, 346-7; al-Tabarî, i, 2384; Yâkbtî, i, 640). These structures, susceptible to fire and wind, were later replaced by ones out of sun-dried brick. It should be noted that reeds were especially abundant in the neighbouring countries [e.g., Iraq], and their value was such that it was said to Ziyād that "a reed is more valuable than a palm-tree". Al-Dâbîrî, who recounts this saying (K. al-Buldanî, ed. Pellat in Machrîq (1960), 200-1; ed. Ş. al-İzî, Baghdad 1970, 504), adds that "I did my utmost to catalogue the advantages of different kinds of reeds, their uses and the things that can be made out of them, but failed and had to content myself with a regrettable that he in fact gave up this plan, since he could have certainly composed a whole monograph about the reed in civilisation.

Amongst the numerous other meanings of kasab (see Dozy, Supplément, s.v.), one should note that it denotes a coloured linen cloth manufactured at Tinnis, or a white one made at Damietta, or sometimes a cotton cloth made at Kâzarûn (Mee, Renaissance, Eng. tr. 461-2), out of which women's fine veils were woven (Abû 'l-Kâsim, Ükîhâya, 54), some set with precious stones [ibid., 53]. Dozy further mentions a silken material, as well as a kind of brocade encrusted with little strips of gold or silver.

Bibliography: Given in the article. (Ed.)

KASAB AL-SUKKAR, sugar cane, also called kasab al-mas, because it looks it (see below), and kasab kâlör (Gloss. Idrisî). Cultivated sugar cane may be from a wild variety, but the attempts which have been made to cultivate the wild species which is related to it have not been successful. The country of origin of sugar cane cultivation is Bengal, from where, in the 7th century B.C., it must have passed to China. Herodotus did not know of it, nor did Ctesias, physician of Artaxerxes Memnon (ca. 410), but in the age of Alexander the Great, Nearchos, his admiral, and Onesicritus, who composed a history of this ruler's expedition, speak of a reed of India producing "honey without bees", as does Megasthenes, who was the ambassador of Seleucus Nicator. Theophrastus, author of a history of plants who died in 287 B.C., speaks of a meli kalaminos, an expression that is translated as "reed honey". Pliny did not know of sugar cane but Dioscorides mentions a kind of coagulated honey from India and Yemen that is gathered from a reed.

It is not known exactly when the cultivation of sugar cane passed from India to Persia. The scholars of the celebrated School of Medicine of Djundaysâbûr, which flourished between 532 and 579 A.D., knew of sugar cane through their relations with India. It is not impossible that they had a part in the introduction of sugar cane into Persia, where it found favourable ground for its cultivation in the hot and humid swampy land of Lower Mesopotamia and Khuzistan (cf. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant au Moyen-Age, ii, 680-1). After the conquest of Persia by the Arabs, the cultivation of sugar cane was developed by them fairly rapidly, wherever the conditions of the climate responded to the needs of the plant, and it reached as far as the Muslim West.

I. — MUSLIM EAST

The zones of cultivation of sugar cane in the Eastern Muslim world are quite numerous, for several regions have low ground enjoying a hot and humid climate favourable to its cultivation and able to be irrigated easily. The cultivation of sugar cane has also developed: in Khuzistan or Ahwâz, in the region of Tustar, watered by the Masrûkân canal diverted from the Daudjâyl, in that of Djundaysâbûr, that of Sûs (Susa)
on the banks of the Karkha, a tributary of the Dudjayl (see al-Istakhri, ed. Cairo 1961, 65; Ibn Hawkal, 253-4, 257; Ḥudūd al-ʿilām, 130; Le Strange, 236-46; Heyd, op. cit., ii, 680-1).

In the region of Baṣra, in the 4th/10th century, according to Bayḥaḵl, who wrote in the age of al-Muḳṭadīr (Kūṭb al-Maḥāsīn wa-l-maṣūrī, ed. Schwally, 62); in the region of Tābāsirīn toward the Caspian, in the region of Mīlā (Ḥudūd, 134); in Fārs, Makrān, Kirmān (see al-Istakhri, ed. Cairo 1961, 65; Ibn Iϩawkal, 302-3, 232, 313, 325; Le Strange, 329; Ḥudūd, 124; cf. Yāḵūt, ii, 6, 346, at Sābūr and Shahrastān); in the region of Baḥḵ (Ḥudūd, 108); in Sind (al-Iṣṭakhri, 102; Ibn Hawkal, 320; Ḥudūd, 91); in Qum (cf. EI, art. ʿomān; Lippmann, 151); in Syria-Palestine, at Kābūl, Tyre, Beirut, cf. Ibn Hawkal, 176 (Beirut); al-Muḵkaddāsī, 162 (Kābūl), 180; Nāṣiri Ḫusrav, Safar-Nāma, 40 (Tripoli); Tafel and Thomas, Urkunden der älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte, ii, 368 (Tyre, plantations in the hands of the Venetians at the time of the Crusades); Foucher de Chartres, at Bulunyas (in Cl. Cahen, La Syrie, 473; cf. M., Renaissance, 410, 439); in the Ghawr of the Jordan valley (Ẓaymirūn: yamūṣun al-kasab), cf. al-Kaḵkṣāhī, Šubāb, ii, 87; at Tiberias (al-Muḵkaddāsī, 161; cf. also Le Strange, Palestine, 17; Heyd, ii, 685); in Egypt, the cultivation of sugar cane has been attested there by some papyri in the 2nd century A.D. (see M., Renaissance, 410 and n. 2); yet, if this cultivation was not exactly introduced there by the Arabs, it was in fact they who developed it, along with the science of sugar production, and who exported it to the Mediterranean area where it is grown at present, sc. Cilicia; in Syria-Palestine, at Kabul, Tyre, Beirut, cf. Ibn Hawkal, 320; Ḥudūd, 91; in the Yemen, al-Hamdanī, in the Yemen, al-Hamdanī, Sifat Ḍazirat al-ʿarab, 45-8; Nuwayrī, Nihydāt al-ʿarab, xxxi-xl.

It is curious that the Arab geographers do not mention at all the cultivation of sugar cane in this land (the kasab fārisī that Ibn Hawkal, 122, mentions there may not be sugar cane, see BGA, iv, 325, although Lippmann, 110, thinks that it does designate sugar cane). Nevertheless, it is certain that, towards the middle of the 4th/10th century, sugar was already being manufactured in Sicily and this sugar was being consumed in Ifriqiya, for the Riyād al-nufūs of al-Malīkī, dedicated to the scholars of Qayrawān, mentions that a faḥīk called Abūl-Faḍl al-ʿAbbās b. ʿĪsā, who died between 332/943 and 335/947 in the war against Abū Yazīd, refused to eat a cake that he believed to have been made with sugar from Sicily, as a result of rights conceded by the (Fātimid) usurper. It is certain that Roger II and his successors encouraged the cultivation of sugar cane in Sicily, and the diploma cited by Amari, Storia dei Musemani in Sicilia, ii, 509, 808, show that this cultivation was flourishing in the 6th/12th century and that sugar was being manufactured at Palermo. This cultivation continued until the end of the 9th/15th century. We are informed about the cultivation of sugar cane and its complicated technique (repeated ploughing and harrowing, division of the field into small squares—abūdā—which the water reaches by channels, planting, irrigation, measures to bring on growth, struggle against weevils by means of tar, the two successive harvests, the first called al-raʿs, the second al-bikhīf, which usually gives better sugar than the first, etc.), by the Arab treatises on agriculture, and the works relative to financial administration, especially on Egypt. We are unable to give the details here and to explain the technical terms. We will only say that the planting was done in February-March (month of phamenōt) and that the harvest took place in November-December (month of koyak), that three kinds of cane were distinguished, the black, the white and the yellow of which only the two last were pressed (cf. Ibn al-Bayṭār, Mufradāt al-adwiyā wa-l-agdiyā, ed. Būláq, 1291, ii, 304; al-Dīnawarī, Kitāb al-nabāt, cited in Abūl-Bakr ʿAbd Allāh al-Miṣrī, Nuzhat al-anām fi maḥāsin al-Ṣām, Cairo 1341, 354). The details on the cultivation of sugar cane are to be found in the following works:

Sugar cane, reached the West (Maghrib, Spain, Sicily, the Balearic Islands, Provence, etc.) in the wake of the Arab expansion in the Mediterranean. Greek and Roman antiquity seems, in fact, to have recognized it as a botanical curiosity only (Dioscorides, Pliny, Strabo, etc.). The exact dates of its first cultivation in the Muslim lands are not known precisely. It can, however, be presumed that they followed closely on the advance of the Muslims, geographers or voyagers as of European ones. As a result, we have precise evidence that sugar cane contributed to the economic prosperity of the Muslim lands of the West for almost eight centuries.

**Bibliography:** A complete bibliography will be found in P. Berthier, *Les anciennes sucreries du Maroc et leurs réseaux hydrauliques*, Rabat 1966, as well as an account of the research and excavations carried out in Morocco from 1948 to 1960. (P. Berthier)
situation, which al-Mukaddasi translates figuratively by saying that if the āmsdr are like the kings and the mudun like the army, the kasaba are like the chamberlains. The insistence on the function, and not on the actual situation of the town, is so strong that one finds, on occasion, the word kasaba to designate, as in the West, the heart of a town, as in connection with Palmyra where it refers to the central quarter situated in the ruins of the temple of Baal.


2. North Africa. The term in the sense of “fortress-citadel”, in the dialectal form kasba, plural kasbî (diminutive kišba), is widespread in the whole of Northern Africa as far as Timbuktu (Mali). It was none the less so in the Iberian Peninsula where it has survived, until our own days, in the form alcasaba (Spanish), alcáçova (Portuguese). The word has been gallicised for a long time, in several forms, of which the most commonly accepted by the dictionaries is casbah.

Essentially, in origin, the kasaba is a citadel which, while being attached to the wall surrounding a fortified town, remains sufficiently independent to constitute a keep capable of holding out even after the fall of the city, or to serve as a refuge for the governor if the population revolts against his personal authority or that of the prince that he serves.

Its position is naturally fixed according to the best strategic situation, and is sometimes blended with that of an older military establishment. It proudly dominates the town from the height of a hill and may be situated on a watercourse, a cliff, a sea front. According to the countries and local means of construction it may be of hewn stone, rubble or puddled clay (ābya). If on a plain, its plan is generally a fairly regular quadrilateral; if on a mountain it espouses practically all the facilities for defence furnished by the topography and relief. A door, generally the sole one and with a single angle, joins the kasaba to the town that it defends or from which it holds itself aloof. Frequently, an emergency escape postern, called the Gate of Treason (Bāb al-rābi‘), would in the old days connect the citadel directly with the country. It allowed the reception of information, reinforcements and provisions or the secret abandonment of the kasaba, so as to have no need of surrender.

Such were the kasabāt of the network that the caliphs of Cordova set up in Spain or the Magrib, and such were those that the Almoravids built for the defence of their empire in the Atlas and the Rif and, in particular, at Marrakesh.

Under the Almohads in the 6th/12th century and under the dynasties succeeding them, the Ḥafsids at Tunis and Marinids at Fās, the sense of the term was enlarged in proportion to their creations. Al-Kalkashandi (Subh, v, 103) and al-ʿUmarī (Masālik al-ābār, French tr. Gaudefroy-Demobynes, ii, Paris 1937, index) definitely insist that the Magribī kasaba is equivalent to the Eastern kal’a (q.v.), but the term is applied to every fortified town and even to the imperial towns of Marrakesh, Tunis and Fās al-Djadld. Those enclosed in their walls not only the palace of the sovereign and his confidants and the dwellings of his dependents, but one or more mosques, the fiscal services, the guards’ barracks, baths, prisons, shops and even markets. They also had great main squares (āṣar-ag from the Berber asarrag) where the people could assemble for the festivals and the army participate in ceremonies. Finally, some gardens more or less large (āgdāl [q.v.]), and, then, some princely or private cemeteries completed the new urban complex. The great gates with a single angle, which were then constructed between town (masālik) and citadel (kasaba), are among the finest monuments which remain to us from this brilliant period (at Marrakesh: Bāb Aġnah; at Rabât: Gate of the Wāḍiya).

Under the Šārifian dynasties of Morocco, the Saʿdiids in the 10th/16th century and especially the ʿAlawīs from the 11th/17th century to our own days, the word serves currently to designate small fortresses of a very simple plan erected in places and analogous with the Turkish burgās and kumās of Algeria, but more solidly constructed. Mawlay Ismāʾīl [q.v.] must have had sixty-six kasabāt constructed and had many others restored. Some constituted fortified outposts against hostile tribes, and frequently Berbers, whilst the others, in being spread out the length of the principal roads of the empire, watched over crossing points and bridges and sheltered travellers at the end of a stage (a list of them and the strength of their garrison is to be found in the study of Lt. de la Chapelle, Le Sultan Moulay Ismaill à les Berbères Sanhadja du Maroc Centrale, in AM, xxviii (1937), 25-29). Finally, in the neighbourhood of certain towns (Meknès, Saïd) some fortified surrounding walls had been built which served as a dwelling for the black slaves (ʿabīd) or which were reserved for the contingents furnished by the tribes of whom military service was required. A certain number of these kasabāt, after the final disbanding of the troops, have today been transformed into residential quarters.

A very large number of Moroccan agglomerations bear the name of kasba, or its diminutive kišba (P. Lancre, Répertoire alphabétique des tribus . . . et des agglomérations de la zone française de l’Empire Chérifien . . ., Casablanca 1939). The most important is Kasba-Tadla, a small town of 12,000 inhabitants on the Wāḍī al-rābi‘, whose bridge has made its fortune. By extension the Europeans apply the word more or less legitimately to the beautiful and sometimes immense half-civil, half-military dwellings of the important ḫāḍids of the Moroccan Atlas and the Saharan oases. These vast kasabāt express in a material form the power that some powerful chiefs had acquired during the 19th century at the expense of the petty Berber republics, weakened by the strife of the opposed lejjīf [q.v.]. The Europeans have in the same way Arabised as kasabāt the tkṛmnīs and āgdāris, defensive forts or fortified granaries of the same regions. These magnificent pieces of architecture, some of which go back to the 16th century, have been judiciously studied by H. Terrasse, Dj. Jacques Meunier and R. Duru (see Bibli.). They testify to the vitality of the rural Moroccan civilization, but the fragility of their construction and their decoration and the decadence of the Berber institutions render their conservation difficult.

In certain cities, Algiers for example, all the quarters of the ancient town combined bear the name of Casbah. This toponym, due to historical circumstances, has since 1830 enjoyed a great literary, cinematographic, and especially journalistic fame.

Bibliography: Apart from the references given in the art., see İmām, Būrg, ʿĪṣān, and the details given for all the large towns in the Muslim West in the collection Guides Bleus (Hachette-Paris). G. Salmon, La Qāṣba de Tanger, in Archives Nationales, i (1904); Capt. Maitrot, Une

KASAK [see ČERKES].

KASALA (variant, Kasl; conventional spelling, Kasala), a town and province in the east of the republic of the Sudan, extending from the frontier of Egypt to that of Ethiopia. Geographically, the province contains five distinct types of country. (1) A rough triangle in the south, bounded by the railway, the river Atbara and the site in succession of the ports of Ba'lī, Sawakin (Suakin) and Port Sudan. The town of Tūkar (Tokar) lies in the delta of the Baraka. Traditionally the granary of the region, it now produces cotton.

Until the 19th century, most of what is now the province of Kasala was tribal territory, open to trade and cultural influences through the Red Sea ports, and, from the 10th/11th century, within the sphere of influence (rather than the effective control) of the Fundūlī sultanate of Sinnār. Holy men played an important part in the region. The Fundūlī sultanate, the Shukriyya emerged as the dominant tribe in the central Butān, based on the herding of flocks and the export of horses to Sinnār and other Sudanese states; he maintained a slave-household and army (see Yûsuf Padl Hasan (ed.), Muḥammad al-Nūr b. Dayy Allāh, K. al-taṣabbūt fī ḫuṣūṣī al-anwār wa-l-ṣalāḥīn wa-l-suwar wa-l-madhīn, Kharj 1971, 133-48; cf. S. Hillelson, Sudan Arabic texts, Cambridge 1935, 194-99). In the 12th/13th century, the holy clan of the Maǧǧāḥīb, propagators of the Shāhdhiliyya ġarba, acquired great influence among the eastern tribes from their centre at al-Dāmir at the junction of the ʿAṭbārā with the Nile. Burckhardt in 1814 noted the security that they afforded to travellers passing between al-Dāmir and Sawakin (J. L. Burckhardt, Travels in Nubia, London 1829, 268). The devastation of al-Dāmir in 1822 by the Turco-Egyptian commander, Muḥammad Bey Khursaw al-Ḍaftardār, and the flight to Sawakin of the chief of the clan, led to a further strengthening of Maǧǧāḥīb influence among the Hadanduwa. In the later 19th century, on the disintegration of the Fundūlī sultanate, the Shukriyya emerged as the dominant tribe in the Butān (See H. A. MacMichael, A history of the Arabs in the Sudan, Cambridge 1922, i, 250-3.)

The establishment of Turco-Egyptian rule in the riverain areas made possible the conquest of the nomadic tribes. Although the Hadanduwa were raided in 1823 and again in 1831-2, their effective subjugation was achieved by the būkūmādīr (governor-general) Ahmad Paşa Abū Wīlān, who invaded al-Tākā in 1840 and established a garrison-post, from which developed the town of Kasala. The resistance of the Hadanduwa was finally broken by his successor, Ab-\mad Manālī Paşa, who made a punitive expedition in 1844. Meanwhile, a new Şūfī ġariba, the Khātimiyya, was being propagated among the Beḍja by al-Ḥasan, the son of its founder, Muḥammad ʿUṯmān al-Mīrānī. He established his headquarters at al-Khātimiyya, near the town of Kasala, where he died and was buried in 1869. In 1864-5 he played an important part as a mediator during serious mutinies of Sudanese (i.e., black) troops at Kasala. (See J. S. Trimming-
The Red Sea littoral, and more specifically the ports of Sawakin and Maşawwa, had been part of the Ottoman Empire since the 11th/16th century. The two towns were granted to Muḥammad ʿAlī Pāša on an annual lease in 1846 but reverted to the vilayet of the Ḥidjaz in 1849. In 1865 they were assigned to the Ḥalīm Imām Muhammad Abū Sīnne, gave loyal support. In May 1883 the Mahdi sent as his emissary ʿUmmān b. Abī Bakr Diğna al-Sawakīn (Osman Dīma), a pagan named of Sawakin and of partially Bedja descent. Rivalry between the Maḏjudīb and the Khmatniyya gave him all an ally in the head of the former group, Shāykh al-Tāhir al-Tayyib al-Madjadhib, who brought over to his side the Shukriyya, or the verb ʿaksama, or the verb ʿaksama, or the verb ʿaksama, which figure expressly in the surat of the Meccan period (vi, 109; xvi, 38; lvi, 75; lxviii, 17; lxxxii, 15; lxxixix, 5; xc, etc.) or which are implied in many of the other suras of the same period, apply, in general, to the oaths pronounced by God himself, which are known to cause some difficulties for commentators of the Qurʾān, and محمد al-Nasir, to be delivered from the bond or oath, for, in the Kurʾān, the word ʿamin [g.v.] and the verb ʿalājfa almost exclusively. But even in that which concerns the extra-judiciary oath, with which the discussion that follows is concerned, the word ʿamin has a tendency to supplement ʿasām. It is also a fact that, in the treatises of ʿiyām, whichever school is considered, and in the collections of ḥadīth, the chapter dedicated to [extra-judiciary] oaths is almost always entitled ʿabīr or ʿasām al-ʿayman.

In the lines that follow, the judiciary oath will not be discussed; nevertheless, there will be occasion to consider, in the field of penal procedure, the kasama, an oath pronounced fifty times, which, although connected with the judiciary oath, derives etymologically from the word ʿaksama. The extra-judiciary oath is that by which a person binds himself to do or not to do a certain specific physical or juridical act, by invoking the name of God or one of the divine attributes (al-Raḥmān, al-Kādir, al-ʿNasir, etc.). At least, that is the definition that the works of ʿiyām give of it, for, in the Kurʾān, the word ʿasām or the verb ʿaksama, which figure expressly in the surat of the Meccan period (vi, 109; xvi, 38; lvi, 75; lxviii, 17; lxxxii, 15; lxxixix, 5; xc, etc.) or which are implied in many of the other suras of the same period, apply, in general, to the oaths pronounced by God himself, which are known to cause some difficulties for commentators of the Kurʾān. Already in the Medinan suras, the word ʿamin is frequently substituted for ʿasām (v, 225; v, 99) and marks the first stage of an evolution leading to the concept which becomes that of ʿiyām with regard to extra-judiciary oaths which bring about voluntary bonds, while the verb ʿaksama is still to be found in these Medinan suras (for example, v, 53).

The bond undertaken under oath is not, in general, a juridical obligation, in the sense that the one who has sworn to perform an act cannot be constrained judicially to carry it out. In a case where he did not respect his oath, he would be perjured (ḥind), but it is then a matter of sin, a moral fault, for which he must account to God alone. Nevertheless, ʿiyām, following very close to the Kurʾānic text (v, 39) pro-

vides him, in the hypothetical case where he has involuntary broken his oath, with a means to put his conscience in order, that is, by expiation, kaffara. Expiation for a broken oath may be to give sustenance to 10 paupers, to distribute clothing to them or to free a slave; and, if, through lack of resources, any of these expiations is not possible, the perjured man must fast for 3 days. These regulations, having been laid down in the Koran, are evidently common to the teaching of all the Schools. The latter are all divided, however, on the methods of application of each of them. For example, should the fast last for 3 consecutive days? Yes, reply the Hanafis and the Hanbalis, but no, according to the Malikis and the Shafiis (Dimashki, Râmah at-\textit{Umma}, ii, 79-80). The same divergences are found in that which concerns the quantity of food to be given to the poor, or the quality of the clothing which is distributed to them. It must be emphasized that, as with the oath itself, the expiation, which sanctions its non-execution, has no characteristic of juridical obligation, and no-one, not even the public authority, can constrain the perjured man to perform expiation. All this is laid out on a strictly moral and religious plane.

The \textit{fsbak\d}e were asked if it was not possible for someone, who had sworn to accomplish a certain act deliberately, to substitute the expiation for the performance of his oath, although nothing prevented him from accomplishing his vow. Strangely enough, the Hanafis and Hanbalis refuse him this option, a prohibition that is not in accordance with the character of vows freely consented to as with the oath and expiation.

The statement of the jurists with regard to oaths (\textit{aym\d}) is, in form, very close to that which they adopt in that which concerns a real juridical act. Necessary capacity, conditions of form and substance, null and void formulas, moment of performance of the vow undertaken, effects of the suspensive condition, expedients (\textit{hiya\d}) to change the law, all would let us suppose that it was concerned with vows which, although unilateral, bound their author by strict juridical obligation. Certainly, a careful examination of the explanations of each School, and especially the non-juridical sanction, which consists of kaffara, quickly restores to these dispositions their real character of strictly religious and moral rules. That is not to say that all the works of the jurists on the question were devoid of practical interest. Throughout the centuries, the pious Muslim did not generally attach great importance to the distinction, familiar to specialists, between moral and juridical sanction. His concern was to know whether his conduct here below was reprehensible or not, and whether it would bring him chastisement in the next world. So it was that the long discussions dedicated in the books of fikhr to oaths (\textit{aym\d}an) often associated with vows, \textit{nud\d t\d}r [\textit{q.v. Nadr}] presented him with a very great interest.

It is not possible to enter into detail on the solutions proposed by authors (different, moreover, according to the schools) for particular cases of oaths and all the kinds that were imagined.

Only one example will be given because of the long discussions that the works of fikhr dedicate to this particular case. It concerns the oath called \textit{shar\d}, which may be translated very vaguely as "incestuous comparison". The word is derived from \textit{zahr}, "back". Presumably the husband says to his wife: "I am for me like my mother's back", \textit{ka-zahri ummi}, or any other comparison of a part of the body of his wife with that of a woman he could not marry without committing incest. In pre-Islamic Arabia it was a general form of repudiation, but the Kur'an condemned everything of that kind (XXXIII, 4 and LVIII, 2-3). Its pronunciation constituted nothing other than a sin, and a serious one, which could only be wiped out by expiation. This is different from the ordinary expiation for oaths not respected, and consists of freeing a slave, or in default, fasting for 2 months (during the day only, of course). If not, the husband would have to distribute the midday and evening meal to 60 paupers.

In a general manner, the solutions of fikhr hinge on two essential points. In the first place, it is concerned with knowing when one may consider that an oath has been respected, the expressions used by the one who swore being borne in mind. On this point, the replies are very often of a lexicological order and battle all systematization. The second point concerns expiation; this is not automatically incurred by the simple fact that the oath has not been performed. There are actually some oaths which, due to an actual or theoretical fault, do not call for expiation, although they have not been respected. It is in this category that one places the \textit{yamin al-gham\d}, or oath to perform a deed that one knows to have been already performed. There would not be any kaffara, except in the Shafi\d school. I have elsewhere mentioned that the kaffara, an oath taken by mistake (through a slip of the tongue) or in a thoughtless manner, does not require expiation (Dimashki, \textit{op. cit.}, ii, 73). The same applies, if one follows an oath with an \textit{isti\d t\d ng\d}, a reservation, of which the most usual is "If God wills". No more can someone who is not \textit{mukallaf} (fully capable) bind himself validly by oath, but the majority of the schools (except the Hanafi school) admit that the oath of the unbeliever (kafir) is valid, and that he will be held liable to expiation if he does not carry out his vow.

During the centuries, the usages, variable according to the regions, have added different ceremonies to the very simple form of the oath that was foreseen by fikhr, in order to render the vow more solemn, and to bind further its author. There were also oaths pronounced in sacred places such as the Ka\b\dba at Mecca, or simply within a mosque, which conferred on them a higher value in popular belief.

In the same fashion, oaths are sworn by touching the tomb of a saint or holding bread and coffee in the hand, or placing on the heart an excerpt from the Kur'an or the \textit{Safy\d\d}li of Bukhar\d. Sometimes this supplementary ceremonial represents a pre-Islamic practice, still strongly marked by paganism, such as pronouncing the oath and throwing salt in the communal fire of the tribe, or within a circle in which cinders and pieces of fabric have been scattered. There are some moments of the day when oaths acquire a particular importance, such as that which follows the evening prayer.

On all these practices which are unknown to fikhr, see Musil, \textit{Arabia Petraea}, iii, 235, 342; Jaussen, \textit{Costumes des Arabes au pays de Moab}, 311; Landberg, \textit{Arabica}, v, 133-4; Snouck Hurgronje, \textit{Mekka}, ii, 306; Lane, \textit{Manners and Customs}, i, 168, 470.

Oaths judicially sanctioned. As has been stated and repeated above, the whole theory of the extrajudiciary oath is placed on a moral and religious plane, and consequently very often means that the question may be treated in the first part of the works of fikhr, dedicated to ritual (\textit{chad\d d}). Nevertheless, in two fields of law, i.e. enfranchisement and repudiation, the oath involved in the past (and sometimes today) a juridical sanction, in the sense that
the one who swore to free his slave or repudiate his wife was held liable to carry out his vow, without being able to substitute a kaffara or expiation, through which he would have been able to free himself from his obligation.

In the matter of enfranchisement, every declaration to this effect, even not dependent on the fulfillment of an act by the master or the slave or any other person, had the validity of an oath of enfranchisement, al-half bi’l-faldk and this oath (which did not, however, mention the name of God) irrevocably entailed the liberty of the slave or the slaves alluded to in the master’s declaration.

Ancient fikhl had set up two institutions both based on an oath which, although not having as principal object the breaking-up of marriage, led indirectly to this result. The first of these institutions is the lar6, or “oath of anathema”, by which the husband accuses his wife of adultery or disowns the child that she carries in her womb. To this end, the husband prayed five times an oath in the form asghadu bi-lal6ki, and the last oath was followed by the formula “may I be cursed, if I lie”.

The lar6 was an “oath of continence”, the husband swearing in the name of God not to have sexual relations with his wife for at least 4 months. When this time had passed without a resumption of conjugal relations, the marriage was not automatically broken up except in Hanafi law, the other schools allowing the wife to judge the occasion for the severance, which would take place by a repudiation that the husband would pronounce, or that the kadi would formulate in his place.

Very soon the rules of precedent, especially those relating to the lar6, had fallen into desuetude. The jurists do not dedicate very long discussions to them, except on account of the importance of the scriptural evidence relating to these two institutions, and not for their usefulness, which had become practically nil.

The oath of repudiation. On the other hand, the oath of repudiation, al-half bi’l-jalab or still more al-yamin bi’l-jalab, has always been in very current usage among the Arabic-speaking Muslim populations. In certain circles, notably that of the small traders, it is not rare in the course of a conversation for one of the speakers to swear two or three times, in order to assert his determination or his good faith: “May my wife be repudiated if such a thing does or does not happen, if I am right or if I am wrong, etc.”. The matters are of no consequence, each one knowing that he is uttering idle words, pronounced mechanically and without attention being paid to them. The moralists have always severely reproved this bad habit, for, in any case, it leads to a blameworthy result, whether the one who has sworn does not respect his oath on the pretext that he had formulated it without a serious intention to repudiate and he finds himself perjured, often several times a day, or whether he respects it and separates from his wife, from whom he had no intention to separate and whom he had no occasion to reproach.

What juridical validity did the jurists attach to these oaths of repudiation? Only the Djafarris (and the Zahiris in the past) have always denied them all legal validity, for the reason, among others, that they do not contain the name of God in their formulation. The other juridical schools regard them as conditional repudiations, and as such, involving the breaking-up of the marriage when the condition is realized. Whether the wife avails herself or not of the oath or the husband respects it in separating from his wife or does not respect it in continuing to live with her, are questions of fact, which do not modify at all the principle itself, i.e. the oath of repudiation determines, in law, the repudiation of the wife, if the tacit or explicit condition that it contains is realized. This troublesome solution of the jurists is still applied today in a certain number of Muslim countries.

Egypt is the first Muslim state to have attempted to restrain the execution of the rule of precedent. The Egyptian law of 10 March 1929 declares as null and void conditional repudiations and oaths of repudiation, when these are dependent on an act being done or not done by the wife; but if the condition is different (i.e. if it is not dependent on the will of the wife) the oath of repudiation is valid. Several Muslim countries (Sudan, Jordan, Syria) have adopted in their turn the Egyptian distinction. One must turn to the Moroccan Code of the Personal Statute of 1958 and the Iraqi Code of the Personal Statute of 1959 to find a radical condemnation of every oath of repudiation, whatever may be the nature of the condition on which the repudiation is dependent.

Kasama.—Derived etymologically from basam, this differs from it in its mode of being taken and its strict field of application. It is concerned with an oath repeated 50 times (either by the ‘asaba of the victim of a murder (Maliki rite), or by the inhabitants of the place of the crime (Hanafi rite) an oath by which is asserted the guilt or, on the contrary, the innocence of an individual presumed to have killed someone. This oath dates from the pre-Islamic period, when it always constituted a procedure of accusation, a weapon in the hands of the members of the victim’s tribe, seeking to make use of retaliation (kisda) against the man presumed to be guilty. The juridical schools of Islam, in adopting this pre-Islamic custom, do not make it produce the same result. Actually, in fikhl—merely quoting the Hanafi and Maliki doctrines which are clearly opposed—the basama is, in the first of these systems, a procedure for the defence of the one presumed guilty, and, in the second, a procedure of accusation.

According to all the early Hanafis (sc. those of Kufa), when in a non-public place (which excludes the mosque, quarter of a town, house, boat, etc., the corpse of a person was discovered, when there were not two male witnesses to point out the murderer, and when the niil al-dam, the nearest ‘asab relative of the victim, came to demand justice, 50 people had to be made to swear to having found it in this place, that they were not involved in this crime and that they did not know the murderer. If 50 people could not be gathered (if the crime was committed in a house, for example), it was possible to make the same person swear several times, in such a manner that the total of 50 oaths was reached. In the light of this, the niil al-dam could not apply retaliation and had to content himself with the pecuniary compensation (diya) provided in such a case.

The Maliki school, following the teaching of the scholars of Medina, has kept the characteristics of the basama which it had in pre-Islamic Arabia, that is to say, those of a procedure of accusation. It is also a fact that in the hypothetical case of a murder of which the author is unknown, the ‘asaba relatives of the victim swore 50 oaths (by the ‘asaba person could swear several times provided that this was not more than 25 times) that such an individual, against whom is weighted serious presumptive evi-
ence, was the one who committed the murder. The notion of serious presumption (lawth) has acquired thereby in this school, and in those that have adopted the same conception of kasāma, a fundamental importance. Serious presumptive evidence was held to be not only the fact that the victim, before dying, had accused the presumed murderer, but also the presence of this last person, with his blood-stained clothing, not far from the victim, or even the testimony of a single witness to the murder. With these conditions combined, the wali al-dam would bring retaliation against the one presumed guilty, such that he could then, as a result, have him put to death. The Malikī version of the kasāma, in which oaths liable to bring about death were taken by the relatives of the victim who, ex hypothesis, were not present at the murder, has formed the subject of some criticisms on behalf of one party, that has nevertheless remained a minority, of the ancient doctrine (Ibn Rushd, Bidāya, ii, 419).

Finally, it does not appear that this institution functioned much, even in the past when the penal law of Islam had a certain practical application.

Bibliography: See the chapter ayāmān, in the works of fiqh, e.g. Marāghnānī, Ḥīdāya, Cairo 1936, ii, 54-5; Ibn Rushd, Bidāya al-mughābīḥ, Cairo 1952, i, 394; Ibn Rushd, Mughātī, Cairo 1367, viii, 676-7; J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, Strasbourg 1914; Y. Linant de Bellefonds, Traité de droit musulman comparé, Paris - The Hague 1965, ii, nos. 1001 to 1011, 1021.


(J. Pedersen-[Y. Linant de Bellefonds])

AL-KĀSĀNĪ, ʿALĪ al-DĪN ʿABŪ BĀKĪR B. MAṢ‘ĪD, called Mālik al-ʿulama‘ “King of Scholars” was one of the greatest jurists of the Hanafi law school. His niṣba stems from Kāsān, in Farghānā, to the north of the Syr Darya in Central Asia. He was the pupil of ʿAlī al-Dīn al-Samarkandī (d. 539/1144), the author of a treatise regarded as the original model. In Hanafi legal literature, the Badā‘i‘ constitutes a masterpiece of a quality which was never reached subsequently. The term “commentary” has been attached to al-Kaṣānī’s work simply because his biographers wished to stress an aspect of his life which they thought worthy of remark, and said ḡarāha Tuhfahāhu wa-tasawwudajī bināh “he wrote a commentary on his Tuhfa [of al-Samarkandī] and married his daughter”.

Despite his qualities of clarity, methodicalness and learning, al-Kaṣānī’s work nevertheless did not exercise any great influence on the later development of Hanafi law. It does not seem that legal scholars of his own time were particularly impressed with its importance; thus properly speaking, he had no disciples, and the Badā‘i‘ was not made the starting-point for numerous commentaries, as was the case with the Ḥīdāya of his contemporary al-Marghīnānī (d. 593/1197). At a later date, his ideas are hardly mentioned in the great compilations of Hanafi law, and even then with no more weight attached to them than to those of other Hanafi jurists. The appearance at the beginning of this century (1328/1909) of the first edition of the Badā‘i‘ quickly gave rise to a real excitement over this work amongst contemporary jurists, and it can be said that the teaching of Hanafi law became then concentrated around it. Apart from the Badā‘i‘, al-Kaṣānī apparently wrote a work called al-Sulṭān al-mubīn fi wujūl al-dīn, apparently lost; and Brockelmann mentions a Kur’ān commentary called the Kitāb al-Tawāṣīl which exists only in manuscript.


(W. Heffening-Y. Linant de Bellefonds)

KASB (see ūṣīrāt al-dīn)

KASB (A.), in economic life, gain. As is well known, in its main trends Islam is not a doctrine of renunciation of the world, but one of respect for the commandments of God according to the uses of the world, which He has given to man for his benefit. There is therefore no objection whatsoever to a man’s realising, as long as it is by legal means, the gain which is known, in its main trends Islam is not a doctrine of renunciation of the world, but one of respect for the commandments of God according to the uses of the world, which He has given to man for his benefit. There is therefore no objection whatsoever to a man’s realising, as long as it is by legal means, the gain which is

KASAM — KASB

KASAM (see ūṣīrāt al-dīn)
by means of which a “gain” might be realised.

Ibn Khaldūn, considering the problem of gain or profit at the end of the classical Muslim period, as it might be presented to a sociologist (although in accord with the Book of God), enumerates (tr. de Slane, ii, 223 f. = Rosenthal, ii, 311 f.) the different means of obtaining it and the two different forms it can take: gain for simple subsistence, or true profit, premium, each resulting to some extent from the application of human effort to the gifts of nature. They can thus be procured, apart from by force or through political power (taxes), by means of agriculture, industry and commerce. This last source is far and away the most respected in Islam.

As would be expected, reflections on the legitimacy of gain became more common from the time of the great economic leap forward of the 3rd/9th century; in fact, it was nearly always the legitimacy of commercial gain which was considered. The affirmation of the legitimacy of gain, as long as it was the fruit of honest toil, was underlined in the face of the ascetic tendencies of some spiritual groups outside Islam, and inside it of the nascent Sufism, which sometimes preached a strict ideal of poverty and sometimes relied on God, that is on begging, on the charity of the faithful, in fact on the efforts of others and not on oneself (unless intercession with God can be so called) for the acquisition of whatever is necessary for oneself and one's family. It is symptomatic that it was among the Ḥanbalis, who had most contact with poorer people and with the petite bourgeoisie, that the reaction against anti-economic trends is most pronounced. "Two kinds of food taste best", says a celebrated ḥadīth widespread in this milieu, "those produced by your own hands and those carried on your own back". Hence, subsistence is in question, but even so, true profits are permitted, though under the strictest regulations. A polemic discovered by S. D. Goitein is highly relevant here. Deriving from a Ḥanafī milieu (always in this period closest to practice), it is a tract attributed, perhaps wrongly, to al-Shaybānī, but one which certainly dates from the 3rd/9th century; it is true that it has come down to us through the medium of a successor, but it is sufficiently clear. In essence, it gathers together all the relevant ḥadīths and therefore all the guarantees legitimising gain. This indicates that the problem was indeed faced by pious men, but that their conclusion was frankly positive, as it has been in all religions during periods of economic development. The attitude remained the same after the great expansion. H. Ritter has recently drawn attention to the contributions of various authors to the subject, al-Ghazālī in particular (end of the 5th/11th century). As would be expected, al-Ghazālī stresses spiritual values and condemns the dishonest merchant, but he equates the honest merchant with a fighter in the ghārdad, thereby demonstrating his regard for commerce.

Teachings from other sources were combined with those of Islam stricto sensu. Ritter and Plessner have demonstrated the importance of the ideas of Neopythagorean Bryson, whose work was translated into Arabic at a fairly early date, in the economic thinking of Islam, both Sunnī and Shiʿī, and of Judaism. Through his works were channelled Platonic and Aristotelian traditions. Incidentally, although this was not their own perspective, the Ḥanbalī al-Ṣaḥḥa also admit work as a source of gain, at least for subsistence (cf. Y. Marquet, in Arabica, vii (1961), 225 ff.).

Without wishing to lay stress on this aspect, which will be more amply covered elsewhere, we must consider practice alongside doctrine. As has been noted, this is mostly concerned with commerce. The conception of merchants entailed here is one of a permanent accord, which can be traced back to antiquity: the purpose of commerce, as expounded by the author of the Tabāṣṣur bi'l-tidjara (3rd/9th cent., ʾIrāk), by Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Dīnābādī (probably 5th/11th century, Fāṭimid region), and by Ibn Khaldūn, is to realise through the differential between the purchase price in one area and the selling price elsewhere. It has therefore an essentially speculative aim; commerce certainly needs production, but it is not its conscious aim to stimulate it, even though only agriculture and industry are, in the material sense, properly productive. Here we must introduce the ideas developed in Islam concerning prices: in one sense they are willed by God and must therefore be left free, but even so a Muslim ruler is obliged to preserve them from excessive speculation, particularly in the case of basic commodities, just as he is obliged to regulate manufacture, weights and measures, currency, etc.

As in all ancient and mediaeval societies, lending an interest, in all the guises by which it was then known, was highly unpopular and officially forbidden. Early Islam stigmatised a term of credit (ribaʿ) whose meaning is unknown. It entailed, evidently, a condemnation, from a moral point of view, of those who grew rich through the misery of others, without the loan granted helping the borrower in any way to retrieve his fortunes, such as lending dates to a starving man, etc. However, as is often the case with sacred texts, this was applied literally to quite different circumstances as early as the 3rd/9th century, and the economic decline of later Islam drew attention to its faults without their being sufficiently analysed. It was therefore concluded, right up to the present day, that all lending at interest was forbidden. In fact, in periods of economic expansion, in the Islamic world as elsewhere, the interdiction was twisted, in the most transparent fashion, by being applied to non-Muslim communities. Thus it was generally accepted that lending at interest was prohibited amongst coreligionists but not between one faith and another, which in the practical life of a multi-confessional society amounted to its reinstatement (see further riwāḥ). Above all, Islam knew, practised and officially ratified customs aimed at securing a profit for money put to work, principally by means of investments in commercial enterprises or domains. This could be done through partnership, ǧirkā (q.v.), or through capitalist merchant commenda, kirdā, mudāraba (q.v.), the money placed acquiring part of the profit in reward for the service rendered or in compensation for the risk taken. Muslim practice, whatever the original reasons behind it, was considered by merchants of all confessions as preferable to previous traditions (A. Udovitch, Partnership and profit in Medieval Islam, Princeton 1965). It was in continual usage, which attests the fact that the Muslim economy certainly relied on profit. The forms it took were those which in large measure soon became general in the Mediterranean and Western world. At the end of the Middle Ages, only the latter gradually outdistanced the Muslim economy. Bibliography: it is impossible to give here a general bibliography of a subject so amply treated at an elementary level; see the specialised articles, particularly Tabāṣṣur bi'l-tidjara (tr. by Heffner), ʾIrāk, kirdā, ǧārī, etc.; to the first, while awaiting the new edition, add E. Bussi, Il concetto


(C. CAHEN)

As a theological term kasb means “acquisition”, “appropriation”. The verb hasaba, usually in the 3rd form and sometimes in the 8th (i'ktasab), is frequently found in Kur’ānic vocabulary, mainly with the sense of “acquiring” those rewards or punishments which are the fruit of moral acts, and so a loose translation could render hasaba here as “carrying out an action”. Therefore, “Each soul is paid a fair price for whatever has accrued to it” (Kur’ān, II, 281; cf. inter alia, XIV, 51; XL, 17, LXXIV, 36, etc.). According to the text, this is the very reason for the creation of the world, “God created the heavens and the earth in truth (bi'l-haqq) and so that each soul could be rewarded for whatever it had acquired” (XLV, 22). Kasaba alludes to the “acquisition” (of the fruit) of each act, good or evil; iktasab, which is very close in meaning, is used in the Kur’ān only for human actions in general (IV, 36), or for acts which merit punishment (II, 286, XXIV, 11, IXXI, 58). Verbs II, all (as also kasb), is given that which it has acquired (hasabat) and against each (is recorded) that which it has acquired (iktasbat). It should be noted that when discussing this verse, al-Zamakhshari, followed by al-Baydawi, stresses the meaning contained in the 8th form.

The masdars of these two verbal forms, kasb (pl. ašaab) and iktisab, have had a long history in the "ilm al-kalām, especially in the Ash'āri school, where they were employed to define which act was reattributed to man in a “freely” accomplished and morally qualified act. The Ash'āri kasb is a narrow margin in which is inscribed the relationship between the act created by God and human responsibility. The school’s subtle analyses tend to safeguard both the notion of “free choice” (iḥtiyāṭ q. ā‘ī) strongly expressed within the subject, and the just, frequent attribution augured in the Kur’ān, while at the same time taking nothing away from God, who “created you, you and that which you do” (Kur’ān, XXXVII, 96). Some writers prefer to use iktisab (al-Ghazālī:) the majority use one term or the other indiscriminately. According to al-Zamakhshari, commenting on Kur’ān II, 286, it appears that iktisab, in its reflexive connotation, lays stress on psychologically proven reality. The discussions about kasb were famed for their very elaborate dialectic, as witness the maxim of their opponents (notably the Hanbalis): “more tenuous than al-Ash’āri’s kasb”, adakht min kasb al-Ash’āri. But perhaps this subtlety, or obscurity, can be clarified when the historical evolution of the committed arguments is taken into consideration.

1. Pre-Ash’āri kalām. It was, in fact, from his predecessors that al-Ash’āri took the concept of kasb as the “acquisition” of acts (see W. Montgomery Watt, The Origin of the Islamic doctrine of acquisition, in JRAS (1943), 234-7; idem, Free will and predetermination in early Islam, London 1948, passim; idem, The formative period of Islamic thought, Edinburgh 1973, index).

It seems to have been in Ghazālī’s teaching and in Murtūjā’il circles that the root k-s-b first took on a technical meaning: to distinguish between science and knowledge “acquired” by man’s efforts, ʿilm muktasab, and “necessary” science or knowledge, ʿilm daruri. Kasb here remains very close to its initial sense of acquisition of profit. Muktasab (associated with nasari “discursive”, “speculative”) and daruri (associated with “immediate” and “self-evident”) became traditional distinctions in the study of the sources or “channels” (asaab) of knowledge (cf. Gardet and Anawati, Introduction à la théologie musulmane, Paris 1970, 375-83).

Dirār b. Amr was the first to employ the root k-s-b in analysing human action, applying it to the problem of man’s free choice in the face of divine omnipotence. According to Dirār, human action arises from “two agents”: God, who creates it, and man, who acquires it (see apud al-Ash’āri, Makālāl al-Islāmīyyīn, ed. ʿAbd al-Hamīd, Cairo 1369-73/1950-4, i, 313). The stress Dirār lays on the two agents (fāʿilān) tends to indicate that this “acquisition” arises from an intrinsic efficacy of human action, but one which cannot exist without a divine motion operating at that moment. A little later, al-Najdīdār divorced this union of causes and opposed khalīk (creator, always God) and fāʿil, “agent” (ibid., i, 315). Action comes under God’s power in the sense that God wills it at the moment that it is accomplished and does not wish it when it is not brought about, but its actual execution belongs to man. Therefore, man possesses “power over the kasb”, he is kādār “able” (cf. XXXIV, 118). One of al-Najdīdār’s disciples, Muhammad b. ʿIsā al-Burghūthī, emphasised, on the basis of Kur’ānic texts, that the same term could not be applied to man, and to God (ibid., ii, 198): whether fāʿil is the province of man, as the texts of the Makālāl seem to indicate, or whether, as al-Baghdaḍī says in al-Farāb bays al-firāb (ed. Cairo 1926, 197), God is Agent, the same term cannot be applied to man, who remains no more than the “acquisitor”, the muktasib, of his action. The Rāfiḍī Hishām b. al-Ḥakām, and after him Ḍjaʿfar b. Ḥarb, also used kasb and iktisab to describe the relationship between man and his voluntary actions: it can be said that human action is “free” (iḥkiyāṭ) in the sense that man wills it and acquires it (iḥtiyāṭ), but it remains “constrained” (iḥtiyāṭ) in the sense that man plays no part in its efficient cause, which is created by God (ibid., 1, 200).

These early musahalātīn therefore tried, by employing the concept of “acquisition”, to retain for man his own position in the act he accomplished. But while for Dirār this part remained a positive action, a participant in the single divine creator Action and thus subordinate to It, al-Najdīdār and al-Burghūthī, anxious to preserve the division between Creator and creature, would not allow of such a conception. For them, man possessed nevertheless “power over the acquisition of his actions. Judging from this evidence, al-Shahrastānī’s dubbing such scholars...
Djabariyya in his Kitab al-Milal wal-nifral (ed. Badran, Cairo 1370/1951, 138-9) must be revised. The thesis of man "the acquisitor" (muktabis) was certainly opposed to the Mu'tazilists thesis of man "the creator" (kaddib) of his actions. Al-Djubbari questioned the very notion of kasb. His arguments have been preserved, scattered throughout the Mahardini and more concisely in the writings of 'Abd al-Djubbbar (Sharh al-usul al-lhamsa, ed. 'Abd al-Karim 'Uthman, Cairo 1384/1965, 365-79) and 'Abd al-'Aziz ibn al-Majidt, the latter editor of Fikh Akbar II (a.7; Eng. tr. A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim creed, Cambridge 1932, 191, where the text is reported at the end of a.6) affirms that all men's actions are in truth their "acquisition" (aash) just as Ash'ari thinkers. The earliest discussions which form the basis of the trends known as Maturidi ignore the problem of kasb, however it was defined precisely, based their belief in man's responsibility for his own actions. For them, the (ontological) root of an act arises from the power (kudra) of God, and its (moral) qualification, which obeys or disobeys divine Law, arises from the power (kudra) of the individual (cf., for example, the brief summary of 'Abd al-Rahim Ibn 'Ali, Nasafi, al-Tawfiq, Al-Sanusi, al-Badjuri, etc.). Their definitions and analyses appear always to be linked to the ideas of kudra khaqi (the "contingent power" created by God) and istisla (the ability to act).

Ash'ari kasb and istisla are undoubtedly heirs to the first trends of 'ilm al-kalcam, those predecessors whom al-Ash'ari linked to call ahli al-atibhit. But the preoccupation with combatting the 'Itizd, and with allowing man nothing that was not subject to the immediate and sole power of God, which was what al-Dyir for example saw as the real and positive nature of kasb, or even with al-Nadjdjar's "power over kasb" and istisla (the capacity to act) is "imputation" extrinsically created by God in the human subject. The extreme subtlety or obscurity imputed to Ash'ari kasb by opponents like Ibn Taymiyya perhaps derived from the fact that in the direct reference to an act freely completed, which is the basic meaning of the root k-s-b, became no more than a psychological semblance, without any reality at all. In Dirar and al-Nadjdjar, kasb and istisla can still be translated as "acquisition" or "appropriation"; but the strict Ash'ari concept demands that we speak of "extrinsic attribution" and "juridic imputation".

To sum up: Ash'ari kasb or istisla is the link between the "contingent power" to act and the accomplished act, but with no concomitant intrinsic effect of the first on the second (e.g. al-Djiwayni, frshhd, ed. and Fr. tr. Luciani, Paris 1938, 101-2). The power, action and kasb are directly created by God within the human subject, which is, as al-Djubbbari states (Sharh al-Mawdhib, ed. Cairo 1325/1907, vili, 48), more than no receptacle, the place (mahall): an expression frequently found in the manuals of this school. Subsequently, kasb was conceived of as pure "connection" (ta'alluk), and its "positioning in annexation" (istikhdafa, cf. Fr. tr. Fih al-milal, ed. Cairo 1347, iii, 48) of the effect produced and the subject from which it derives, without a man having any efficacy over his act, "without even his being assured of the production of that act" (al-Badjuri, Hikhyt al-dalal al-Tabarid, ed. Cairo 1353/1934, 61). In strictest Ash'arism, this concept of kasb attributes to "acquisition" an "imputation" deriving solely from the inscrutable divine Will.

Other analytical essays, perhaps influenced by the legacy of Dirar or al-Nadjdjar, or by Maturidi elucidations (see below), suggest that kasb should be defined as a "wish" (irda) which is created as it were by accident (farad), but always acknowledging that the three conditions present—contingent wish, contingent power and effect produced—are directly created by God, without their being an intrinsically subordinate link between them. The Mu'tazils objected that an accident (the kasb) could not be inherent within another accident (the human act). In reply, Ibn Hazm asserted that this inheritance was possible (op. cit., iii, 52). Al-Badjuri (loc. cit.) discussed both trends and their respective definitions, acknowledging both as valid, but declaring that the theory of kasb will be less "reliable" than that of kasb-relations.

3. The Hanafit-Maturidi tradition (including some Ash'ari thinkers). The earliest discussions which form the basis of the trends known as Maturidi ignore the problem of kasb, however it was defined precisely, based their belief in man's responsibility for his own actions. For them, the (ontological) root of an act arises from the power (kudra) of God, and its (moral) qualification, which obeys or disobeys divine Law, arises from the power (kudra) of the individual (cf., for example, the brief summary of 'Abd al-Rahim Ibn 'Ali, Nazm al-fardg, Cairo n.d., 72). Kasb is precisely this qualification, and therefore derives from human "power". Subsequently, some measure of an effect by man on his action was acknowledged, which was a return, beyond Ash'ari, to the older views of Dirar and al-Nadjdjar. The definition of kasb as siha, a moral quality (ibid., 73), is the usual response in tracts of a Maturidi bent (cf. al-Nasaf, al-Taftzn, al-Lakani, etc.). Some Ash'arists, while adhering to their school's viewpoint on the analysis of human action, especially on the "capacity to act" (istikhdafa), opted for a theory very close to kasb-siha. Among these latter, the Hanafis-Maturidis are fond of citing al-Bakhilani (ibid.): Fakhrit al-Din al-Razi (Muhassal, ed. Cairo n.d., 143) can also be included here.

Thus we have three appreciably different concepts, all three permitted in the official doctrine of 'ilm al-kalcam: kasb-relations (strict Ash'arism), kasb-will (secondary Ash'ari trend) and kasb-siha (Maturidis and some Ash'arists). It should be noted that through their theory of kasb, however it was defined precisely, the Ash'arists, like the Maturidis-Hanafists, deliberately opposed Djabariyya as well as Mu'tazila, and on this basis their belief in man's responsibility for his own actions...
actions. Whether as pure relation, contingent will or moral quality, it was, they stated, in... its own governorship, or at times two distinct governorships. Renowned from the Seljukid period for its madrasas, its


KASBAH (see KASABA).

KASF (see KUSUF).

KASH, the modern Shahr-i Sabz (‘green town’) on account of the fertility of its surroundings, a town in Özbekistān on what was once the great trade route between Samarkand and Balkh. According to Chinese authorities, Kash (Chinese transcription K’ia-tsa or Ki-shuang-na, also K’usha, as a town Ki-she) was founded at the beginning of the seventh century A.D.; cf. J. Marquet, Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften, Leipzig 1898, 51; Ernāmah etc., Berlin 1901, 304; E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Youshine (Turco) occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, 146. In 572/982 it is mentioned by Huddud al-Samām, 113 (§ 25, 15) as well-irrigated and protected by a citadel; it exported mules, manna and red salt. Yākūt’s statement (Mu’jam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv, 274; Barbier de Meynard, Dict., 488 f.) on the authority of Ibn Makūlā, who died in 473/1080-1, that in Transoxiana the name was everywhere pronounced Kiss is very doubtful. For the later period the pronunciation Keš (Kish) is proved by the frequently recurring expression Keš-i Dilkesh. The accounts of the Arab conquest are discussed by Marquet in particular (Ernāmah, see Index). The Keš of the Samanid period is described very fully by the Arab geographers (al-Istakhrl, 324 f.; Ibn Hawkal, cf. N. Sitnyakowsky in Protobul Turk. Kruška Lyub. Arch., v, 114 f. As late as the 10th/11th century Kash or Shahr-i Sabz is described by Ūfī al-Tanīsī (‘Abd Allāk-Nama, Ms. of the Asiatic Museum, 574 age, f. 5b) as an important town usually protected by a prince of the ruling house, while the administration of Nafās or Karšī [q.v.] could be

left to a military official (Darvāga). In the 10th century, the amr Nāṣr Allāh of Bukhārā (1826-60) tried during the whole of his reign to subjugate the town; he succeeded only in 1860, but his successor lost Kash as early as 1865. In 1870 it was ceded by the Russians to the amirs of Bukhārā. At the present day the situation is reversed and Shahr-i Sabz is an unimportant town in comparison with Karghī, the result of the political changes in the 12th/13th century. The district of Shahr-i Sabz is surrounded to the N. by the Hazret-Sultān hills, to the S. by the Bay Suntaw-mountains and irrigated by the Kara-Daryā with its affluents.

Bibliography: Le Strange, 469 f.; Barthold, Turkestan, index, esp. 134 f.; idem, K Istorii orosheymi Turkestana, St. Petersburg 1914, 125 f.; B. Spuler, Iran, index; idem, Geschichte Mitteleasiens, Leiden 1966, index (s.v. Shahr-i sabz).

(K. W. Barthold/B. Spuler)

KASHAN (Kāsān, Kāshān; 33°59’ lat. N., 51°27’ long. E.), a town of the Jīlībāl, on the ancient N.—S. axial route of central Iran, chief town of a shahrīstān of the central province (Ustān-i markaz); it gives its name to an oasis adjoining the Dašt-i Kāvīr on the N.E. and on the E., closed on the W. and on the S. by the buffer of the median chain of central Iran (3,900 m. at the extreme Kaftān, 944 m. altitude (945 m.), the town has a warm climate (average of 38° C. in July, obs. 1881-4), has a bad reputation for scorpions and suffers from lack of water. This has been supplied by the perennial spring of Fin and by the traditional systems of kanārs and ab anbars (cisterns); constructed under Šāh ‘Abbas the Great, the Kurūd Dam also supplied the town; and likewise from the Safawid period, the Kamsar Dam served for irrigation until the floods of 1958. Today, the sinking of deep wells and water supply works allow a much greater provision of water for drinking and for irrigation. Apart from its craftsmanship and textile industries, the district is renowned for its natural products (figs and pomegranates from Fin, rose water from Kamsar, melons, grapes etc.).

At the S.W. exit of the town, the site of Tepe Sialk/Sialk testifies to a new occupation of the oasis (3 periods from the 5th to the 3rd millenium; a small Indo-European “state” destroyed around the 8th C. B.C.; objects preserved in the Louvre and Tehran Museums; see R. Ghirshman, Fouilles de Sialk, i—ii, Paris 1938-9; idem, L’Iran des origines à l’Islam, Paris 1951). The region abounds in Sasanid remains (shahr-i disks of Nīyāštār/Nīyāsār and Natanz). Although the name Kāsān/Kāshān may not be attested before the 4th/5th C. and its origin remains uncertain, the importance of the Sāsānīd town is proved, notably by its resistance to the Arab invasion (anecdote of the scorpions: see al-Mukaddasī, 390; the town furnished soldiers for the Sāsānīd army: see H. Narādī, Tarikh-i igīmānī, 28; the legend of the Magian kings having left from Kāshān for Jerusalem was circulated in an early period: see Monneret de Villard, Le leggende orientali sui magi evangelici, Vatican 1953, 83 ff. and index s.v. Qāšān).

According to various authors, the Islamic city was founded (or fortified) by Zubayda khātān, wife of Hārūn al-Rashīd, and then claimed by the Imāmī Shī‘is, who are said to have constructed a fortified surrounding wall to protect the town from the attacks of the Daylamids (Mirju-i kāšān, 6-7). Subsequently attached to the governorship of Fasānī, it then formed with Kūmān its own governorship, or at times two distinct governorships. Renowned from the Saldjukid period for its madrasas, its
scholars, its calligraphers, its administrators (known by the nisba Kashan, Kāshānī, Fīn, Rawandi, etc.) and its glazed ceramics (safl, rauh or mudhir), it was relatively spared by the Ilkhānids, the Timūrids and the Turcomans, who derived profit from its craftsmanship (pottery, brassware, textiles). It enjoyed its greatest prosperity under the Safawids; a true cultural capital of Islamic Iran in the 10th/16th century, it was favoured by Shāh 'Abbās and his successors who embellished it with a palace, gardens, avenues and covered bazaars. From 5,000 to 5,000 hearths in 1524 (Tehrān), it counted 5,000 to 6,000 in 1565 (Mestre Afsarī) and Chardin enumerates 6,500 houses in 1763 (counting 5 to 6 persons per hearth or house). The town was then renowned for its gold brocades (sar baft, sari), its silks (thread and fabric), its velvets (mashkahn), its wool or silk carpets (sometimes embroidered with gold and silver), its painters and calligraphers, its scholars and theologians and above all its famous kāfrī [q.r.] widespread in the Islamic world. After having suffered the Afghan and Afshārīf domination, with their massacres and exactions, the town was destroyed by an earthquake in 1192/1779 in the time of Karīm Kāshānī Zand. Although reconstructed by this sovereign and "embellished" by Fatḥ 'All Shāh Kāshānī, it has only recently recovered a part of its prosperity (modernization: the textile industry, improvements of the roads and railways, of which the Tehran-Zahidan line is in the process of completion).

After the depression of the 18th century (ca. 15,000 inhabitants at the beginning of the 19th century), the city was repopulated (ca. 30,000 inhabitants in 1840, ca. 50,000 in 1908). Nevertheless, the development of the oasis has been checked mainly due to the transfer of the axial N. - S. route to the W. of the median chain. While the census of 1956 reflects the exodus towards Tehran (ca. 46,000 inhabitants), that of 1966 seems to indicate an improvement (58,468 inhabitants). Numerous authors have stressed the enthusiasm for work and natural disposition of the Kāshānī for the arts, literature and philosophy, as well as their spirit of independence. Although their devotion to the divination and the twelve Imāms may be generally attested since the Saltānīd period, the majority of the settlements of the district were Sunni at the time of the conquest of Shāh Ismā'īl, and the faith of the people of the town itself also poses a problem (see B. Scarcia Amoretti, in AFIQN (1969), 263-8; M. Mazaouei, THE ORIGINS OF THE SAFAVIDS, STī'īm, STī'ISM AND THE OVLĀD, Wiesbaden, 1972, 31, n. 3). The ancient Jewish community of the town, which served as a refuge to the Jews of Iran were Sunnī at the time of the conquest of Shāh Ismā'īl, now in decline (2,000 persons in 30,000 inhabitants in 1907, 525 in 1956). As elsewhere in Iran, factionalism divided the social body there, practically until the end of the Kāšānī period. Despite natural destructions and sackings, the town has preserved a part of its historic architectural appearance: from the Saltānīd period, a minaret of the Dīmūrī Mosque dated 468/1074, the solitary Zayn al-Dīn Minaret with a height of 47 m, the remains of the Djalālī Fortress and a part of the fortified double surrounding wall; from the Mongol period, the Khādājī Tādī al-Dīn Mausoleum; built in 687/1443, the Mausoleum of the Dīmūrī, the tomb of Shāh 'Abbās the Great (mīrūrī of the ancient mausoleums of the Shī'ī poet Muḥtāram Kāshānī (d. 966/1558) [q.r.] and of the Shī'ī theologian Muḥtaṣīm-i Fayz Kāshānī (d. 1901/1680).

The act of lifting and tearing away the veil [which comes between man and the extra-phenomenal world]. Al-Djurđjanī's Ta'rīḫī (ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 193) states that, according to the Arabic lexicon, kashf means "to take away the veil", but in technical terminology (istilāḥ) it means "to make appear in a complete and actual realisation the mysterious senses and the realities which are behind the veil". It is worthy of note (see below) that this definition copies word-for-word a text of the Iṭlāmi scholar Ḥāḍir Amlī, some twenty years the senior of Al-Djurđjānī. Experience of kashf works within and brings about mukaddama, which may be translated as "unveiling" in the sense of "illumination" or "epiphany". Their opposing correlates are satr and istilāḥ, the acts of veiling and occultation.

The technical environment of the word's use, as evoked by Al-Djurđjānī, is essentially that of ṣaṣawwuf and of Shi‘i theology. The verb kashf (but not the maḍar kashf) occurs several times in the Kur‘ān in its current sense of to uncover (part of the body) and to take away (misfortune, evil, danger, torment). However, two texts serve as the basis for future elaborations: "We have lifted thy covering off thee (kashfuna), and today thy sight is sharp" (L, 22) and "The portending [Last Day] is near at hand, Short of Allāh, there is no-one can lift it away" (LIII, 57-8). The first of these two texts is cited by al-Ghuṭalī at the opening of his Munḥīb.

1. Some examples of Sufi elaborations:

(a) Al-Kalābādī. It seems that in the first centuries (e.g. in al-Hallādī) the opposite (mubābah) of satr or istilāḥ was not so much kashf as tādālīl ["divine" irradiation]. Al-Kalābādī, K. Al-Ta‘arruf, ed. Arberry, Cairo 1352/1933, 90, headed his ch. ivii. The tādālīl wa l-istilāḥ. He distinguishes three types of tādālīl: that of the essence, that of the attributes of the essence and that of the status...
defines mukāhsafa as “a state which bayān cannot in any way describe”. Kashf and mukāhsafa are thus freely put into connection with the superior worlds, those beyond the senses, ājiwarūl and malakūl, beyond mulk [see ‘ālam]. Also, some of the general treatises on Sufism employ the term kashf in their very titles, as in the famous Kashf al-mahdīb of al-Hudžwirī, written in Persian (Eng. tr. by R. A. Nicholson, GMS, Leiden-London 1911). The spiritual steps forward envisaged by al-Hudžwirī are destroying the veil of the world of reality. The raising of the veil will be the supreme state of enjoyment in Paradise, and it is only the state of kashf “which is the degree of closeness (kurb) which makes possible the miracles of saints (ibid., 111, 226). There is thus no question now of any intermediary stage. Al-Hudžwirī seems to place himself more in the line of al-Sarraideg than in that of al-Kushayrī, and does not hesitate to bend into a new sense the borrowings which he makes (without naming any source) from the latter. Thus when he compares mukāhsara and mukāhsafa (ibid., 374-5), he defines the first as “the presence of the heart in the subtleties of bayān”, and the second as “the presence of the inner secret (sirr) in the field of intuitive vision (‘iyān). If mukāhsara definitely refers to the miraculous signs (āyiid) of God, as al-Kushayrī says, then mukāhsafa is already a kind of direct vision (mukāhsafa); contrary to the analyses of the Ristā al-kushayriyya, he no longer seems to distinguish them apart. It is described as a continuous and admiring tremendum in face of the infinite grandeur of God. A little later, al-Hudžwirī compares the diurnal state of kashf to the nocturnal one of sāiir (“occultation”) and suggests that a divine meeting (mukāhsara) may be necessary to very different activations, the troubled and burning desire for an “other place”, which is that of the bai al-baidīb (lit. “state of the veil”), and also the peaceful vision of the bai al-kashf.

2. A certain usage in theology: that of al-Ghazallī. Kashf occurs frequently in this scholar’s vocabulary. But it is a question here of a usage not merely “mythical” of this term, but of a “theological” one, seeing that spiritual experience and states are for al-Ghazallī in effect an article of faith. References to kashf are to be found not only in the Iḥyāʾ, but equally in the Iḥtiṣād, the Mucṣafa and the Munkidh; kashf lays the foundation for yaḵīn, the assured certainty of genuine faith (as opposed to faith received purely by being handed down, ṣabīḥ). The Munkidh states that “The key to most of the branches of knowledge is the light (nir) which God shines into the heart”. Also, “Whoever imagines that kashf depends on logically-arranged arguments reduces the immensely-wide mercy of God to narrow proportions... Kashf must be sought from this [divine] light” (Munkidh, ed. Ābd al-Halīm Māḥmūd, Cairo 1372/1953, 55). Kashf, the unveiling of the world of mystery, is mentioned several times in the Iḥyāʾ; see the main references in Farid Jabare, Essai sur le lexique de Ghaṣdī pl, Beirut 1970, 244. Also, the Iḥyāʾ, ed. Cairo 1352/1933, IV, 218, doubtless in conformity with the tradition from al-Kushayrī, places kashf and bayān in connection with each other.

If kashf appears in many of al-Ghazallī’s works, mukāhsafa is found in the vocabularies of the Iḥyāʾ and the Faygul only. As Jabare notes, op. cit., 245-6, this second term is used in a double sense: (a) subjective, an interior state brought about by kashf, and (b) objective, meaning “the truths, the objects
of the act of unveiling". Al-Ghazâlî's famous distinc-
tion between *ulum al-mu’dmala (ritual observ-
ances, social customs and ethical rules) and *ulum al-
mukdshafa, by means of which realities are ap-
prehended, is well-known. The *Ihya*, i, 18, says
that the *‘ilm al-mukdshafa is the knowledge of
what is concealed (bâjin), and is the aim of all the
sciences. It is the science of the saints (siddîdbân)
and those "brought near to God". It is a light
which shines into the heart if the latter is purified
and freed from its reprehensible qualities, a light
which bears upon God. His angel, His acts, the
prophets and the future life (cf. ibid., i, 48). It is not argumentation, nor simple acceptance,
but an intuitive and sure grasping of the subject.
"By *‘ilm al-mukdshafa, we mean the pulling-aside
of the veil so that the Real One Shows Himself in
all his splendour; and this is effected with a clari-
ty which sets the object present right before the eyes,
without any possible grounds for doubt" (i, 18; see
other references in Jabre, op. cit., 246, and idem,
La notion de certitude selon Ghazâlî, Paris 1958,
index, s.v.). Muhâkafaât and mukdshafa appear
equally all through the *Ihya*.

Hence for al-Ghazâlî, kashf is a light, a freely-
bestowed grace from God, which at the same time
alone bestows its quality of certain knowledge. In
so far as the later *‘ilm al-mukdshafa was open to in-
fluences from al-Ghazâlî (or directly from Sûfiism),
kashf and mukdshafa were sometimes freely accepted;
but the most classic treatises hardly ever refer to
them.

3. Brief references in Shi’ism. In Shi’ism, the
spiritual experience of kashf inevitably came to
form a theological (or "theosophical") dimension.
The apprehension of the "hidden meaning" (bâjin),
which is the perfection of Islam and which is the
prerogative of the great Imams, led to a high value
being placed on kashf. To give only one significant
example, the two treatises of the Imâm Sayyid
Haydar Amûlî, ed. Henry Corbin and Osman Yahya
as La philosophie ghîrite (Tehran-Paris 1969), deal
with kashf as a manner and a method of knowledge.
The Diûrdjani al-asrâr mentions it, after waqâya (reve-
lations, although angelic, divinised) and itâdâm (divine,
inner inspiration), as a participation stemming
from the universal intellect and the universal
soul (La philosophie ghîrite, 448-53). When
Amûlî defines kashf (ibid., 452), it is in the same
lexicographical and technical terms as to be taken
from his works by al-Diûrdjani, as already men-
tioned above. The ending of the chapter distinguishes,
among other things, (a) kashf swârât (the "imaginal"
perception of reality) whose irradiations (lajâjaliyyât)
reach the senses of sight and hearing; mention is
made in this connection of the master Ibn ʿArâbî
and (b) kashf ma’nawî, which is of the spiritual
order (râkî); the text emphasises strongly mukdshafât
received in this fashion (ibid., 462-72). In his Risâla .
fi ma’rifat al-wudâd, Amûlî enumerates three
modes of knowledge: by the intellect (ʿâbî), by
transmission (makhlûk) and by kashf (ibid., 632), and
only the last one leads to the apprehension of Reality.
Hence it is with some justification that, in regard
to Haydar Amûlî, the phrase "the method of kashf"
has been used (cf. Peter Antes, Zur Theologie der
Schi’îa, Freiburg 1971, 49, 68), this method being an
intuitive one in which certainty is sought from
spiritual illumination. Amûlî’s admiration for Ibn
ʿArâbî and for the latter’s deliberate scheme for
"reconciling" the Sûfis and the Imânîs, is well-
known. Amûlî’s work was to influence all later
Twelver theology, and is in fact the applying of the
Šîf kashf to the Šîtî search for the hidden meanings of
things. If we bear in mind that his definition of kashf was adopted as it stood by Ibn
Diûrdjani, we can accordingly discern, despite the
divergencies of various climates of thought, a
continuity of viewpoint.

Ismâ’îlî writings put the accent on the idea of the
"state" of kashf from a double point of view,
both gnostic and cosmic. The title chosen by al-
Hujjârî in the 5th/11th century, Kasjîf al-mabdîjîb, designates equally the 8th/14th century tradition
of the Ismâ’îlî scholar Abû Ya’qûb al-Sîdîjînâ, and
kashf now introduces an ontology and cosmology
gnostic type. Furthermore, the classic opposition
or mukhâlaf of kashf-satr is frequently found, this
set forth according to wide cosmic perspectives,
in the Ismâ’îlî cycles of metaphysics. The sever
of "proto-history" (Corbin) and of post-history are
unfolded according to alternate phases of "unveiling"
("epiphany", as tr. Corbin) and "occultation". The
length of these cycles may vary, and may refer
indifferently to the "premordial Adam" (the "Per-
fect Man"), to the "partial Adam" (the Kûrîânic
Adam) or to the "spiritual Adam" for the intelligible
realities. According to al-Husayn b. ʿAll, a Yemeni
al-ʿârî of the 6th/12th century, the cycle of unveiling
(daur al-kashf) is 50,000 years, and the cycle of
occultation (daeur al-satr) is seven millennia. The
present age, since the creation of the "partial Adam",
is the fourth millennium of a cycle of occultation,
which has been preceded and will be succeeded
by a cycle of unveiling (cf. al-Husayn b. ʿAll, Risdla .
de l'âra d l-mabdîb gegen 'ma‘âd, ed. and Fr. tr. Corbin,

An exhaustive study of kashf in Shi’i thought—
Imâmî and Ismâ’îlî—would in fact require an ex-
tensive exposition.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(L. Gârdet)

Kâshghar, a town in Chinese Turkestan
(Sin Kiang); the same name is still used in Chinese
official documents. The name Kâshghar first appears
in Chinese transcription (K’iu-châ) in the Tang-chu
of E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-Kiue
in Chinese transcription (Kashghar; the story of Kutayba’s campaign in
3
The pre-Islamic Kâshghar and the ruins of Buddhist buildings in the vicinity, see A. Stein,
Ancient Khotan, Oxford 1907, i, 52 f.; idem, Serindia,
Oxford 1921, 80 f. Arab armies did not reach
Kâshghar; the story of Kutayba’s campaign in
96/715 is, as shown by H. A. R. Gibb in BSOS, ii
(1923), 467-8, a mere legend. Since ca. 1317/50,
Kâshghar was under Karluk rule and turkicized
by them. On the flight of a prince of Farghana to
Kâshghar in the time of the Caliph al-Mansur
(36-58/754-75) see the article Farghana. In the
Sâmânî period a Dîkhân of Kâshghar with the name or title Tughân Tîgin is mentioned (Ibn
Al-Athîr, viii, 37), with whom the rebel prince
Ilyâs b. Inâbît took refuge; whether this Dîkhân had
already adopted Islam is not mentioned. At a later
date Satûk Boghîr Khân is mentioned as the first
Muslim Khân of Kâshghar; in the oldest reference
to him that we have (Djâmîl Kurâshî in Barthold,
Turkestân, ii, 255, 257) the date of his death is given as
344/955-6. This story already contains features
which are certainly legendary; in the story of
the building of the first mosque we have the well-
known folklore motif of the cutting of an ox-skin into
stripes. The later legend, reproduced by F. Grenard
(JA, Ser. 9, vol. xv, i, 1), has not this feature but
KASHGHAR — AL-KASHGHAR

contains many other legendary traits and absolutely false dates. The year 344 A.H. is perhaps too early, as probably the story of the adoption of Islam by a numerous Turkish people (200,000 tents) in 349/960 must be referred to the Turks of Khashghar; this story is found not only in Ibn al-`Atif (vii, 396) but also in Ibn Miskawayh (The Eclipse of the Ab-basid Caliphate), ed. Margoliouth and Amedroz, Oxford 1921, text, ii, 182, tr. v, 196; the original source is probably Thāl al-Sabīh (cf. Ibn al-`Atif, viii, 476, 491; The Eclipse etc., Index). The tomb of Satuq Boghār Khan is in Añīq (now pronounced Artuș) north of Khashghar, where it is still shown.

Under the rule of the Ilīgh Khāns [see Ilek Khans], who confessed Islam since ca. 950, Khashghar was politically the most important town in the Tarim basin; perhaps it was also the most important from the point of view of culture. In the 5th/6th century there was already in existence a work in Arabic on the history of the town, composed by Abu `l-Futūḥ `Abd al-Ghāfīr (or `Abd al-Ghaffār) b. Husayn al-Alma`ī al-Kashgharī (sic); the author's father, who survived his son (according to al-Sam`ānī by about ten years), died in 486/1093. On father and son and the works of the latter, see al-Sam`ānī, Kitāb al-masālik, ed. M. 'A. M. Z. H. al-Sam`ānī, Leiden-London 1912, ii, 470a, 472a; Dīmāl Kūrāshī in Barthold, Turkestān, i, 123 f. The rulers—since 1130 under the overlordship of the Karakhitay—were in a special mausoleum (Arabic al-dinbadha al-khakāniyya) on the bank of the Tümen; the first prince buried there died in Muharram 424/Dec. 7 1032-Jan. 5 1033, and the last in Radjāb 601/2 Feb.-3 March 1076. During their rule, Mahmūd al-Khashgharī [g.v.] wrote his great Turkish dictionary in its library was the copy of the Diwdn lughdt al-turk, ed. Margoliouth and Amedroz, Oxford 1921.) with plan of Kashghar on p. 268, oblong., xv, 313 f.) with plan of Khashghar on p. 326, and M. Hartmann, Österreich-Türkestan, Halle a/S. 1908, especially 45 f., 89 f., with a plan of the town from Kornilow. The most important building in Khashghar and vicinity is Hāḍrāt Apāk, the tomb of the famous saint of the 11th/12th century. Khashghar has now approximately 70,000 inhabitants (mostly Sunni Uyghur Turks).

Bibliography: Huddād al-İlam, 96 (§ 131), 280 f.; Yākūt, ed. Beirut (1957), iv, 430 f.; Hand Allāh Mustawfī, Nushat al-bulūkh, 258; Barthold, Turkestān, index; B. Spuler, Iran, index; idem, Geschichts Mitteilungen, Leiden 1966, index; A. Schulte, in Mitteilungen aus dem Seminar für Geographie der Universität Hamburg, 1921.

(W. Barthold—B. Spuler)

AL-KASHGHAR, MAHMUD B. AL-KASAYN B. MUHAMMAD, Turkish scholar and lexicographer of the 5th/11th century whose work, the Diwan lughat al-turk, is one of the most significant records of the Turkish languages and also an important source for the history of the Turkish peoples. The only information which we possess on his life comes from his own work, and that much is only fragmentary. It seems that he came from Bars ḡān on the southern shores of the Isk-Köl (cf. Huddād al-İlam, tr. Minorsky, 98, 292-3), and was born into a noble family connected with the Kārā-Khānids [see Ilek Khans]. Khashgharī was deeply grounded in Islamic culture and learning, and he himself states that he had travelled extensively and visited many of the Turkish lands before journeying to Baghdad. It may well be that internal conflicts within the Kārā-Khanid federation led him to undertake these travels and to go to Baghdad. It is there that he mingled with the circles of scholars, and realised that there was a great interest in the Turkish peoples and their languages; hence he was stimulated to compose two works on them. He began to write his Diwan lughat al-turk in 464/1072. According to the information in the book itself, he wrote four reductions of it during the period 464-76/1075-94). The original of the Diwan is lost, but the unique surviving manuscript, dated 27 Shawwal 1266, is a good copy, though not entirely free from errors. Khashghari's second work, a Turkish grammar called the K. Diwanīh al-nahu fl lughat al-turk, has been lost, and is known only from the author's own reference to it.

Khashghari's work is of particular importance for the Turkish languages, and also for the history, geography and folklore of the Turkish peoples, for this linguistic corpus consists not of coherent texts in one particular Turkic language, but of a comparison-oriented explanatory dictionary and a modest grammatical outline of the language. In fact, it represents the first scholarly approach, and thus the first description of the linguistic material by a particular method, to these languages. At the same time, both in its introduction and in the individual entries, Khashgharī's work contains a number of facts and remarks—occasionally supported even by personal experience and observation—about the process of the differentiation and spread of Turkic languages, cited in order to elucidate the situation in the 5th/11th century. The information he gives on the writing of Turkish peoples (sc. the Uyghur script) is also useful from a linguistic point of view.

Although he aims at a fairly comprehensive coverage of the Turkish languages, and includes several of them in his dictionary, the linguistic material in the work is primarily a record of the 5th/11th century
Turkish spoken in Kāshgār, which he terms Kāshānī Turkish. Kāshghārī's work is related essentially to Karakhanid linguistic records. Aside from the material on Kāshgār, the linguistic date from the Oghuz and Kıpchak are of considerable value. The dictionary was originally designed as a language-manual for scholars in Bağdād who had some contact with Turkic peoples. Hence he deliberately adopted the methods of Arabic grammar and lexicography in describing his linguistic material. While Arabic grammar served, to some extent, as a guideline, the products of Arabic lexicographic literature also furnished him with a complete entry-word list, a sort of lexicographic questionnaire, with which he confronted the Turkic word-stock, his own mother-tongue. It is highly probable that this starting point considerably enlarged the word-stock in his work.

The fact that the Turkic linguistic material had to be fitted into the categories of Arabic grammar certainly impelled Kāshghārī carefully to study his material. Yet the fact that the work was prepared in Bağdād—at a great distance from the homeland of the Turkic peoples—made him unable to complement and control his linguistic material to the fullest extent; and it is open to question how far he grasped those modest opportunities for such control which were probably available in Bağdād. Also questionable is the extent to which the assumed—repeated reductions of the work enhanced or diminished the authenticity of the linguistic material. Since we do not possess the autograph manuscript of the work and the copyist was not a Turk, the relation of the copy to the original raises similar questions.

Kāshghārī's dictionary pays particular attention to place names, tribal names, proper names, ranks and titles. Except for Kāshgār, the Oghuz and Kıpçak linguistic data and personal experiences as well as specimens of Turkic folklore, verses, proverbs, etc., which make the work an important source for these last, which are of particular significance as coherent Turkic texts, in addition to their historical-folkloristic value. Kāshghārī's comparative remarks are also highly instructive, though his material is less rich in this respect. The elements in the author's mother-tongue included in his work should be regarded as a record of the standard usage of local scholars, for, as we have noted, Kāshghārī's main aim was to make Arab scholars acquainted with the Turkic languages. He rightly regarded his mother-tongue as one representative idiom of this language-group. At the same time, and understandably enough, he refused to include those Arabic loan-words which he considered irrelevant in this context. However, those words already played an important role in the Kutadghu bilig, the most significant literary monument of the period, and it seems highly probable that they had also found their way into the spoken language. One major merit of Kāshghārī's work, however, lies precisely in the fact that he tends to focus his attention on the word-stock of the "everyday" spoken Turkish languages. His dictionary thus complemented the assumed repeated reductions of the work, which are of particular significance as coherent Turkic texts and translations of the Divan: Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Kāshghārī, Kitab divān-i lugāt at Turk, ed. İlisiş MüallaMit Rifat Bilge, Istanbul 1925-7; B. Mutallibov, Divan lugat-it-Turk cemcesi, Ankara 1939-41, see A. B. Taymas, in TM, vii-viii (1940-2), 212-52, xi (1954), 75-100; idem, Divanü Lügat-it-Türk tarihhsam, Ankara 1941; idem, Divanul Lügat-it-Türk disini, Ankara 1943; D. Dilcin, Arap alfabetesi gelen Divanul Lügat-it-Türk disini, Ankara 1957; Maḥmūd Koşlagıyı, Türk irşal dilvleri (Devonu lugâtî turk, ed. S. M. Mutallibov, Tashkent 1960-5); G. Abdurahmonov and S. Mutallibov, Devonu lugat-it turk (Indeks-lugat), Tashkent 1967; Mutallibov, "Divanul lugat-it-Turk" Maḥmud Kāshgārskogu (Perevod, kəmentarnyi, issledovanii), thesis, Tashkent 1967.


4. Studies on various subjects relating to the Dîvân: Brockelmann, Mûhammed al-Kâshgârî’s Darstellung des türkischen Verbalbaues, in KS, xviii (1918-9), 29-49; ibid., Alturkistanische Volksweisheit, in Österr. Arch. Zeitschr., vii (1919-20), 50-75; ibid., Mahmûd Kâshgârî’s art of using the alphabetical and stems in the XI. Jahrh., in KSA i/1 (1921), 26-40; G. Bergsträsser, Das Vorbild von Kâşgârî’s Dîvân lugat al-turk, in OLZ, xxiv (1921), 154-5; Brockelmann, Alturkistanische Volkspoesie i-i, in Asia Major, i (1923), 1-22 (1924), 24-44; F. Hommel, Zü den alltürkischen Sprachwerken in ibid., 182-93; Brockelmann, Naturlaube im Mitteltürkischen, in UJb, vii (1922), 257-5; idem, Hofsprache in Alttürkestan, in Donum natalis Schricrin, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1929, 222-7; A. Z. Valld Togan, Dîvân’s Lugât ül-Türk’in telâsî senesi hakkında, in Asis mecmuasi, ii, no. 16 (1922), 77-8; idem, Mahmûd Kâşgârî’s ait nolar, ibid., ii, no. 17 (1923), 135-6; G. Frtsaks, Karakhanidische Streitfragen 1-4, in Oriens, iii (1950), 270-28; idem, Mâkmu’d Kâşgârî kimdir?, in TM, x (1953), 243-5; E. Rossi, A note to the manuscript of the Dîivân Lugatü al-Türk, in Charis—teria Orientalia praecipue ad Persiam pertinentia (Joannis Ruppha... sacrum), Prague 1956, 280-4; L. Bazin, Les dates de rédaction du “Dîvân” de Kâşgârî, in Acta Or. Hung., vii (1957), 21-5; S. Abally, Slouar Mâkmu’d Kâshgârîsko id türkmenchii jashk, Ashkhabad 1958; T. Banaguolu, Kâşgârî’s divan, in D. and J. Sourdel, Tiirk dili ara$ttrmalan in 1928, 257-65; idem, Hofsprache in Altturkestan, in Türk dili ara$ttrmalan (Sovetskaia Tyurkologiya) has since 1970 contained

Kâşgârî, a Persian word designating the tiles or trimmed pieces of faience serving to cover completely or partially the main fabric of buildings in a design principally decorative but also, at times, to protect them against humidity. This term, which also exists in Turkish, is an abbreviation of Kâşgârî; the town of Kâşgâr [q.v.] was in effect the most important and most famous centre of production in Iran. It appears already in Abîl-Kâsîm, author of the first treatise dedicated to this subject (ca. 700/1300) in the form kâşgî-karî, which means literally “the art of making the kâşgî”, but for this author it had a wider sense and designated the art of faience. (See J. W. Allan, Abîl-Kâsîm’s Treatise on ceramics (Thirteenth century B.C.).) The development of Çughâ-Zanbil (Kâshîstân) have brought to light several types of glazed tiles (11th century B.C.). (See P. Amiet, Élam, Paris 1966, pl. 261).

The origin of the kâşgî is linked with the techniques of pottery and with that of baked brick. So it has connections with a very ancient art. The excavations of Çughâ-Zanbil (Kâshîstân) have brought to light several types of glazed tiles (11th century B.C.). (See P. Amiet, Élam, Paris 1966, pl. 261). There have also been discovered (ibid., pl. 383-92) some polychrome-coated tiles with zoomorphous decoration at Susa (ca. 5th and 7th centuries B.C.). The famous Frieze of the Archers (Louvre, 5th century B.C.) is a well-known example of the enamelled brick of the Achaemenids (M. Ruten, Les arts du Moyen Orient ancien, Paris 1962, pl. xxx) that the Assyrians and Babylonians also knew about (Assyrian Palace of Khoşâbâd, 722-705 B.C.; Gate of the Lion at Babylon 6th century B.C.). Later on, in the period of the Parthians and Sâsâns, this art experienced a certain decline and appears to be represented only by mosaics (Bîghârû, 2nd half of the 3rd century, see R. Ghirshman, Par Isaiah Sâsâns, Paris 1966, p. 60).

Moreover, it is the technique which prevailed at the beginning of the Muslim period and the mosaics of this era are of Hellenistic or Byzantine inspiration. They were also much used for floors (rest room of the bath of Khîrbât al-Madjdar; D. and J. Sourdel, La civilisation de l’Islam classique, Paris 1968, pl. 124), as well as on the walls (Dome of the Rock, dated 691, above, art. ARCHITECTURE, pis. IV-VI; Great Mosque of Damascus, dated 775, Sourdel, op. cit., pl. iv), but the use of kâşgî in the form which later spread seems to emerge in the 5th/11th century. One of the first examples of its tentative appearance is to be found at the top of the minaret of the masjid-i dîavân of Dâmghân (2nd half of the 11th century, C. Adle and A. S. Melikian Chirvani, Les monuments du vi° s. du Dâmghân, in Studia Iranica, ii, 1972); the monumental arch at the end of the 8th century B.C.) is a well-known example of the enamelled decoration at Susa (D. and J. Sourdel, The Manârs of Isfâhân, in AI, 1936/2, fig. 212). Approximately at the same period points of turquoise blue enamel appeared on buildings (Gonbad-i Surk, dated 1147 at Marâgâh, A. U. Pope, A Survey of Persian Art, repr. Tokyo 1964, viii, pl. 341). This new type of insertion of quite small enamelled tablets drew inspiration from the embossed joints of plaster which are already in existence on the buildings of the 5th/11th century. The arrangement of these small tablets then developed without interruption and various decorative schemes were adopted (frieze of tower of Mu’îmsîn Kâshîtân, dated 1186, in Nakhîjîvan, ibid., pl. 345; Gür-i Amlî, dated 1105, at Samarkand, ibid., ix, pls. 541-3). Emanating from these first productions, two techniques saw the light of day: that of the faience mosaic or kâşgî-yi mu’arrab-kârî, and that of the faience tile or kâşgî-kârî. Kâşgî-yi mu’arrab-kârî (or simply mu’arrab-kârî): this technique consists of cutting, according to precise forms, pieces of monochrome kâşgî of different colours to compose a polychrome design (technique described by Godard, op. cit., 383-4; H. E. Wolf, The traditional crafts of Persia, Cambridge Mass. 1966, 121-5, figs. 188-94; Pope, op. cit., pl. 546). One of the
first examples of the use of this process in Iran is
the Imamzada Diacfar (dated 1325) at Isfahan
(Godard, 386). Perfection was achieved at the
Imamzada Darb-i Imâm (dated 1453), situated in
the same town (ibid., 386) and especially at the
Blue Mosque (Masjd-i Kabîd, 1453) of Tabriz
(ibid., pls. 145, 146; Pope, op. cit., viii, pls. 452-6).

Kâshî-kâri: by contrast with the above, in this
process the design is reproduced on tiles of baked
earth which are then painted, generally with
different metal-oxides, to become polychromatic, then rebaked.
This technique, which varied widely according to
periods and places, has given birth to two great
schools, the kâshî-yi falazari-rang (glazed) and the
kâshî-yi haft-rang (polychrome/seven colours).
The first are from the 3rd/9th century at Baghdad
and at Sâmarrâ. They were even exported as far as
Kâyrawân (D. Talbot Rice, Islamic Art, London 1965,
fig. 35) to be used in the Great Mosque (ca. 862).
But it was the kâshîs manufactured principally at
Kâshân, from the 7th/13th to 9th/15th centuries,
that were the most famous. Their metallic glints were
produced by “a thin film of metal obtained by
reducing in the kîn a metallic oxide applied on the
enamel” (J. Sauvaget, Introduction à l’âude de la
céramique musulmane, Paris 1966, 36-8; Wolff,
op. cit., 219-20).
Two categories of glazed tiles exist:
first, the flat kâshî in the form of a star or
a cross (cf. panel of the Louvre dated 1267; Art de
l’Islam, catalogue de l’exposition de l’Orangerie des
Tuteries, Paris 1971, pl. and no. 58), and then much
greater kâshîs, often modelled in a manner to
constitute the elements of a mîbarî (cf. that of
the sanctuary of the Imâm Ridâ at Mesjid, dated
1215, and that of the Mosque of the Maydân of
Kâshân, dated 1226). In Bâbista, on les carreaux de revêtement dans la céramique
sanctuary of the Imam Rûmâ at Mashhad, dated
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of Kubadabad (7th/i3th century) had very fine
productions were not numerous (Madrasa Madar-i Shah,
dated 1612-28, at Isfahan; Godard, 384). Perfection was
achieved at the instigation of Kâdd-zâda al-Rûmî, he
settled in Samarkand. From this town he wrote to his
father (Eng. tr. E. S. Kennedy, in Orientalia, xxix/2 (1960),
192-213) describing the lifestyle of the court, his
relationship with Ulugh Beg and Kâdd-zâda al-Rûmî,
and the problems with which the latter was particu-
larly concerned. This document is of exceptional
scientific interest; in some passages he brings to
mind, in quite a different context, the tests under-
gone by poets when they were admitted to the sov-
ereign’s court. He assisted in the establishment of
Ulugh Beg’s tables and took part in the construction
of the great observatory, the ruins of which can still
be seen and which, in the opinion of Sayhî (The ob-
servatory in Islam, Ankara 1960, 260-8), probably
influenced the first European observatories.
In 826/1423 he completed his al-Risâdâl al-Muhiyya
(ed. with Ger. tr. by P. Luckey, Der Lehrbrief über
den Kreisumfang, Berlin 1953; Russ. tr. by B. A.
Rosenfeld, V. S. Segal and A. P. Yushkeviç, Mos-
cow 1956) in which he established the value of π
with extraordinary exactitude, so that 2 π = 6 16,
e.g. 59, 2 3, 34, 51, 46, 14, 50 in sexagesimal
notation and 6.2831853071795865 in decimal notation.
Allied to the mathematical work of this work is the
determination of sine x° worked out by an iterative
method (cf. A. Aaboe, in Scripta Mathematica, xx
(1954), 24-9). This problem, one with which Kâdd-
/zâda was preoccupied, was recorded by his grand-
son, Miram Celebi, in his commentary on the tables
of Ulugh Beg entitled Dâstar al-samâl wa-tabâk al-
gijdâsî. It can be seen here that al-Kâshî employed
the equation: sine d = 3 sine d — 4 sine 3d, which was
used in the Western world by F. Viete (1540-1613)
and established the value of sine $\frac{i}{6} = 0.017452406437283571$. In 829/1426, he composed a book, *al-Manadik*, in which he described an equational interpolation scheme, enabling the rapid calculation of linear interpolations. These two works are edited and translated by E. S. Kennedy, *The planetary equatorium*, Princeton 1960.

In 830/1427 he dedicated to Ulugh Beg's library his *Miftah al-hisab* (ed. with Russ. tr. B. A. Rosenfeld, V. S. Segal and A. P. Yushkevich, Moscow 1951). In the prologue to this work he gives an (incomplete) list of his works and in the explanatory part expands the arithmetical operations, teaching the method of extracting roots by the system which today is called after Ruffini-Horner, calculates the Tartigian triangle (see *al-Karaqī*), demonstrates that he knew the proof by $\div$, works out the sum of series up to the fourth power of natural numbers (cf. F. Woepcke, *Sommations de séries*, in *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées*, x (Paris 1865), 32-6), develops, like the ancient Babylonians, the sexagesimal system, and devises decimal fractions which, despite the endeavours of Emmanuel Bonfils of Tarascon (14th century), were not recognised in Europe before Stevin of Bruges (1585); he also indicates the rules for passing from one system to another, gives auxiliary tables for various computations, deals with trigonometry and algebra and solves some undetermined systems (see *al-Karaqī*).

Al-Kāshī died on 19 Ramadan 832/22 June 1429 at Samarqand. *Bibliography:*

Apart from references in the text, Brockelmann, II, 231, S II, 294; Suter, 173, no. 429; Kābhānī, *Muṣājam al-muṭallīfīn*, ii, 155, viii, 43. (J. Vernet)

**KĀSHIF, MUHAMMAD SHARIF B. SHAMS AL-DIN AL-DJANADJI AL-NADJAFI.** Shaykh Dja far was born in al-Nadjaf in 1154/1741 or, more likely, in 1164/1751, according to conflicting records. His father, whose family belonged to the Arab clan of Banī Mālik, had come from Djanadiya (Kanakiyā), a village in the region of al-Hilla, to al-Nadjaf, where he won a high respect for his piety and religious learning. Shaykh Dja far studied in al-Nadjaf and Karbalāʾ under the most famous Imāmi scholars of the time, among them the Āḵā Muhammad Bākīr al-Bihbānī and the Sayyid Mahdī Bahāʾ al-ʿUlama al-Ṭabāṭābāʾi. After the death of the latter in the 1221/1779, Shaykh Dja far was recognized as his successor in the leadership of the Imāmī community.

Shaykh Dja far was actively engaged in the local affairs of al-Nadjaf as well as in the concerns of the Imāmī community, entering into close relations with both the Ottoman authorities in Baghād and the Kāḏīrī ruler Fāṭḥ ʿAlī Shāh (1212-50/1797-1834) of Persia. In reply to a pamphlet of the Wahhābī ruler al-ʿAzīz b. Saʿūd (d. 1218/1805) espousing Wahhābī doctrine and attacking Shiʿism, he wrote a rebuttal *Risālat manḥādī al-rasūl li-man arādā al-saddād*. During the siege of al-Nadjaf by the Wahhābīs in 1220/1805, he led the successful resistance of the inhabitants. In 1221/1806 he served the Ottoman governor of Baghād, ʿAlī Pasha, as an envoy to the Persian army advancing on that city and brought about a peaceful settlement. To Fāṭḥ ʿAlī Shāh, during whose reign he visited Persia frequently, he dedicated his general *fisḥ work Kāshī al-ghīrāʾ* "an muḥāmāt al-sharīʿa al-ghirara." The book became popular with students of Imāmī law and earned him his nickname Kāshī al-ʿArāf. He repeatedly authorized Fāṭḥ ʿAlī Shāh to lead ǧīhād.

In treatises and in public debates in ʿĪrāk and Persia he vigorously supported the ʿUṣūlī doctrine of ʿidāḥād [q.v.] against the Akhbarī position. This brought him into sharp conflict with the Akhbarī leader Mīrzā Muhammad al-Nāṣībī al-Khājiyā. When the latter found refuge at the court of Fāṭḥ ʿAlī Shāh in 1223/1808 and tried to defame him personally, he wrote a scathing attack on him entitled *Kāshī al-ghīrāʾ* "an maʿāṣīb Mīrzā Muhammad ʾadwaw al-ʿulamāʾ* and sent it to the shah. Towards the end of his life he became involved in a bloody conflict between the Zūkūrt and the Shīrīm, two factions of the inhabitants of al-Nadjaf, which led to a feud lasting over a century. He died at the end of Radjab 1227/early August 1812 and was buried in al-Nadjaf. Several of his descendants have distinguished themselves in scholarship.

KASHIFI, KAMAL AL-DIN HUSAYN B. 'ALI, BUR-
named al-Wâjîq ("the preacher"), Persian writer
and preacher. Born at Baybakh or Shahzâdâr, where
he spent part of his youth, Kâshîf then lived in
Nishâbûr, Maqâbâd, and for about 20 years at Harat,
during the reign of Abu 'l Qâhir Sultan-Husayn
Bâyqarâ' [q.v.]. There he received encouragement
from the sultan and from 'All Shir Nawâ'î [q.v.]. He
was well-known as an eloquent preacher with an
exceptionally beautiful voice and as a prolific writer
of Persian prose. Kâshîf lived to a ripe old age, dying
in 901/1504-5 at Harat. Being a Shi'ite, when he was buried
at Baybakh, a Shî'ite centre, he was regarded as a
Shi' in Harat, but his relationship with Dâmi [q.v.] and his companionship with 'All Shir Nawâ'î
resulted in his being considered a Sunni in Baybakh.
His famous son, Fâkhîr al-Din 'All Safl (d. 939/
1532-3) in his Râkhhâ'î 'a'syn al-bayâtî (lith. Lucknow
1368/1850) mentions his father's adherence to the
Naqshbandîs [q.v.], who were Sunnis. However,
some of Kâshîf's works, such as his Rawdât al-
shuhadà, attest that the author was an Îmâmî Shî'î.
In any case, the Lâlitî'î al-taw'ûfî, written by Fâkhîr
al-Din 'All Safl (Tehran 1363/1947), and other works by Kâshîf, express the authors' devotion to the
Ahl al-Bayt [q.v.] as the "family of the Prophet".
In some of Kâshîf's books, such as al-Risdîa al-
âlîyya fi'l-ahdâth al-nabawiyya (Tehran 1360/1851) and
Futuwwat-nâma-yi sultdn (Tehran 1791), his tendency
towards Shi'ism is obvious. Husayn Wâjîq occasionally
wrote Persian poems under the pen name of Kâshîf.
His only known child was the above-mentioned Fâkhîr
al-Din 'All Safl, the author of several books, who
succeeded his father as a celebrated preacher in Harat.

The following list of Kâshîf's works is not in chronological order, as the dates of many of his writings have not been established. Of the author's works, the best known are the Anwâr-i Suhayli and Rawdât al-shuhadà: (1) the former, which is the basis of Kâshîf's fame in the East and the West, is a new version of Ka'ilat wa-Dinna [q.v.,] translated into Persian by Abu 'l-Mâ'âlî Naşr Allâh. Kâshîf's aim in recasting these fables, done at the suggestion of Nîzâm al-Din Amir Shâhîy al-Surkhâ (d. 901/1502-3), a Turkish amir at the court of Sultan Husayn, was to simplify the difficult style of Abu 'l-
Mâ'âlî. Kâshîf omitted Abu 'l-Mâ'âlî's first two chapters, reducing the book to 14 chapters. But the Anwâr-i Suhayli, "The Lights of Canopus" or rather "The Lights of Suhayli", written in a very decorative style, cannot compare with the first Persian translation of Ka'ilat wa-Dinna, and Kâshîf did not achieve his object. The book has been published several times: in Calcuta 1805 etc.; Hertford (by Ch. Stewart) 1805; (by J. W. Ouseley) 1851; Bombay 1853; and repeated since then in India, Iran and Europe. A versified version of the work exists, entitled Shakarštân and made by Amir Khusraw Dârâ'î (Tehran 1947). The Ottoman Turkish translation of the work, entitled Hümâyûn-nâme by 'All Câlebi (d. 950/1543-4), became widely known in Europe, and its translation into French is one of the sources of La Fontaine's Fables. The Anwâr-i Suhayli has also been translated into English (by E. B. Eastwick, Hertford 1854, and by A. N. Wol-
laston, London 1878). Parts of the book have been
printed in text and translation in Europe (see Ethé, Cat. Pers. Ms., India Office, No. 757). Having
achieved fame in India, the work found an imitator, Abu 'l Faqâl b. Mûbârak, minister of the Emperor Akbar and author of the A'sîm-i Akbarî, who com-
piled the 'Tyûr-i dâmîkh (996/1598); (2) The Rawdât al-shuhadà, "Garden of the Martyrs", a Persian
martyrology of 'Alî and his family, particularly of the Îmâmî Husayn [q.v.,], was written at the wish of
Prince Murghâb al-Din 'Abd Allâh, called Sayyid Mirzâ, in 908/1502-3. It comprises ten chapters (bâbâ)
and a conclusion (kâtîma). It has been published
many times; abridgments entitled Dah maghîs and Muntabab-i Rawdât al-shuhadà are also available
(see Storey, i, 212, 1261). Popular among Shî'îs and
used in the commemorative speeches of Muâarram, the book has left a lasting mark on the mourning
monories called raûda. The work was translated into
Turkish, with additions, by Fu'âdî [q.v.] of Baghdad
(d. 970/1562-3) under the title 'Hadîdî al-sw'âdà' (see Storey, i, 213; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iii, 90).
There is a metrical paraphrase in Dakhânî: the
Rawdât al-shuhadà by Wallî, compiled in 1139/1728
(Storey, i, 213). Translations in Urdu and Hindi also exist (see Haydar-Bakhsî Haydarî, Guî maqûfat, Lahore 1965, Introduction by Nâzir Hasan Zâydi, 8, 9, 10).

Other works are: (3) Dâwâshîr al-taqâsîr li-tâfakkîr al-Amir, an extensive Persian commentary on the Kur'ân, written at the request of 'All Shir Nawâ'î in 890/1485. Kâshîf intended to compile it in four volumes, but discontinued his work after finishing the first volume, which includes the first two suras, and part of the fourth. Later, he wrote a shorter commentary. Dâwâshîr al-taqâsîr has a detailed introduction dealing with the 22 branches of Kur'ânic sciences. Manuscripts of the work are extant (see Rieu, Cat. Pers. Ms., British Museum, i, 11; Ethé, No. 2680; Storey, i, 12, 1195; A'âmîd Munzawi, Fîrârist-i maqûhî-yi Bâyqarî-yi Fârsî, Tehran 1969, i, 42; (4) the Muâshîrî-i 'âlîyya is a shorter commentary on the Kur'ân, composed in 879/1474-5 and dedicated to 'All Shir Nawâ'î, from whose name the work's title is derived. It is also called Ta'fîsîr-i Husayni, after the author. The book has been litho-
graphed several times in India (Storey, i, 13), Iran,
and printed in four volumes in Tehran 1938-40. There
is a Turkish translation by Abu 'l Faqî Muhammad b.
Idris Bîlîfî (d. 982/1574-5) and also an adaptation,
Muoâshîrî taqâsîrî, by Ismaîlî Fârîkî Efendî (d. 1001/1635), Istanbul 1380. Urdu and Pashtu translations also exist (Storey, loc. cit.); (5) the Aâlîkâhî-i Mu'âshîni, an epic, was composed in 900/1499-5 and as an offering for Abu 'l Muâshîn, a son of Sultan Husayn. It comprises 40 chapters, and has been published several
times in India, Tehran, Hertford, London, etc. Translations exist in English by H. G. Keene, Hertford 1851; in Turkish, under the title Anîs al-
'ârîfin, by A'âmîd, 974/1566-7; and extracts from the
latter translated into German, published by R.
Peiper, Breslau 1848, Das Kapitel von der Frei¬
gehkeit, etc.; (6) al-Risâlîa al-Sâîyya fi'l-âdâhidh
al-nabawiyya, a Persian commentary in eight chapters on the 40 hadîths, compiled in 875/1470-1. It was
influenced by the 'Abdî al-Ḥîlabî of Abu 'l Sa'dî al-
Hasan b. al-Husayn al-Sabzawârî (d. 854/1449), one of the Shi'î ulâmâ, and dedicated to Shams al-
Din Abu 'l-Mâ'âlî 'Allî al-Muâţâr al-Nassâbâ al-Nâjîb. A Turkish translation was made by Kamâl al-Dîn Muhammad Tâshkhüprize (d. 1303/
1620-1) for Sultan Ahamîd I (see O'M, i, 349-50; A. Karahan, Islâm-Türk edebiyatında Kîrk Hâds, Istanbul 1954, 109-11 and index s.v. Husayn Wâjîq; (7), (8) Two anthologies from Rûmî's Mathnâwî: the first entitled Lubbî-i ma'naütî fi'idât-i Mathnâwî, and the second a rearrangement of this entitled Lubbî-i Lubbî-i ma'naütî. The latter was
compiled at the suggestion of Muṣayyib, one of the eminent officials at the court of Harat, in 875/1470-1 (Kashf-i, comp. 1864, ed. Tehran 1940); (g) Rasīlā-yi Hāšemīyya, a short Persian treatise including the story of Hāṣim Tā'ī [q.v.], compiled for Sultan Hūsān Bāyūkār in 891/1486 (printed, Ch. Scheler, Chrest. Pers., Paris 1883, i, 174-203; Tehran 1941); (10) Maḥkam-i iskān, a treatise on the art of Persian epistolography, containing all a secretary must know: forms of address, forms of answer, topics, which must be stated, forms of prayer used in letters. It was compiled in 907/1501-2, in the name of Sultan Hūsān and the author's patron, 'Allā Shīr Nāwāt; (11) Saḥfi-yi Ẓaḥḥāt, another treatise, including some epistolary writings in Persian and a few in Arabic, is dedicated to Sultan Hūsān (lith., Lucknow 1844, Cawnpore 1848); (12) Badd-i Ḍalqār fī Ṣind-i Ḍalqār, a work on figures of speech and errors, particularly in poetic usage (see A. Munzawi, i, 2126); (13) Futuwmat-nāma-yi ṣulṭānī, printed in Tehran 1971, is one of Kashīfī's most valuable works. As well as having a fluent style, the book is the most detailed of all the Arabic and Persian treatises written on futuwma [q.v.]. Kashīfī compiled all the information about ẓulṭān handed down from earlier generations and never before mentioned in books. At the same time, he used important written sources. Some special aspects of the mediaeval history of Iran, i.e. about the ẓulṭān and their social organisation, are fully described; (14) the Aṣrār-i Kāsimī, a short Persian treatise on witchcraft, spells and alchemy, in five parts, is written in the name of Amīr Saʻīd Kāsim, one of the eminent personalities of the period (lith. Bombay 1872, etc.). Kashīfī's son wrote a commentary to this book, entitled Kashīf-i Aṣrār-i Kāsimī (lith., Bombay 1889, 1900; printed in Berlin); (15) Tāḥfīt al-ṣulṭānī, with eight chapters and a conclusion; (16) Marsad al-ṣanā’ fī istikhrādāt asmā’ al-ḥusnā (lith., Bombay 1893, 1905); (17) Zād al-musūfiyān (matnāt, lith., Lucknow 1885); (18) Saḥbā Kashīfīyya, completed in 878/1473-4, containing seven treatises on astronomy and astrology, entitled: Manāhīj, Muṣahhār, Ruḍaḥ, Kābhū, Ḍalqār (or Sawdād) al-Mīrāk, Lāwā Ṣams, Maḥbūdī (or Maḥbūf), al-Zuhrā, Manāhīj al-ʿUjlādī and Lāwā al-Kārm (or Ikhtiyārāt-i maqṣūm); (19) al-Tawḥīf al-ṣulṭānīyya “fī ẓil’ al-burāṣ wa-bayyān asrār-hā, compiled in the name of Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh Naḵshband; (20, 21) Two more commentaries on the Kurān, entitled Maḥfūzan al-Dawādhar “abridged from Dawādhar al-lāfṣfī,” and Dīmās-i sittīn, Kashīfī's dictatorial commentary on the Sūrat Yāsūs (ch. xii), which is probably identical with the Tāfsīr-i sāra-yi Yāsūs by Tādī al-Dīn Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Zayd of Tūs (Tehrān 1667; see Storey, i, 29, 1195, 1220; A. Munzawi, i, 38); (22) Skār-i Mathnawī; (23) Risāla al-ʿalāyīyya; (24) Risāla dar “ẓil’ al-adād; (25) Risāla dar arsād ad-dastur; (26) Ṣafy al-qāwil fī bayān al-tawāwul; (27) Maḥbūf al-kūnān on alchemy; (28) Maḥbūm al-ihtikābī fī kawdād-i ihtikābī; (29) Aʿsān-i iskandari or Dīmās-i Ẓaḥḥāt; (30) Ṣāḥīb al-nisba “fī ʿl-māzdakh; (31) Manāhīj al-ulūm; (32) Fadl al-shālāt “ala ʿl-nabī; (33) Mīrāt al-ṣafā fī šfāl al-Mustafā; (34) Skār-Mīrāt al-Shurārī “fī ʿl-māASN’a” by Sūfīyān al-Thawrīi (lith. Bombay); (35) al-Nakāwa fī Ḍāb al-naṣīna, on the method of reading the Sūrah (A. Munzawi, i, 120); (36) Dīnār-Dīnār, Kashīfī (ibid., ii, 2490); (37) Tabākāt-i Khudāṣja-ḡānī-i Naḵshbandīyya (ibid., ii, 1274); (38) Maḥfūzan al-Yāsīn (ibid., ii, 1394); (39) Maḥfūzan al-aʿlāyīyyā, (ibid., ii, 1423; Storey, i, 213); (40) Maḥālīs-i wastra (A. Munzawi, ii, 1670), etc.

Bibliography: In addition to the works and sources mentioned in the text: "Allā Shīr Nāwāt, Maḥālīs al-nafṣāt, Pers. tr., Tehran 1944, 93, 268-9; Khādurum, Habīb al-Siyās, Tehran 1373/195.4, iv, 345-6; Hājjī Ḥuṣain, ed. Fīlū, i, 199, 204, ii, 230, 310, 365, 642-4, iii, 43, 421-2, 461-2, 500-1, iv, 485, v, 239, 353, 376, 466, 483, vi, 244, 280-1, 643; N. Šāhṣaḥtarī, Maḥālīs al-muṣawwara, Tehran 1375/1956, i, 119-21, 547-8; Maḥmūd “Allā Shīr, Tarbīt al-halākī, Tehran 1960-66, iii, 114; Browne, iii, 441-4, 453, 503-4 (Pers. tr., As Sa’dī tā Dījāmt, by “A. A. Hikmat, Tehran 1960, 639-41, 643-5, 734-8); Ṭābī Ḍūrūz al-Ṭāhrānī, al-Dījāmt tā tasāfīn al-Shīr, Nādāf and Tehran 1936 etc., cf. relevant titles; M. R. Dīlāyī Nāmil, Introduction, in Mahbūbīn-i alāyīyya, 7-132; “A. A. Dīḥgūdū, "Kashfī," in Lughdānana, Tehran 1946 etc.; “A. Khashyāmūr, Farhang-i sukhawasan, Tābrīz 1951, 479; Kh. Muḥṣir, Muṣālīfin-i Kutub-i Ṣāfī "Fārsī-yu ʿArābi," Tehran 1961, ii, 810-16; J. Rypka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, Leipzig 1959, index s.v. Husain Wāzī, and p. 600 (bibl.), Eng. tr. History of Iranian literature, Dordrecht 1968, index s.v. and p. 795; "Gholam Ḥosein Yousopi) KASHSH-Dagh, (see Dagh or Daghīs.) KASHKHĀ, KASHNĀ (see Katsina). KASHKHĀY, the name of a Turkish people living in the Fārs province of Iran. Persian works refer to this people as Kashkhāy. The exact origin of the name is not known. In western Turkish Ḥašha is the name given to a blaze on the forehead of animals such as horses, sheep and cattle; in Ǧaghtāy the word also means "brilliant" and "galant". It is probable that the name Kashkhāy is related to one of these meanings, especially the former, i.e. a blaze. It is impossible to agree with the claims of the chroniclers of the Kāḏār period that the word is derived from kāmāk "to flee, escape". The Kashkhāy are a comparatively recent community, not referred to in works earlier than the 15th century. A branch of the Kḥalad [q.v.]s, whose original home is the Sūfīrah region, used to live in Fārs during the 19th century, and whilst we have no knowledge of the causes leading to the formation of the Kashkhāy, it is probable that many Turcoman communities living in Fārs gathered around the strong Shāhīli tribe of the Kḥaladī during the Afghan invasion, thus forming this people. It seems also that some small tribes belonging to such peoples as the Lurs, Kurds and Shūls also joined this union.

The territory of the Kashkhāy extended from the northwest of Fārs to the southeast, comprising Shash Nāhiya, Čahār Danke, Kamīnīrūz, Ardāhān, Kāzarūn, Fārābīābī, Maḵbūrābī, Maḵond, Afraz, Khundj and Mahur Milan. Of these, many Turcoman communities living in Fārs gathered around the strong Shāhīli tribe of the Kḥaladī during the Afghan invasion, thus forming this people. It seems also that some small tribes belonging to such peoples as the Lurs, Kurds and Shūls also joined this union.
always a member of the ruling family of Khans, was appointed by the Shah. Among the many boys and girls of the Kashkay people, the following were of the greatest historical importance: Bayāt (from the Oguz tribe), Igdir (Oguz tribe), Beg Dili (Oguz tribe), Carlhlu (Carlku, an Oguz tribe?), Shāmlu, Aḥaṭ-Eri (of the Karā-Koyunlu), Khaladi, Musullu (of the Ak-Koyunlu), and Oryad (Mongol?). These sub-tribes were not very populous. One characteristic of the Kashkay people was that it had a strict tribal code, which determined all conduct and was obeyed by every member, from the throne down to the simplest member of the community.

The great majority of the Kashkay led a nomadic life, raising horses, camels and cattle. An important number of these nomadic people, however, had fields near their pastures, which were watered and protected by peasants living in the neighbourhood. In return for these services, the peasants, called ra'īyāt-i Kashkā'ī, received two sheep and some share of the crop each year. While serving in the army, the Kashkay was regarded as good fortune by the peasants of Fārs, for in this way they enjoyed the help and protection of the Kashkay and were free from the molestations of government officials. The Kashkay exported sheep, longhaired lambskins similar to the Kara Köl sheep of Buḫkhārā, wool, cotton, and rugs. Kangareh, carpets woven from pure wool, decorated with traditional motifs and dyed with natural dyes, are still in high demand both in Iran and abroad.

The Kashkāy women occupied an important place in the social life of their community, and as among the ancient Turks, the Kashkāy observed the rule of demanding ḥaššīl (ḥaššīl) in marriage. Kashkāy Turkish is a dialect of Oguz, i.e. south-western, Turkish. Like the arians of the Oguz, the Kashkāy had their ḍaḥšīs, who sang songs of love and bravery and recited the legend of Koroğlu.

Dupré (1807–9) gives their number as 12,000-15,000 (Voyage en Perse, Paris 1829, ii, pp. 453-4), while Lady Shell (mid-19th century) writes that they had 30,000-40,000 tents (Glimpses of life and Manners in Persia, London 1856, 396-9). Curzon (1899), on the other hand, gives the number as 25,000 (Persia and the Persian Question, London 1892, ii, 112-3) but he mentions that formerly they had comprised 60,000 tents and were capable of raising 120,000 horsemen. This figure is greatly exaggerated, since the Kashkāy were in fact never able to raise more than 15,000 horsemen. They put 5,000 horsemen in the field against the British during World War I.

Their first important chiefs were Hasan Khan and his brother Isma‘īl Khan, who both lived during the time of Karīm Khān Zand (q.v.) (d. 1303/1789), but for reasons unknown, Hasan Khan’s hand was cut off, and Isma‘īl Khan’s eyes put out towards the end of the Zand period. Djiān Khan (d. 1239/1823-4), the son of the latter, and Muhammad ʿAli Khan (d. 1268/1851-2), the son of Djiān Khan, his brother Muḥammad Kulf Khan (d. 1867-8), and his son Sultan Muḥammad Khan, were the most prominent of the Kashkāy chiefs during the 19th century. Of these, Muḥammad ʿAli Khan and his son Djiāṅghr Khan took wives from the Kājdārs. One of the main rivals of the Kashkāy dynasty was the Ḥādżīdī Ibrāhīm family living in Shīrāz. This family ruled over the five large tribes (Khamsa) in Fārs with the support of the government. Another enemy of the Kashkāy was the Bağštīyārī, their northern neighbours. When a constitutional monarchy was established in Iran, by law the Kashkāy were represented in parliament by Ḥādżīdī Kārīm Khān of the ruling family. Although the Kashkāy, with the secret encouragement of the government, fought the British in Fārs together, they were defeated. Like the other tribes, the Kashkāy were disarmed by Riḍā Shāh in 1930 and brought under government control. During the operations carried out for this purpose, the Il-Khan Šawlat al-Dawla was brought to Tehran and imprisoned there, and his sons were forced to leave Iran. During World War II, and after the removal of Riḍā Shāh from the throne, the sons of Šawlat al-Dawla, who had himself died in prison, returned from exile. Of these, Nāṣir was elected Il-khan and started administering the Kashkāy. When the Kashkāy, according to their tribal tradition, refused to surrender to the British the German agents who had taken refuge in Kashkāy, they were faced with the danger of being crushed as a possible consequence of an armed expedition against them. They were fortunately saved from this plight by the intervention of the Turkish ambassador (1943). In 1965 the government of Iran decided to carry out land reform in Kashkāy territory and to subject the Kashkāy people to the authority of the central government. Kashkāy resistance was overcome by force, the tribesmen disarmed and the family of Khāns forced to leave Iran for the second time.

Bibliography: For detailed information and bibliography on the Kashkāy see F. Sūmer, Kaşgär doğrudan Türk oymakları, in Selçuklu Arastırmalar Dergisi, V, Ankara 1973. (F. SÜMER) KASHKUL, a Persian word denoting an oval bowl of metal, wood or coconut (calabash), worn suspended by a chain from the shoulder, in which the dervishes put the alms they receive and the food which is given to them. The etymology of this word is obscure; a popular one is given by the Persians: kāsh “draw” (imperative) and hāl “shoulder”, “what one draws over the shoulder”; but as we find a form ḥakāthūl attested in the older poets (Anwār, Sāyf Isfarangi), this explanation can hardly be accepted. The dictionaries give as the first sense “beggar” and then “begger’s bowl”; it seems impossible to decide how correct they are.

This term passed at a late date into Arabic, and appears in the title of the Kitāb al-Kashkul of Baha’ al-Din al-ʿAbīlī (953-1030/1547-1621) [see AL-ʿAIMIL], which is a collection of passages taken from various sources. It is sometimes used in modern Arabic in this sense, in which, as well as denoting “beggar’s bag”, it denotes a kind of album or collection of press cuttings. In Algerian colloquial Arabic, it has retained the sense of “begging bowl, bowl made of wood or of esparto grass” (Beaussier, s.v.); in Dory, Supplément, s.v., we also find the forms ḥaškul and ḥaškula.

Bibliography: Farhang-i Rakhšān, s.v. Ḫaškul; Burhān-i Rāfī, s.v. Ḫaškul; R. du Mans, Estait de la Perse en 1660, ed. Schefer, 217; Ricaut, Present State of the Ottoman Empire, fig. in ch. xvii; Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, i, 337; A. von Kremer, Topographie von Damascus, ii, 4; E. G. Browne, A Year amongst the Persians, 52. (CL. Huarte*) KASHMIR (Sanskrit: Kāshmīra; Persian: Kāshmir; Kāshmir: Kashmir), a region of northern India.

I. BEFORE 1947

1. Geography. It is situated in the western Himalayas about 5,000 ft. above sea-level, and is shaped like an elliptical saucer with a similarly-shaped level
valley in the centre. This valley, comprising an area of 1,800 or 1,900 sq. miles, is about 84 miles in length, from north-west to south-east, while its width varies from 20 to 25 miles. It is surrounded by high mountain ranges, whose highest peaks rise up to 18,000 ft. The inner slopes of these mountains possess lateral valleys, some quite large and very picturesque. The whole area within the mountain boundaries is about 3,900 sq. miles. Through the central plain flows the Dehlam (Vitasta), which is joined by numerous rivers and streams which drain the slopes of the upper ranges. The high mountains which surround the valley are pierced by a number of passes through which it has, over the ages, maintained contact with the outside world. The most important passes are the Bānīhār, the Būdīl, the Pīr Pandīl, the Toshmaidān, the Hādīlī Pir and the Zblj-Lā. According to an ancient legend mentioned by Kalaḥa and the Nilamata, Kashmir was once a lake; there is a certain geological basis for this in the lacustrine deposits found in the alluvial plateaus called kārtevas or ṣudars.

The name Kashmir does not occur in Vedic literature. Its earliest reference is found in Pāṇini's grammar. Later the Mahābhārata and some of the Purāṇas also refer to it. There is no mention of Kashmir by Herodotus or in the accounts of Alexander's invasion, but Ptolemy defines the latter, by al-Ṣudairī, as her successor. Under the Lohara kings, who were mostly incompetent, social and political conditions in Kashmir were shrouded in legend until we come to the period of Aśoka the Great, who, according to the records of the Chinese pilgrims, erected many monasteries and stupas and Śaivism shrines in the Valley. It was also he who laid the foundation of Srinagar, which was near the present Srinagar, and which has given a name to it. However, the medieval Muslim chroniclers of Kashmir refer to Srinagar as the "town of Kashmir" (Ṣahr-i Kashmir).

Kashmir's history again assumes a legendary character until the time of Kaniṣka, the Kughan ruler of north-western India, who was a Buddhist and who organised the Fourth Buddhist Council in Kashmir. In 278 A.D. the Kughan rule was replaced by the Gotanda dynasty, under which Buddhism declined because of the policy of persecution followed by some of its rulers.

Ca. 528 A.D., Kashmir came under the rule of Mihirakula, the White Hun ruler, who, according to the tradition preserved by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsiang, encouraged Brahmanism and persecuted Buddhism. Towards the middle of the 6th century, the Kashmiri ruler Matagupta acknowledged the sovereignty of Harsha-Vikramaditya of Udijāy. But beyond this, nothing is known of Harsha's connection with Kashmir.

In 627 was laid the foundation of the Kārkotā dynasty (the origin of this designation is uncertain) by Durlabhavardhana, a man of obscure origin. Hiuen Tsiang, who arrived in Kashmir during his reign, says that Kashmir was in decline but that the country was peaceful and prosperous. The greatest ruler of the Kārkotā dynasty was Lalitāditya-Muktāpīḍa, who reduced Kāṅgar, Paṇḍ, Radjaur and Djamū, but Kalaḥa's account of his conquests round the whole of India is legendary. In 733 Lalitāditya sent an embassy to the Chinese Emperor Huan-tsang (713-35), seeking help from him against the Arabs who were pressing from the south and the Tibetans and Turkish tribes from the north. He was a great builder, his greatest building being the temple of Mātrand, which owes a great deal to the Gandhāra school and which became a model to all subsequent temples in the valley. Lalitāditya also carried out extensive drainage works, reclaimed large areas for cultivation and established law and order. Ou-K'ong, who visited Kashmir a few years after Lalitāditya's death, found Buddhism in a flourishing condition.

Since the successors of Lalitāditya were worthless, his dynasty was replaced by the Utpala dynasty founded by Avantivarman (853-83), grandson of Utpala, who was related by marriage with the Kārkotās. Avantivarman founded the town of Avantipūr, which still bears his name, and built great temples there. His able engineer Suyya, whose name still survives in the modern town of Sāpur (old Suyayapurā), constructed irrigation channels, and by measures designed to prevent floods, reclaimed land from the river and marshes and thus made Kashmir prosperous. Avantivarman's son and successor, Shankaravarman (883-902) imposed heavy taxes, and introduced the system of forced labour (bāḍavā), which remained, until recent times, a characteristic feature of Kashmir life. He was succeeded by weak rulers who were puppets in the hands of Tantrins or feudal chiefs. In 950 Kāhmagupta ascended the throne. But he was too weak and the real authority was exercised by his wife Diddā, who was the daughter of the ruler of Lohara. On her husband's death, she herself ascended the throne in 981 after destroying her son and her grandson one after another. She ruled ably until 1003, when she appointed Śangramardāla, her nephew, as her successor.

Under the Lohara kings, who were mostly incompetent, social and political conditions in Kashmir
greatly deteriorated; the people were subjected to corvees and to all kinds of oppressive taxes. The Damara feudal chiefs, by their constant revolts plunged the country into confusion. Since Râmadeva (1252-73), the last ruler of the dynasty, had no child, he adopted Lakhamanadeva, the son of a Brahman, as heir-apparent. It was under Lakshmanadeva's son, Sûhadeva (1301-20) that the Mongols, led by Zûlghûr, invaded Kashmir in the spring of 720/1320. The origin of Zûlghûr is obscure, but he appears to have been a Turk from Türkistan. He entered Kashmir by the Djjahlan valley route; Sûhadeva did not offer any resistance but fled to Kishêtwar. The Mongols continued their ravages in the valley for 8 months and then withdrew before winter. The anarchy that followed the invasion and withdrawal of the Mongols paved the way for the establishment of the Islamic Sultanate.

3. The foundation of the Sultanate. It was in the 2nd/8th century that Kashmir came for the first time in contact with the Muslims. Two governors of Sind, Djinayd and Hîghâm b. Amr al-Taghlibî, attempted to invade the fringes of Kashmir, but they could only reach as far as the southern slopes of the Hîmalayas. Mahîûd of Ghazna in 404/1014 and again in 412/1021 tried to conquer Kashmir but did not succeed. When finally Muslim rule came to be established, it was not the result of the native invasion but of a palace revolution. Taking advantage of the chaos into which Kashmir was plunged after the Mongol withdrawal, Rîchhanna (Lhachen rGyalbu Rîchhanna), the son of a Ladakhî chief, who had sought refuge in Kashmir, made himself master of the country. He embraced Islam under the influence of a Suhrawardî saint, Sayyid Sîrâf al-Dîn, commonly known as Bûlûn Sîrâf, and adopted the name of Sadr al-Dîn. He was the first Sultan of Kashmir.

At the death of Rîchhanna, his widow Kû'tâ Rânî, on the advice of the nobles, married Udayânadeva, the brother of Sûhadeva, and made him king; and when he died, she herself became ruler. But her authority was challenged by Sîhâm al-Dîn, a soldier of fortune, who was most probably of Turkish origin. Under his leadership, adventurers invaded the Valley from the end of the 5th/11th century, and were employed by Hindî kings in their armies. Sîhâm al-Dîn also came in search of fame and fortune and was employed by Sûhadeva. He gradually became so powerful that when Udayânadeva died, he refused to acknowledge Kû'tâ Rânî's authority. He defeated her and, in 739/1339, ascended the throne under the title of Sultan. When finally Muslim rule came to be established, it was not the result of the native invasion but of a palace revolution. Taking advantage of the chaos into which Kashmir was plunged after the Mongol withdrawal, Rîchhanna (Lhachen rGyalbu Rîchhanna), the son of a Ladakhî chief, who had sought refuge in Kashmir, made himself master of the country. He embraced Islam under the influence of a Suhrawardî saint, Sayyid Sîrâf al-Dîn, commonly known as Bûlûn Sîrâf, and adopted the name of Sadr al-Dîn. He was the first Sultan of Kashmir.

4. The Sultanate Period. Very little is known of the two successors of Shams al-Dîn, Djarâmî and 'Alî al-Dîn. But the latter's son Shihâm al-Dîn (755-75/1354-73) appears to have been an able ruler. After consolidating his position at home, he was able to reduce Djanmû, Pûntî, Râdjaurî, Camba, Baltistan and Ladakh; but the accounts in the Kashmir chronicles that he conquered Multân, Kâbul, Badakhshan and Samarkand and that he defeated Firûz Shâh Tughluk are apocryphal. An important event that had considerable impact on the social and religious life of Kashmir was the arrival of Sayyid 'Ali Hamadâni, a Kurbwali saint, once during his reign in Râbi 'ii 774/September 1372 and again in the reign of his younger brother and successor Kutb al-Dîn in 781/1379 and 785/1383. Sayyid 'Ali is said to have come with 700 Sayyids and to have made large-scale conversions to Islam.

During the reign of Kutb al-Dîn's son, Sikandar (792-816/1389-1413), there came Sayyid Muhammad, the son of Sayyid 'Ali Hamadâni. Under his influence, Sikandar tried to enforce the Shâhârî and established the office of the Shâhîkh al-Islâm, and he began to persecute the Hindus by forcibly converting them to Islam and destroying their temples. But the accounts given in the chronicles of the wholesale destruction of temples have been greatly exaggerated, for there is evidence to suggest that the massive temples of Mârtand and Avantipur were destroyed by earthquakes and tried by Sikandar, for gunpowder was unknown in Kashmir in the 8th/14th century.

The policy of religious persecution pursued by Sikandar was reversed by his son, Zayn al-Abîdîn (823-75/1420-70), who is popularly called "Budshâh" or the Great King. He virtually abolished the dîya, gave money to Hindus to rebuild their temples, and allowed those who had been forcibly converted to Islam to return to their old religion. This, however, did not check the progress of Islam because, although the successors of Zayn al-Abîdîn followed a policy of religious toleration, yet through the efforts of Shîfs and ri'âfs conversions continued, so that by the end of the 9th/15th century, a majority of the inhabitants of Kashmir had embraced Islam. But at the same time, Islam itself became diluted with non-Muslim usages and practices, and it has retained this character to this day.

History and tradition combine to credit Zayn al-Abîdîn with the introduction of various arts and crafts for which Kashmir has become famous. He sent Kashmiris to Iran and Turkistan to learn the arts of book-binding, wood-carving and paper-mâché, and those of making shawls, carpets and paper. He also invited craftsmen from these countries to instruct his people in various skills. Of all the arts in which the Kashmiris have achieved excellence, that of book-binding and paper-making has since the 9th century disappeared, but the other crafts are still flourishing and provide employment to a large number of people.

The Hindu râdiqûs had built their temples in stone, but the Sûfis popularised the constructional use of wood. Sikandar's two buildings which have survived, the Khân-khâkh-i Mu'âlî, the pavilion for the mu'âlî, and the mosque of Shâh Hamadâni, and the Djjâmî Masjid, are constructed in wood. Zayn al-Abîdîn, on the other hand, built both in wood and brick. His mosque of Mandân is constructed in wood, but the tomb of his mother and the tomb of Mandân represent the masonry style, and their chief feature is the use made of Persian tiles. The chief feature of the wooden style of architecture is that the pyramidal roof projecting over the whole structure is built in three tiers, and is surrounded by an open pavilion for the mu'âlî, over which rides the steeple with its final.

Under Zayn al-Abîdîn, the Shâhîrî dynasty reached the zenith of its power and glory. But after his death, succession disputes, incompetent rulers and refractory and intriguing nobles brought about its downfall. In consequence, Kashmir was subjected to foreign invasions. In Rajab 947/November 1540, Mirzâ Haydar Dughlât, a cousin of Bâbur, who was in Humâyûn's service, invaded Kashmir and seized power. At first he ruled with ability and justice, but later he failed to protect the Kashmiris from the high-handedness of the Mughals. Moreover, he banned Shî'îism and all Sûfî orders, and compelled every Muslim to accept the Hanafî law school. The result was that the Kashmiri nobles united against him and brought about his defeat and death in Ramadân 958/ October 1551. But this did not bring peace to the Valley, because a struggle for power began among the
nobles belonging to the Raina, Mâre and Câk families. In the end, the Câks emerged victorious. The Mughals gave peace and promoted trade, industry and agriculture. Kashmir, however, lost her separate identity and became like any other province of the Empire. The Kashmiri ruling families of the Câks, Mâres and Rainas were replaced by a hierarchy of Mughal officers who were responsible for the administration of the country. Moreover, Kashmir, which had achieved a high degree of culture under the Sul-tâns, was intellectually impoverished: because of the absence of local patronage, poets, painters and scholars left the valley and sought employment at the Mughal Court.

6. The Afghans and the Sikhs. Mughal rule after the death of Aurangzâb became inefficient and corrupt and failed to maintain law and order. Hence in 1660/1747, some of the Kashmiri nobles wrote to Ahmad Shah Abdâlâ Durránt [q.v.] inviting him to annex Kashmir. He accordingly despatched a large force in 1669/1752. The Mughals were defeated and Kashmir passed into the hands of the Afghâns. The Afghân rule was harsh and oppressive, however, and the burden of taxation was heavy. The Shi'éts were persecuted by the Afghan governors and there were constant Shi'î-Sunnî riots.

In 1819 Kashmir was conquered by Ranjît Singh, the Sikh ruler of the Punjab. The Sikh rule, which lasted from 1819 to 1846, was also oppressive. The famous Djâmi' mosque of Srinagar was closed to public prayers and, in addition, several mosques were declared to be the property of the state. The slaughter of cows was declared punishable by death. Butchers, bakers, boatmen, scavengers and even prostitutes were taxed. Heavy taxation of the shawl trade led to the decay of this industry. The effects of all this was the impoverishment of the people and their emigration to the Panjâb and northern India.

7. The Dôgrâs and Modern Kashmir. Sikh rule over Kashmir came to an end after their defeat in the First Anglo-Sikh war. By the treaty of Amritsar (16 March 1846) the British transferred Kashmir for a sum of 75 lakh of rupees to Râgâl Guláb Singh, the Dôgrâ ruler of Djammu. This treaty was better than that of the Sikhs, but no improvement took place in the condition of the people. The high price of rice, which was made a government monopoly, and the high-handedness of officials brought great suffering to the people. The Muslims, who formed over 90% of the population of Kashmir, had to pay a tax for the Dharmarth, a Hindu religious trust, established by the Mâhrâdjiâ. They could not slaughter cows and some of their mosques continued to be in possession of the government.

Ranbâr Singh, who succeeded his father Guláb Singh in February 1856, was an able ruler. He tried to revive the shawl industry which had been declining. He began the construction of the cart road between Srinagar and Rawalpindi and built a track between the Valley and Djâmîlâ. A telegraph and postal service was also introduced. However, he made no efforts to redress the grievances of the Muslims.

At the death of Ranbâr Singh on 15 September 1884, his eldest son, Prâtâp Singh, succeeded him. Since Prâtâp Singh was an imbecile and strong government was necessary in view of the threat of a Russian invasion of India, he was deprived of all authority, and his state was placed in the hands of a Council of Regency under the control of the British Resident. It was not until March 1927 that Prâtâp Singh was restored to full powers. During this period, valuable reforms were introduced under the direction
of the Resident. But in one respect they were deficient. The interests of the Muslims were ignored. The Muslims, influenced by the Islamic, Khilafat and Non-co-operation movements, had become politically conscious and were demanding their rights. In 1924, when the Viceroy, Lord Reading, visited Srinagar, some members of the Muslim community submitted a Memorial demanding the complete abolition of corvée, larger representation of Muslims in government service, and the restoration of mosques in possession of the government. The Maharādžā’s response to this was to exile the signatories of the Memorial and to confiscate their property. This, however, only served to increase the discontent among the Muslims. On 13 July 1931, open demonstration against the despotic rule of Hari Singh, who had succeeded his uncle Pratāp Singh in 1925, took place under the leadership of Shaykhi Muhammad ʿAbd Allāh, who from now onwards began to play a dominant role in Kashmir politics. Hari Singh’s government replied by floggings, arrests and shootings in various parts of the Valley. However, owing to the pressure of the Government of India, a Commission was appointed under the presidency of B. J. Glancy to inquire into the grievances of the Muslims. The report of the Commission did not, however, satisfy them. In October 1932 the Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference was set up, and in March of the next year it launched a Civil Disobedience Movement, demanding a constitutional government. This led the Maharādžā to appoint a Constitutional Reforms Commission under the presidency of Glancy. But since its recommendations, too, failed to satisfy the Muslims, the agitation against the government continued.

Meanwhile, Shaykhi ʿAbd Allāh and his close associates realized that in order to achieve their goal, it was necessary to win over the Hindu and Sikh inhabitants of Kashmir. So they converted the Muslim Conference into the National Conference. But some members did not approve of this and decided to keep the old organisation alive and draw closer to the All-India Muslim League. In October 1939 it passed a resolution demanding responsible government and in May 1946 it launched the “Quit Kashmir Movement” under the leadership of Shaykhi ʿAbd Allāh. The Kashmir government arrested ʿAbd Allāh and his colleagues and unleashed a reign of terror.


ii. Since 1947

The project of partitioning the Indian Peninsula announced on 3rd June 1947 by the British Prime Minister affirmed that the ancient princely states should be free to choose their future destiny; yet on 25th July 1947 Lord Mounbatten, Viceroy and Governor-General, advised the princes to ask to be joined to India or Pakistan, while taking into consideration the religious distribution of the populations and the peoples' wishes.

With regard to Kashmir, two factors militated in favour of annexation to Pakistan: the population having a Muslim majority (77% in the census of 1941) and the geographical situation of the region. However, the Maharādžā refused to choose, although he consented to sign a provisional agreement with the Pakistani Government which was to take effect on 15th August 1947.

In October 1947, some members of the Pathan tribes who had come from Pakistan began to give aid to the Muslims who had revolted in the region of Pānč and approached within a short distance of Srinagar, capital of Kashmir. On 26th October, the Maharādžā requested military aid from India and signed the annexation of Kashmir to the Indian Union. The Indian Government accepted, while stipulating that this accession of Kashmir to India should be ratified ultimately by popular consultation. Yet, since 1947, this consultation has never taken place.

The war which followed between India and Pakistan came to an end on 1st January 1949, and, on 17th July 1949, agreement was reached on the demarcation of the ceasefire line in Kashmir.

In the part under Indian control, the constituent Assembly elected in October 1951 adopted a project for a constitution which safeguarded, thanks to the ability of Shaykhi ʿAbd Allāh, the autonomy of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, but abandoned to the central government of Delhi the fields of Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications. On 9th August 1953, Shaykhi ʿAbd Allāh was arrested and his government replaced by that of Bāhshī Ghiyām Muḥammad, who sought to reinforce the links with the Indian Union. On 17th November 1956, the Assembly adopted the definitive Constitution of the State which declared its integration with India. This
Constitution, accepted by the central government, took effect on 26th January 1957. In October 1963, the new Government of Pakistan under the resignation of Bakshht Ghułam Muhammad, accused of the mishandling of administrative and social affairs. The year 1964 was marked by the accession to power of G. M. Sādīk and the freeing of Shaykh 'Abd Allāh.

In the part of Kashmir under Pakistani control (Āsād Kashmir), Sādār Muhammad Ibrāhīm took charge of the local government on 24th October 1947; he was replaced in May 1950 by Ghułam Ābbaś, who retired at the end of the year 1953 to make way for Colonel Sēr Ahmed Khān in June 1952. The latter resigned in June 1956. There then succeeded to the Presidency of the local government Mir W. Yūsuf Khān for a very short time; 'Abd al-Kāyūm from 1956; Sādār Muhammad Ibrāhīm from 1957; and K. H. Khorshīd from 1959.

Relations between India and Pakistan on the subject of Kashmir worsened seriously after an agreement on the delimitation of the frontier between Sinkiang and Pakistanī Kashmir was signed on 26th December 1962 between China and Pakistan. Despite a certain détente during the year 1964, the situation became critical from the beginning of 1965. Incidents multiplied in the month of August in the territory of Kashmir. On the 5th September, the Pakistanis crossed the ceasefire line in the direction of the town of Diammū and the Indians replied on 6th September that they would proceed with some readjustments of the ceasefire line.

In Kashmir under Pakistani control the President of the Government of Free Kashmir, 'Abd al-Hamīd Khān, promulgated in September 1966 a new constitution fixing the method of electing the head of the government and the composition of the council of ministers. In Kashmir under Indian control, which has become a State of the Indian Union, G. M. Sādīk, head of the local government was deposed on the 12th December 1971 and was replaced by S. M. Kāsim in the post of Prime Minister.

Kashtâlá, Arabic name for Castile in Spain. The first, and not the least problem, is that of the original name of the territory called, from the 9th century onwards, Castilla. This name appears to be derived from Latin castella, and would have been given to the region because of the abundance there of fortified places. Arabic al-Kilâ would accordingly be the expected translation, but many sources (Yâkût, al-Iдрsid, al-Udrî, al-Hîmyar, Ibn Dîhârî, al-Mâkkârî, etc.) have Kashtâla, Kashtîla, or Kashtîya. Above all, al-Râzl on several occasions mentions enemies min abyâ Banâbalûna wa-‘Alâba wa l-Kilâ wa-‘ahl Kashtîla (cf. al-Udrî, Maslîkh, who also uses al-Kilâ and Kashtîla). This excludes the identification al-Kilâ/Kashtîla explicit or implicit in modern historians (cf. Lâvi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. musulmane, i, 143, 204); hence one must seek another etymology, different from the Spanish late Latin (which usually predominate castrum) and look for an Arab-Islamic borrowing.

One thinks naturally of the Tunisian Kashtîlya [q.v.], and it seems that one should follow the opinion of J. Oliver-Asin in his En torno a los orígenes de Castilla, su toponimia en relación con los árabes y bereberes, Madrid 1974, which cites, with phonetic equivalences, the frequency of Arabic and Berber toponyms in a region whose ancient centre was called Medina Castella. This hypothesis is partly confirmed by the frequency of “îlîfîyâr” toponyms in al-Andalus, cf. idem, Les Tunisiens en Espagne à travers la toponomie, in Cahiers de Tunisie, xviii (1970), 15-20. Hence according to Oliver-Asin, there must have been an “African latinisation” of the region, brought about by the Latin-speaking Berbers of Tunisia (which would explain the peculiarities of this “Castilian”, different from other Hispanic Roman dialects).

Al-Râzl’s text points to a juxtaposition of al-Kilâ and Kashtîlya under the rule of the Count Ferran González (Fardhiland Gundishâl), which makes an investigation of the relationship between the two toponyms necessary. The first known mention in Christian sources is in a Castilian document of the Abbot Vitula in 800, in the Mena valley, who speaks of the territorio Castelle, whilst the Crónica Abeldense speaks specifically of Bardulia qui nunc vocatur Castilla. This region is which is progressively extended, as it becomes organised as an autochthonous unit, on the topographical and juridical margins of the kingdom of Oviedo; this has led S. de Moxî, ¿Castilla, principado feudal?, in RUM (1970), 229-57, to speak of an “autonomous territory”. This situation away from the centre of royal power led to its constitution as a “frontier march” and the need for an immediate and local authority in the shape of a comes or Count (Alava, Mijangos, Oca, Burgos, Panchorbo, Cellorgo, Castroregis, C-recos). We now have a document drawn up in 852 in territorio Castellensi which speaks of a Rodericus comite in Castelle, Castile had to fight in order to expand. This fighting comprised mainly attacks, but also replies to expeditions by the Banû Kasî [q.v.] and the Banû Dîhû ‘l-Nûn [q.v.], as well as the campaigns of ‘Abd al-Rahûm III [q.v. in 917, 920 and 924 (San Esteban de Gormaz, Mirona, Valdejuncuera). On the other hand, the famous Alphonso II of Castile was repulsed with heavy losses by a coalition of Leonese, Castilians and Navarrese. It was at this time that Fernán González, comes totius Castilia, either carried along by a feeling of Castilian autonomy or himself provoking it, obtained from the king of Leon the right to pass on his country hereditarily to his descendants. The campaigns of Ibn Abî ‘Amîr [q.v.] ruined the region of Leon and the Catalan-Aragonese region, but largely spared Castile, then in revolt against Garci Fernandez, and in vassalage to Cordova; this in part explains why, after the fall of the ‘Amîrs, the initiative passed almost wholly to this region.

This primitive region of Bardulia, Castella Vetula, was to pass on not only its dialect of Spanish and some of its institutions to the neighbouring regions (above all, New Castile), but also an ideology of conquest (reflected by the “chansons de geste”) which in the end monopolised in effect the war against the Hispano-Arabs and imposed a political supremacy which involved the extinguishing of the “mudéjar” [q.v.] tolerance of Aragon. At one and the same time, Castile brought about, to its own profit, the unification of Spain.

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited above, see J. Perez de Urbel, Historia del Conado de Castilla, Madrid 1945; idem, Los primeros siglos de la reconquista, in Historia España de Menendez Pidal, Madrid 1964, vii, 3-248; J. de M. Rodriguez, La rebelión de Sancho García, heredero del condado de Castilla, in Hispania Sacra, xvii (1969), 31-7; Cl. Sanchez-Albornoz, Alfonso III y el particularismo castellano, in CHE, xiii (1950), 19-100; P. Chalmeta, The clash between ‘Abd al-Rahmûn III and the Christians at Simancas-Alhandega: a new interpretation, in Islam and the Medieval West, conference held at Binghamton, New York, 1975 (proceedings forthcoming). (P. Chalmeta)

Banû Kasî, one of the important mudâli families who figure prominently in the history of al-Andalus. Together with the Banû Tâwîl and the Tujibîds [q.v.], they divided between them effective power in the region of Aragon. The history of this region only becomes clear when considered in the light of the centripetal-centrifugal struggles which are a constant feature of Spanish history. The Banû Kasî first followed an opportunistic policy in order to preserve their virtual autonomy, but they were at the same time relatively faithful to the Umayyads and served in a very real fashion as a shield against pressure from the Christians of the North in the period of the beginning of the Reconquista and from the Carolingians. Their heyday was thus in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries.

According to Ibn Hazm, Dîamhratur ansâb al-Arâb, 502, “Kasî was Count of the [Upper] March in the time of the Goths. When the Muslims conquered al-Andalus, he went to Syria and became a Muslim at the hands of al-Wâlid b. ‘Abd al-Malik, a bond of patronage of which he was very proud. This is the reason why the Banû Kasî always took the side of Mudar in their fights with Yemen. This Kasî gave birth to Fortún...”. The first really well-known member of this family was Mûsâ b. Fortûn, who vanquished Sa‘îd b. al-Husayn al-Anşârî who had rebelled against Hîshãm I in the region of Tortosa and Saragossa in 172/788-9. On his death, his widow remarried with Ítigo Arista, the first ruler of Pamplona. One can readily discern in the links arising from this union a major cause of the intermediary role played by Mûsà b. Mûsà, kinsman to the Banû Kasî, who gave himself out as the “third king of Spain” (see on him Cl. Sanchez Albornoz, La autenticâ ba-
talla de Clavijo, in CHE, ix (1948), 96-116, and idem, El territorio de España, in ibid., xli (1969), 5-49.

In ca. 226/840-1, Mús b. Músá, at that time at Arnedo (as governor?) was ill-treated by the wāli of Saragossa and Tudela (thus according to al-'Udhri's version) and rebelled, capturing the commander Harthbh b. Bazi'. An expedition sent by 'Abd al-Rahmān II forced him to submit, but he retained Arnedo, and in this peace agreement the amīr confirmed his half-brother Yannāb b. Yannikī (= Iltīqīz) in possession of his lands for a tribute of 700 dinārs per annum; this marks the birth de jure of the kingdom of Pamplona. The raids which followed with the aim of bringing him to submission were systematically directed against his Basque allies, showing the importance of their support. In 230/844 Músá marched down with his troops as far as Seville in order to repulse an invasion of the Northmen. In ca. 236/851 he captured Emenon, Count of Pardorg and the Duke of Gascony, in what seems to have been a "proto-Crusade" and in what was fierce fighting. This important victory explains to a considerable extent why the succession of Muhammad I in 238/852 marks a new stage in relations with the central government and why Músá became governor of Huescas, Tudela and Saragossa. In 238/856 he raided the region of Barcelona and one of his captains, a man named Al-Rahman, captured Tarrasa. It is at this time that he began to style himself "tertium regem in Spania." According to the Crónica de Alfonso III, between 234/857 and 245/859 the rebels in Toledo invoked Músá's help, and he sent to them his son Lubb as governor. But ca. 243/857 he was decisively defeated by Ordoñez I of Leon and lost the fortress of Albelda which he had just built; hence the amīr deposed him from the government of Saragossa and conquered Tarrasa. It is at this stage that the part of his journey de facto becomes of more interest. He was moreover resented by the poets themselves; they are without doubt the cause of the fragmentary nature of his work, which does not seem to have been originally composed under the same designation, although the funerary elegy (marthiya or rithkh) does not seem to have been included originally under the same designation. Certain ancient pieces, nevertheless describable as kaslda, may nevertheless be classified in this poetic genre. On the other hand, the poetic satire (hidīd), which, furthermore, does not go beyond insult in verse, is often called kaslda by the ancient poets, even though it does not present all the characteristics of the kaslda.

The classical kaslda, represented ideally by the pre-Islamic or at least archaic poems (see muallaqāt), collected and perhaps also given their form during the first centuries of Islam, has been defined by Ibn Kutayba in a famous passage many times translated and commented upon (see Gaudey-Demombays, "Introduction à l'art de la poésie en des poètes, Paris 1947, xvi-xviii, 13-15, 54-55), and then by the various literary critics who pronounced their judgments (particularly Ibn Raghi, see A. Trabulsi, La critique poétique des Arabes, Damascus 1955, passim). It contains a series of successive developments whose conventional character implies a tradition already immemorial. The kaslda, which numbers at least seven verses, but which generally comprises far more, consists essentially of three parts of variable length: (1) a prologue in which the poet sheds some tears over what was once the camping place of his beloved now far off (bukhā ṭalā' l-atlādī), then describes the charms of the latter, which he forebears to describe (the nasīb, see ghazal). (2) The poet's narration of his journey (raḥīl) to the person to whom the poem is addressed. This part of the kaslda is a pretext for descriptions of the places passed through, whilst Fortun b. Músá occupied Tudela. The amīr Muhammad sent several unsuccessful expeditions against him. The rebel was captured in 270/883 by Muhammad b. Lubb, who then took his place, but who had to sell the town in the following year to the Umayyads because he was unable to withstand the pressure from the Tujūfbids stirred up by the amīr. In exchange he received the governorship of Arnedo, Tarazona and Dar ḥaṣīrī and, later that of Tudela. He was killed whilst besieging Saragossa in 276/890; it has been suggested that he was conniving with 'Umar b. Hafsūn [q.v.], but al-'Udhri says nothing of this. His son Lubb b. Muhammad was governor of Tudela and Tarazona and died fighting the Navarrese in 294/907. The decay of the Banū Kasi henceforth became accentuated. Muhammad b. Lubb occupied Lérida, but was expelled by its inhabitants in 315/927, and in 317/929 he was murdered as a result of the ambitions of his brother-in-law Raymond, lord of Pallars.

Biography: In addition to the works cited above, see Ibl al-Kutiyya, Itīṣāh; Ibn 'Udhri, Bayān; Garcia Gomez and Lévi-Provençal, Textos inditios del "Muqtabis" de Ibn Hayyān sobre los orígenes del reino de Pamplona, in And., xix (1954), 281-303; Ibl b. al-Aḥṣār; Altürk, El reino de Zaragoza en el s. XI, Madrid 1956; M. Ocaña Jimenez, Banū Qasi, in Diccionario historia de España; and above all, al-'Udhri, Nuyṣā masāliḥ, partial tr. F. Granja, La Marca Superior en la obra de al-'Udhri, in Est. E.M. Aragón, viii (1960). (P. Chalméta) Kasida [see safía]. Kasida. 1. In Arabic. — Kasida collective kasida is the name given in Arabic to some poems of a certain length. It is derived from the root kasada, "to aim at," for the primitive kasida was intended to eulogize the tribe of the poet and denigrate the opposing tribes. Later it was concerned with the eulogy of a personality or a family from whom the poet was soliciting help or subsidies. Although the funerary elegy (marthiya or rithkh) does not seem to have been included originally under the same designation, the form of the kasida may nevertheless be classified in this poetic genre. On the other hand, the poetic satire (hidīd), which, furthermore, does not go beyond insult in verse, is often called kasida by the ancient poets, even though it does not present all the characteristics of the kasida.

The classical kasida, represented ideally by the pre-Islamic or at least archaic poems (see muallaqāt), collected and perhaps also given their form during the first centuries of Islam, has been defined by Ibn Kutayba in a famous passage many times translated and commented upon (see Gaudey-Demombays, "Introduction à l'art de la poésie en des poètes, Paris 1947, xvi-xviii, 13-15, 54-55), and then by the various literary critics who pronounced their judgments (particularly Ibn Raghi, see A. Trabulsi, La critique poétique des Arabes, Damascus 1955, passim). It contains a series of successive developments whose conventional character implies a tradition already immemorial. The kasida, which numbers at least seven verses, but which generally comprises far more, consists essentially of three parts of variable length: (1) a prologue in which the poet sheds some tears over what was once the camping place of his beloved now far off (bukhā 'talā' l-atlādī), then describes the charms of the latter, which he forebears to describe (the nasīb, see ghazal). (2) The poet's narration of his journey (raḥīl) to the person to whom the poem is addressed. This part of the kasida is a pretext for descriptions of the places passed through, whilst Fortun b. Músá occupied Tudela. The amīr Muhammad sent several unsuccessful expeditions against him. The rebel was captured in 270/883 by Muhammad b. Lubb, who then took his place, but who had to sell the town in the following year to the Umayyads because he was unable to withstand the pressure from the Tujūfbids stirred up by the amīr. In exchange he received the governorship of Arnedo, Tarazona and Dar ḥaṣīrī and, later that of Tudela. He was killed whilst besieging Saragossa in 276/890; it has been suggested that he was conniving with 'Umar b. Hafsūn [q.v.], but al-'Udhri says nothing of this. His son Lubb b. Muhammad was governor of Tudela and Tarazona and died fighting the Navarrese in 294/907. The decay of the Banū Kasi henceforth became accentuated. Muhammad b. Lubb occupied Lérida, but was expelled by its inhabitants in 315/927, and in 317/929 he was murdered as a result of the ambitions of his brother-in-law Raymond, lord of Pallars.

Biography: In addition to the works cited above, see Ibl al-Kutiyya, Itīṣāh; Ibn 'Udhri, Bayān; Garcia Gomez and Lévi-Provençal, Textos inditios del "Muqtabis" de Ibn Hayyān sobre los orígenes del reino de Pamplona, in And., xix (1954), 281-303; Ibl b. al-Aḥṣār; Altürk, El reino de Zaragoza en el s. XI, Madrid 1956; M. Ocaña Jimenez, Banū Qasi, in Diccionario historia de España; and above all, al-'Udhri, Nuyṣā masāliḥ, partial tr.
At the end of the 8th century, the classical kasida, while it continued its triumphant reign among poets with a classical tendency, on the other hand bursts forth among the "modern" poets and gives birth to a whole series of autonomous poetic genres, which are however already present in embryo form in the themes employed by the classical kasida; thus the nasih gives birth to the erotic-elegiac genre, directly associated with the Baccic genre; the description of the desert becomes description of nature and gardens; the description of the mount and the ride results in the poetry of war or hunting; etc.

All these genres are represented in independent pieces, to which the name of kasida continues often to be given, even though incorrectly. The long classical metres become shorter, and lend themselves better to musical adaptation.

The tripartite form of the kasida survived through the agency of the post-classical poets who did not always observe it strictly (see notably R. Blachère, Aboo t-Tayyib al-Motanabbī, Paris 1935, passim), until the modern period in its neo-classical form. The Bedouin or partially sedentarised societies—as in Mauritania—still cultivate it with delight.

The classical or neo-classical kasida can in certain cases be a vehicle for information of a historical nature. It is always advisable to use it in this respect only under the greatest need, and when the form is the one established by the exordium, which is always, in an almost exhaustive frame of mind by the exordium eulogy for a prince or protector, is the madh, the central portion of the kasida; thus the second distich (masrī*) of the kasida, which must supply the rhyme for the whole poem. The rhyme was repeated in each darb, the final part of the second hemistich of each distich, according to complex rules. No study has yet been made of these rules, but fortunately we do have P. N. Khanlari's basic study of Persian metre (Wazn-i ghir-i farš, Tehran 1969). Quantitatively, a poem cannot be a kasida unless the number of its distichs exceeds 15 and does not exceed 30. As a general rule, the poet must ensure that the meaning of each bāyān is independent of its neighbours; in Persian poetry, tadmīn [q.v.] is an error unless it is dictated by a rhetorical figure. The kasida comprises three parts; The first, the exordium, must command attention by touching the hearts of the listeners, an effect which is often achieved by a ghazal, a courtly song, either by describing the beauty of the beloved and the state of the lover (nasīb), or through the amorous poet making his listeners share in his condition (tashkīb); by the time of Shams-i Kays, these distinctions no longer existed, as he himself remarks (Mu'ādjam, 413), because of the wealth of the subjects treated in the exordium: mainly love, nature and wine. The kasida is first and foremost a poem composed for a princely festival, especially the spring festival (nawряд) and the autumn one (mihrīgān); it can also be a poem on the occasion of a funeral, a victory or an earthquake, the themes being adapted according to the circumstances. The madāh, eulogy for a prince or protector, is the central portion of the kasida; put into a sensitive frame of mind by the exordium (tashkīb), the listener will be carried away by the poet's skill; all that is required is a degree of rhythm in the eulogy, a strong effect of balāgha (a wealth of meaning in a few words) but an uncontentious one, and the transport of the soul out of its ordinary element (cf. Čahār makāla, 42).

After the eulogy comes the petition: the poet must reward him by the charm of his poem and the renown it engenders. Three basīs require particular care: the first (mašū'a), because it opens the one single piece, and signals all the areas of expression; the transitional basī (makhab) between tashkīb and madāh, which must
skilfully introduce the name of the person being eulogised; and the last bayt (mafrta'), which must be of a quality that redeems any mediocrities in the work above.

Among the variations in the Ḃasīda and its components with which have emerged through the ages two types of poem that appeared very early on are especially significant: the tardji', a Ḃasīda (cf. Mu'ādam, 400) written in a single metre composed of parts which each have their own rhyme and are separated by a distich (tardji' band) that often serves as a refrain; and the musammat, a Ḃasīda (cf. Tardjumān, 104.) made up of rhyming figures.

From the outset, the Ḃasīda was connected with courtly life in Iran, where it perpetuated poems recited in honour of the Šāhīn kings, and it had almost as many schools as there were important dynasties, at any rate until the arrival of the Mongols.

This latter precipitated a group of phenomena which, to some extent, were acutely aware that the poetic ethos was em-

ation to differing sectors of society. The Ḃasīda was in turn philosophic, mystic, meditative, then hymnologic under the Šāfsūids, and panegyric once more when it returned to the ancient style under the Ḧājjārs. In fact, it ceded to the ṭasal [q.v.] its privileged place in panegyric poetry. The Persian Ḃasīda, a homogenous phenomenon of a great culture, is a largely unexplored field open to the modern study of mediaeval poetry. Its authors were acutely aware that the poetic ethos was embodied in form (in the sense employed by P. Zumm- thor) of its later destiny, the Ḃasīda made a definitive mark on Persian poetry.


3. In Turkish. — It was under the influence of classical Iranian literature that the Muslim Turks adopted and developed the Ḃasīda, a verse form very different from their own traditional poetry. The Turkish Ḃasīda has the same rhyme scheme and metric patterns as the Ḃasīda in Arabic and Persian and at first appears very similar, though in fact, it is practically the same as the subject matter, the nasīb, and the organisation of the poems shows that there are considerable differences. At first the Turks tended to use the masnakwāt and quatrain (kīš'ā) which, to some extent, resembles their own older verse forms, rather than the Ḃasīda and ṭasal. The fact that the earliest verse works in Islamic Turkish literature, such as Kula'du bīlūq, ʿAtabat al-ḥākîm or Dīwan-i hikmat, are written in the masnakwāt and kīš'ā forms, supports this view.

Variation in the form and nature of the Ḃasīda were inevitably the reflection of the geographical, social, economic and cultural differences between the Arab, Iranian and Turkish worlds. It is easy to see that these variations in the first and best-known section of the Ḃasīda is the nasīb or the ṭasal. In this opening section, the Arabs usually chose love themes or descriptions of desert life, while the Persians and Turks tended to rhhapsodie on the beauties of their native lands or to describe geographical phenomena or social events.

Theoretically, a complete Turkish Ḃasīda should contain six sections: nasīb, ṭagḥazzul, gīrīzgāh, muḥaddiyah, ṣahāzul and ḍuw'. The nasīb is the Ḃasīda's longest section, and the subject which it describes often gives its name to the whole poem. A great variety of subjects is possible: religious fervour, love, nature, wise or moralising thoughts, buildings, war or peace, descriptions of towns, holy days and festivals, mourning or rejoicing. If a Ḃasīda has a section embracing subjects more often found in ṭasal, such as love or wine, then this section is called ṭagḥazzul. The passage marking the transition from the nasīb to the main part of the Ḃasīda consists of one or more couplets and is called gīrīzgāh or gīrīzgāh.

The couplets known as the eulogy or muḥaddiyah comprise the central part of the Ḃasīda, and it is here that the poet praises the person to whom the Ḃasīda is addressed. The recipients of Ḃasidas were usually men who held high office in the state, such as sultans, viziers or šaykh al-ḥālam or they might be palace officers, men of religion or men of wealth. This section is always fairly long, and usually comprises the real reason for writing the poem. In cases where the poet hopes to ingratiatate himself with influential people and receive in return favours or office, then the exaggerated praise usually sets reasonable bounds and detracts from the sincerity of the works. The ṣahāzul is the last but one section of the Ḃasīda where the poet praises himself; and in the final section, the ḍuw', the poet implores God for the prosperity of the Sultan or person to whom the Ḃasīda is addressed, and expresses his thanks for the completion of the work.

However, Turkish Ḃasidas do not invariably contain all these sections. Very often, one or more are left out, the most frequent omissions being the ṭagḥazzul, ṣahāzul and ḍuw' sections. For example, the greatest Turkish Ḃasīda writer, Neš'ī of Erzurum ([q.v.], 929/1522-1044/1635) wrote some Ḃasidas which contain all these sections, and so did Fīqānī of Trabzon ([q.v.], 920/1505-937/1532) and Nefīd of Damascus ([q.v.], 1052/1641-1070/1759). Nevertheless, the Ḃasidas of these and many other poets contain Ḃasidas with no ṭagḥazzul or ṣahāzul and some even with no nasīb. The subject and arrangement of the Turkish Ḃasīda has thus varied according to the poet, the era, the place, and the social conditions.

In Turkish, as in Arabic and Persian Ḃasidas, the first couplet is musārāt', that is, the first two hemistichs are rhymed. Thereafter, the second hemistich in each couplet rhymes with the first couplet. The first couplet is called the ma'ali and the one towards the end where the poet reveals his pen-name (makhlas) is called the ṭālī bāyi. Turkish also adopted the term bāyi al-ḥaṣīd for the couplet considered the finest in the poem. The usual length of a Turkish Ḃasīda is between 15 and 99 couplets, but in fact, some longer ones exist. Ḃasīdas may take their name from the general subject matter. One inspired by the unity and existence of God and describing His qualities and acts is called tawhīd, a supplication and prayer to God is called munādala. Na'ī is the name for a Ḃasīda praising and expressing devotion to the Prophet Muḥammad. A Ḃasīda in praise of a great man describing his virtues and achievements is called muḥaddiyah, while a satirical Ḃasīda attacking an enemy or someone of whom the poet disapproves is called ṣahāzul. It is also common in classical Turkish literature to name the Ḃasīda after the subject of the
KASIDA — KÄSIM

nasib. Hence basidas describing spring, summer, autumn or winter are called bahdriyya, sayfiyya (or tammâstiyya), khashiyya and qâtiyya respectively.

If the nasib describes a festival or New Year's Day, then the basida is called bayramiyya (or 'idiyya) or nauruziyya. A Râmadân basida is a Râmadânîyya; basidas commemorating a royal accession, circumcision or wedding, or a death are djuâliyya, sûriyya and marhûriyya. Basidas can also take their name from the letter of the rhyme or from the word repeated after the rhyme (radif). If, for example, the rhyme letter is 1âm, mim or râ, then the basida is a lâmiyya, mimiyya or râ'iyya. Similarly, if the basida has a radif such as 1ûn, sûbûl or kerem, then it would be named accordingly. Some basidas describe particular cities which then gave their name to the poem, such as the Edirne, Istanbul or Baghdad basidas. Others describe things, places or events such as appointments or removals from office, and hence one finds the Nîle basida, the Polish Campaign basida, basida on the return from the German Campaign, basida on the building of the mosque or pavilion, the haleûl-party basida, congratulatory basidas (tablîkiyya), appointment basidas (tawfiqiyya) or dismissal basidas (azliyya). Even after the Tanzimat, basidas continued to be written in accordance with modern thoughts and feelings, cf. Namlk Kemal's.presentation of a new thought in a basida form is a shahrâqûâb, a bitter and indignant commentary on the political, social, economic, cultural and spiritual degeneration of society in the Mughal Empire of his day. Ghalib (q.v.) who, however, wrote most of his basidas in Persian and only a few in Urdu, in general dispenses with the praise of his patron in a few lines, and devotes the bulk of the basida to the elaboration of his views on life and love and poetry. (R. RUSSELL)

KÂSIM, the name of several Turkish princes.

1. Lâmiî, Fi Rânt, Hayreti, Dhaût, Khâyûl, Fuqûl, Fwtr, Nevi and Bâkt. But the greatest Turkish basida writer, Neftî, lived in the following century. The other famous 11th/12th century poets—Wâysi, 'Azmî-zâde, Hâlet, 'Âtâ'I, Şâbîr, Nâfilli, Neghâtî and Nâbi—never reached the same standard as Neftî, but nevertheless show great maturity in technique and in handling of the subject matter. In the 12th/13th century, the basida partly manumitted the rhyming form and its old artistry, scope of subject matter and novelty of expression. Poets like Thâbitî, Naftâm, Sâmî, Sayyid Wâhbi and Hâmî-ylî Amlîî kept the form alive, but the basida was by this time becoming outmoded; it was a form tied to a single rhyme and could hardly help being repetitive. In these circumstances it could only die.

However, the generation following the Tanzîlmât (1228/1389) continued to express the new thought in this form. Shîhâsî (q.v.), 1239/1828-1871, Dîyâ Pasha (q.v.), 1240-1297/1824-1871, and Nâmîl Kêmâî all occasionally wrote basidas. Today the form has disappeared; modern social and cultural conditions are hardly favourable.


4. In Urd. — In Urdu poetry, it is the ghazal that takes pride of place, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and the basida is less important. It is the generally accepted view that only two Urdu poets, Sawdâ and Dhwâk (q.q.v.), composed basidas of a standard comparable with that achieved in Persian by Anwarf and Khâkhânîn (q.q.v.). Most Urdu basidas are, formally speaking, encomia addressed by the poet to his actual or intended patron; in this aspect, they are designed above all else to display both his virtuosity in the craft of poetry and the range of his learning. A more lasting value derives from the fact that the form also offers the poet scope for the extended expression of his feelings on any poetic theme that inspires him; and some basidas are definable as such only in terms of form (length and rhyme-scheme). Thus one of Sawdâ's most famous poems in basida form is a shahrâqûâb, a bitter and indignant commentary on the political, social, economic, cultural and spiritual degeneration of society in the Mughal Empire of his day. Ghalib (q.v.) who, however, wrote most of his basidas in Persian and only a few in Urdu, in general dispenses with the praise of his patron in a few lines, and devotes the bulk of the basida to the elaboration of his views on life and love and poetry. (R. RUSSELL)
Kasim, one of the nine sons of Sultan Ahmad I, born in 1022/1613 of the same mother as Sultans Murad IV and Ibrahim I, the famous Kösem Mahpeyker; he lived in confinement within the Palace till his death. Murad IV, afraid of the possibility of his brothers’ seizing power or being raised to the throne in a revolt, had them all killed successively, with the exception of Ibrahim; Kasim was executed on 2nd Shawwal 1047/17th February 1638.


(R. Mantran)

Al-Kasim, a district in northern Najd in the central part of the kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Lying west of the northern end of the long scarp of Tuwayq [q.v.], the district is intersected by the lower reaches of Wadi ‘L-Rumah [q.v.] shortly before that great watercourse loses itself in the eastern sands. In classical Arabic the term kasim (nom. unit.: kasima) is applied to sandy areas where the khada bush abounds. This description fits the district, which has large masses of sand to the north (‘Irk al-Maḥbūr), the east (Nafud al-Thawrāyät), and the south (Nafud al-Sīr), all of which curve round the contour of the Arabian Shield [see qalat al-‘Arab, ii]. The district also contains a smaller stretch of sand running contrary to the Shield’s contour, such as Nafud al-Ghamis, which trends from west to east.

The twin cities of Burayda (the present capital) and ‘Unayza [q.v.] form the heart of al-Kasim. Further up Wadi ‘L-Rumah is al-Rass, the main outpost of the district on the side towards al-Hijāz. North of al-Rass are al-Khubra, al-Bukayriyya with its neighbour al-Hilaliyya (both originally colonies of the tribe of Subay), al-Ṭuyīn, al-Ṭihāwāt and Kuṣayyab. Along the eastern edge of al-Kasim in a line from north to south are the oasis settlements of ‘Abbāl ‘L-Dūd, al-Tannūmā and ‘Ayn Ibn Fuhayd, which, along with other places, are known collectively as al-Asyāḇ (“the Plains”). This line is continued farther south by al-Shamaisiya, al-Awqashīyya (or al-Awqashīyya) and al-Mīdhābah.

Among the districts of Najd, al-Kasim stands out for the relative richness of its natural and human resources. When stockraising was one of the principal occupations of Arabia, al-Kasim was known abroad for the fine quality of the horses brought to market there by the nomad breeders. The Kuṣmān (pl. of Kasīm) are a talented and industrious people whose devotion and energetic proponents of Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab was Hudjaylan b. Hamad of the Anāṭir of Tamīm, governor of Burayda for Āl Su‘ūd from the late 12th/18th century until the invasion of Najd by Ibrāhīm Pasha of Egypt. On his way back home in 1234/1818 Ibrāhīm took Hudjaylan to Medina, where he died an octogenarian.

After the destruction of Āl Su‘ūd’s capital al-Dir‘iyya [q.v.] by Ibrāhīm’s forces, its place was taken by al-Riyyā [q.v.]. For nearly a century afterwards al-Kasim, as the key intermediate district, was the bone of contention between Āl Su‘ūd of al-Riyyā and the new rival power of Āl Raṣḥīd with its base at Hā’il in Djabal Shammār [q.v.] northwest of al-Kasim. Whichever side held al-Kasim tended to dominate the other side, and the tide of battle kept flowing back and forth. Internal dissensions in al-Kasim, particularly between Burayda and ‘Unayza as well as between contending aspirants to political control in both cities, prevented the district, despite its resources, from effectively resisting for long the hegemony of one or the other of the opposing houses. The issue between the two protagonists was finally decided in the early 14th/20th century with the defeat of Āl Raṣḥīd in al-Kasim by ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Āl Su‘ūd, even though Āl Raṣḥīd then had the support of regular Ottoman troops.

In recent times many of the Kuṣmān, above all the people of Burayda, have been among the most devout and energetic proponents of Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab’s unitarianism. Great progress in communications, education and other fields has, however, somewhat tempered the severity of the puritanical spirit of the Kuṣmān.


Kasim b. Aṣbagh, Muhammad b. Yūsuf b. Nāṣr b. ʿĀṭa, al-Bayyāni, Abu Muhammad, famous traditionist, philologist, historian and genealogist, maqād of the Spanish Umayyads,
who was born at Baena (Bayyana) in the hūra of Cordova in 244/859 or 247/862 and died in the capital in 340/952-3. At Cordova, he was the pupil of Muhammad b. Waqqād, al-Khuğ̣ṣāl and other noted scholars. In 274/887, he made an extended trip to the Orient, and in Mecca, Baghdad, Egypt, Kayrawān and other cities acquired an education in tradition, the Qur'ānic sciences, poetry and history from the various renowned specialists in these subjects; amongst his masters were a son of Ahmad b. Hanbal, Tabbāb, al-Mu’ārabd and Bakr b. Muhammad al-Ṭāhārī. He acquired also a knowledge of the numerous works of Ibn Kutayba. On his return to Spain, people flocked to him from all parts to hear his instruction; ʿAbd al-Rahmān III and his son al-Hakam were amongst his numerous pupils.

Kāsim b. Aṣbāgh introduced into Spain the works of Ibn Kutayba and other adab works, including the Ma’dārī, the Adab al-kutūb, which was highly regarded and much commented upon, as well as the Gharīb al-Kur’ān and Mughūl al-Kur’ān. For his part, he wrote a musawwarf based on the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd and following the plan (adwāb) of Ibn al-Dījarī’s al-Manātih, and an abridgment of this last called al-Mujaddān, dedicated to al-Hakam and containing 2,490 traditions divided into 6 volumes. He also wrote a fine work on genealogies, one on the honorific titles of the Umayyads, Kuraysh and hadiths dedicated to al-Hakam and called al-Mudjādah, both historical and geographical interest, was of court in Baghdad. However, we know comparatively little about his military career. On 15 Dīnāmād I 195/15 March 812 he commanded, on the orders of the caliph al-Amin, the right wing of the army led by ʿAll b. ʿAbd as-Samāhī against Tāhir b. al-Husayn; but this army dispersed without fighting when its commander was killed in an assassination incident. This participation clearly affected adversely Abū Dulaṭ’s interests. When al-Ma’mūn became caliph, he gave orders for measures against him; later, he reproached him for allowing panegyrics considered semi-blasphemous to be addressed to himself by the poet ʿAll b. Diwālā al-ʿAkwāwī [q.v.], who had offended this hostility had at least one further motive behind it; the ʿIṣla chief was a fervent partisan of the ʿAlīs. At a time when the régime was taking up an attitude well away from the Shiʿi ideology, it was obviously disturbed about the existence of a vassal firmly installed in a difficult region.

Abū Dulaṭ is then found as governor of Damascus for the Mu’taṣim. He led against Bābāk a contingent of volunteers raised from his dependents. He was part of the group of Arab chiefs whom the Iranian general al-ʿAṣfīn attempted to eliminate in order to gain an ascendency over the caliph and to retain power. On this occasion, the caliph’s attitude was extremely ambiguous; he gave his agreement to al-ʿAṣfīn, but at the same time warned Ibn ʿAbd al-Dīr orthodox about what was afoot, and the chief ʿIṣla, who was allied on the maternal side with the ʿIṣla, intervened in a decisive fashion.

Abū Dulaṭ has left behind the reputation of being a warm, intelligent and extremely generous personality. Himself a litterateur, musician and poet, he managed to form around himself an important circle of scholars and artists. From amongst his own poetry, there is extant only a small number of short poems written in a simple but powerful language, and in his faḥhr poems, in a style with elements of nobility and strong martial touches. He was also the author of works on hunting, military and political themes, none of which have survived.

Abū Dulaṭ was a much-sought after Maecenas, and he entrusted the presidency over his salon to his brother Maṣṣūl, himself a poet and impassioned propagandist of his magnificent personality. He brought into his elder brother’s circle ʿAll b. Diwālā and Bakr b. ʿAl-Nṭṭb, and he secured invitations for Abū Tammān and Diṭbīl and for such celeberated singers as Muḥārīq. Many other poets and artists of lesser fame also found a welcome in Diṭbīl and a congenial environment, e.g. Diṭayyīrān al-Muwawas, the powerful satirist Maṭṣr b. Badḥūn al-Iṣbahānī and Muhammad b. Wubayb. An examination of this list confirms the fact that membership of this circle revolved round either tribal alliances or adherence to Shiʿism. For these professional poets, the attraction of largesses was multiplied here by an assurance of finding with a powerful patron a mind occupied with common sympathies and feelings.

The historical sources record several descendants of Abū Dulaṭ. His grandson Bakr b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz tried to recover the principality of his forefathers, but was put to flight and then poisoned in 285/898 during the caliphate of al-Muṭaqīd; Abū ‘I-l-Kāsim Ḥibat Allāh b. ʿAll was vizier to the Imām al-Kāʾīm bi-amr Allāh; Ḥibat Allāh’s brother Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAll was chief ʿIṣla of Baghdad; and his son Abū Naṣr ʿAll b. Ḥibat Allāh, known under the name of Ibn Mākūlū, was a learned traditionist and author of highly-esteemed works.

Bibliography: Aghdānī, viii, 246-55, notice, xix, 289-91, xx, 153-5, and index; Sūl, Abhār
Kāsim (Gussem), 'Abd al-Karīm (1914-63), 'Irākī officer and dictator, born in Baghdad of poor parents. His father was a Sunni Arab and his mother possibly of Fayli (Shī'ī-Kurdish) descent; he himself claimed to be purely Arab. After working in the army in clandestine opposition to the Western-oriented monarchy, and perhaps half-conscious imitation of the Egyptian example. By dint of his shrewdness, his gift for dissimulation and, most important, his independent operational command (of a brigade group near Baghdad) he became chairman of the Free Officers Central Committee in about 1956—though he never reached anything like the position of 'Abd al-Nāṣir at a comparable stage of his career. An army movement ordered in support of Jordan gave Kāsim his chance. In the night of 13-14 July 1958 a brigade taken over by Kāsim's protégé 'Abd al-Salam 'Arif occupied the capital almost without opposition. King Faysal II, the crown prince 'Abd al-lāh and, a day later, Nūr al-Sā'id were killed and the republic proclaimed. Immediately afterwards a "Republican Decree" declared Kāsim commander-in-chief, prime minister and acting minister of defence, with 'Arif as his deputy and minister of the interior. The cabinet was mainly civilian and represented most shades of political opinion—proof of the initial popularity of the revolution. From then and until his murder Kāsim was virtual dictator, though a provisional constitutional promulgation was formulated within a fortnight of his rule. In the following confrontation Kāsim proved infinitely superior to the Communists in determination and tactical ability; moreover, in this contest he could count on solid army support. After the summer of 1959 the Communist situation deteriorated until they had been edged out of every position of consequence they had acquired during their advance, and they became a barely tolerated marginal group. Kāsim had first staved off the Communists' importunities by promising the legalization of political parties. The law was duly promulgated in January 1960, but after a brief spurt its effects petered out, and ultimately none remained legally active except a phantom pseudo-Communist Party tolerated by Kāsim. From about the spring of 1960 all genuine political life degenerated into disgruntled torpor, plotting or, in the case of the Kurds, open warfare (from September 1961). Externally, Kāsim upset the West by his disputes with the oil companies and by his inept attempt to seize Kuwayt after it had become independent (June 1961). Relations with the Soviet Union cooled because of Kāsim's treatment of the Communists, though not before he had virtually re-equipped the army with Soviet supplies. On the Arab front Kāsim never lived down his reputation as an enemy of the nationalist cause. Kāsim may be fairly described as post-Arab, for in the Agrarian Law of 30 September 1958 is a milestone in the social history of 'Irāk. He was one of the most secular-minded rulers in the Arab world in recent times. Though he occasionally paid lip-service to the excellence of Islam, religion really had no place in his scheme of things, and his usual adroitness deserted him when he dealt with men and matters of religion. The trend of his was well known. It is instructive that Kāsim's "atheism" caused in all probability deeper resentment among far wider circles than more narrowly defined issues of a more "modern" nature. His Personal Status Law (1959), applicable to Sunnīs and Shī'īs alike, was repealed after his overthrow. 


Kāsim Agha, b. 978/1570 architect-in-chief at the Ottoman court. His proper name was Meḥmed Kāsim but he was known as Kōdja. He was born in a village between Awlonya (Valona) and Berat (Beylegrad) in Albania (Ewliya Celebi, Seyyidhane, viii, 695). Collected through the derehna and brought to the Imperial Palace, he was acceptable in the courts of gardeners of the Imperial Household (kābās-bāghē gulāmī) where he grew up. During the great promotion (elbma) which took place at Mejemmed III's accession to the throne, he was made an apprentice with the court architects (Zarif Organ, Hassa mimarları, Istanbul 1939, 7). In 1032/1623 he was made court architect-in-chief (Sidrī, tīgneh, iv, 49). He became good friends with the Grand Vizier Kara Muṣṭafā Pașa, an Albanian like himself. On the latter's execution he was dismissed as court-architect-in-chief, an office until then conferred for life, and
was exiled to Gelibolu. However, through the solicitations of Şefi-asker Diindji, he returned to Istanbul and was again appointed architect-in-chief in Rabî‘ al-‘akhir 1055/June 1645 (Na‘im, Târirh, v, 35, 112, 167). In Dhu ‘l-‘Ka‘da 1061/November 1651 he was made kedişhüdâ of the Wâlide Sultan (Na‘im, Târirh, v, 51). However, at the instigation of the dâr al-se‘âde aghasî Sarl Süleyman Agha, he was dismissed in Muhammara 1062/December 1651-January 1652 and exiled to Cyprus, but through the intervention of the Wâlide Sultan enabled to return to Istanbul (Na‘im, Târirh, v, 179). After long service, he died in Istanbul at ca. one hundred years of age.

Kâsim Agha is known both as an artist and as a politician. As court architect-in-chief he built the Cinili Diâmî in Usküdar, the pavilion of the Bahâî in the Palace of Usküdar, the Sepetçî Kãsrî of the Palace of Topkapu and the Ye‘ni Wâlide Diâmî in Istanbul. His mastery as an architect is apparent from the Cinili Diâmî and from the ‘Atîk Wâlide Diâmî. The pavilion of the Bahâîs and the Sepetçî Kãsrî no longer exist. As a politician, Kâsim Agha was one of the influential personalities of the 12th/18th century, with activities falling in the reigns of Sultans İbrahim and Mehemmed IV. He established friendships with prominent people, such as Ka‘c Mustafa Paşa, the Seyyid al-‘alâm Bahâ‘ Efendi [q.v.], Celebi Kedkhuda Bey, Sarl Süleyman Agha, Diindji Husayn Efendi, Khâdijî Türkhan Wâlide, and his recommendations and suggestions influenced the affairs of state. With Kosem Wâlide Mâhpâykar Sultan and Melek Ahmed Paşa, he was on bad terms, and his meddling in political affairs caused his exile on two occasions. However, his most important function in public life, which history was to pave the way for Koprûlu Mehmed Paşa to become Grand Vizier and obtain power.

**Bibliography:** Na‘im, Târirh, Istanbul 1281, iv, 35, 52, 72, 112, 117; v, 169, 178, 250; vi, 218, 220. Ahmed Refik, ‘Alimler we san‘atkarlar, Istanbul 1924, 205. For Kâsim Agha’s Sepetçî Kãsrî, see TOEM, v. (İSME Parmarsıozîolu)

Kâsim Amin, Arab publicist and writer on social topics, was the precursor, in Egypt, of the emancipation of the Arab woman and upheld her right, as well as her corresponding obligations, to participate in the renaissance of the Arab-Islamic world which saw the light of day at the end of the 19th century.

He was born in Alexandria in 1863 (cf. Ahmed Bahâ‘ al-Din, preface to Ta‘hir al-mar‘â, ed. Dâr al-Ma‘ârif, Cairo 1970, 10; but the sources do not all agree as to the date and place of his birth), of an Egyptian mother and a father of Turkish origin; his family settled in Cairo, where Kâsim, after his secondary studies, registered at the Khedival school of law (Madrasat al-hukuk al-khâdiyya) and gained his “licensure” in 1881. After a period of instruction by a great lawyer of the Egyptian capital, he went to complete his studies of law in Paris where he continued to follow, with the passion and restlessness that had been his since the first signs of them appeared in Cairo, the new developments of the Egyptian political reality, i.e. the British intervention of 1882 which led to the occupation of Egypt by the English and the failure of the revolt of ‘Urâbî Paşa [q.v.].

Kâsim Amin made his first contribution to the programme of reform already partially put into practice in Egypt and the more advanced regions of the Arab-Islamic world, by renewing contacts already established in Cairo with the two greatest reformers of modern Islam, ‘Îmâm al-Dîn al-Afghânî and his disciple Muḥâmmad ’Abîd [q.v.]; these latter had taken refuge in Paris where they undertook the publication of the Arabic language weekly al-Urwa al-wulûd, financed by a secret Muslim society of the same name, of which only eighteen issues appeared and in which Kâsim Amin offered his collaboration.

Kâsim Amin died when still young, in 1908, without having had the satisfaction of seeing realised the reforms in favour of the Arab woman for which he had fought and which continued to be the object of the struggle in Irâk of the poet ‘Îmâm Siddîk al-Zâhâwî [q.v.], in Tunisia of al-Tâhir al-Haddâd [q.v.]; and in Egypt, notably, of the woman writer Malak Hifnî Nâsîf [q.v.], surnamed Bâbîyet al-Bâdiyya.

It was during his stay in Paris that, thanks to his contacts with a milieu always very clearly oriented towards socio-cultural progress, and perhaps equally, according to certain sources, under the influence of a sentimental attachment to a young Frenchwoman, his conviction matured that it was necessary to awaken public opinion, in Egypt and in the Arab world in general, to one of the most urgent social problems, that of raising the living conditions of women. It is evident that every attempt at reform in this field involved a persistent struggle against the partisans of the traditional current in the country, enemies of every change, even if it had a clearly social character, because they considered every innovation as an affront and outrage to tradition and the memory of the ancestors.

Kâsim Amin fully realised the difficulties of the task and worked towards the achievement of his objective by using not only the weapons of juridical dialectic with which his profession as a lawyer supplied him abundantly and effectively, but also an argument of an emotional and moral character to which he was predisposed by his own temperament; this action aimed at assuring women of a more dignified social situation by means of instruction, equality of rights with men, abolition of the wearing of the veil, and revision of the matrimonial law with its two scourges of polygamy and repudiation.

The resistance of Egyptian conservatism was so obstinate that it was only in ca. 1922 (about a quarter of a century after the appearance of Ta‘hir al-mar‘â, and solely in the upper classes) that the suppression of the veil was allowed and, in 1925, that the first secondary school for girls was created with a programme and subject matter similar to those of the equivalent for boys.

His patriotic feeling is to be found in his book Les Égyptiens, Paris 1894, that he wrote in French in reply to the Duc d’Harcourt who, in L’Égypte et les Égyptiens (1893) judged the country, and especially its social structure, from an exaggeratedly “colonialist” point-of-view, and he attempted to discredit him; but it is his two works, Ta‘hir al-mar‘â (“The emancipation of women”) and al-Mar‘a al-‘alâmîyya (“The new woman”), that he dedicated to the social advancement of the woman. The first provoked the reaction of the most ardent representatives of Egyptian conservatism, among them Ta‘hir Bar and ‘Abd al-Majîd Ghrîyân, who replied, the first in his Faṣl al-khâbîf fîl-mar‘a wa l-ḥidâb (Cairo n.d.) and the second with al-Dafî al-masîn (Cairo n.d.). The other work by which Kâsim Amin intended to answer precisely the attacks of these despisers of every innovation, gave rise to a reply not only from the same Ta‘hir Bar, in Târirîyat al-mar‘a wa l-ḥidâb, but also from the scholar and publicist Muḥâmmad Farîd
KASIM AMIN — KASIM-I ANWAR
Wadjdi in al-Mar'a al-muslima (Cairo 1319/1901). It is with these two works that Kasim Amin's name has been linked, as an apostle of the rights of the woman, far more than with the Parthian work which has been discussed above and with the collection of meditations and maxims entitled Ashab wa-na-ladidi wa-aabdi-sa wa-mawdi-sa, Cairo 1898 (reprinted 1913 under the title Kata'id al-fil-lladidi in an appendix to the edition of the Risala fi Madadati al-nu'as of Ibn Hazm [cf. Brockelmann, S III, 330-1].

Bibliography: Tahrib al-mar'a, Cairo 1899 (German trans. of O. Rescher, Stuttgart 1928); al-Mar'a al-djadda, Cairo 1901; the two works have been made the subject of numerous other editions whose prefaces supply biographical information on Kasim Amin and his social activities. It is hardly necessary to draw attention to the study of R. Faret, Zur Frauenfrage in der arabisch-islamischen Welt, Stuttgart 1934, for the historical account of the social situation of the woman in Islam, a fundamental work. For specific bibliographical information on most of the works mentioned in Brockelmann, S III, 330-1, see I. Y. Krackovskiy, Kasim Amin, sovetnik appellyutsipnogo suda. Novyi tezogenni. Perevod so 2-30 arabskogo izdaniya i predelovoi, in Mir Islama, i (1940), app., 119 ff.; ii (1942), 666, ix (1920), 237-42 passim; Husayn Haykal, Tardjim misriyya wa-qaribiyaa, Cairo 1929; Doria Ragai (Shafik), La femme et le droit religieux de l'Egypte contemporaine, Paris 1940; A. Khall, Kasim Amin, Cairo 1944; F. S. Fu'ad, Tayyib hayat al-mar'ahim Kasim Amin, Cairo n.d.; U. Rizzitano, La funzione della donna orientale, in Oriens 1945; Rome 1945. Some pages have been translated in Anouar Abdel-Malek, Anthologie Kasim Amin, in the Semi-Centennial Volume of the Middle Eastern Section of the American Oriental Society, Bloomington, Indiana 1969, 189-207.

KASIM-I ANWAR, the labab of Mu'in al-Din 'Ali Husayni Sarafi Tari'fi, mystic, poet and leading Safavid dâ'î. Born in 735/1335 in the Sarab district of Tabriz in Azerbaijan, Mu'in al-Din 'Ali became at an early age the disciple (murid) of the Shaykh of the Safavid tarikas Shadr al-Din Mousa [q.v.], who bestowed on him the labab of Kasim-i Anvar, "Distributor of Lights", as the result of a vision experienced by his disciple. Mu'in al-Din 'Ali saw himself standing in the Masjid-i Dami over the Takiya, holding in his hand a great candle from which the members of the congregation lit their own candles, the light of which illuminated the whole mosque (a fuller, and variant, version of the vision is contained in the Madjasil al-Usbâkh; see Nafsi, cited in bibliography, 23 ff.). Shadr al-Din Mousa, who had recognized at an early stage the peculiar intensity of the devotional powers of Kasim-I Anvar, interpreted this vision to mean that his disciple was destined to distribute among the faithful the divine light with which he was endowed.

After the completion of his training at Ardabil, Kasim-I Anvar received from the hands of Shaykh Shadr al-Din Mousa the khirka which entitled him to proselytize and give spiritual guidance (irshi'da). At some later stage, Kasim-I Anvar is said, by Dami (q.v.) and sources based on Dami, to have become the disciple of a certain Shadr al-Din 'Ali Yamin (for reasons for doubting the authenticity of this tradition, see the article of Savory cited in the bibliography). After a period of missionary activity in Gilan, Kasim-I Anvar went to Khorasân. Opposition from the ulama forced him to move from Nishapur to Harat, which became his base of operations for half a century. According to his own statement, Kasim-I Anvar was established at Harat by 779/1377-8, and he remained there until his expulsion from the city in 830/1426-7.

In that year, Kasim-I Anvar was implicated in the attempted assassination of the Timurid ruler, Shahrub [q.v.], by a Hurufi [see HURUFIYYA] named Ahmad the Lur. Kasim-I Anvar was not, himself, a member of the heretical Hurufi sect. In the present writer's view, his alleged complicity in the assassination plot was a convenient excuse for the Timurid political and religious authorities to rid themselves of a man whose missionary activities had become a source of embarrassment to them. The sources alternatively allege that Kasim-I Anvar was expelled from Harat because (a) Mirzâ Eysununâr b. Shahrub [see BAYSONJUR, CHYVAN AL-DIN] bore him a personal grudge; (b) he did not show proper respect toward Shahrub and his sons; (c) the majority of the young men of Harat had become his disciples, and his popularity with these elements constituted a source of possible mischief. (A) and (b) may be discredited; (c) more probably goes to the heart of the matter (the charge of moral turpitude made against Kasim-I Anvar in connection with his association with these young men seems to have been the sole reason for his expulsion). The Timurid authorities took action against Kasim-I Anvar because his activities as a dâ'î had been too successful; he had become too popular with admittedly heterodox elements, and Shahrub was fearful of a possible revolt. There is no doubt that Kasim-I Anvar was closely associated at Harat with followers of the Khalwats [q.v.] and Shahrubs, together with the Nimât Allâhs, Nakshbandis [q.v.] and other Sufi orders, played an important part (not yet adequately investigated) in preparing the ground for the Safawid revolution. There is evidence that Kasim-I Anvar's success as a proselytizer was not confined to the young men of Harat. Many notables of the city, and sons of Timurid amirs, are also said to have become his disciples; this, of course, would have given Shahrub additional grounds for anxiety.

After his expulsion from Harat, Kasim-I Anvar resided at the court of Shahrub's son, Ulugh Beg, at Samarkand. Some years later, he returned to Khurasân, and died at Kharjard in RabîI 837/1433. Kasim-I Anvar was the author of a number of mystical treatises, and of a diwan comprising gha'aab, rubâ'is, several mathnawis, and occasional pieces. Some of his poems are in Turkî, and others in the local dialect of Gilân. E. G. Browne claimed to have found "unmistakable" traces of Hurufi influence in one of his poems, but such a connection cannot be proved on the evidence of his poems. The language of these is rather the conventional stock-in-trade of Sûfis, and the style reminds one of Dami or Rûmî [q.v.]. Like Rûmî, he was more concerned with meaning than with elegance. Kasim-I Anvar normally used the tâlkhallus (nom-de-plume) Kâsim or Kasmî, but sometimes also the full form of his labab, Kasim-I Anvar.

Bibliography: For further details, and a fuller discussion of the problems involved, see R. M. Savory, A 15th-century Safawid propagandist at Harat, in the Semi-Centennial Volume of the Middle Western Branch of the American Oriental Society, Bloomington, Indiana 1969, 189-197. For a full bibliography of the Persian sources, and a valuable analysis of the historical and literary evidence, see
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Sa'd Nafisi's introduction to his edition of the collected poems (Kulliyatı) of Kāsim-ı Anwār, translated by S. H. Rizvi, in I. S. Terven (ed.) Kāsim-ı Anwar: Poems of the Early Ottoman Court, no. 370, p. 546. (C. ORHONLU)

KĀSIM PAŠA, DJAZARI, Ottoman officer and poet of the 9th/15th century; he belonged to a family who had come from Egypt and entered Ottoman service. His father was Mêmed Djazari, who had worked in the imperial Diwān and had become nihândî in 890/1481, attained the rank of vizier, holding the post for about three years; he also served for a time in Salonika. He died in 888/1482, and was buried beside the medrese which he had built near the tomb of Emir Sultan in Bursa.

Djazari Kāsim Pasha achieved fame in his own capacity as a poet, using the makâhîî Sâfî. Although it is known that his poems were collected in a diwan, no manuscript has yet come to light; however, an incomplete text of his versified discourses exists in the Ali Emiri legal archives in Istanbul (ms summa esoseri, no. 1000/1). Āṣhîk Celebi [g.20] states that he was influenced by Ahmed Pasha [g.6] and that he wrote competent ghâsals (ed. G. M. Meredith-Owens, London 1971, p. 214 a).

He established several pious foundations: a mosque in the Çagâhâlghu quarter of Istanbul (İstanbul nubâsîars tâhirî defterî, 935/1529 tarihî, ed. O. L. Barkan and E. H. Ayverdi, Istanbul, 1970, p. 52); a medrese and bath in the Emir Sultan quarter of Bursa (Güldeste, 66); a mosque at Kefe (Başbakanlık Arşiv Genel Müdürlûüğü, Kefe tahrir defteri, no. 370). Bibliography: Bibliographical works have confused three Kāsim Pashas: Djazari, Ewliya, and Kōlja (for whom see 'Āṭâ', 104); thus Mêmed Thüreyya makes Djazari Kāsim live until 950 (SO, i, 47); cf. also Ayverdi, Badâkâ, i, 29, 80, 260). According to Sehil, 24, Djazari Kāsim died and was buried in Salonika.

Additional information may be found in the following works: Āṣhîk-i bâsîha, ed. ʿÂlî, Istanbul 1332, 192, 193; Nêşri, ed. Taeschner, i, 231; Sa'd al-Dîn, Tâdi al-ławâdîrî, Istanbul 1279, i, 216; Kōlja Huşayn, Bâdâyî al-nubâsî, ed. J. S. Terveníkova, Moscow 1965, ii, fol. 414 a; Ewliya Celebi, Seyyât-i nâme, i, 335, 340, ii, 17; M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, XV-XVI. aslîlarnda Edirne ve Paşa livâsî, Istanbul 1935, 153, 433, 434; Koyunluoğlu Memduh Turgut, İstânbul Taarihî Tarihî, Bursa 1935, 155, 164, 196. (C. ORHONLU)

KĀSIM PAŞA, Ewliyâ, Ottoman officer and poet of the second half of the 9th/15th century. It is conjectured that he was the son of Todor Muzak, the great Albanian lord (Āṣhîk-i bâsîha, ed. ʿÂlî, Istanbul 1332, 129; Nêşri, ed. Taeschner, i, 230; H. Inalcik, Fatih devri ittice tarihîler ve reşitâlar, Ankara 1954, 162). It is not known at what date he was taken by the derşîrîme to be brought up in Ottoman service; however, as he came to prominence during the reign of Mehmed II, this probably occurred towards the end of Mehmed I's reign. The most important post he had was that of beylerbeşî of Rûmelî, and it is known that he spent a part of his life at Edirne. In 883/1478, he caused to be built a domed mosque, a hospice (şâmârâq and a double hammâm near the district of Selâhîne on the Tundja river (Hîbrick).


KASIM PASHA, Ewliya, Ottoman officer and poet of the second half of the 9th/15th century. It is conjectured that he was the son of Todor Muzak, the great Albanian lord (Āṣhîk-i bâsîha, ed. ʿÂlî, Istanbul 1332, 129; Nêşri, ed. Taeschner, i, 230; H. Inalcik, Fatih devri ittice tarihîler ve reşitâlar, Ankara 1954, 162). It is not known at what date he was taken by the derşîrîme to be brought up in Ottoman service; however, as he came to prominence during the reign of Mehmed II, this probably occurred towards the end of Mehmed I's reign. The most important post he had was that of beylerbeşî of Rûmelî, and it is known that he spent a part of his life at Edirne. In 883/1478, he caused to be built a domed mosque, a hospice (şâmârâq and a double hammâm near the district of Selâhîne on the Tundja river (Hîbrick).


KĀSIM PASHA, Ewliyâ, Ottoman officer and poet of the second half of the 9th/15th century. It is conjectured that he was the son of Todor Muzak, the great Albanian lord (Āṣhîk-i bâsîha, ed. ʿÂlî, Istanbul 1332, 129; Nêşri, ed. Taeschner, i, 230; H. Inalcik, Fatih devri ittice tarihîler ve reşitâlar, Ankara 1954, 162). It is not known at what date he was taken by the derşîrîme to be brought up in Ottoman service; however, as he came to prominence during the reign of Mehmed II, this probably occurred towards the end of Mehmed I's reign. The most important post he had was that of beylerbeşî of Rûmelî, and it is known that he spent a part of his life at Edirne. In 883/1478, he caused to be built a domed mosque, a hospice (şâmârâq and a double hammâm near the district of Selâhîne on the Tundja river (Hîbrick).
resting on accumulated wealth and an alliance with the older indigenous faction of Īrām, just as its
opponent, the Dhu ’l-Fākārīyya (q.v.), allied with
the rival faction of Sa’d. Hostility between the two
groups manifested itself in 1057/1647, when the Otto-
man viceroy combined with the two leaders of the
Kāsimiyya, Kānsawh Bey and Māmāy Bey, to over-
throw the powerful amīr al-ḥādīdī Rīdwan Bey al-
Fākārī. A counterboup by the Dhu ’l-Fākārīyya was,
however, successful, and in the resulting proscrition of
the Kāsimiyya, Kānsawh and Māmāy were put
to death. After Rīdwan’s death in 1066/1656, the fondness of the Kāsimiyya gradually revived under
its leader, Ahmād Bey the Bosniak. In a revolt of the
Dhu ’l-Fākārīyya in 1071/1660, Ahmād Bey gave
strong support to the viceroy Gūrğū Muṣṭafā Pasha,
and was personally responsible for the killing of
three boys who had received a safeconduct. His own
assassination was procured by the next viceroy (1072/
1662). Thereafter until the early 12th/18th century,
factional hostility between Kāsimiyya and Dhu
’l-Fākārīyya was unimportant. In 1123/1711 a clash
between rival corps of the Ottoman garrison in Cairo,
the Janissaries and Āzāb (’Āzābān), involved the Mamlūk factions, the Kāsimiyya supporting the
Āzābs. By their victory in this insurrection they re-
established their ascendancy in Egypt, but at the
same time reopened the fatal vendetta with the Dhu
’l-Fākārīyya. Ismā’īl Bey b. Īwāz Bāy, the head of the Kāsimiyya, as the holder of supremacy (al-rī’āsā)
was entitled “commander of Cairo” (amīr Misr), a
term synonymous with the better known shaykh al-
balād. Conflicts between the adherents of Ismā’īl, the
Īwāzīyya, and a rival Kāsimi household, the Shāhā-
biyya, resulted in the assassination of Ismā’īl in 1161/1774, and gave the Dhu ’l-Fākārīyya an op-
tportunity to gain the supremacy. In 1142/1730 they
finally broke the power of the Kāsimiyya. Surviving
members of the faction took service under Shāykh
Humān of Hawwārā (q.v.), who at this period
dominated Upper Egypt, and they became assim-
lated to his tribesmen. The last Kāsimi notable,
Sālīh Bāy, played a part of some importance in the
relations between Humān and the Kāsimi Bey (q.v.), who procured his assassination in 1182/1768.


Kāsimov, the chief town of a district of the
governorate of the province of Ryazan (USSR), which was the capital of a khanate whose sovereigns bore in Russian
the title of “tsar” or “tsarevitch” and whose exist-
cence is a historical curiosity.

The khanate of Kāsimov was founded between 850/1442 and 860/1452 by Kāsim, the son of Kān Ulugh Muḥammad of Kāzān, who was driven from his īslām by his brother Māmāy in 850/
1442, but escaped to the service of Grand Prince Vasili II, who conceded to him the small town of Gorodets (or Gorodok Meshčenskiy), which later received the name of
Kāsimov (in Tatar, Kān Karmān) in his honour.

It was a small principality—just as a feudal, Tatar
vassal of Moscow, whose īslām nominated or affirmed
the īslām; their position vis-à-vis Moscow was com-
parable to that of the īslāms of the Crimea vis-à-vis
their overlords, the Ottoman paşāshahs, but their
autonomy was more limited. The internal affairs of
the khanate were in fact administered by a Russian
vōyod named by the Polu’skiy Prikaz. The īslāms
received a salary from Moscow and collected the
yaqūt of the local population, composed mostly of
Finns, Mordvins and Meshčerans and some Russian
colonists; the Muslim Tatars formed only a minority.
Kāsim remained a Muslim, but served the grand
prince of Moscow faithfully; this was the first time
that a Īzgīzīdī had become his vassal. After this,
and almost throughout its entire history, Kāsimov
served as a place of refuge for the various Īzgīzīdī princes driven from their īslāms. They were used by
the Russians against their cousins and co-religionists
of the Golden Horde and of Kāzān.

In 872-3/1468, after the death of Maḥmūdī in
Kāzān, Kāsim, at the head of a Muscovite army,
tried to seize power in Kāzān, but failed. His son
Dāniyār succeeded him in 873/1469 and reigned until
908/1406. He took part, on the side of the Muscovites,
in the war against Abū-l-Ṭaymī of the Golden Horde,
and almost throughout its entire history, Kasimov
remained a Muslim, but served the grand prince of Moscow, whom he served
devotedly. After his death, the throne of Kāsimov
was occupied for some time by his sons, Sa’dallāh
and Dijānī. Ca. 918/1512, the īslāms were replaced by
another Īzgīzīdī branch. The first ruler was Shaykh
Awliyār (grandson of Kān Kücük Muḥammad,
descended from Orda, brother of Batu and the first
khan of the “White” (or “Blue”) Horde and cousin
of Kān Sayyid Abū-l-Ṭaymī). In 922-3/1516-17, his young brother, Shāh ‘All (the “Shigaley” of Russian
sources), succeeded him and remained intermittently
the khan of Kāsimov until his death on 10 Shawwal
974/21 April 1567.

The period between 927/1521 and 959/1552 is that
of the struggle between Moscow and the Crimea for
the possession of the īslām of Kāzān. In this conflict,
Shāh ‘All played a very active role. Twice he was
placed by the Russians on the throne of Kāzān—
between 925/1519 and 927/1521, then again in 931/
1546. While he was governing Kāzān, he was replaced
at Kāsimov by his brother Dīnāb-Īl— who also was
khan of Kāzān between 938/1532 and 941/1533 (he died in a popular uprising).

Shāh ‘Ali, who died childless, had as a successor
a distant cousin, Sāyín Bułāt, the great-grandson
of Kān Abū-l-Ṭaymī of the Golden Horde, who was
converted to Orthodox Christianity in 980/1573, took
the name of Simeon Bekbulatić and reigned in Kāsimov
until almost 991/1583. In 982/1574, Ivan the Terrible
named him in his place “tsar and grand prince of all
the Russians”. The next two years, during which
Russia was ruled by a Īzgīzīdī prince was a period
unique in Russian history.

Simeon Bekbulatić died in 1616; but between
981/1573 and 991/1583, he had been replaced in
Kāsimov by Muṣṭafā ‘All, another Īzgīzīdī prince,
who was also descended from Kān Abū-l-Ṭaymī of
the Golden Horde. During the period of troubles
the throne of Kāsimov was occupied by other Īzgīzīdīs:
at first by a member of the dynasty of the īslāms of
Kirgiz Kazak, Uraz Muhammad, who took part in the civil war and was killed in 1610, and then, under the Romanovs, by the descendants of Kutum, the last khan of Siberia. His grandson Arslan is mentioned as "tsar" of Kasimov in 1623-1614; the son of the latter, Sayyid Buhân, seems to have ascended the throne towards 1036/1627. This prince was baptized under the name of Vassili and ruled until his death, which occurred suddenly in 1678. He was the last sovereign of Kasimov. For a few years after his death until 1032/1628, his mother, Faïman Sultan, who apparently remained a Muslim, was still mentioned as "princes" of Kasimov. The town was then annexed administratively to the crown domains.


KASUYAN (Djabal), mountain which forms part of the Anti-Lebanon and rises to the north-west of Damascus [see Dimashq]. Two tributaries of the Barada [q.v.], the Nahr Thawra and the Nahr Yazdû, up until the middle of the 20th century used to irrigate the orchards of Nayarab, which rose in tiers on the southern flank of this mountain.

This mountain has a sacred character because God is said to have spoken to it and also due to ancient traditions which relate to some grottoes opening in the midst of the slope. Three of them, Musallât al-Khîrî, Maghârat al-Djawâ and Maghârat al-Dam, which marks the place where the blood of Hâbil was shed and where people used to come and pray for rain, today constitute a modern oratory known by the name of Kubbat al-Arâhân in memory of forty prophets—seventy according to certain traditions—who died of hunger there; a legend speaks of Yahyâ b. Zakariyâ having allegedly stayed there forty years with his mother. Slightly to the south-west of this oratory, is situated the Grotto of Adam, also called Kahf Pjibrîl or al-Kahf, an oratory dedicated to irrigate the orchards of Nayrab, which rose in tiers on the southern flank of this mountain. Three of them, Musallât al-Khîrî, Maghârat al-Djawâ and Maghârat al-Dam, which marks the place where the blood of Hâbil was shed and where people used to come and pray for rain, today constitute a modern oratory known by the name of Kubbat al-Arâhân in memory of forty prophets—seventy according to certain traditions—who died of hunger there; a legend speaks of Yahyâ b. Zakariyâ having allegedly stayed there forty years with his mother. Slightly to the south-west of this oratory, is situated the Grotto of Adam, also called Kahf Pjibrîl or al-Kahf, an oratory dedicated to the Asfcab al-Kahf, the Seven Sleepers of Sura of Sura, to develop, while a radio-television station functions at the summit of the mountain.


KASKAR, the name of a town in 'Irāk. When al-Hâdjdâdî [q.v.], the governor of 'Irāk appointed by the caliph 'Abd al-Malik had put down the rebellion there, he began in 83-6/702-5 to build a new town which was called Wâsi't ("centre") because it was midway between the two older Arab capitals of this province, al-Kūfa in the north and al-Baṣra in the south. For the site of the town he chose the vicinity of Kaskar, on the Tigris, which had played a not unimportant part in the Sasanian period. The new Muslim town was built on the east bank of the Tigris, while Kaskar lay opposite it on the west side; a bridge of boats linked the two halves of the city. Neither Wâsi't nor Kaskar exist at the present day, and until modern times their exact situation was uncertain as the Tigris bed has changed its course, bypassing the sites and rendering them obsolete by the 9th/14th century. The exact relationship between Kaskar and Wâsi't is not clear. Recent excavations at Wâsi't indicate the administrative importance of the city as the centre of Unayyad rule (F. Safar, The Sixth Season's Excavations, Cairo 1945). The remarkable similarity of the administrative buildings to those of the Round City at Baghdad (O. Grabar, Al-Mushatta, Baghdad, and Wâsi't, in The World of Islam, Studies in Honor of Phillip K. Hitti, London 1959, 98-108) raises the question of whether Kaskar was originally intended as the administrative centre for the general populace as distinct from Wâsi't, which would then have housed the administration and perhaps military garrison. A similar situation apparently prevailed at al-Rakka-al-Rafîka (Yâkût, Mu'âjavam, ii, 734). In the course of time, Kaskar was subsumed by the more famous site. For further information on Wâsi't, see the article.

Kaskar probably dates back to the Assyrian period. A Babylonian town, Ka-as-ka-ri, appears to be mentioned in a fragment of an inscription probably of the time of Assur-baniapal in the British Museum (18 82:3-2:128; see Besold, Catalogue, 1824; cf. Streck, Assurbanipal, Leipzig 1916, pp. lxxviii, 790). The place is perhaps also mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud (Yoma, fol. 104a, where Bashk should probably be amended to Kaškar; see Marguart, Erânsârâh, Abh. G. W. Götte, New Series, i,2a, Berlin 1907, 164). In any case Kaskar, called Kaškar in Syria and Christian Arabic sources, is one of the oldest Christian towns in Babylonia. It frequently appears in the ecclesiastical history of this region. The episcopal diocese of this name was considered second in importance within the Nestorian church. Its occupant was the right arm of the patriarch of Seleucia-Ctesiphon [see Al-Madâ'in] and his representative when the official residence, Ta'rikh Dimashq, was vacated.

Among the signatories to the acts of the Syriac councils from the period 410-790 were bishops of
Kaskar (Guidi in ZDMG, xliii, 411, and Chabot in Notices et extraits, xxxvii (Paris 1902), 679). According to the Syriac “Chronicle of Arbela” there was a bishop in Kaskar as early as the first half of the 3rd century A.D. The Christian Arabic “Chronicle of Se’ert” also mentions an occupant of the episcopal seat there of the period before 410 A.D. On the bishopric of Kaskar and for a list of its occupants, see J. Labourt, Le Christianisme dans l’empire Persé sous la Dynastie Sassanide, Paris 1904, passim (see the index s.v.); Sachau, Die Chronik von Arbela (= Abb. Pr. Ak. Wiss., 1915, no. 6), 21; Sachau, Zur Ausbreitung des Christentum in Asien (= Abb. Pr. Ak. Wiss., 1910, no. 1), 30-1.

The town of Kaskar, like the bishopric which bore its name, was the home of many founders of monasteries, as may be seen from the work compiled in the 8th century by Yeshu’denab, entitled K’tubah al-Nakhâpatâ (ed. Chabot in Mélanges, et d’histoire de l’École Française de Rome, xvi (Paris 1896), 225 f.); the Great Abraham (d. 588) was especially famous (see Yeshu’denab, no. 14; Labourt, op. cit., 315; A. Baumstark, Gesch. der syrisch. Literatur, Bonn 1922, 130). One of the most influential personalities at the court of the Sasanian King Khusrav II Parvēz (590-628) was Abâd of Kaskar; on him see Baumstark, op. cit., 123. On other Syriac writers who belonged to Kaskar (‘Ab’dshù, Grîghî, Elijû) see Baumstark, op. cit., 30, 128, 420. For the Syriac sources on Kaskar, see also the indices in Wright, Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, London 1870, and idem, Cat. of the Syriac manuscripts in Cambridge, Cambridge 1901, 128, also in Sachau, Katalog der syrisch. Handschr. in Berlin, Berlin 1909, 92.

In the Arscadic period, there seems to have been a little kingdom of Kaskar, which was destroyed by the first Sasanian, Ardashîr I; cf. Noldeke, Gesch. der Arab. und Perser zur Zeit der Sasaniden, Cal., Mission scientifique en Perse, i, Paris 1894, passim (see the index s.v.); Sachau, Isl., xiv (1924), 17 f. The bishopric of Kaskar must have coincided pretty much with the Sasanian district of the same name; cf. the map in Sachau, Die Chronik von Arbela, 16.

Kaskar is mentioned as one of the 72 administrative districts; see Streck, (see Sachau, Die Chronik von Arbela, 16.

Kaskar is also given as the name of the capital of Daylam, which was usually called Dûlûb; cf. G. Le Strange, The Lands of the East. Cal., 174; de Morgan, Mission scientifique en Perse, i, Paris 1894, 276.


(M. Streck—J. Lassner)

KAYSAR, from the root KSR, with the sense in Arabic of “to break”, as a mathematical term means “fraction”. Ibn al-Banna’ (q.r.); in his Talkhs̲s al-’as̲b̲āb gives the following definition: “A fraction is the relationship between two numbers when it is a part or several parts. The relationship between the part and the number which bears the same name is called a fraction”. The part or the numerator is called bas; the number with which it is in relationship (asmâl) is called imâm (Talkhs̲s, Kâsh al-’as̲b̲āb). Bahâ al-Dîn al-‘Amîlî (9th/10th century) uses the terms ܨܪܐ and ܡܡܐ, as do al-Kâshî (ms. Tunis 2039, f. 7a) and the Revue de l’Académie du Caire, 1937; mushk̲ār̲d̲î or mukhr̲ād̲î is also found (the Ikhwan al-Ṣaḥâba), connecting the idea of the fraction to that of division (kasr). The term being specialised to translate “quotient”. The idea of the part, by definition, is not as the whole, led the Arab academics to consider the fraction as being, by its very essence, inferior to the idea of the unit; at the base of this is the concrete idea of dividing up a given amount. Ibn al-Banna’ is very explicit here: “The addition of fractions stops when one arrives at a fraction whose numerator is less by a unit to its denominator”. Al-Kalâsâdî says in a precise fashion that “One does not say four fourths or five fifths” (Kashf al-’as̲b̲âr, ms. Tunis 3292, f. 39b).

For denoting fractions whose denominator lies between 3 and 10, the paradigm fuṭ’ or fu’dî is used; for “half” or “equal part”, however, nisf is used. This category of fractions is called musnâd “pronounceable”: or nishîd “open”, cf. al-Kâshî, Misbâh al-hisâb, ms. Tunis 1901, ff. 7b-7c. The rest are called asamm “deal” they are expressed by using the expression gjûz min ("a part of ...", “a part from amongst ...”).

For the notation of fractions, it was al-Kalâsâdî who first used the symbols still in use today, sc. writing the numerator above the denominator and separating the two terms by a horizontal line (Kashf al-’as̲b̲âr, f. 17b). Since this notation was new, al-Kalâsâdî seems to stress its explanation, using the expressions ’alā ra’îsî ("placed above it") and mā fawk al-khâṣî ("that which is above the line"); see the commentary on the Talkhs̲s, ms. Tunis 307R, f. 112b.

From the time of Ibn al-Banna’ onwards, the Arabic mathematicians distinguish five kinds of fraction: (1) simple or ordinary fractions (mufrad); (2) fraction of relationship (muntassîb), as in this example from al-Kalâsâdî 3.1.4.5. which is written in modern notation: 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 7 \cdot 9.

\[
\begin{align*}
& 1 + \frac{3}{4} \\
& 4 + \frac{3}{5} \\
& 7 + \frac{480}{9} \\
& 9 \times 7 \times 3 \times 4 \times 3 \\
& = 756
\end{align*}
\]

(3) disjunct fractions (mukhlâfîf), which do not have the same denominator. (4) subdivided fractions (musha’dâd), or fractions of fractions, noted by al-Kalâsâdî 6 \frac{1}{4} or 6 \times 4 \times 1 = 24 \frac{7533}{33}, the numbers making up the numerator and denominator being separated, but without using any dots (5) excepted fractions (mistaṭnîhî), separated but without using any sign.

In geometry, the idea of the fraction is usually conveyed not by kasr, but by the terms nisba "relationship" or tasmiya "denomination". However, words derived from the root KSR are used to translate the concept of area: kassara, tasbîr “area”, mukhassar “square of a unit of linear measure” (al-
The Umayyad castle in the Syrian desert at 60 km. SSW of Palmyra, a 'birkah', was an important water-distributing system. The traces of the watch-tower's house can still be seen. Upstream, on a lateral drain, are the ruins of a water-mill. Close to the 'birkah' rise the vestiges of an almost square construction, about 55 m. long, none of its angles is a right angle. This is the 'khân al-mîh', "whose walls had been of mud brick resting on a base of well cut stone." On the eastern side was a large gateway which has now been removed to the National Museum at Damascus. Its lintel carried an inscription dated Raqjâb 109/Sept.-Nov. 727. The entrance was framed by two wings which stood out 18 m. from the façade along the northern and southern walls. In the southern wing was a mosque, as can be concluded from a still-existing mîhrāb with small columns; the northern wing contains a drinking-trough. Inside there is a central court-yard 22.50 by 23 m., surrounded by a portico 2.50 m. deep. On the northern, western and southern sides are three rooms 45 m. long and 4.80 m. wide, possibly stables or cattle sheds. On the eastern side there are six rooms of various size and a vestibule.

Lying 30 m. north of the palace there was a bath of classical type, dating from the Roman-Byzantine period. It had four cool rooms, the southern one containing a mîhrāb, and a suit of three warm rooms constructed over hypocausts. Externally the palace was of a square construction 70 m. long—the equivalent of 200 Roman feet—, with a wall of limestone and basaltic blocks 2.60 m. surrounded by mud brick which rests upon a zone of burnt brick. This wall has a semi-circular buttress in the middle of each side, except the oriental one, where two half-towers flank the entrance-gate. The corners are protected by round towers, except at the north-western angle, where the enclosure incorporates a Byzantine tower, which on its southern side has a machicolation defending a gate. Later, this tower served as watch- and relay-tower for the fire-signals between Bayḍâ and Karyatayn. The round buttresses of the wall, unknown in Roman and Byzantine fortifications, are Sasanian elements.

Through a round-arched gate, 3 m. wide, provided with a semi-circular tympanum built in brickwork covered with cubes of glass and two jamb of 4 m. decorated with leafwork of vine-tendrils, one enters a large entrance passage 11 m. long, cradle-vaulted and provided with small benches on each side. It leads into a courtyard of 37 m. square, paved with a small basin in the centre. The portico has columns with Corinthian capitals, the bases of which consist of Doric capitals. At the angles of the portico, which is 4 m. deep, are square-sectioned piers.

The palace is a residence on two floors. The ground floor consists of six insulae, sets of rooms (bayds) accessible through the portico. According to Creswell, their disposition originates from the palace of the Roman governor at Bosra [q.v.]. The plan of the...
upper floor repeated that of the ground-floor, with which it is connected by two staircases. All around ran a gallery with small columns and balustrades. The residence, which had no windows on the outside, received light through the doors and through stucco grilles in the tympanums of the doors, none of which was found undamaged on the spot during the excavations. It has been possible to replace a great number of these window-grilles (claustra), made in stucco and then bored out with a trepan. They now received light through the doors and through stucco ran a gallery with small columns and balustrades.

It has been possible to reconstruct many elements of figurative art: human beings or animals in bas-relief in one of the divisions of the semi-towers of the entrance, and on the panels of the interior balustrade. There are even genuine sculptures, among which figures the statue of a man, almost life size, sitting on a throne, with a crown (ṭādjī) on his head, knees wide apart and heels close together, generally identified as Ḥishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik. Human beings and animals are also represented in the large compositions which are painted in fresco on the floor of the two staircase rooms of the palace. One, 5 by 4.58 m., is divided horizontally into three parts. On the upper one two musicians are depicted, on the second one a hunting scene, representing “the caliph on horseback with bow and arrow and using stirrups, which is almost the oldest known record of their use” [see Architecture, I, 613A]; on the lower part, badly preserved, one can distinguish animals and a human being leading a bovine. On the second painting, 5.24 by 4.43 m., there is in the centre a great medallion with a large bust of a woman on a background of foliage, with on upper side there are marine centaurs and on the lower animals, including a fox and two crested stilt-legged aquatic birds.

On the walls of the rooms on the ground floor there have been discovered simple geometrical motifs, in which the lozenge dominates, and imitations of marble facing, painted in fresco-colours and executed schematically. The central part of the eastern wing, the most decorated of the palace, has been reconstructed in the National Museum of Damascus.

Kasr al-Hayr is particularly important, not only because it has the characteristics marking Umayyad castles, as defined by Henri Stern (Note, 81): “A rectangular fence with rounded, buttressed towers and bayāts within it and a mosque are the centre of an area of agricultural exploitation irrigated by means of a big dam”, but the variety of its various architectural elements and the riches of its decorations make it a first-class piece of evidence for the study of art and civilization in the Umayyad period.


**Kasr al-Hayr al-Sharqī**, important Umayyad agricultural settlement in the Syrian desert at the foot of the Djabal Bighri, about 100 km. NE of Palmyra and 65 km. S of Rusafa-Sergiopolis. It lies at the intersection of the road joining Mayyadīn on the Euphrates to Palmyra and Ḥims with the one leading from Halab to Rusafa and permitting to reach Baghdaḍ and Baṣra by crossing the pass of Tayyib, situated at 14 kms. to the N–NE. The village of Tayyib is usually identified with Oriza mentioned in the Annals of Assurbanipal (*Ur* of the Middle Ages).

Many travellers who took that route between the 14th and the beginning of the 19th centuries, have been able to see the ruins of Kasr al-Hayr. Later, towards 1840, the desert route to India was abandoned in favour of the "Overland Road" and the site was mentioned no more.

The ruins, visited by A. Musil in 1908, were re-discovered and studied on the surface by Albert Gabriel in 1925 and by K. A. C. Creswell in 1928-30, before being excavated by Oleg Grabar in 1964, 1966 and 1969.

The whole of the settlement covers an area of over 6 x 3 km., surrounded by a wall 17 km. long. The southern part comprises a curious system of canalizations and openings which have been variously interpreted. At the northern angle, down stream from a large artificial wāḍī, are two square enclosures, reinforced by semi-circular towers; the small one being called al-Karṣ, the big one al-Mudīna. Their fronts are orientated perpendicularly to the cardinal points, whereas the eastern and western axes are not in even line with each other, there being a difference of 10 m. These are the oldest fortified Muslim enclosures that exist.

The small enclosure has a side-line of 70 m., the eastern front not being parallel to the western front, which is the only one to have a gate. The wall, 2.03 m. thick and ca. 14 m. high, is built with pieces of limestone, in courses 0.35 m. thick and strongly joined with gypsum. Each angle of the wall is reinforced by a round tower 4.43 m. in diameter and two semi-circular towers on each front; altogether 12 towers all covered with a small cupola of bricks. On the western front the disposition is different because from the monumental gate which is flanked by two semi-towers 4.15 m. in diameter, jutting out 2.95 m. The entrance, 3 m. wide, is surmounted by a round arch and a tympanum of masonry. The higher parts of the towers have a decoration of bricks and of stucco panels with vegetative motifs, representing the oldest decoration of this kind in Islam. In the centre above the entrance a parapet consisting of three consoles form the oldest Muslim example of a machicolation (sakhbāt) being used as an element of defence and no longer as latrine.

To enter the inner side of the fence, one passes through a flagged vestibule 5.30 m. wide and 7 m. deep, flanked by two rooms facing a courtyard with sides of 37 m., and is surrounded by a portico 5 m. wide with arcades resting on columns 0.55 m. in diameter and a shaft of 3.70 m., surmounted by capitals of acanthus leaves. This portico gives access to many rooms with cradle vaulting, 12 m. deep but of different width. On the upper floor, under the gallery, are rooms with flat wooden ceilings whose
Disposition corresponds to the plan of the ground floor. Nothing is known about the use of these rooms. The building was constructed at two periods: begun under Hishām [q.v.] and finished in the early 'Abbāsīd period. Fragments of ceramics indicate that it was occupied from the 5th-7th/11th-13th centuries.

The big enclosure with sides of 160 m. has a stone wall 2.12 m. wide which is in a very bad condition. On each front are towers with rounded corners 4 m. in diameter, and 6 semi-circular towers, altogether 28 towers, standing at a distance of 26.25 m. from axis to axis, except those which flank the entrance constructed in the middle of each front. To be noted are two sally-ports on the eastern front and some inside staircases which lead one to imagine that there was once a gallery facing the interior front of the wall. At the top of the towers, which are crowned with a cupola in bricks, is a room with three loopholes permitting shooting to the front and sideways. The entrances are all identical: 3 m. wide, surmounted by a lightly broken arch, with a tympanum in masonry and a parapet with two openings. The parapet of the northern gate has five machicolations and covers the space between the two flanking towers. In the middle of the enclosure extends a vast open space, the midān.

At the southeastern corner survive the vestiges of eight big pillars, some of which support arcades. Creswell has discovered there a mosque, the plan of which shows close analogy with that of the Great Mosque in Damascus. This sanctuary is dated by an inscription of 1107/289-9. The prayer-room, 22 m. deep and 37 m. wide, has a central nave with pillars in T-form while the remains of arcades mark off three aisles. The room faces a courtyard with a cistern fed by water from a canalization.

The arch at the southeastern corner of the courtyard is slightly broken and in shape a Norse arch: it is the oldest example of this type actually known.

According to O. Grabar there is, to the southwest of the mosque, an official building, the dār al-imāna, with a courtyard surrounded by a portico, rooms and a reception-hall, the back wall of which leans against the enclosure wall.

To the north of the mosque, in the extension of the western wall, a street 3.50 m. wide is bordered, on its eastern side, by installations with ovens and presses, that reveal the existence of soap-works. In the same area, a bath faced the midān and not towards the southwest; an enormous cistern should also be noted there.

The vestiges of the southwestern part of the enclosure suggest that it may have been destroyed during the Karmatī expeditions of the beginning of the 4th/10th century.

In the space of 42 m. which separates the two enclosures there rises a square tower with sides of 2.94 m. and 10 m. high. An entrance on the south side gives access to a spiral staircase. The analysis of the construction permits us to date it to the same period as the enclosures, with a post-Umayyad reconstruction. Why does the tower stand isolated? There is no minaret attached to the mosque, hence possibly it served as minaret for both enclosures. If so, it would be the third known minaret in the history of Islam.

To the south of the Kāsr and the Madīna, a vast polygonal enclosure 17 km. long covers an area of 850 hectares. One can distinguish a wall to retain water, alternately reinforced on both sides with four rows of stone 0.30 m. high, above which there are rows of mud bricks at a height of about 2 m. and a row of stone to protect it. There is also a wall for lock-gates, the buttresses of which have a diameter of 2 m. and are at 10 m. distance from each other; they frame a series of four locks, 1.11 m. wide and 1.55 m. high, with double vaults of bricks. The locks worked through a system of sliding-doors. The water arrived from the region of Tayyība through two subterranean aqueducts. This enclosure poses problems of interpretation: accordingly some have considered it a lake at some point for irrigation, others that it was a reserve for animals. H. Seyrig considers it to be a large garden protected against Bedouin razzias.

To epitomise the history of the site: it may be recalled that an installation, dating from the 7th century B.C., is mentioned in the contemporary texts; the Roman occupation in the Palmyran period was followed by a Christian period, the Umayyad constructions and finally building activities at the beginning of the 'Abbāsīd period. Destroyed by the Karmāṭ in 289/1002, the complex became part of the ḏīḥ [q.v.] of Shirkūh and his successors, the āmirs of Hims; it was devastated by the Mongols in Rājīb 702/March 1303. It was certainly reoccupied before being ruined in 1048/1638 by order of Murād IV, in order to prevent the creation of a Bedouin centre of rebellion. From the end of the 10th century onwards, the ruins have been giving shelter to nomad encampments.

The site of Kāsr al-Hayr poses identification problems: most of the authors identify Tayyība with Orīza-ʿUrd while Kāsr al-Hayr, according to Ptolemy, followed by A. Musil, is identified with Adada, an ancient Roman camp. In 1939 J. Sauvaget positively identified the site with Hishām, as being those of a caravanserai, which in that case would be the oldest ḏīḥ [q.v.] of Muslim architecture.


(Elisséeff)
with Madinat b. Hubayra, which was situated closer to al-Kufa, where the same Yazid began building until forced to abandon the site by order of the Umayyad caliph Marwan II (Baladhuri, Futūḥ, 287; Tabari, iii, 80, 183; Yāqūt i, 680; 3, 280; 4, 123, 946; see also Le Strange, Baghdād, 6 n. 1; Lands, 71). Yāqūt reports that the 'Adabṣābil al-qalīf al-Chifīnī established his capital at Kasr b. Hubayra, completing the construction begun by Yazid, and named it al-Hashimiyā, but as the populace persisted in calling the town by its original name, he felt compelled to abandon the site for a location nearby. This account apparently confuses the report of Baladhuri which indicates that al-Saffāf settled at Madīnat b. Hubayra (Yāqūt, iv, 546; Baladhuri, 287; see also al-Ḥashimiyya, where Yāqūt's account is given greater credence). The 4th-5th/10th-11th century geographers report that it was the largest town between Baghdād and al-Kufa and was situated close to the Euphrates and the bifurcation of various water channels which brought wares to its many markets. With its decline some time before the 6th/12th century, al-Ḫilla became the major town of the area (see al-Ḫilla). (J. Lassen)

al-Ḵāṣr al-Kabīr, Alcazarquivir, a town in North Morocco, about 50 miles south of Tangier on the right bank of the Wādī Lūkkus; at one time, this ran through it, but the course of the stream was diverted to prevent inundations. Lying in a vast plain commanded on the east by hills, it is divided into two parts, al-Shari'a in the north and Bāb al-Wād on the south, between which lies the market-place. The only buildings of any importance are the great mosque which is pre-Islamic, the mosque of the Khlot, Thk and Djbala. It also included Rifans, a settlement west of town between Baghdad and al-Kufa and was situated close to the Euphrates and the bifurcation of various water channels which brought wares to its many markets. With its decline some time before the 6th/12th century, al-Ḫilla became the major town of the area (see al-Ḫilla). (J. Lassen)

al-Ḵāṣr al-Sāghīr, El-Ksar al-Acabir, a town in Morocco, 14 miles west of Ceuta, 23 miles

ever, a makes a distinction between Sūk Kutāma "a large and magnificent town situated on the river Lūkkus with a djāmīsī and a very busy market" and Kasr Danhādja "a castle built on a hill and commanding a large river". Ibn Khaldūn, on the other hand (op. cit., text i, 188, tr. ii, 291), connects Kasr Kutāma with the Danhādja (cf. also Kitāb al-Idhtisāb). Sūk Kutāma was the capital of the state governed by Idrīs al-Maṣūm b. al-Ḵāṣr al-Sāghīr; Almohad, the mosque of Sidl al-Azmlri and the Diamī ḥalām, finished in 1100/1689. Within and around the town are many kubbas dedicated to local saints. The most venerated marabouts are Abu 'l-Ḫasan al-Kurashi (Kurashi), a native of Spain who came towards the end of his life to teach in the town between Baghdad and al-Kufa and was situated close to the Euphrates and the bifurcation of various water channels which brought wares to its many markets. With its decline some time before the 6th/12th century, al-Ḫilla became the major town of the area (see al-Ḫilla). (J. Lassen)

The period following the disappearance of the Banū Ḥadhīlūla was one of calamities. The Portuguese, who first established on the coast, threatened the town. The inhabitants did not dare to cultivate the soil more than six miles from the walls. In 1503 the governor of Aqliya, Don Juan de Meneces, attempted to take it but without success. In the century following, al-Ḵāṣr became the most advanced post of the "volunteers of faith" (Muqāḏimān) who harassed the Christians settled on the coast. During the period of anarchy that preceded the establishment of the 'Alwī dynasty, the town became the residence of the Kālid Ghlān, who had gained possession of all Gharb. Driven from his capital by Mūṣāy Af-al-Rašīd in 1078/1668, Ghlān was able to return to it on the death of this prince. He held out there till 1084/ 1673 when he was defeated and killed by Mūṣāy Ismā'īl. Al-Ḵāṣr fell again, this time finally, into the hands of the Ṣafar, who dismantled its walls.

E. of Tangier, at the head of a bay sheltered by a spur of the Djebel Ghomari at the mouth of a navigable river.

In ancient times this site was perhaps occupied by a Phoenician factory and then by a Roman town (Lissa or Exilissa of Ptolemy). A fortress was erected there quite early in the period of Muslim occupation, in 907/08-9, according to al-Ziyânî, in **Archives Marocaines**, vi, 494, on the territory of the Maamûd, whence the name of Kašr Naamûd (cf. Ibn Khaldûn, *Hist. des Berbères*, ed. de Slane, i, 280, 13, tr. ii, 134) which is given by the author of the *Kitâb al-Istibdâr* and by al-Idrîsî. Al-Bakîr calls it al-Kašr al-Anwâl to distinguish it from al-Kašr al-Kâbir [q.v.]. According to him, it was inhabited by the Banû Tarîf and surrounded by great plantations. Under the Almohads it took the place of Marâs Mâsâ as the port of embarkation for Spain. Many authors call it therefore Kašr al-Madâjz (Georg. d'Aboul-fida, tr. Reinaud, ii, 185; Ibn Khaldûn, loc. cit.), or Kašr al-Siwaâ “Castle of the crossing” (Ibn Abî Za'r, *Raud al-Kifâs*, ed. Tornberg, 138, 143, 146). The Almohads erected important buildings in it and established naval dockyards there. But the prosperity of the town declined in proportion as the rulers of the Maârîb lost their hold on Spain. Deprived of the income the transport of the armies had assured them, the inhabitants turned to piracy. Al-Kašr therefore became one of the first towns that the Portuguese sought to capture. In 1458 King Alfonso V attacked it with a fleet of 80 ships and an army of 17,000 men; after repelling two assaults, the Muslims, overwhelmed by the Christian artillery, capitulated. They were, however, granted permission to retreat with their arms and baggage. Alfonso V entered the town on Oct. 19, 1458. The great mosque was turned into a church, the fortifications were strengthened and a garrison installed under the command of Don E. de Minecez. Two attempts made by the Sulînân of Fâs in 1458 and 1459 to recapture the town did not succeed. In 1463 the tribes of Angierra recognised the suzerainty of Portugal and in 1471 Sulînân Mûsâ Sa'dî signed a treaty by which he ceded al-Kašr to the king of Portugal.

Al-kašr remained in Christian hands till 1540 but during this period it was continually being attacked by the Moors. John III therefore decided to evacuate it after previously dismantling it. Some years later (1559) a French prince, Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, obtained al-kašr in exchange for the men-at-arms that he was to supply to the Sharîf of Fâs, but the intrigues of the king of Spain, Philip II, prevented the treaty from being carried out. Since that date no attempt has been made to rebuild the town. The inhabitants abandoned it and the harbour became silted up and no longer used except by smugglers. The site is marked by the ruins, still imposing, of the Portuguese fortress, by ditches, and by the remains of the walls and the ruins of the gate through which the citadel communicated with the town proper.


(G. Yver)

**KAŠR-I SHIRIN,** town in the south-western part of the district of Ardîlân or Persian Kûrdîstân in 34°30' N. lat. and 45°30' E. long. (Greenwich) on the right bank of the Hulwân. To the west and south-west of Kašr-i Shirîn lies the great range of Agh-Dagh; in the S.E. also on the left bank of the river run imposing mountain chains. Kašr-i Shirîn was an important caravan station from the earliest times. The most important route through it is the very old road from Baghdad to the Iranian highlands—the Târîk Khurâsan of the Arabs of the Middle Ages. Kašr-i Shirîn lies about half-way between the two stations of Khânîkîn [q.v.] in the south-west and Sar-i-pul (in mediavals times Hulwân, south of Sar-i-pul) in the east. Less important roads also branch off here to the north, north-west, and south-east.

The modern Kašr-i Shirîn (1600 feet above sea-level) is an insignificant town surrounded by a wall of earth and stone. Only the walls of the site of Kašr-i Shâh, a commodious caravanserai; to the west is a fort in modern style which, according to Aubin (*op. cit. in Bibl.*), Dîwân Mir built at the beginning of the 19th century, using it to plunder passing pilgrims to Karbâlî and merchants. Opposite the town on the left bank of the river lies the Bâgh-i Shâh, “King’s Gardens”, a park laid out with date-palms and orange and pomegranate trees by Nasr al-Dîn Shâh on the occasion of his pilgrimage to Karbâlî.

The most remarkable feature of Kašr-i Shirîn, which makes it one of the most interesting places in Persia to the historian or archaeologist, is the extensive system of ruins dating from the Sâsânian period in its vicinity. The name Kašr-i Shirîn, “Shîrin’s Palace”, dates from the later period of the Sâsânian empire (farhâd), a Christian, was the favourite wife of Khusrâw II Parwâz (560-628 A.D.), who called the great palace he built as a summer residence after her. Kašr-i Shirîn and the neighbourhood was the scene of the unhappy love-story of Shirîn and the royal architect Farhâd [see *farhâd wa-shâhre*]. A rock tomb south of Kašr-i Shirîn is popularly known as Úãâ-k-i Farhâd, “Farhâd’s chamber” see Sarre and Herzfeld, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, 63), also spent some time at the imperial court at Kašr-i Shirîn.

The period of Kašr-i Shirîn’s glory was only brief. Ten years after the death of Khusrâw II the Sâsânian empire collapsed before the Arabs, and in the Muslim period the palaces of Kašr-i Shirîn seem no longer to have been inhabited. They fell quickly into ruins. Ya’kûtî, *Buldân*, 270, mentions the ruins as early as 798/891. Ibn al-Afîrî, viii, 388, mentions that as a result of an earthquake in 454/956 the walls of Kašr-i Shirîn cracked. Such Arab and Persian authors as Ibn Rusta, Ya’kûtî, al-Kâzwinî and Hamd Allâh Mustawfî emphasize the great scale of Kašr-i Shirîn, with its halls, hermitages, treasure houses, etc. and the splendid gardens containing very rare animals, but give no detailed descriptions. Ya’kûtî and al-Kâz- winî give especially the story of the origin of the palace, which the former (iv, 113) actually regarded as one of the wonders of the world.
We owe the most accurate description of the modern ruins to the French expedition of J. de Morgan. The main ruins lie on a broad plateau north-east of the modern town. Near the latter is the rectangular citadel flanked by six round towers (called Kal’a or Kasr-i Khusrav, also Kal’a-i Khusravi) surrounded by a ditch. North of the Kal’a are further mounds of ruins whose object is unknown. About 300 yards to the N.E. is the wall of a gigantic park, enclosing the summer-residence proper of the king, which measures, according to de Morgan, 300 acres. The wall round it, which also served as an aqueduct, reaches 20 feet at the highest part and is about 6,000 paces in extent. Another aqueduct-wall divides the park into two parts. The water for the irrigation of the gardens was brought from the Hulwan-Rud; the aqueduct can still be traced in the Hulwan-Rud valley until it is lost in the maze of ruins of Hawsh Kuri. In the centre of the whole scheme is the main palace, now called ‘Amrārat-i Khusrav (“house of Khusrav”)’ or Hājjī Kala’sī (“pilgrim’s palace”). In front of the palace still exists a 600-yard long stretch of the aqueduct flanked by two kiosks. West of the ‘Amrārat-i Khusrav stands a smaller, similar vaulted building with four doors and a square principal chamber. It is now called Cudr Kapu, Kār Darud, or Hadjdjl Kal’c. It is 220 feet long, and is so called from the words “four Doors”, or Kal’a-i Cudr Kapu, “Palace of the four Doors”. The purpose of this building is obscure. About 3 miles E. of Kasr-i Shirin is another late Sasanian ruined palace, popularly believed to have contained the stables belonging to the palace of Kasr-i Shirin. These ruins, which consist of a palace 600 feet long with annexes and another mound of ruins, are the latest of all the palaces of Parwez so far known. Kasr-i Shirin is, of course, a site of much greater antiquity, but it has not been ascertained what ancient city stood there.

Bibliography: BGA, passim, especially viii, 164 (Ibn Rusta); Yākūt, iv, 121 f.; al-Kazwīnī, Abhār al-Biład, ed. Wustenfeld, 295-7; Hamd Allāh Mustawfī, Nasā, 43 f., Le Strange, 63; Pietro della Valle, Reise-Beschreibung, Geneva 1674, ii, 4: “Olivier, Voyage dans l’empire Otho-

Kāsr Yānī [see KASRYANNIH].

KASRA, the Arabic grammatical term denoting the vowel i: kasra designates the written sign itself, kasr the sound as question (Wright, Ar. Gr., i, 8A). This distinction corresponds, for example, with the text of al-Dānī, al-Muḥkam fi naḵt al-maṣāḥīb, Damascus 1379/1960, 42, ii, 4-7, and Kitāb al-Naḵt (Bibl. Isl., 3, 1932), 137, ll. 8-21, but kasr can also have another interpretation: the verb kasara (i) “to break”, can be used to mean: “to provide [a harf] with a kasra”, the mouth being considered “broken” at the time of the pronunciation of the harakāt al-mushbaṭ, not mushbaṭ, sounds reduced by the ikhtilds or the rawm (see H. Fleisch, Traite, i, 36 f., and IDAFA. In the normal pronunciation of the kasra, the latter are opposed to the harakāt, not mushbaṭ: sounds reduced by the ikhtilds or the rawm (see H. Fleisch, Traite, i, 36 f., and IDAFA. The first notation of the kasra and the other harakāt, fatha and damma, was made by means of full points (al-Dānī, Muḥkam, 23, i, 11; 42, i, 12), in order to remedy the deficiencies of kur’ānic script and at first to indicate the direction in which the sound was to be pronounced. The kasra in the middle of a word was invariably attributed to Abu ’l-Aṣwad al-Du’ālī (d. 696/1298) (al-Dani, 43, 1. 15), like kur’ānic script, and according to al-Dānī, 47, 1. 15, like kur’ānic script, and according to al-Dānī, 44, 1. 16, it was still in use (ibid., 98). This innovation was not imposed without long resistance (ibid., 95-98), and at the time of al-Dānī (d. 444/1053) it was still in use (ibid., 98).

Care must be taken in distinguishing the vowel points in the body of kufrānic script. They are characterized by the use of red points; a green point is used for the hamza (the unvoiced glottal occlusive); and a yellow point for the tashdi (gemination) (Abū Bakr b. Ḫudayjād, cited by al-Dānī, Muḥkam, 23, ii, 9 f.; see also, ibid., 19-20, for other old practices in the use of colours). All these points constitute al-šakl al-mudawwar. But the diacritical points of the harāfī are bi ’l-sawād “in black” (ibid., 22, i, 17; 43, i, 15), like kufrānic script, and according to al-Dānī, 43, i, 16, serve to establish a distinction between the diacritical marks and the harakāt; see his chapter (35-41) on the diacritical marks. In matters of tāb, the kasra was the sign of ājār (or kafād) [see ʻrāʾ]. On the nature of the kasra and the other harākāt, see HARA KWA-SUKUN. For the way in which the presence of the kasra is explained, in the second part of the iddāa, see ʻrāʾa. Some further points: (1). The points indicated concern al-harakāt al-muḥṣabād, the normal ones (literally “satisfied”). The latter are opposed to the harakāt, not musbādā: sounds reduced by the ikhtilds or the rawm (see H. Fleisch, Traite, i, 36 f.,
He also attacked much of Persian poetry, concentrating on Ḵayyām, Saʿdī, Rūmī, and particularly Hāfiz. This poetry, he asserted, is replete with doctrines such as fatalism, Ṣūfism and ḵẖāḍālīgāri (as in Ḵayyām's ideas), with excessive praise of wine and shameless talk of homosexuality. It encourages beggary, flattery, cowardice, hypocrisy and the like.

As an act of confession, and to draw attention to their activities, Kasrawi and his supporters instituted a festival, on the first day of winter, to destroy harmful writings which they had owned before joining the group. Called Ḵḏišḵtī Kitāb-sūzūn, "festival of book-burning", this activity attracted considerable hostility.

In Kasrawi's view, there are two opposing forces or "essences" (gawhar or širvēt) within each individual. Ḫḏišn is the source of egoism; from it emanate self-interest, greed, injustice, jealousy, etc. Rawṯn is the source of altruism; from it emanate self-sacrifice, justice, sympathy, honesty, truth-seeking, etc. Related to Ḫḏišn is ḵẖāsad, the faculty of distinguishing right from wrong, good from evil. Ḫḏišn and Ḳawtht are constantly at war. The duty of religion, and of similar institutions, is the strengthening of Ḳawthn. Religion means "learning the truths" and living by the dictates of the Ḫḏišn. It should help man to subdue his Ḫḏišn, and find the hanggliders. Large enterprises should be owned only by partnerships. "Land should be owned by him who tills it, who keeps it cultivated". Failing this, he should sell it or hand it over to others. Few middlemen should intervene between the producer and the consumer. The government's functions should be limited chiefly to legislation, national security and defense, foreign relations, education, public health. It should not engage in agriculture, commerce, and, in general, industry.

Education means preparing for life, and the strengthening of Ḳawthn. Compulsory education should include literacy and basic science, in the elementary school, and the "truths of life", including civics. Vocational and professional education and work in advanced science should follow. "Evil teachings" should not be taught under any circumstances, unless they are clearly exposed as harmful.

Women should not enter certain professions, e.g., law, engineering and politics, but should vote. Bigamy should be permitted only when the first wife is barren. Those with contagious diseases should not marry. Kābin ("marriage portion"), ṣẖirbāḥ (bride price), and Ḫḏištī ("dowry") should be eliminated. Divorce should be available to women as well as to men, and on the same grounds.

Kasrawi denied that Ḳawthn claimed to be a prophet (payḵẖẖūm). He termed his ideology ḵẖāḥḏīn "pu-rity-of-religion" (occasionally ḳẖāṭīḏīḏ), and referred...
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to it as a 'rah, "road, path," not a din "religion"). "Pâkđînî is Islam's successor and its continuation," although he was rarely very explicit on the relationship between the two.

Kasrawi's writings created a widespread intellectual movement, particularly among the youth. He formed a fraternal organization, called the Pâkđînîn, "the pure of religion," or the Assagîn, preaching this doctrines with missionary zeal and in the teeth of intense antagonism. The numerical strength of his followers is not known.

Kasrawi's bold and outspoken views, particularly those on religion and literature, met with vehement and violent opposition: some of his books were banned; his supporters were often persecuted and socially ostracized; and, finally, charges of "slander of Islam" were brought against him. On 11 March 1946, at the last session of the preliminary hearings on those charges held in the Palace of Justice in Tehran, he was assassinated by the Fidâ'îyyân-i Islam [q.v.], who had only wounded him in an earlier attempt in April 1945. His followers continue, however, to be active.

Bibliography: The only detailed account of Kasrawi's life is found in his own Zindasînî-yi man (Tehran 1945) and Dâr ʿalîyya (Tehran 1945), covering his life up to about 1929. A bibliography (neither complete nor always accurate) of his books is found in Khânbâbâ Muḥârag, Muʿallîsîn-i kutub-i āspî-i farsi wa ʿarabî az dghdz-i ʿarabi az dghdz-i sâbî ta kurnân, i, Tehran 1961, cols. 437-46; and a partial bibliography of his articles on language and history is in ʿIrâdî Afghâr, Index Iranicus, i, Tehran 1961. A selection of his scholarly articles has been collected by Yahya Dhuka, in Cihâl makbûd-i Kasrawî, Tehran 1956.

(M. A. Jazayeri)

KAŞRYANNIH, Arabic version of the mediaeval Sicilian place name Castrum Ennae, itself already deformed in local speech usage; the Arabised form was used in the mediaeval Arabic sources, Kasryannih seems to be the most acceptable; it appears in Yâkût's Muṣḥarâtik, with the exact pronunciation, including the geminated nîn, specified, although it does not appear in his Muṣhtag.

It was besieged from 243/859 onwards by the Arab-Berber army of Asaf b. al-Furat [q.v.], who had landed two years previously at Mazara, and this fortified rock became the symbol of Christian resistance in the island after the capitulation of Palermo in Radjab 216/August-September 831. For a period of thirty years, the town and citadel underwent various vicissitudes, and the fortunes of war went backwards and forwards until the Byzantine strongholds surrendered in Radjab 243/January 859. The concluding military operations were prepared and led by al-ʿAbbâs b. al-Fadl, amîr of Sicily 236-46/851-61, who during the preceding years had sapped the resistance of the defenders by continuous assaults. Nevertheless, according to the sources, it was a Christian captive who brought on the surrender through his showing the Muslims, in order to save his own skin, a secret way into the fortress. Certain Arabic chronicles say that al-ʿAbbâs celebrated this victory by building a mosque in Castrogiovanni, and immediately afterwards, he went on to restore the citadel's fortifications.

The rule of the Kalbid amîrs came to an end ca.

431/1040, and in the general state of anarchy which followed and which continued to rack the island till the arrival of the Normans, Kasryannî, together with Girgenti and Castronuovo, formed part of the possessions of the kadîd ibn al-Ḥâwâs [q.v.]. Some months after the Normans landed in Sicily (Muḥarram 1453/February 1061), Robert Guiscard laid siege to the fortress, whose garrison had meanwhile been reinforced by new troops sent by the Zîrids from Africa, but difficulties made him give up the attempt. The Count Roger made a fresh attempt, and after some temporary successes, he finally compelled it to capitulate. Western chroniclers place the capture of the stronghold, thanks to Altavilla, at dates which vary between the middle of 480/1087 and the opening months of 481/1088, whilst the Arabic chroniclers place it three years later. The local ruler ibn ʿAbbâs surrendered himself without resistance, and according to the Norman historian Malaterra, became a convert to Catholicism.

The Arabic sources all agree that Kasryannîs constituted not only a stronghold which was powerfully fortified and difficult to dismantle, but was also an important town in a fertile and well-watered region, with commodious markets, a lively commercial activity, abundant provisions and an excellent urban organisation.

Bibliography: The Arabic sources with information on Kasryannîs have virtually all been brought together by M. Amari in his Biblioteca arabo-sicula, Ar. text, Leipzig 1857, Ital. tr. Turin-Rome, i-ii, 1880-1; see also for other details Amari, Storia dei musulmani di Sicilia, Catania 1933-9, index, and see further U. Rizzitano, L'Italia nei secoli ar-râwî, fi ḥabar al-ʿaṭṭar dî ibn ʿAbî al-Musîm al-Ḥîmyârî, Cairo 1908, also in Bull. of the Fac. of Arts, Cairo University, xviii/1 (May 1956), 170-1.

(U. Rizzitano)

KÂSS (a.), pl. kâssât, "popular story-teller or preacher, deliverer of sermons" whose activity considerably varied over the centuries, from preaching in the mosques with a form of kûr'anic exegesis to downright charlatanism. This term does not appear in the Kur'ân, although the verb kâşṣa is quite often used (see Flügel, Concordantiae) always, except in VI, 57, with the meaning "to recount, to relate, to report" a generally edifying narration (see kîṣā) and frequently in the first person, when the narrator is God Himself. The LA (root kṣṣ) reproduces zadîqîs in which appear the word kâṣṣ (al-kâṣṣ yâstâṣîr al-mâṣîḥ) and the verb kâṣṣa, in the absolute use, with the meaning "to tell, to recount stories" and also "to preach" (kâṣṣa `alâ l-nâs); the Prophet is reported to have said "None but an amîr, a subordinate [of an amîr] or a proud man shall preach" (lâ yaḥṣûṣu lâl amîr asw mā mîr asw maḥdîlî, where we have translated kâṣṣa by "to preach") because it probably concerns the khabûba [q.v.]. It would be difficult to date precisely the intransitive use of the verb in the sense of "to perform the function of a popular story-teller or deliverer of sermons" which was to become current (e.g. al-Ḍabhî, Ḥayâyûn, iii, 24-5 and Bayân, i, 367-9) for it seems likely that the zadîqîs cited in the Lisan may be later and may date from the time when the men of religion and the mystics had reacted against the kâṣṣa. Indeed, if it is reasonable to suppose that all pious Muslims early deemed it their duty to improve the religious sentiments of the uninformed majority, the function of the kâṣṣ did not yet exist at the
time of the Prophet; according to al-Makrīzī, Kḥāṣṣ, ii, 253-4, there was a distinction between the private Kāṣṣ and the official one, instituted by Muʿāwiya who, after morning prayer, was supposed in particular to curse the enemies of Islam and all the infidels and, after the ḥuṣba on Fridays, to explain the Qurʿān; however, only in Egypt are there traces of the existence of this function, which was occupied formerly by the kāṣṣ, then little by little fell into disuse. From the 8th century onwards this kāṣṣ was replaced by the muḥātkhir and by the waṣīq [q.v.].

Otherwise the office was loosely defined. At its inception it was supposed to consist of commenting on the Qurʿānic narratives concerning the fates of the Prophets and the official one, instituted by Muḥammad. Indeed, to enliven their narration, the first religious authorities and to appeal to the crowds, the "sermonisers" who were among them men of great learning in Islamic law and who, in addition, expressed themselves in very correct language. This partly explains that interest which the authorities were making an exception in favour of al-Dārān, who was, moreover, al-Dārā at Dārā, and who, in addition, expressed himself in very correct language. In the 4th-5th/10th-11th centuries, the first religious authorities and to appeal to the crowds, the "sermonisers" who were among them men of great learning and Ibn al-Diʿawī, who is still nevertheless hostile towards them, very rightly stresses this (Ṭabīk Iblīs, Cairo, 1340, 131); the list which al-Dībājī provides (Bayān, i, 367-9; used by L. Massignon, Essai, 141 ff. and Ch. Pellat, Milieu, 108 f.f.) is instructive in this respect. It includes, among others, al-Hasan al-Baṣrī, his brother Saʿdī and his son Ḥafṣ, ʿAlīb al-Taymī, and in particular, Mūsā b. Sāyār al-Uṣwārī (see Līdān al-Mīṣān, vi, 120, 136; al-Samḥānī, Anṣāb, 37), who commented on the Qurʿān in Arabic and Persian, as well as another kāṣṣ, Abū ʿAlī al-Uṣwārī (d. after 200/815; see Līdān al-Mīṣān, iv, 372-3), who at the age of 36 did not manage to exhaust his flow of commentary and who, in addition, expressed himself in very correct language. These two people are described as Kādarīs [see KADARIYYA], as was another well known kāṣṣ, Shālīb al-Mūrī (d. 172/788-9; cf. Abū Nuʿaym, Ḥiyā, Cairo 1351-6/1932-3, vi, 165-7); the Kāḍārīs equally distinguished themselves by their talent in this field.

L. Massignon (Essai, 143-4) considers that the 2nd/8th century is "especially at Baṣra, the century of "sermonisers" who, without any official mandate, and before the ʿAbbāsid rules and regulations for the Friday sermons, delivered ḥuṣbas to arouse the fervour of the faithful and to spread the word of Islam. Probably the activity of a great number of ḥuṣbas was quite disinterested to begin with, each sāhih or nāṣik feeling an obligation to preach, even to the point where later mystical theology claimed several of them; but if some strove by their narrations to edify the faithful, and to arouse their religious zeal, others were not slow to be employed by the supporters of the various political and religious doctrines, which were emerging at that time. From the year 65/685, in the course of the affair of the Tawwābūn [q.v.], there were in the crowd gathered to avenge the murder of Ḥusayn, three ḥuṣbas. Al-Taḥbīr (ii, 559) records their names and their speeches designed to sustain the zeal of the fighters; other examples have been collected by Goldziher (Mukh. St., ii, 162), who thought (Goldziher (ii, 168-9) that these "sermonisers" had no partisan tendencies. Again in the 4th-5th/10th-11th centuries, Shīʿīs and Ḥanbalis did not overlook this useful means of reaching the masses (cf. G. Māḏkūsī, Ibn ʿAqīl, Damascus 1953, 323); it is true that the representatives of the two rival factions sometimes came together and shared the takings (Mukh. St., ii, 165-6). The names of three Kādarīs are cited above, and it seems legitimate to believe that from the 2nd/8th century the Muʿtazzīls themselves had used "sermonisers" to spread abroad their opinions. This partly explains that interest which al-Dībājī takes in them, who was, moreover, always ready to admire eloquence even in the common people.

It appears therefore that the prohibitions were also justified by the care which the authorities were taking to limit propaganda carried on by word of mouth by the opposition parties, knowing well that they were provoked in the first place by the complaints of religious figures anxious to put an end to these abuses. Indeed, to enliven their narratives, the ḥuṣbas did not hesitate to quote the apocryphal traditions (and it is probable that they contributed to the propagation of these traditions which, put together from all sorts of different fragments), fabulous deeds and marvellous stories which the credulous masses took for gospel truth, thus placing...
the authentic Islamic tradition in real jeopardy. Because of this conduct, they incurred the theoretical and practical condemnation of the religious authorities. Al-Ghazâlî ([Ihya', ix/3) protests against the reprehensible doings of ḥussâs and the ṭūna [see wa'tir] who mixed heresies with their subject-matter; Ibn al-Djawâlī (Tabîb, 131) and the mystics gave strong advice not to join their congregations because they lacked integrity. In Spain, where they were less numerous (al-Mukaddasî, 226), for the Mâlikîs would scarcely tolerate them, the word kâşs had become synonymous with "storyteller", and the authors of works of hisba do not fail to express a desire that the activity of the ḥussâs should be limited. Ibn ʿAbîn (cf. Lévi-Provençal, Sûvîlî musulmane, Paris 1947, § 54) wished to forbid them, as fortune-tellers were forbidden, to install themselves in the cemeteries, and they were also prohibited from telling stories in which the Prophet was mentioned. Ibn ʿAbd al-Raḍîf [cf. R. Arié in Hsîpîris-Tabîda, i/3 (1960), 362] calls the kâss a mere story-teller of the streets.

At this period, and already for a long time in the Orient, it was indeed difficult to distinguish a "sermoniser" from one of those narrators of whom al-Maṣʿûdî speaks (Murūjû, v, 86; viii, 161 ff.); al-Maṣʿûdî himself (Kasâf, ii, 25; Ibn al-Ḥâdîdî, Madâhîr, ii, 146); The author of the Kitâb al-Tâbîdî (40; tr. Le livre de la Couronne, 68) speaks of the "wiles of ḥussâs and men who go round with performing monkeys". So, after having been a popular ex-voto, the Kârisîn and a "sermoniser", the kâşs became a sort of buffoon who mainly replaced edifying narrations by comical and often improper stories especially ridiculing biblical characters (see for example the story of the wolf that did not eat Joseph; Ibn Abî I-Hâdîdî, Sharh Nāhâj al-balâgka iv, 260). Some became notable mountebanks, who contributed to "play to the gallery", provided that the collaboration produced a substantial reward. From the rivalry among these comedians sprang the mawâllîd proverb "a kâšs not another kâšs" (al-Majdûdî, ii, 76). It is understandable therefore that the discredit thrown on an otherwise respectable function reboarded on the serious preachers of popular sermons, and they were replaced by more or less official preachers.

All things considered, passing from edifying narrations to profane stories was very easy, and the raʾsaî [q.v.] or the meddâh who narrates the episodes of The Thousand and One Nights or chivalric romances—not without playing the rôle of a political agent if the opportunity presents itself—is easily comparable to the later kâsîs, whereas the mukâddî [q.v.] who recounts his own adventures and fore-shadow the Spanish plácido is not far removed from him. (See also Maškâmâ.)

Bibliography: Largely given in the text. I. Goldziher (Muh. Studien, ii, 161-70; tr. L. Bercher, 198-208) has largely exploited the K. al-Kuṣṣâs of Ibn al-Djawâlî, and the pages which he devoted to the "sermonisers" represent the most thorough study of this social group. See further, L. Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mythique, Ch. Pellat, Milieu (on the kuṣṣâs of Baṣra); A. Med, Renaissance, index; M. S. Swartz, Ibn al-Jawâlî's Kitâb al-Qusṣâs wâlī-Mudâkhîrîn, ed., Eng. tr. and introd., Beirut 1971; C. E. Bosworth, The medieval Islamic underworld i. The Danû Bâṣrîn in Arabic society and literature, Leiden 1976, 24 et seqq.; see also Sayûtî, Tahâwar al-hâwâsî min aḥâdîth al-kuṣṣâs, ed. Muḥ. Ṣâbâḥî, Beirut 1973. (Ch. Pellat)

KASSALA [see KASALA].

KASSAM, the title given in Ottoman law to the trustee who divided an estate between the heirs of a deceased person. Ottoman law recognised two types of kâssâm, those under the kâdî's (q.v.) and the others employed locally in each kâdî's (q.v.) court (Kânân-name, Veliyüdîn Efendi 1970, ff. 66 a-b). The earliest references to the post date from the 9th/10th century.

The kâsîm received a fee from the heirs called resm-i kîsmet in payment for the trusteedship of the estate. Resm-i kîsmet levied from a member of the military (tâshkîr, [q.v.]) class was entered in the kâdîasker's accounts, so that in places where the military class was numerous, kâssâmms appointed by the kâdîaskers divided inheritances (Kânân-name-i Âl-i ʿOṯmân, TOEM suppl., Istanbul 1329/1911, 40). These military kâssâmms recorded their transactions in separate registers, called kâssâm registers (kâssâm defterleri) (O. L. Barkan, Edirne askeri khasmaana ait terehe defterleri 1545-1589, Belgeliler, in Türk Tarih Belgeliler Dergisi, iii/5, 1966). The local kâssâmms, called shekrib or beledi acting in the name of the kâdî, kept registers recording the resm-i kîsmet levied from non-military townspeople and villagers. There was a separate kâssâm register for each kâdî's district. In the division of inheritance kâssâmms were obliged to respect the rights of orphans and the law forbade them to overvalue goods or to levy resm-i kîsmet where this was not the legal requirement (Kânân-name, Veliyüdîn Efendi 1970, 1:66; cf. also the Kânân-name of ʿAbd al-raḥmân ʿAbdî Paşa, MTM, iii, Istanbul 1331/1913, 541). The kâssâm register of 924/1518 from the court of Bursa shows the procedure in the division of inheritance. The belongings of a deceased person were first examined in the presence of the kâssâm and entered in the register. An expert then valued their worth and, if the money was recorded on each item, before the kâsîm assessed the proportion to which the husband, wife or others heirs were entitled. After the deduction from the total of the kâssâm's fees and the deceased's funeral expenses, the remainder was handed over to the heirs (I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devletinin ilmiye teşkilâtı, Ankara 1965, 124).

Occasionally, the government appointed inspectors to examine the proceedings of the military kâssâmms and to collect the resm-i kîsmet levied in the name of the kâdîaskers. Kâssâmms from the three wings of the cavalry (sûvîrî) divisions were despatched to Anatolia and Rumelia for this purpose. These mounted inspector-kâssâmms took delivery from the kâdî's treasury of the resm-i kîsmet that had been raised, and had the registers sealed by the kâdî or deputy who transferred the money. The mounted kâssâmms had the authority to remove a local military kâssâm and appoint another in his place (I. H. Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., 121 ff.).

The question of who had the right to the resm-i kîsmet led occasionally to disputes between the local and the kâdîaskers' kâssâmms. A major factor in these disputes was the tendency of the military kâssâmms to extend the military class in order to increase the revenue on the kâssâm registers for which they worked. To prevent this, the government intermittently issued decrees to define who belonged to the military class, but they were never able to stop
the practice altogether (Basbakanlık Archives, Istanbul, Dışiş-i hükmâyên mükmîm defteri, vol. iv, 120; vol. lxx, 33). There was a kassâm in the covered market in Istanbul and another in Galata, whose duty it was to deputise for the bâdî′asker of Rumelia in settling disputes concerning the division of inheritances (Hzârînîn Rusayn, Talhâvi al-bâyân fi hâkimîn-i Âl-i Othmânî, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, f. 140 a).

The functions of the kassâm began slowly to diminish in the 19th century. After the Tanzîmât (q.v.), the separate offices of the bâdî′asker and bâdî′s kassâmns were abolished, to be replaced by a single office in Istanbul called the Treasury kassâm's office (bayt al-mâl kassâmîlgâh), which combined the functions of all the others (Lutfi, Taʾrikh, Istanbul, 1290/1873, vi, 30). The court concerned with inheritances, known as the hizmet-i belediye makameısı, was, at about the same time, united with this lower bâb court. Therefore, the bâb courts supervised the division of inheritance among the heirs (Dîwân-i hükmâyên mükmîm defteri, no. 261, serial nos. 36, 440).

In the years 1333-34/1915-16 there was a section called the general kassâm (kassâm-i umumî) in the Courts Department of the Office of the Shâkh al-İslâm (q.v.). At the head of the section was an official called the General kassâm (kassâm-i umumî) with two assistants as first and second advisory kassâm (dîmiyên teşkilâtî, Istanbul 1334/1916, 155 ff.). With the abolition of the šârî′a courts under the Turkish Republic, the civil section of the court of first instance (asilîye makameısı hukuk dairesi) replaced the kassâm court.

Bibliography: in addition to the works mentioned in the text: Başbakanlık Archives, Istanbul, Dîwân-i hükmâyên mükmîm defterleri, no. 80, p. 160 serial no. 408, p. 335 serial no. 816; no. 131 p. 147; L. Fekete, Türkische Schriften aus dem Archive des Palatins Nikolaus Estorhazy, 1665-1645, Budapest 1932, 470; Halit Ongan, Aus dem Archive des Palatins Nikolaus Esterhazy, Tirolische Schriften 816; no. 131 p. 147; L. Fekete, Turc. Arch. des Pal. 467-69); Kattani,AVAILABLE; Suda, i, 255, ii, 369 and n. 4; Kattânî, Salwa, ii, 265; ‘A. Ibn Sûda, Dâli, i, 139, ii, 312, 401. (M. Lâkhdar) KASÂRA, ÂBU ‘L-HUSAYN ‘ÂLI B. IDRîS B. ÂLI AL-HIMYARI, jurist, poet and historian of Morocco, who was born and lived in Fâs, where he put together a Dîwân, in one volume; a history called Takkîh al-âkhbîr ‘amman mâta min ’ulumî al-karn al-thâlîth′ askar; and above all, three commentaries, the most important being the one on the Sharî′a Bannânî alâd Sülâm al-Ashbârî, the second on Ibn Hîghâmîn Al-Mawdîdî and the third on the Bahàrîm Al-Şâhirî. He died at Fâs on 13 Râdîb 1259/9 August 1843, and was buried in that city.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 369 and n. 4; Kattânî, Salwa, ii, 265; ‘A. Ibn Sûda, Dâli, i, 255, ii, 390. (M. Lâkhdar) AL-KASTALLÂNî, ÂBU ‘L-’ABBÂS ÂHMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. ABî BAQR AL-KÂHTÂN SHÎHÂB AL-DÎN AL-ÂGÎRî, an authority on tradition and theologian, born on 12 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 851/20 January 1448 in Cairo, where he spent his life as a preacher — apart from two stays of some duration in Mecca — and died on Friday, 7 Muḥarram 923/31 January 1517. He owed his literary fame mainly to his exhausive commentary on the Sahîh of al-Bukhârî etitleld Ithâb al-Šâri fi Sharh al-Bukhârî, which exists in numerous manuscripts and printed copies; of these, the latter, the earliest may be that of Bûlûkî of 1267 and next the Lucknow edition of 1567 (other editions: Brockelmann, i, 165, S ii, 262-3). The Cairo edition in 1325-6 gives the glosses of Yahyâ al-Anṣârî and the Cairo edition of 1279 those of Hasan al-Idâwî (d. 1303/1887). In the field of Hadîth he wrote a Muḥaddîmûm which was printed at Cairo (n.d.) with the commentary of ‘Abd al-Hâdî al-Abyârî (d. 1305/1883). Great popularity is enjoyed in the Muslim world by his history of the Prophet entitled Al-Mawdîdî al-Adâmîyya fi l′-Minâh al-Muḥaddîmîyya, which he completed on 15 Shabân 899/21 May 1474 and which caused him to be accused of plagiarism by al-Sûyûtî. It exists in numerous manuscripts and has also been printed several times, e.g. Cairo 1281, several times commented on, e.g. by al-Zurkânî (d. 1122/1710), printed in 8 vols., Bûlûkî 1278, 1295, and translated by ‘Abd al-Dîdî into Turkish, printed Istanbul 1267; Al-Nabîbî published a synopsis of it entitled Al-Anbût al-Muḥaddîmîyya min al-Mawdîdî al-Adâmîyya, Beirut 1310-12. Finally in the same field, he prepared a commentary on the Kitâb al-Šamâlî′ of al-Tirmîdî (Brockelmann, i, 170, S i, 268). Besides studying the science of tradition, he worked also at the readings of the Kur′ân. His principal work on the subject is entitled La′fi′î al-İshârîl-i Fumnân al-Karîdî. He also wrote a biography of the teacher of Kur′ân reading, Abu ‘l-Kâsim al-Shâbî (Brockelmann, i, 520, S i, 725), and a commentary on the Muḥaddîmûm of al-Djazârî on Taqwilî (op. cit., ii, 250). Finally, he also wrote on mysticism and
personal piety; among his works in this sphere are his *Mawdadi* al-Šarfi, *Mashā'iq al-Šuhna* (*fī Ṣaḥar al-Mašā'iq* al-Šalii *fī l-Nabi al-muṣafā*), and his commentary on the *Burda* of al-Buṣūrī (Brockelmann, I, 310).

**Bibliography:** ʿAllî Bāsha Mubārak, al-Khaṭāʾi al-tawfīhiyya, Bulāk 1306, vi, 11; Wistenfeld, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber*, no. 509; Brockelmann, II, 87-8; S, 78-9. (C. Brockelmann)

**KASTALLANI** (Kestel, Kestelli), Muṣliḥ al-dīn muṣṭafā, Ottoman theologian and Hanafi jurist, d. 901/1495-6. He was a native of Kestel (Latin *Castellum*), a village near Bursa, where later in his career he built a mosque; from this village comes his nisba of Kestelli if or, more grandiloquently, Kastallani. He studied at Bursa under the famous scholar Ḳhidr Beg, *madrasa* at the Sultan madrasa there, and after concluding his legal and theological studies became himself a teacher in Murdunk, in the Urudu *Fasha madrasa* at Dimetoka (Demotica), and then in one of Mehmed 11’s newly-founded “eight madrasas” in Istanbul. Later he became kādī in Bursa, Edirne, and in (886/1481) in Istanbul. In this latter year he also became Kādī-ud-dīn, i.e. of Rūmeli, the first man to hold this office after the division of this important post into two, Ḳādī-ud-dīn Hasanāzāde Mehmed Efendi becoming Ḳādī-ud-dīn in Anatolia. He was dismissed with a pension in 891/1486 during the reign of Ḳāyız, and died in 901/1495-6 in the capital, being buried in the Eyyūb cemetery.

Kastallani was the author of a number of highly-esteemed legal works in Arabic, including glosses to al-Taftāzāni’s commentary on the *Åṣik‘id* of Naṣāfī al-Dīn al-Naṣāfī (cf. Ḳādī-ud-dīn Khilafī, iv, 226; Brockelmann, I, 549); a work on seven difficult problems (aškhāl) in al-Durǧānī’s commentary on al-Ṭāfī’s *K. al-Mawṣūb* fī *ṭiʿām al-kalām* (Ḵādī-ud-dīn Khilafī, vi, 240); an epistle on the orientation of the kibla, *R. fī Dirḥ al-kibla* (ibid., i, 357); and a work called *Yabāta Ṭāwīb* fī *ṭiʿāb* (ibid., vi, 511).


**KASTAMONI,** modern Turkish form *kastamona*, a town (pop. 1970, 29,338) situated in the western Pontic zone of northern Turkey (42°22′ N, 35°47′ E), the provincial capital (*il merkezi*) and a busy market town for the surrounding region. The *il* (province) of Kastamonu—an area roughly equi-

valent to the ancient Paphlagonia—which is divided at present into fourteen administrative sub-divisions (*ilçe*), is bounded by the Black Sea on the north, and by the *ils* of Zonguldak, Çankiri (*Kangırli*), Candarlı (*Kandirli*), Sinop (*Sinup*), and had a population (1970) of 446,601.

The town of Kastamonu lies on both sides of a narrow valley (Kastamonu deresi or *Kara-omak* deresi) which has been formed by a minor tributary of the upper Giyirmak. The centre of the town, situated on the left (west) bank, is dominated by the precipitous mass of the citadel. This, the “lofty stronghold of the Turcomans” of Ibn Saʿīd, is a congeries of Byzantine, Saljuk, Candarlı and Ottoman structures, being in part, un-
garrisoned and deserted since the reign of Mahmūd II, and finally almost destroyed by an earthquake in 1943.

The toponym of Kastamonu remains obscure in its origins. As Ramsay long ago pointed out, although Kastamonu was situated on “the most important Roman road in the north of Asia Minor” (sc. Nicoma-

edia Iznikmīd (*Izmit*)—Pompeipoli (Taşkőprü, near Kastamonu)—Amaseia (Amasya), and was evidently an important city in later Byzantine times, it is never mentioned in Roman or early Byzantine documents. Consequently attempts to identify Kastamonu with, e.g. Germanicopolis (Ainsworth, Boré, and many later writers) or with Sora (Doublet, *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, 1889), or to supply specious derivations from even the Hittites (Gas-

Tumanna > Kastamonu) (Yūcel, ch. vii) from its known association with the Comneni, must founder on the fact that no form earlier than the 11th cent. Byzantine usage of *kastamona* has yet been traced.

From this form (or, rather, as commonly in such direct transfers, from the accusative *kastamuna*— cf. P. Wittke, *BZ* (1935), 49-50) derive the various forms of Arabic and Turkish usage. Most commonly, from the Saljūkīs down to and throughout the Ottoman period, the name is given as Ḳaṣāmūnī. Cf. however, the variants Ḳaṣṭamūnī (Iḍrisī, cf. Miller, *Mappae Arabicae* 1977, pl. 39; *cf.* 4); Ḳaṣṭamūnlūyā (al-Dimashkī, R. Nābkī, Mehren, 228); Ḳaṣṭamūnīyya (al-ʿUmarī, ed. Qua-

tremère, 340; ed. Taschner, 23, 39-40), and also the various western corruptions: civitas Constamnanis (Albertus Aquensis); Castamana (Clavijo); Castamina, Castamena (Promontorio de Campis (c. 1475), ed. Babinger); Chastarmina, Castimama (Benedetto Del); Castemol (Menavino); for the 19th century: Castemboli, Castemouni (Boré, 1838); Costambone (Murray, *Handbook for Asia Minor* [c. 1870].

The political history of Kastamonu during the four centuries which lie between its first seizure by the Turks in the aftermath of Manzikert (463/1071) and its second and final absorption into the Ottoman state, as a *sandjak* in the *eyālet* of Anadolu (866/1462-3), is often confused, and the establishment of the exact sequence of political authority has not, despite efforts by Cl. Cahen and others, been satisfactorily accomplished. Until the expansion of the Ottoman state in the first part of the 8th/14th century, and the consequent shift westwards of the frontier between dār al-Islām and dār al-barb, the town and fortress of Kastamonu formed the centre of a vast province, which was dominated by the Turkishmans of the * ugl*, and formed a battleground for the conflicting and successive claims of Byzantine, Dānishmend and Saljūk rulers, and of various more or less local autonomous dynasties, of which the *Isfendiyār-oghullar* or *Čandarlar* [q.v.] were the most significant.

As early as 1073-4 the Byzantine emperor Alexis Comnenus had great difficulty in escaping from some Turkmans in the vicinity of Kastamonu; hence, according to a dubious tradition the city is said to have been conquered by a certain *Othmānḡiğ* Beg, one of the commanders of the Dānishmend Malik Ṭāmā Bahzī, shortly before the latter’s death (Ḥusayn Ḥezārfeh, *Tanbih al-tawāirīḥ*, tr. A. D. Mordtmann, *ZDMG*, xxx (1876), 470)—a tradition which attributes to Kastamonu the former name of Askanos. A slightly different version is given by Kāṭib Čelebi, *Dīqān-numā*, 629. In 1101 the Lombards and Turks clashed near and at Kastamonu, but Dānishmend rule seems to have endured until the invasion of Paphlagonia by John Comnenus (7126 or 1123), by the winter of which latter year Kastamonu was again in Muslim hands. By the latter
part of the 6th/12th century, Kastamonu had passed under the control of the Seljuk of Rûm. Clearly Kastamonu belonged to the dynasty, which established there—possibly as early as 608/1211, and certainly by 625—the enigmatic figure of Husâm al-Dîn Çûpan (Çoban) as their beşlerbegi. The political role of the Turkomans during this period is a matter of conjecture; one possibility is a de facto division of authority between the provincial authorities of the Seljuk, controlling the town itself, and the Seljuk amirs, in virtual control of much of the hinterland of the province. At a lower level, it is clear that a Greek or Hellenized (and Christian) population continued to exist under Seljuk rule; the province was also a source for Greek slaves, obtained in razzias on the udî, and destined for the Seljuk army.

The history of Kastamonu during the period of the Ilkhâní and in eastern and central Anatolia is also not entirely clear. At first under the rule of one Yavatsah, as beşlerbegi, by c. 660/1262 the town was controlled by a creature of the Mongols, one Tâşî al-Dîn Mu'tâzî, to whom it was secured as an 8ârî. He died in 670/1271; his son Mu'dîr al-Dîn Amirshâh (d. 701/1302), succeeded to his offices. Also during this period, Kastamonu was held at times, and for short periods, by the son (Husâm al-Dîn Alî Yûrûk) and the alleged grandson (Müzaffar al-Dîn Yavâlk Arslân) of Husâm al-Dîn Çûpan. The grandson certainly founded the second oldest surviving Muslim monument in Kastamonu, the so-called Atabeg Dîâmî (672/1273), held political power before 679/1280, and died in the disturbances of 691/1292. Furthermore, before 677/1278 Kastamonu had been administered by a son of the perde ne Mu'nîn al-Dîn, whose son Mehmâd Beg once more reconquered it in 1295-9.

Cahan has argued that there was no connexion between the descendants of Çûpan and the family which, in the last years of the shadowy Seljuk sultanie of Rûm, founded the most notable of Kastamonu's dynasties, the Isfendiyar oghullarl./Candarids. By 715/1314 Candar's son, Sulaymân Paşa, was already imitating the Seljuk sultanes as a vassal of the Ilkhânî ruler Abû Sa'id. Certainly Ilkhânî coins were struck there in 725/1325 (Lame-Pooe, Cat. B.M., vi (uncertain); Yamanî, 105) and apparently as late as 740/1339 (Zambaur, Münzprägung, 195). Around this time Kastamonu was visited by Ibn Batûtah (winter of 1331/2 or 1332/3), who stayed there forty days and described it as one of the largest and finest cities [of Rûm], where commodities were abundant and prices low. Ibn Sa'id (apud al-Kalkashandî, Şebîb, v, 342) described Kastamonu as a stone-built town of medium size, possessed of mosques, markets and baths, but without walls, and situated in a region of streams and abundant gardens—terms which have been applied, grosso modo, by most Muslim travellers and their western successors down to the 20th century. Kastamonu was incorporated into the Ottoman state by Bayezîd I in 794/1392; restored to its native dynasty by Timûr after Ankara, and once more conquered, this time by Mehemmed II, in 866/1462. The suppression of the old dynasty was symbolised by the appointment of Dîm Sultân as provincial governor of Kastamonu in Sağhab 873/ January 1469, a post which he held until the middle of Sha'bân 937/late 1724. What seems to be the earliest (ca. 1469-74) notice of Kastamonu under restored Ottoman rule—the “Capitaneati dui di Castamina”—is given by the Genoese man of affairs Frumorto de Campen, “magis citta... prouinicia degna et utilissima”, with revenues of 14,000 ducats and the obligation of sending 2550 men into the field.

The geographical position of Kastamonu in relation to the Ottoman military and courier road network—it lay to the north of the great road of the orta ke knock from Üsküdar to the east, which, linking Gerede, Tosya and Oğmângiık (Osmancık), left Kastamonu relatively isolated on the far side of the lofty Ilgaz (Olygassus) range—perhaps explains in part its relative obscurity under Ottoman rule and the paucity of travellers to it until the 19th century. Evliyâ Çelebi's description of the town is lacking, and in the 12th/13th century Kastamonu seems to have been unvisited by any major traveller, although it is known that Ahmed Paşa Bonneval was briefly exiled there in the middle of the century.

The first report by a western visitor is that of J. M. Kinneir, who passed through in 1814. He computed the town to possess 30 mosques with minarets, 25 hamâmans, six khans and a Greek church. The baazars were well-supplied, but the inhabitants were described as being frequently exposed to famine, particularly after a severe winter had impeded local agriculture. A more detailed description was given by the French traveller Eugène Boré (1838), who was the first to give an account of the kabî, “élèvant hardiment dans les airs ses tours et ses remparts en lambeau”, and who found the local administration in the hands of the new men of the Tanzîmât. More scrupulous in his observations, in the year following Boré, was W. F. Ainsworth, who laid down a plan of the town and notes that it was briefly exiled there in the middle of the century.

The population of Kastamonu, in later centuries at least, was preponderantly Muslim. According to Ainsworth the Christian inhabitants were expelled ca. 1730 to a village on the Göklrmak, but were later permitted to return. Ainsworth speaks of 160 Greek and 20 Armenian households out of a total of 12,000, and a manifestly exaggerated population of 46,000; Kinneir, a quarter of a century earlier, had estimated 300 Greek and 500 Armenian families. The population of 12,000. At the end of the 19th century Cuiñet, working on published Ottoman statistics, estimated the population to be 13,200 Muslims, 1,793 Greeks and 572 Armenians.

By the early 19th century Kastamonu, like much of Ottoman Asia, had fallen into economic decay. Kinneir regarded the commerce as "trifling", and noted the lack of manufactures; Boré, likewise, "L'appauvrissement et la gêne" of the inhabitants, and the great decline in trade, with only tanning being carried on actively. Ainsworth, however, one year later, speaks of "the crowded and bustling city" of Kastamonu, with a large trade in wool of a quality almost equal with that of Ankara; in copper wares, and in cotton cloth. The cotton was brought up from Adana and worked up in the town.

The economic and political collapse of Turkey after the First World War reduced the fortunes of Kastamonu to a low ebb. Not lying on a railway, it had not shared in the opening up of Anatolia at the end of the 19th century. More recently, however, the rapid expansion of road transport in Anatolia has brought a new prosperity to the Kastamonu, which now presents an appearance reminiscent of Ainsworth's description, in a setting still little changed from those days.

Bibliography: Apart from works cited in the text, Mehmed Behcet, Kastamoni ațâr-i...
or Kashtiliya, the Castle of the Christians [see Kashtilä]—must be connected with Latin castellum (pl. of castellum), since there existed strongholds in the Djurd, a land of ḫūṣr, just as in the Mūnicipium Florentinum Iliberitanum, which became the diocese of Iliberri (Granada); the Iberian etymology put forward by Dozy in his Recherches, i, 335, looks improbable.

Bibliography: (in addition to the references in the article, and especially Fray Angel Custodio Vega’s book and the bibliography there): Razī-Lēvi-Provençal, La “Description de l’Espagne”, in And., xviii (1953), 66-7; Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Ḥiṣāḥ, ed. Inān, Cairo n.d., i, 99, 104; Yākūt, iv, 97, Ibn Hayyān, Muḥṭābīs, ed. M. M. Antuña (mentions p. 53 Kasīla (sic), and p. 100 Kasīla, ḫādīrat Ilbīra), F. J. Simonet, Descripción del Reino de Granada, Madrid 1861, 27-37; although Kashtiliya is not expressly mentioned there, see also Himyar-Lēvi Provençal, al-Raḍū al-mīṣṭār, text 24, tr. 30; art. GARRĀTA. For Kashtiliya in both al-Andalus and in Tunisia, see now especially J. Oliver Asín, En torno a los orígenes de Castilla: su toponimia en relación con los árabes y los beréberos, in And., xxxviii (1973), index. (J. Bosch-Vila)

KASTILIYA, or KASTILIYE, or KASTILIAN. A place name of the Arabicizer section of the Turkish Ministry of Culture. An extensive photographic survey of the monuments was undertaken by Beşik Çeşen, Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü, Findikli, Istanbul. Reference should also be made to a report by Doğan Kuba (Kastamonunun tarih yapısı...ügli rapor, Istanbul, 1967, 21 8 pp., duplicated. All this material is in the custody of Bay Hüseyin Aydın, Ferahleri indirür, Belediye Sarayı, Kastamonu, who kindly allowed reference to be made to it.

Cf. further RCEA xii, 178, 188; xiii, 46; xvi, 43, 133, 183-4 (all taken from Behect and Yaman); C. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, London, 1968 (consolidates recent research on the pre-Ottoman period); and, to supplement the bibliography s.v. Candar, the articles by M. Yaşar Yücel, AUCTCFD xxiii/i-2 (1966) and Beleten, xxiv (1970). (C. J. Heywood)

KASTILIYA. I. A district, and originally, the chef-lieu of the kūra of Ilbīra in Muslim Spain, which should not be identified and confounded with Granada (Ilbīra). The Arab authors who describe Granada, Ilbīra and Kashtiliya (ḫādīrat Ilbīra) stress the fertility of its soil, comparing it to the Gūṭa of Damascus and mentioning the existence of marble quarries; these descriptions all apply to the zone including Granada and its sego, bounded on the north by the Sierra Elvira. The exact identification of Kashtiliya, the ḫādīrat Ilbīra of Ibn Hayyān, Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, and before them, probably of al-Rāzī, has been a subject of sharp contention since the 19th century (see Fray Angel Custodio Vega, in España sagrada, iii and iv: De la Santa Iglesia Apostólica de Ilbīra [Granada], Madrid 1961, and especially the conclusions noted on pp. 63-4). We believe that Kashtiliya was an ancient fortress which became the first residence of the wāli or ʿāmil of the kūra of Ilbīra and which remained there from the conquest till 400/1010, when it was destroyed by the Berbers, causing the displacement of the political centre of the kūra to Granada. Its site must therefore lie between Atarfe and Pinos Puente, in any spot or spur of land at the foot of the Sierra Elvira.

The Kashtiliyas of Ifrīkya [see below, 2] and al-Andalus—not to be confused with Kashtilä, Kashtila or Kashtiliya, the Castle of the Christians (see Kashtilä)—must be connected with Latin castellum (pl. of castellum), since there existed strongholds in the Djurd, a land of ḫūṣr, just as in the Mūnicipium Florentinum Iliberitanum, which became the diocese of Iliberri (Granada); the Iberian etymology put forward by Dozy in his Recherches, i, 335, looks improbable.

Bibliography: (in addition to the references in the article, and especially Fray Angel Custodio Vega’s book and the bibliography there): Razī-Lēvi-Provençal, La “Description de l’Espagne”, in And., xviii (1953), 66-7; Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Ḥiṣāḥ, ed. Inān, Cairo n.d., i, 99, 104; Yākūt, iv, 97, Ibn Hayyān, Muḥṭābīs, ed. M. M. Antuña (mentions p. 53 Kasīla (sic), and p. 100 Kasīla, ḫādīrat Ilbīra), F. J. Simonet, Descripción del Reino de Granada, Madrid 1861, 27-37; although Kashtiliya is not expressly mentioned there, see also Himyar-Lēvi Provençal, al-Raḍū al-mīṣṭār, text 24, tr. 30; art. GARRĀTA. For Kashtiliya in both al-Andalus and in Tunisia, see now especially J. Oliver Asín, En torno a los orígenes de Castilla: su toponimia en relación con los árabes y los beréberos, in And., xxxviii (1973), index. (J. Bosch-Vila)
Historical geography. The toponym Kastiliya is not found exclusively in Tunisia. Apart from the variant Kaštala for Castile, Yaqūt, iv, 347-8, cites Kastalla in Spain, and Kastiliya in the district of Elvira [see preceding art.]. He also mentions al-Kastal, a place name between Aleppo and Damascus. The ancient citadel of Mesralfa, between Tobna (Thubunae) and Biskra (Vescera) also bore the name of Kaštlla. We have here clearly a toponym of Latin origin, derived from castella, pl. of castellum "citadel", and the incoming Arab conquerors used it to denote first of all Tūzar (= Thusuros), the main fortress of the limes backed by the oasis, and then the whole region dependent upon it.

According to al-Yaḵšūbī (d. ca. 282-92/895-905), this region comprised four oases: "The main one is called Tūzar, and is the residence of the governors the second is Hāmmā; the third, Tāḵyūs; and the fourth, Naftu" (tr. Wiet, Les Pays, 212). Only Tāḵyūs (= Thiges) has now vanished today and given place to Dēgal. This division is given by most of the later Arab geographers, and especially by al-Bakrī and Yāḵšūbī. Ibn Hawḵalī, al-Muḵaddasī and al-Idrīsī merely give descriptions of the towns without giving information on the extent and boundaries of the region. But in later authors, Kaštīliya, now called the Bilad al-Djarld, spills over to include Kaʃa (= Kafisa) in the north and the region of Nafzawa to the south of the Shotts (Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, vi, 199), and even Biskra, Gabēš and the island of Djerba (John-Leo Africanus, Description de l'Afrique, ii, 442-3). The place name Bilād al-Djarld ("Land of the Palms"), or simply al-Djarld, appears for the first time after the middle of the 8th/14th century, from the pen of Ibn Khaldūn, who henceforth uses it as much if not more than Kaštīliya to designate this region. The ancient term of Kaštīliya gradually disappeared, and is today completely unknown except to specialists. Already al-Tīḏānī (wrote in ca. 706/1306), Ibn Abī Dīnār (ca. 1110/1698) and al-Wazīr al-Sarrāḏī (1149/1737) only use it when citing material from earlier authors. John-Leo Africanus, who visited Tunisia in 1517, knew nothing of the term.

Until the 3rd/9th century, there was no appreciable Arab element in Kaštīliya. Al-Yaḵšūbī writes that "The inhabitants are non-Arabs, descendants of the ancient Romans, Berbers and Afārīkā" (loc. cit.), i.e. Latinised and Christianised Berbers. Ibn Khaldūn, speaking of the disturbances of 224/839, mentions Zuwagha, Luwata and Miknasa Berbers (Ibar, iv, 428). The ethnic map cannot have varied much till the middle of the 5th/11th century, sc. till the Hilālīan invasions which brought into the region the Suʾaym, and especially the Kuˈūb section of this latter tribe. From this moment, the ethnic picture began to change noticeably, and Christianity, which had maintained itself, began to disappear. In 706/1306 al-Tīḏānī noted a large number of ruined and abandoned churches (Rīkwla, 162), and he also commented with horror on the practice of eating dogs, which had not yet quite disappeared.

Mediaeval Arabic authors unanimously describe Kaštīliya as a rich and prosperous land. According to al-Bakrī, the tax-yield reached 200,000 dinārī in the middle of the 5th/11th century, compared with a mere 50,000 for Kaʃa. In the 8th/14th century, Ibn Khaldūn marvelled at the density of population there (mustabbirat al-ʿumrān, 'Ibar, vi, 199). There was there an ingenious irrigation system, which struck all observers, and the region produced a vast quantity of dates. Al-Yaḵšūbī mentions an important cultivation of olives, subsequently vanished. In the 4th/10th century, according to Ibn Ḥawḵalī, sugar cane was one of the richest products of the region, but by the next century, says al-Bakrī, was yielding only a mediocre crop, nor was the banana flourishing very well. On the other hand, citrus fruits (al-muḥammaddīt), and above all the citron (al-ulrūd), were of unsurpassed quality. Also cultivated were flax, henna, cumin and caraway, and the fennecfox, esteemed for its fur, was trapped. Ibn Ḥawḵalī further states that Kaštīliya was in his time an important commercial focal point, bustling with merchants from all countries. Its main import was corn, traditionally fetching a high price, and it exported dates, at the rate of a camel's load for two dirhams, says al-Muḵaddasī, and wool—implying the existence of extensive sheep-rearing—and all sorts of woolen products. Trans-Saharan trade to the countries of black Africa was certainly one of the reasons for the region's prosperity in the Middle Ages, and it is known that Abū Yazīd al-Nuḵkārī's father, who was originally from Tāḵyūs or Tūzar, took part in this (Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, iv, 84).

Bibliography: i. Sources (classified chronologically): Ibn ʿAbd al-Hālam, Futāḥ, ed. and partial tr. A. Gateau, Conquête de l'Afrique du Nord et de l'Espagne, Algiers 1942, 64/65 and n. 66, p. 156; Ibn Khurdadhūbī, Masālik; Ibn al-Fākhl, Buldān, ed. and partial tr. of dates. Al-Yaḵubī mentions an important culti-
The leaves and the young shoots of this shrub contain an alkaloid, katin, which produces a euphoric, stimulating, exciting but finally depressing, effect when chewed or drunk in a decoction. It is widely used in Ethiopia, Djibouti, East Africa and the Yemen. The bunches of twigs or shoots (kilt, pl. kaltwit) of the kaf shrub can only be utilised a short time after being gathered, hence in order to transport them and to keep them fresh as long as possible, they are bound up in fresh, moist foliage. Kaf addicts choose young and tender leaves and branches, and chew them up to form a ball about as big as a goolnut; they then keep on chewing this for hours, especially during social gatherings. In this respect, kaf is a factor making for social cohesion and peace, but this is outweighed by its harmful effects. Whilst the state of euphoria induced may be accompanied by a certain feeling of intellectual expansion, this happy feeling is soon succeeded by a state of anxiety which is alleviated by drinking a decoction of coffee husks (kibhri); all reports state unanimously that the habitual use of kaf, being comparatively cheaper than today, this document also shows the fact that its use fell into the category of khibh which ought to be avoided (Tabaks xal-thibh min akl al-kafsa wa 'l-kaf, in al-Faladow al-kubr al-fihsuya, Cairo 1308, iv, 223-24).

The leaves, the raising of this shrub, which is propagated by means of cuttings, plays a great role and gives a considerable income to its cultivators on the plateau, and above all to the middlemen dealing in it. Some economists have put forward remedies which seem, however, hard to apply (see M. S. el-Attar, Le sous-développement economique et social du Yemen, Doc. APD/I27, Rev. I, 1964), and containing two decrees regulating the town in 1164/1748 and 1234/1819 respectively, shows that in the interval between these two dates, the price of a bunch of ca. 280 gr. and of the best quality went down by a half and corresponded at the beginning of the 19th century to one-quarter of a workman’s salary, i.e., it was comparatively cheaper than today. This document also shows that the consumption of kaf was officially authorised, although Ibn Haji al-Haythami (d. 1572) had written—in reply to questions about its use which had come from people in San'a and Zabid, and without taking up a definite attitude towards the contradictory opinions of reputable scholars on the effects of kaf—that its use fell into the category of khibh which ought to be avoided (Tabaks xal-thibh min akl al-kafsa wa ‘l-kaf, in al-Faladow al-kubr al-fihsuya, Cairo 1308, iv, 223-24).

Bibliography: In addition to references in the article, the works of European travellers include: La Roque, Voyage de l’Arabie heureuse, Amsterdam 1765, iii, 65; Destrée, Description de l’Arabie, Paris 1779, ii, 240 (his colleague the botanist Forskal was the first to study kaf); Botta, Relation d’un voyage dans l’Yemen, Paris 1841, 45-6, 83, 90, 98-9; idem, in Arch. du Muséum d’histoire naturelle, ii (1847), 71-2; Maltzan, Reise nach SüdArabien, 213, 347, 400; A. Deflers, Voyage au Yemen, Paris 1889, 90, 121-2; idem, in J. de Pharmacie et de Chimie, xxiii (1890), 174-5. See further: Id., Le bras, Le problème du kat, in Pount, (1967), 17-27; J. Guedel, Incidences médiko-sociales de la consommation habituelle du kat, ibid., 29-37; M. Charpin, Incidences chirurgicales de la consommation habituelle du kat, ibid., vi (1969), 25-9; J. Chelhod, La société yéménite et le kat, in Objets et mondes, xlii (1972), 2-33 (with bibli.); M. Rodinson, in JA (forthcoming).

KAT (A), cutting off. The Arabic verb kafa has been very widely used in a variety of literal and metaphorical senses; this diversity is often of interest for both religious and cultural history.

The infinitive kaf does not occur in the Kur’án, but the finite verb occurs both in the literal and in a rather metaphorical sense: Sura V, 42 (38): “Cut off the hands of the thief and the female thief”—the well-known prescription which has passed into jkk and is sometimes briefly designated as kaf al-liss; Sura VIII, 7: “and [Allah] may cut off the root of the Infliders”, i.e., extirpate them. Sura II, 25 and XIII, 25 (27) (“those who cut up what Allah has ordered to join”; Sura XXIX, 28 [29] “will you cut the road?”, i.e., commit highway robbery; Sura XXVII, 32 “I decide nothing”).

To the early reciters of the Kur’án (kurraj), kaf was the pause in reading, used on the sense or otherwise. Later a distinction was made between the short pause for breath, and the other pauses,
based on the sense; according to some, kaṭ̣ indicated only the first; according to others only the second.

The grammarians use alif al-kaṭ̣ for the disjunctive hama which, opposed to the so-called hamsat al-wasāl, cannot be elided [see ALIF]. Kaṭ̣ further indicates the deliberate cutting, for a special purpose, between elements of a sentence which syntactically are closely connected, e.g. instead of al-ṣamudu li ʿlāhi ṣamudī one might say al-ṣamudu li ʿlāhi ṣamudī (= wahhā wa-ḥamīdu), or . . . ḩamīda (= aš-šamīda).

In prosody, kaṭ̣ indicates cutting short the ending of certain metrical feet, e.g., the shortening of the metrical foot fāsil kun to fāṣil = faṣalun or of mustafīṣilun to mustaṣil = maṣilun. This shortened form is then called maṣūbi.

For mathematicians, kaṭ̣ al-maḥārīb, the conic section, is of importance; specifically kaṭ̣ al-ṭārīq is the hyperbola, kaṭ̣ ʿalḥiṣ the ellipse, kaṭ̣ muḥāfi the parabola and kaṭ̣ muḥāfi maṣūṣah the paraboloid.

In astrology, kaṭ̣ indicates scission = διαφοράς, specifically διαφοράς, climacteric. Kaṭ̣ (al-warārah), in the sense of format of paper, has had a certain importance in the history of official administration. The Arabic paper is of many different formats, but according to Grohmann the Arabic libraries to have assessed both the dominations and sizes from the Greeks. In any case, one can recognize a certain continuity in the dimensions of the format. An ordinary roll of papyrus of 20 leaves, about 5 metres long, was called kīrāṣ (from Greek χιτήσις, Aramaic בּשָׁלַח) and the sixth part of it, fīmār or fīmār kīrāṣ (τομή χιτήσις). In the papyrus texts parts of the roll are mentioned frequently, e.g., 2/3 roll (δισυλακτος kīrāṣ), 1/3, 1/6 (fīmār) and also 1/2 and 1/3 of a fīmār. The surviving documents emanating from the Egyptian provincial chancellery of Kurra b. ʿSharīj (90-96/709-714) [q.v.] are distinguished by an exceptionally large format and wide spacing between the lines. Documents emanating from the government chancellery of the Umayyads in Damascus have apparently not survived but it seems that as early as Muʿawiyah’s reign distinctions of format were known according to the rank of the addressee. This information comes from a lost Kitāb al-balām wa-l-dāgit of Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-Maʿdānijī, who is perhaps identical with Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Madinī (d. 581/1185, Brockelmann S I, 604, 10c). According to this work, caliphs were addressed on 2/3 fīmār (li ʿl-baḥūla) fi kīrāṣ min ṣuḥūsay fīmār, governors on 1/2, finance directors and secretaries on 1/3, merchants on 1/4, bookkeepers and geometers on 1/6. Apart from these distinctions, it is worth noticing that literary papyri have an almost square format whereas an oblong format, later on called maṣūṣah, was reserved for the Qurʾān. According to a statement by Ibn ʿAbdūs (d. 331/942), al-Walīd I (86-96/705-715) was the first Umayyad caliph who was addressed on fāṣil and who introduced a larger format and a more elegant writing (wa-amara bi-an tuʿażama kūtubhū wa-yudājallala ʿl-khafī). But ʿUmar II (90-101/717-720) was opposed to such extravagance and ordered the clerks to write closely (bi-dījām al-khaṭāf); his own writings were only one span wide (fa-kānāt kūtubhū inna mā hā yuḥbr). The state chancellery of the ʿAbbāsid had also a distinct format, described by al-Sūfī (d. 335/ 946); he mentions the sizes of the sheets (al-maḥādīr al-lābiʿ yuḥbr fikā min al-khafī). The formats are the same as those used under the Umayyads, to which was added a 2/5 format for special (khāṣṣ) documents, autographed or dictated by the vizier.

The Arab riots informant on this point was Abūmān b. Ismāʿīl b. al-Khaṣṣāb al-Anbārī, an intimate of the caliph of one day al-Muṭṭadād (296/908) = Ibn al-Muṭṭazz [q.v.].

From the Mamlūk period we have no less than three lists which show some development in the formats. The oldest is that preserved by Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Faḍl-Allāh al-Umārī (d. 749/1349) in which he describes the sizes of the formats of the sheets (maḥādīr kaṭ̣ al-wārārah al-lābiʿ yuḥbr fikā). Here also there are five formats, which however include only three of the early ones: 2/3, 1/2 and 1/3. The largest is an in-folio (al-kaṭ̣ al-khāmi) used for treaties and the smallest is an ordinary format (kaṭ̣ al-sāda) used for decrees and appointments of the lowest rank. The latter was therefore the format most commonly used and corresponded with the two early formats 1/4 and 1/6. The author adds that the formats are thus sufficiently explained and that the rest may be inferred by analogy (tajāj ilāhī bi-ʿalaykh wa-bi ʿlāhi ʿl-tawfīq).

Al-Kalkashandī (d. 821/1418), the greatest authority on the secretarial art, also deals thoroughly with the formats and their history. His lists contain nine Egyptian and six Syrian formats. Besides the five ancient Egyptian sizes, he mentions three in-folios. One is from Baghdad, a larger and a smaller, and a third from Syria. He also adds a particularly small size for use with carrier-pigeons (al-kaṭ̣ al-saghīr min warāk al-lāy). The four Syrian sizes were intended for the chancelleries in the province of ʿkāmil, 1/2 hamawi, ʿdda and warāk al-lāy. From Al-Kalkashandī’s explanations, it is clear that he does not conceive the names of the format as indicating parts of the sheet, but as indicating the width in Egyptian ells as used for measuring cloth, e.g., 2/3 = ṣuḥūsay [Greek χιτήσις] bi-ḥdnah bi-ḥdnah al-ḥamād al-Misrī.

After Al-Kalkashandī, the number of formats increased still further and resulted in an excess of formats too numerous to systematize. An anonymous description of Egyptian chancellery procedure, dating from the end of the 9th/10th century, is preserved in a Paris manuscript under the title Dēdīkī al-imāk. Quatremer used this in his introduction to his Histoire des Mongols, while Karabacek used it to try and introduce some order into the scattered data. In assuming that the Egyptian textile ell was 48.886 cm. and that the relationship of breadth to height was on average two to three, he was able to calculate all the formats in centimetres. His findings are put together in a table comprising fifteen formats, including the classical five formats, and in addition, no less than seven folio formats. Despite the enormous effort involved, the findings are somewhat uncertain, and an edition of the text would be desirable. This Egyptian development came to an abrupt end with the Ottoman conquest in 1517. As an Ottoman province Egypt had no state chancellery.

Ottoman documents, according to Fekete, were always long and narrow, but the so-called Imperial Letters to foreign rulers had very varied and sometimes huge formats. The Arabic formats were apparently not known, but many styles of writing had names like sīlūs and ʿumrār. In the Mongol state chancellery also, paper was long and narrow, on the Chinese model. In the Arab east, kaṭ̣ as a format is still not entirely forgotten (cf. the dictionaries of Belot, Elias, Wehr), while in Turkish the word şaḥa is in common use (cf. Samy, Heuser, Ağakay).

In religious history, the expression kaṭaʿa yaṣmaṇa = “to swear an oath”, which Pedersen (Der Eid bei
The term KAT — KATA 743

den Semiten, 46 and 12 n. 5) compares with the Hebrew karat bet "to make a covenant". As in other Semitic languages, KATA acquires the meaning of "resolve", "decide". In logic, it means "to assert or, e.g. ^alima kafan karat bet = "to make a covenant". As in other... ghataf, (from its guttural cawing), the Large Pintailed Sandgrouse (Pterocles alchata, a taxonomic preservation of the

A small Shfi sect is known as the Kat'iyiya for they "cut off" the line of Imams with the death of Musa al-Kazim.


Astrology: C. A. Nallino, Del Vocabolo qat nell' astrologia araba, in RSO, viii Part 2 (1921), 729-43;


Arabic generic name). Its geographical distribution
is the same as that of the Black-bellied Sandgrouse
but extending also to Cyrenaica. As big as the latter,
the cata has a white belly with a broad bright red
band bordered by a black stripe across the chest.
In the female, this breast plumage is bright yellow
transversely crossed by a black streak like that
of the male Lichtenstein's Sandgrouse. Both sexes
have their eyes camouflaged with black.

The nomads could well be excused for having
differentiated only three species of sandgrouse out
of six, on account of the close similarity of the
plumage of each one. All are predominantly sandy-
yellow, with fine speckles giving a pearl-grey tone
(māriyya) which assures complete nilmisis, and
all the species also display identical behaviour.
With the added factor of sexual dimorphism,
only a skilled ornithologist could draw up an
inventory of this rather homogeneous family. On the
other hand, few observers other than these desert
people have known in detail the biology of the
sandgrouse which, placed between the Columbidae
and the Gallinaceae, are essentially granivorous and
live principally at ground level. On the ground they
look like little partridges with short legs, but in
flight they resemble pigeons (see above, the Touareg
names which apply to the Columbidae also). Bod. in
their habitat is the semi-desert regions they are
obliged to cover long distances (sometimes 50 km.
or more) in order to quench their thirst. For this
purpose they assemble in large flocks (sīrb, pl.
ṣarāb, rā'sa pl. rīḍāl) and reach the watering place
in a great turmoil of cries in order to keep in contact;
they cleave the air rapidly and some bathe while
the mothers gorge themselves with water so that
on their return they can regurgitate it into the
 parched gullets of their chicks. Their stop at the
water source is very short and the birds hurry to
get back to their own grounds.

From the earliest times in their life in solitary
places, the Bedouin have had the time to notice
all the details of the behaviour of the sandgrouse
and to incorporate them into the dicta which the
poets have turned to account (see al-Maydam,
fiyyawdn, v, 217, 287, 573-81 and index). The sand-
grouse. This extraor-
dinary instinctive ability to come straight back
to her nest, among the hundreds of nesting-places
of the colony, after each "watering party", and
then to recognise her own hatched chicks (djawāl
pl. djawād) in order to give them water, this maternal
solicitude joined with the attachment of the mate
which shares all the tasks of educating the young,
were such good examples that the admiration of
the nomad was expressed in the saying akhā min
al-ḥaṣā "with a better sense of direction than the
sandgrouse". Exposed and defenceless in a hostile
world, "the survival of the fittest" is the
rule, these little chicks of the sandgrouse are unable
do without the protection and experience of
their parents, from whom they have much to learn
in the art of self-preservation, amid the many
perils which threaten them; but in such a good
school, they soon manage to acquire this permanent
mistrust which is the secret of survival of the species.
The tent dwellers, in their laconic way, knew how to
crystallise all the wisdom to be drawn from this
contrast of powerful and weak in this saying:
layṣa ḫatān miṯl khatayy "Sandgrouse old and sandgrouse
young make a pair".

It is of course round these watering points that
man has at all times lain in wait for and captured
the sandgrouse as a source of food, using in the
process all the tricks and inuence born of his
ingenuity in the art of birdcatching. Nooses, trip
nets, snares and all kinds of booby-traps are set up
for them at the watering place, as a number of
pre-Islamic verses prove. Very few poets indeed of the
Diḥālīyya and the beginnings of Islam have
omitted to cite the sandgrouse and its daily visit
to the pool, which exposed it to the greed of the
stalker. There are, first of all, these verses pointing
with reality from the famous Lāmiyyat al-`Arab
(verses 36-42) attributed to Ṣhanfārā. The poet,
having returned to a life close to nature, overtakes
in the watering place the packed flights of sand-
grouse and contends with them for the vital ele
ment. Ḥumayd b. Ṭhawr knew how to present the
bird in its habitat (Diwashn, Cairo 1321/1905, 53 no. 6,
verses 16-27), while Zuhayr b. Ḥabīl Sulmā shows it
fleeing before the attack of the falcon (Diwashn, ed.
Ahlwardt, 36 no. 10, verses 13-24), a theme taken
up again by al-`Akwīl (Maṣahīn biḥaṭība, ii, 96).
Also touching is the composition variously attributed
to the Maṣūn of the `Amar, to Kays b. Dharīb
and to Tawba b. Ḥumayyir (al-Damlīrī, ii, 253;
Aqānī, iii, 40; Hayawān, v. 577), which is thus
conceived: (metre wafir, rhyme -dā): "My heart,
on the evening when it learned that he should
go away with Laylā of the `Amar on the morrow,
in the morning or in the evening, was like a sand-
grouse which had fallen into a snare and which
struggled ceaselessly throughout the night, but in
vain, its wing caught fast in the mesh."

The treachery of the nets did not escape Zuhayr
when, comparing the speed of his charger with that
of the sandgrouse in flight, he said (Diwashn, Tunis
1323/1905, 44 verse 13, metre bāṣī, rhyme -dā): "He is as
swift as one of these [untiring] sandgrouse of the
pools, but one which the drawers of water
have chased, and whose companion the snares
have ravished." In his turn, Ubayy (d. 90/709)
evokes the same picture in this verse (L.A, s.v.
SH-B-K, metre bāṣī, rhyme -dā): "Or a flight of sandgrouse of Fayhān which the snares and
stalkers chased from the watering place of Yaḥribt"

Another characteristic of the sandgrouse which
the poets have brought into relief is its embarrased
gait, caused by the smallness of its feet; it walks,
waddling along with measured step, head and tail erect and with its chest thrown out, evoking rather well the portly and majestic bearing of the woman of ample form, the ideal of feminine beauty for the Arabs. Al-Kumayt, among others, knew how to exploit this comparison (see Bayawān, v, 370); but it would not be possible to mention here all those who include the sandgrouse in their rhymes without making the list too long.

In the more concrete domain of the hunt, with the development under the 4 Abbásids of the sport of hawking [see Bayzara], an attempt was made to attract the goshawk to the sandgrouse, but without great success. Access to the grounds of this bird was already difficult, and the sandgrouse was little inclined to fly off individually. It was impossible to dislodge it from the dense thickets where it took refuge without recourse to a hunting dog (zaghārd); bustards, partridges and francolins were put to flight more easily. As for falcons, they were too noble for this low flying. On the other hand they perfected the methods of capture with the net by joining to the swinging trip net the contrivance of a live calling bird (da'āwa) with a young pigeon disguised as a sandgrouse. 'Isā al-Asadī (7th/13th century) indicates in his vast cmegetic encyclopedia (al-bayzara, ms. Escurial, Ar. 903, fol. 159b-160a) the way to transform this pigeon by dying its plumage with saffron or henna, and by docking its tail, to make it look like a sandgrouse. The stalker at the hut (Kawāqū) would set up his net upwind on days of high wind and place the pigeon a few metres in front, being able to make it move with the aid of a leash. When the flock of sandgrouse arrived flying very low in the wind, the hunter would make the calling bird jump about. To complete the resemblance, he would make the cry of the young sandgrouse by means of a decoy call made with a fine tongue of leather which vibrated between two wooden plates with the wind. The birds would begin their descent and would immediately see themselves covered by the clap net which dropped down. This method of hunting was very much in favour in the 19th century and "the mighty rampart of the Yemen mountains" towards the north. Although travellers can go from Aden to Ta'izz via Kaţaba, the main route swings westwards before reaching al-Dālīf and Kaţaba. The way north from Kaţaba towards Yarim and Sanā' is very difficult to traverse. Kaţaba's importance derives primarily from its position as a border stronghold.

Kaţaba is not mentioned by the older geographers such as al-Hamdānī, though they speak of the tribe of Dja'da [q.v.] as dwelling in this region. In the 12th/18th century Kaţaba was fought over by Yāfī [q.v.] and other peoples in the vicinity. After the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, the Ottoman government reinforced its authority in the Yemen and stationed a garrison in Kaţaba. British influence having spread from Aden into the hinterland, a joint Anglo-Ottoman commission worked from 1319/1902 to 1323/1905 in demarcating a boundary line that left Kaţaba just inside Yemeni territory. This line still divides Northern Yemen from Southern Yemen.

During World War I, Ottoman forces advanced from the Yemen against Aden, which they failed to capture after a long siege. After the close of the war, the Turks withdrew from the Yemen, and the Imām Yābiyā b. Muḥammad Hamd al-Dīn [q.v.] acquired full sovereignty over the country. As Yābiyā claimed that the areas under British protection south of the boundary rightfully belonged to the Yaman, clashes took place along the line, with Kaţaba being one of the most sensitive spots. Although Yābiyā and Britain concluded the Treaty of Sanā' in 1352/1934, providing for the maintenance of "the situation existing in regard to the frontier [al-ḥudād]", the troubles did not cease. Yābiyā was assassinated in 1367/1949. When a revolution overthrew his grandson Muḥammad al-Badr in 1382/1968, the new Yemen Arab Republic adopted the old territorial claims of the imamate,
but the republican government was diverted by the civil war against al-Hadir and his supporters.

In 1383/1963 the National Liberation Front, a leftist party in Aden and its hinterland, began an armed struggle against the British in Diabat Radfan south of Ka’taba. This struggle culminated with the Front seizing power when the British evacuated Aden in 1385/1967 and establishing what is now called the People’s Democratic Republic of the Yaman. Relations between the two Yemeni states have been strained, and the Aden government has charged that Northern Yaman uses Ka’taba and other places as bases for subversive activities against its territory.


**Katabán,** a pre-Islamic people of southwest Arabia, for knowledge of whom we are dependent on the ancient native inscriptions. They were known to the Greek and Latin geographers, under the names Kāṭbān, Cattabanenses and other variants, but the data available from that source need to be controlled against the background of the primary epigraphic sources. Muslim writers had no knowledge of them as a people, though Yākūt records Kitābān as a simple place-name “in the region of Aden”.

The distinctive culture of pre-Islamic southwest Arabia was that of a settled farming population, having at the base of its social structure the village community. A plurality of such communities formed a social unit described by a term corresponding to the Arabic word ṣaḥāb; the cohesion of this unit was fundamentally economic, secondarily political and social, but it was not a kinship-group. At a third level of grouping we find cases where one ṣaḥāb gained a dominance or hegemony on its surrounding ṣaḥāb groups. Finally, there is a fourth level of differentiation within the culture area as a whole, based on linguistic criteria: the language of the inscriptions is classifiable into four main dialects, and when the Greek geographers tell us that there were four principal “nations” in the area, it is clear that they are using the linguistic criterion of differentiation.

The existence of these various levels of grouping has led to some confusion in the use of the term Katabanian, for scholars have not always been careful in distinguishing the levels at which the term is applicable. It is certain from the inscriptions that Kataban was a ṣaḥāb, whose territory consisted of the present-day Wādī Bayḥān [q.v.], and probably also the Wādī Harib [q.v.] parallel to it on the west; in ancient times, Bayhan had been the name merely of a group of a number of village communities which together constituted the ṣaḥāb Kataban. At certain periods in its history, however, the ṣaḥāb Kataban was the dominant element in a hegemony which extended over the highland plateau south of the Wādī Bayḥān (now the Yemeni province of al-Bayḍá’, 3rd century A.D.; and beyond that into Daqín [q.v.], the lowland area at the foot of the escarpment which forms the southern boundary of the plateau. The classical geographers tell us that the Katabanians extended as far as the Red Sea and Indian Ocean coasts; but in so doing they were probably referring to the linguistic “nation”, i.e. the ethnic group which used the same dialect as the ṣaḥāb Kataban, for there is no epigraphic evidence to show that the latter ever exercised real political control over so wide an area.

The most we can say is that there were certain social linkages between the Katabanian heartland and the isolated highland massif in the extreme southwest of the peninsula of which today Ta’if is the administrative centre, for the township of Ḥarbād in the Wādī Harib was founded by immigrants from Sawwa, not far from Ta’if.

There are some indications that, in the earliest phase of our historical records, it was the ṣaḥāb Awsan which was the dominant partner in a confederacy covering to some extent the same area as the later Katabanian confederacy. This is the most probable interpretation of the Sirwāḥ inscription (RES 3945), which records that Saba crushed Awsan and liberated Kataban from Awsanian domination. F. Hommel supposed this to mean that Awsan then vanished completely and finally from the map, which is certainly wrong, since mention of Awsan occurs again much later—probably when the Katabanian confederacy had in its turn broken up.

The chronology of Kataban is still in some dispute. An American school, of which the protagonists are W. F. Albright and A. Jamme, hold that its history stretches from the 6th century B.C. or even earlier, down to the early years of the Christian Era. A continental school, headed by J. Ryckmans and J. Pirenne, dates the whole process some two centuries or so later. The only certainty is that there is no mention whatever of Kataban in inscriptions from the 4th century A.D. onwards; and we are forced to believe that by this time Kataban had disappeared from the political and social map. This is why Muslim writers knew nothing of it as a social entity, for such knowledge as they had of pre-Islamic affairs extends only to the couple of centuries immediately preceding Islam. It could also be surmised that it was the disappearance of Kataban that paved the way for the rise of Bayhan from being a mere village community to an entity giving its name to the whole Wadi, but at the same time speaking of the king of Hadramawt as overlord: this suggests that Kataban may have been overthrown by a Sabaean-Hadrami alliance, which assigned the former lands of the ṣaḥāb Kataban to Hadhrami overlordship.

Apart from the uncertainty of the absolute chronology, a diversity of attempts have been made at establishing an internal relative chronology; but it is doubtful whether even the best of these can yet be regarded as definitive.

**Archaeology.** In this respect, the Wādī Bayḥān is better known than any other area of comparable size in the culture area, thanks largely to the intensive research campaigns of 1950-52 under the auspices of the American Foundation for the Study of Man. These concentrated much of their attention on a site now known as Ḥadjar Kūjān, 3rd century B.C.; and on the south-western badlands in the Wādī Harib, which are now engulfed in desert sands, was formerly a highly prosperous settlement. There was a rectangular walled town, one quarter of the area of which was an open market space, wherein stands a stela of ancient date containing the market regulations; a temple outside the walled town; and a burial ground at a small rocky outcrop now called Ḥayd Bin Ṣākil; a few kilometres north-east of the town. This site was the metropolis of the Katabanian confederacy in its
heyday; but it came to a violent end, being destroyed by fire. There are, however, indications that the original headquarters of the sha'b Kataban, before it emerged into paramountcy over the confederation, may have been at the site now called Hadjar Bin Ḥumeyyed, approximately halfway between Ḥāḍjar Kūḥlān and the present administrative centre at Baybān al-Ḳaṣāb, for the stratigraphic evidence here seems to indicate a very high antiquity indeed for the site.3

Three possible routes link the Wāḍī Baybān with the Wāḍī Ḥarīf. One can skirt the northern end of the mountain range separating the two wādīs, but this route must always have been insecure, exposed as it is to attacks from desert tribesmen. Somewhat further there is a pass known as Ḍakāl Markād, devoid of inscriptive records but having on the eastern approach two stone walls which start from the sides of the valley and gradually converge, as they ascend, to a narrow opening at the summit of the pass; this ensures that caravans could only cross the pass at that precise point, thus facilitating customs control. Further south again there is a much more impressive relic. Due west of Ḥāḍjar Bin Ḥumeyyed, the Wāḍī Mablaḵa strikes up into the dividing mountain chain. At the head of this, one ascends by a steep zigzag climb to the mountaintop (this last the name of a prominent mountain on the west side of the Wāḍī Baybān)—see Beeton, Qaṭḥān, ii.

Institutions. The titular head of the sha'b Kataban was a king, malīk; but he was by no means an autocrat. Legislative enactments were passed in the name of the king together with other functionaries having a variety of titles impossible to interpret with any precision, but who may have been grouped together under a name etymologically related to Arabic sayyid. The composition of the body probably varied according to the business in hand; in the market regulations a prominent role is played by the "overseer" (ḥr) of the market, in irrigation texts by the landlords. The king was not supreme legislator but rather chief executive. His functions were to register, promulgate and secure the carrying out of the acts of the legislative body; to initiate major public works; and to act as commander in war.

He had moreover a dual role. By virtue of being head of the sha'b Kataban he was also head of the confederacy in which the sha'b Kataban was the dominant member—in rather the same way that the Queen of England is also "head of the British Commonwealth". As head of the confederacy, he used formally the title mḥrb (vocalization unknown) of Kataban, i.e. in this context, the Katabanian confederacy. It must be stressed that a theory propounded by F. Hommel, and still unfortunately being given currency, has in the last few decades been proved conclusively to be unfounded and is not now believed by any expert: namely, that mḥrb was the title of the "priest-ruler" (Acadian ensi) of a theocratic state anterior to the establishment of a secular state headed by a king.

The crucial evidence on this point is the inscription at the head of the Mablaḵa pass. This is in two parts: in the first (RES 2550) the credit for sponsoring the work is claimed for an individual styling himself mḥrb of Kataban; in the second (Ryckmans 390, not published until 1949), the director of public works states that he supervised the work "on behalf of his lord the king of Kataban". King and mḥrb are the same individual. It is clear that, to a member of the sha'b Kataban, his superior was simply "king of
Katabān", but the latter, in sponsoring a major public work for the benefit of, and probably financed by, the whole confederacy, used the title *mḥrb* which stressed his position as head of the confederacy and not merely of the *shāb*.

While it is possible that every *mḥrb* may have been also a king, the reverse is not true. There are several instances of two brothers, or a father and son, being designated "joint kings of Katabān", but the title *mḥrb* never occurs in dual or plural. It would be safe to conclude, at least provisionally, that when there were two joint kings of the *shāb*, only one could be formal head of the confederacy.

Certain holders of the *mḥrb* office list and elaborate series of other formal titles, among which two phrases deserve note. The *mḥrb* is tax-collector (ṣqr, cf. ṭigirinya *ṣaq* al-dārī), chief administrator (ṣyn), and priest, of the tutelary deity of the confederacy, "Amm; he was therefore responsible for federal tax-collection and other administration, and for the maintenance of the federal cultus. Further, he is "first-born" (*ḥbr*) of that deity: this expression has to be evaluated in the context of the fact that all members of the Katabanian confederacy are collectively the "children of 'Amm", that is, under the special protection of the tutelary deity of the confederacy; there is no reason to think that "first-born" implies anything more than the primacy of status enjoyed by the head of the confederacy in relation to the other "children of 'Amm".

One institution which emerges with greater clarity in Katabān than elsewhere is the *corvée*. The maintenance of the great irrigational installations which served a number of properties was the responsibility of the landowners concerned, and the latter were obliged to provide for the corvée labour in each period of fifteen days (RES 354 as reinterpreted in Beeston, Calendars, 6-7).

Language. The dialects of the culture area constitute an independent language within the southern branch of the Semitic languages, as distinct from Arabic as is, on the one hand Aramaic, and on the other Ethiopic (albeit in the later, post-Katabanian, phase a good many Arabic lexical items begin to creep in). Of the Katabanian dialect itself, the most noteworthy features are: (a) the prefix of the causative verb-system, and the base of the third person independent and affixed pronouns, are sibilants, as they are in Minaean and Hadrami, whereas Sabaeans has h in these forms; (b) the imperfect indicative of verbs has a b-prefix, contrasting with absence of the prefix in subjunctive and jussive.

The script is the South Semitic alphabet used throughout the culture area (either directly ancestral to, or at all events closely related to, Ethiopic script), but with a fairly distinctive Katabanian ductus, which in the earlier phases resembles Minaean ductus and in the latter phases evolves its own characteristic style of great beauty. The alphabet contains 29 consonantal symbols, representing the 38 consonantal phonemes of Arabic plus an extra unvoiced sibilant phoneme.


**KATĀDĀ B. DI'ĀMA B. KATADA AL-SADūSĪ, ABU'L-KHATTĀB, A Successor,** who was blind from birth and who became proverbial (see, e.g., Ibn Bassām, *Dhakhira*, i, 1, 2) for his prodigious memory and his knowledge about genealogies, lexicography, historical traditions, Kur'ānic exegesis and the readings, and hadīth. Of Bedouin origin, he spent his life in Basra, where he said to have gone about without a guide. He was the pupil of al-Ḥasan al-Ḥasīfī and Ibn Sirīn, and also transmitted the *Ṣaḥīfa* of Dālib b. ʿAbd Allāh (Goldzahler, *Muh. Stud.*, ii, 10, Eng. tr. ii, 23). He was considered to be a proponent of the doctrine of free will (see *Kadāriyya*), and it was he who gave their name to the Muʿtazilīites, but it is also said that he reproached his Kadāri views. His exegetical teaching was written down by Saʿīd b. Baghīr (*Fīhrīst*, 51), who died in 168/784-5, according to Ibn ʿImād, *Shahrārī*, i, 265-6. He was supposedly born in 606/880, and died of plague at Wāṣit in 117/735, but the information on the place and date of his death is contradictory.


**KATĀDĀ B. IDRĪS,** usually known as AbūʿUzayyīz, the ancestor of the *ṣaḥīfs* of Mecca from the beginning of the 7th/13th century. He was born in the district of Yanbuʿ, probably soon after 540/1145-6. Yanbuʿ, a fortress, on the Mecca-Medina road, was then dominated by the Katada family, one of the ʿAlawi families which belonged to the branch of al-Ḥasan b. ʿAli. At the beginning of the 7th/13th century Mukhaṭhir b. Kāsam, *ṣaḥīf* and ruler of Mecca, died. He was succeeded by his son Muhammad, the last *ṣaḥīf* from the ruling family of the Hawāshīm. Katada b. Idrīs, who had earlier succeeded in uniting his tribe with the other tribes of the district of Yanbuʿ under his leadership, captured Mecca and killed Muhammad b. Mukhaṭhir. The last *ṣaḥīfs* of the Banū Ḥāshim had lived in an atmosphere of constant family strife and quarrels. Meanwhile, Katada had established himself in Yanbuʿ and extended his power southwards in the direction of Mecca, thus preparing his attack on the holy city.

(CH. PELLAT)
Katada was a man of political genius. He pursued the idea of founding an independent state in Arabia, recognizing the weakness of both the 'Abbásids of Baghdađ and the Ayyūbīds of Egypt and Syria. Since neither they nor the Zaydis of Yaman presented any real threat, he endeavoured to capture the whole of the Hijāz. After repairing the ruined walls of Mecca, he captured al-Ta'fi and brought the Ṭaḥṣīf tribes under his dominion. Katada rebuilt the fortress of Yanbu', organized his army and then tried to capture Medina, but Sālim b. Kāsim, the sharīf of Medina, and a member of the Husaynī branch of the 'Alawl family, thwarted his purpose.

Although Katada was a Shīfī, he acknowledged the suzerainty of the 'Abbāsīd caliph al-_NSīr. On the whole, however, his relations with the caliph were frequently strained and sometimes broke into open hostility. Nevertheless, the caliph, who was working to reunite the Muslim world under his leadership, once invited him to visit Baghdađ. It is said that Katada started on his journey to the capital, but returned to his own country when he was met by an embassy of the caliph which had in its train lettered lions. Be this legend or fact, this much is certain, that Katada embodied his idea of the "splendid isolation" in verses which are a typical illustration of his negative attitude towards foreign powers. Probably his encouragement of the Zaydis occupation of Yaman is to be viewed in the same light.

In 609/1212-13, the mother of Dīlāl al-Dīn, leader of the Assassins, lord of Alamūt and the ally of al-NSīr, the 'Abbāsīd caliph, went to Mecca on the pilgrimage. Her visit coincided with the murder of Katada's cousin. Katada, who greatly resembled his relative as candidate for the throne. His son Irlasan, who suspected him of favouring one of his relatives, put him to death. While Katada's cousin was sure that he himself was the intended victim and that the murderer was an Assassin sent by his cousin, was sure that he himself was the intended victim and that the murderer was an Assassin sent against him by the caliph. Greatly angered, he attacked and looted the Irlakī pilgrims and imposed a heavy fine on them, which was paid by the lady of Alamūt.

In his last days Katada undertook an expedition against Medina. Illness, however, induced him to return to Mecca, where he was killed in 618/1221 by his son Hasan, who suspected him of favouring one of his relatives as candidate for the throne. His descendants were ruling sharifs in Mecca until 1916, when Husayn converted the sharifate into a kingdom.

Bibliography: Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi, Mirʾat al-saman, Hyderabad 1952, viii, 617-8; Fāṣ, Shīfī al-šarīf, ed. Bib. Ind., 55-9; Barani (op. cit., 288) includes the whole of Katāh in the regions affected by 'Alawi al-Dīn Kalbūjī's revenue reforms (ca. 701/1301); in about 770/1372-8 the murder of the governor of Badāʿūn by Ṣayyid Khān, the chief of the Katariya Rādīpūṭs, led to a terrible vengeance by Feroz b. Rādīpūṭ ("Feroz Shāh Tughluḳ").
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region's main avenues of approach were from Benguela via Bihé on the west, and from Lakes Tanganyika and Nyasa on the east. The principal highway of Islamic penetration in eastern Africa, however, from the coast to Lake Tanganyika, where by 1840 a permanent trading centre had been established at Ujiji, continued thence due east to Maniema and the Luapula valley, where Islam has struck its deepest roots in Zaire. Only a branch route turned southwards. Tippu Tip, the most outstanding of the so-called "Arabs" from the east coast of Africa, in the Congo, may perhaps for a time, about 1870, have operated in conjunction with Msiri, ruler of Katanga, against the Lunda of Kazembe; but later it was reported that Msiri had plundered one of Tippu Tip's lieutenants. Tippu Tip travelled through Urua, in northeast Katanga, early in his career, but found the area disappointingy sparse in ivory, the main export item, together with slaves, to the east coast, and his attention was finally diverted northwards. For these reasons, the story of Islam in Katanga remains but a minor theme in the general development of Islam in Zaire.

A state called Garenganze had grown up in the Katanga region under Mrsi, a Nyamwezi immigrant. Nyamwezi trade with Katanga may have begun as early as 1800; Msrí's father, Kalaasa, had often visited the region to buy copper. Msrí was once able, with the aid of a few guns, to render valuable help to the local Sanga chief, and became his heir. Both the Sanga and the Lamba over whom Msrí also became ruler, had been vassals of neighbouring Kazembe; Msrí successfully beat back an attempt by Kazembe to re-assert his authority. Msrí, strengthening his position by encouraging immigration, welcoming refugees, amassing slaves, and building up an armoury, came to rule an area the size of Great Britain, from the Luabalá to Lake Mweru and the Luapula, and from the Luvua to the Congo/Zambesi watershed.

Such a state was attractive to traders, and these came from all quarters, Zanzibar, Uganda, Nyamwezi country, the Zambesi, Lake Nyasa, Angola and the Congo basin. Some of the incoming traders Msrí tempted to stay on, with gifts of land and women. Ivory, salt, slaves, iron and copper were exported. Copper, crosses of which served as currency in the region, was particularly important. The Arabs introduced brassworking at Ujiji, one part of zinc from the coast to two of Katanga copper. Arab influence grew at Bunkeya, Msrí's capital; the "Arabs" had reception days at court, when their master traders presented Msrí with gifts. Msrí depended upon these traders, above all for his arms supply; but he was envious of their wealth and fearful of their power. When in 1886 the first Christian missionary, F. S. Arnot, arrived, Msrí welcomed him, in part as a counterweight to the "Arabs". At Arnot's first interview with Msrí, he was introduced to several "Arab" traders from Zanzibar. The "Arabs" had evidently promulgated infamous stories about the English, to prejudice Msrí against them, but he suspended judgment, remarking that he did not yet know the English while he did know the "Arabs". Arnot visited a camp of "Arab" traders at the capital, where he saw numerous slaves, mostly full-grown men and women. He watched a man being bought for ten yards of calico, and was told that a young man or a young lad might fetch from twelve to sixteen yards. Grown men, untameable and liable to escape, were less valuable. Slave sticks were in use. Slave babies were often killed. Arnot, of the Plymouth Brethren, was followed by other Brethren missionaries. Rivalry grew between the missionaries and the "Arabs": the latter ridiculed reading the Bible from left to right, the material poverty—in accord with strict Brethren principles—of the missionaries, and their failure to supply Msrí with munitions. The extent of Islamic religious influence in Katanga is hard to gauge, but was almost certainly very slight: Muslim written charms were evidently prized for healing; some immigrants from the east recommended that Msrí punish theft by amputating the hand, but he demurred, preferring the death penalty; he did prohibit smoking and snuff. But these are only scraps of evidence, and may not all even reflect Islamic influence.

Until the end of 1891, Msrí steadfastly refused to acknowledge the claim of the Congo Free State of King Leopold of the Belgians, to the territory, and in December of that year he was killed by a State agent. These events happened in relative isolation from the mainstream of Muslim development further north. There, in 1889, Tippu Tip accepted appointment as governor by the Congo Free State, placing his domains nominally under the State. This approachment did not last long: in 1892 war between the "Arabs" and the State and the "Arabs" broke out, and by 1895 the power of the latter was broken, their main leaders dead or fugitives. In Katanga, there was confusion, uncheckcd "Arab" slave-raiding and famine; Msrí's authority had begun to crumble even before his death, and the State was only very gradually able to impose control. The State introduced, incidentally, a new Islamic element, for some of the State troops were Hausa Muslims.

Following the consolidation of the Congo Free State, later the Belgian Congo, the natural links eastwards of Congolese Muslims were for a time dislocated. The Belgian authorities were generally more suspicious of, and hostile to, Islam than were French and British colonial governments in several other, more Muslim, part of black Africa. Contacts with East Africa recovered, partly as a result of German employment of coastal Muslims as government servants in the interior of German East Africa. In 1932-3, the Kádiriya íaríka was observed spreading among the Muslims of the Congo. The first national Muslim Congress met in Kasongo in March 1964.


(H. Fisher)

Katangiya [See šikilivya].

Katár, in the local pronunciation Gitar, a peninsula of some 4,000 square miles in area which juts out into the Arabian Gulf. It is about 115 miles long and 55 miles broad at its widest part. The discoveries of the Danish archaeological expeditions from 1956 to 1964 show that Katár had been inhabited since prehistoric times, the earliest object found, a pair of hand-axes, dating from about 4,000 B.C. The earliest Arabic source to mention it is the Kitáb al-masdlik wa 'l-mamalik of Ibn Khurádadhíb, who notes it briefly as one of the stops on the route from Basra to 'Umán; this despite the fact that it is believed to have provided the nizba of the Arab fishermen. Later the main shipping b. al-Fujjá'á. It is briefly mentioned by al-Handámáli in a list of Arabian place-names and elsewhere as a halt on a route. Even much later, neither Yákút nor Ibn Mánzũr gives significantly more information
on Katar. It is mentioned in Umayyad poetry; indeed, Yakût cites a reference from Dzhair. Ibn Hawkal makes an early mention of Katatari pirates, and Mas'udî mentions the waters of Katar as a source of pearls.

For such a prominent physical feature, it attracted strangely little notice from European travellers in the Gulf area. Early maps show Katar only as a slight bulge on the mainland and the first representation of it as a peninsula is on Arrowsmith's map of 1825. Although by 1825 two ships of the Indian Navy had surveyed this whole area, it was not until comparatively recently that the complete outline of Katar was accurately mapped.

Yakût mentions Katar as a settlement (karya) and Pedro Teixeira at the end of the 16th century calls it "a port of Arabia". Whether or not it was a "settlement" or a "port", much of the history of Katar does centre around settlements on or near the sea rather than round a country. It was only under the ruling Āl Thānî dynasty that the various city states were finally united.

In 1766 the Āl Khalîfah clan of the 'Oţub immigrated from Kuwayt and occupied Zubâra on the western shore of the peninsula. With their arrival begins the modern period in the history of the country and the only one for which we have adequate information. At this time there were already settled in Katar the Āl Musalam clan of the Banū Khâlid in Huwayla, the Ma'âdîd and other Āl b. 'All in Fuwayrît, and in Dawha (then called Bid') (cf. above), Suwaydî refugees (Sîdîdān) from that part of eastern Arabia later called Trucial Oman.

A little later, 'Uţub kinsmen of the Āl Khâlîfah, the Djalâhîmâ, joined them at Zubâra. Dissension arose between them, and the latter moved to Ruways where they took to piracy. Although they were later nearly exterminated by the Āl Khâlîfah and their allies, their piracies combined with their feud with the Āl Khâlîfah were an important factor in the history of the area.

The occupation of Basra by the Persians from 1722 and the influx of merchants to Zubâra and it became for some time the centre of the pearl trade and of trade in general in eastern Arabia. It successfully defended itself against a number of Persian attacks and after the failure of the 1783 expedition, the Āl Khâlîfah, together with 'Uţub from Kuwayt, mounted a successful expedition against Bahrayn and Abîmd b. Khâlîfah became the first 'Uţub ruler of those islands.

The Djalâhîmâ, by this time at Khawr Hassân (now called Khuwayr), began to play a dominant role in Katar and, by 1809, under the famous Rabha b. Djbâbîr, in alliance with the Wâhhabî power, they controlled even Zubâra. Indeed in 1810-11, through the alliance with the Djalâhîmâ, a Wâhhabî, 'Abd-al-Djabir b. 'Ufaysân, governed Qattîf, Katar and Bahrayn. In 1811 after a successful expedition by Sayyid Sa'id of Muscat against Zubâra and Khawr Hassân, the Wâhhabîs withdrew from Bahrayn and Katar and the Āl Khâlîfah returned to power. Rabha withdrew to Dammâm and pursued his feud with the Āl Khâlîfah from there and from other centres in the Gulf. During all of this time he was careful in his piracies not to attack British ships, and this policy gave him immunity from their reprisals.

In 1817 after a successful expedition against the Kawašim, the pirates of Ra's al-Khaymah and al-Shârîkâ, who so successfully harried the ships of the area, including those of the British.

Meanwhile Bid' (later Dawha) was destroyed by a British cruiser in 1821 as a reprisal for acts of piracy committed by some of its inhabitants, but by 1823, under the Āl Bû 'Aynayn, was still only the port in the peninsula to possess trading ships. Though still in this period and until 1840 nominally subject to the šaykh of Bahrayn, in fact, though not openly contested, his suzerainty was not accepted, though for a time šaykh 'Abd Allâh did indeed reside in Katar.

It is a feature of all of the earlier history of Katarr that the inhabitants of its city-states would remove or be removed within the area. Many of these migrations are of importance later when they are used as proofs in the kind of territorial disputes which were important to the area after 1918. Thus in 1828 the Āl Bû 'Aynayn were removed after a revolt to Ruways and Fuwayrît and the inhabitants of Huwayla were re-settled in Bahrayn after a revolt in 1835. More important for Katar, however, were movements of the Banî Yās from the area of Abû Zabi (q.v.). The Banî Yâs under Suwaydân, by their maritime depredations from Dawhâ, brought the then ruler of Abû Zabi close to war with Bahrayn. This raiding ceased when Suwaydân returned to Abû Zabi in 1828, but the Banî Yâs had fines for piracy laid on them in 1835 and many emigrated to Dawhâ al-'Udayd to avoid payment of these, leaving only in 1878. In this period this group was the cause of much friction between Katar and Abû Zabi.

The piracies of one of these emigrants, Djasîm b. Djbâbîr, continued despite energetic attempts to apprehend him. In 1841, however, his ship was seized and burnt at Dawhâ, although Djasîm himself escaped.

The Kataris were also involved to some extent in the hostilities of 1840-9 between the rival Bahraynîs shaykh, 'Abd Allâh and Muhammam. The Kataris went to the aid of Muhammam, who had seized Murayr and Fuwayrît in Katar, when he used them as a base for the successful attack on Mubarrâk in Bahrayn, which established him firmly there in 1843. But for the peace agreed in 1851 between the Shaykh of Bahrayn and the Su'dîs to ensure the safety of Katar from attacks by tribes within their sphere of control. However, late in 1867 Bahrayn and Abû Zabi launched a joint attack on Dawhâ and Wakra, totally destroying them and removing their population. From then to the present day, relations between Katar on the one hand and Bahrayn and Abû Zabi on the other have remained uneasy.

One of those who had fled from Dawhâ was Muhammam b. Thânî of the Āl Thânî of the Ma'âdîd. He was induced, because of his great influence, to sign an agreement in September 1868 with the British, by the terms of which he was virtually the only area to possess trading ships. From then to the present day, relations between Katar and Bahrayn have preferred this to the Bahraynî connection. Certainly, after this time the shaykh of Bahrayn paid a yearly tax to the Su'dîs to ensure the safety of Katar from attacks by tribes within their sphere of control. However, late in 1867 Bahrayn and Abû Zabi launched a joint attack on Dawhâ and Wakra, totally destroying them and removing their population. From then to the present day, relations between Katar on the one hand and Bahrayn and Abû Zabi on the other have remained uneasy.

One of those who had fled from Dawhâ was Muhammam b. Thânî of the Āl Thânî of the Ma'âdîd. He was induced, because of his great influence, to sign an agreement in September 1868 with the British, by the terms of which he was virtually a base for the successful attack on Mubarrâk in Bahrayn, which established him firmly there in 1843. For the peace agreed in 1851 between the Shaykh of Bahrayn and the Su'dîs to ensure the safety of Katar from attacks by tribes within their sphere of control. However, late in 1867 Bahrayn and Abû Zabi launched a joint attack on Dawhâ and Wakra, totally destroying them and removing their population. From then to the present day, relations between Katar on the one hand and Bahrayn and Abû Zabi on the other have remained uneasy.
driven out of al-Hasā began to use Kātar as a base for military harassment of the Ottomans. The Turks as a result landed troops and guns at Dawḥa in 1872 and stationed themselves nearby; but the Āl Thānī nevertheless remained the paramount ṣayḥah; in 1876 Djasim was appointed habīm-māḥām of Kātar, and in 1879, after the death of his father, governor of Dawḥa. Relations were no longer good, however. By 1880 Djasim had attempted to resign his responsibilities and there were outbreaks of hostilities between the big tribal alliances.

In 1878, however, Djasim was able to evict the Naʿīm from Zubārā, which they had settled some years earlier, their repeated piracies having provided adequate pretext. This action had far-reaching repercussions, since the Naʿīm were the last tribal group in Kātar to accept the writ of Bahrāyn consistently, and this acceptance of their suzerainty gave substance to Bahrāyni claims to rule all or part of Kātar. Zubārā remained an uninhabited place long after this engagement. This event caught the imagination of the Kātarīs and they have much oral literature on this theme and on the theme of the hostilities between Kātar and Abū Ṣabī in the years immediately following. (See Ibn Yāsīn and the Turks were also worsening, and in early 1893 Djasim refused a summons from the visiting wālib of Bāṣra. The Arabs were provoked into an engagement to the north of Dawḥa. In this, however, the Turks were forced to withdraw in poor order, although their losses were much lighter than those of the Arabs. Peace was soon restored, and a later rising in 1898 seems to have been a small affair in comparison. The jurisdiction of the Turks still extended not much beyond Dawḥa.

In 1895 two ṣayḥahs of the Āl b. ʿAll, Sulṭān b. Salāmah and Nāṣir b. Mūbārak, made an attempt to seize Bahrāyn. These ṣayḥahs had removed from Bahrāyn and gathered a sizeable armada in the north of Kātar. They had the support of the local Ottoman muṣāf and also apparently of Shaykh Djasim, though the latter claimed that he was not concerned. Peace was made only after a large number of ships had been seized or destroyed by the British.

Shaykh Djasim died in 1913, shortly after the conclusion of the convention by which Turkey renounced any claims to Kātar. Then during 1916 Britain’s relations with Kātar were regulated by a treaty on the same lines as those with Bahrāyn and Trucial Oman. Some of its clauses, however, were not put into effect at that time, and no resident Political Agent was appointed, responsibility falling to the Political Agent in Bahrāyn.

The status of Zubārā would still seem to have been a matter of dispute. Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh (1913-49) occupied it in 1937, and though this was not accepted by Bahrāyn, the matter has been left largely in abeyance. In 1949 Saudi Arabia raised a claim to a strip of land in South Kātar, but although these claims were discussed in 1952 they were not pursued. Boundary disputes in Eastern Arabia have assumed a different complexion since the discovery of oil in the area. Oil was discovered in Kātar in 1940, the discovery well having an estimated production capacity of 5,000 barrels a day. War shortages, however, inhibited further development. By 1960 output had however reached nearly 17 m. tons and there has been considerable development, especially off-shore, since 1969.

Meanwhile the population of Kātar, although it has increased greatly, is still relatively small (about 150,000 in 1970) and concentrated largely around the capital Dawḥa. The British role in Kātar after the end of hostilities in 1945 was related increasingly to specialist and technical aspects of external and defence affairs and the country has been since September 1971 an independent Arab country.

he was acclaimed "Caliph" of the Azrakis when the latter, defeated by al-Muhallab, was passing through a very serious crisis. Katari, endowed with tremendous energy and indifferent to danger, was able to arouse the enthusiasm of his partisans, and after leading back the remnants of the army into the mountains of Kirmân, reorganised them; he then went down again into 'Irák, occupied Ahwâz and threatened Bayra. Kept for a long time in check by al-Muhallab, he nevertheless succeeded in maintaining his position on the left bank of the Dudiayl even after 'Irák, as a result of the defeat of Mšûb b. al-Zubayr at Maskin (72/691), had fallen into the hands of 'Abd al-Malik. Finally al-Ḥaddîdî b. Yusûf, appointed governor of 'Irák, decided to reappoint al-Muhallab to the command against the Azrakis, in which he had been replaced without success by other chiefs. Al-Muhallab soon drove the rebels across the Dudiayl and assumed the offensive, pursued them into the very centre of their power, Kirmân. Katari nevertheless was able to hold out for a long time in his lines (it is to this period that a silver coin with a legend in Pahlavi and Arabic of the year 75/694 struck in the name of Katari as Amir al-Mu'minin, refers [see ZDMG, xii, 1858, 52, no. 993]. The dissensions that broke out within the Azraki army were short-lived and Masûlî resulted in a split: Katari had to leave the town of Djiruf which was the Azraki headquarters and take refuge along with the Arabs in Tabaristan, while the Masûlî continued to hold Djiruf under the command of their chief, 'Abd Rabbî or 'Abd Rabbîhi (there are two individuals of this name among the Masûlî, distinguished by the epithets al-Kâbr and al-Ṣâghîr, and the sources give the rank of commander sometimes to one and sometimes to the other, or even distinguish two groups of the Masûlî which separated successively from al-Ḵâṭarî and were led by 'Abd Rabbîhi the Great and the Less respectively). This division proved fatal, for al-Muhallab had no difficulty in routing the Masûlî and killing their chief; al-Ḥaddîdî sent the Kâblî warrior Sufyân b. al-Abrad against Katari: or rather the latter (according to a tradition recorded by al-Yaḥṣûbî) as governor of Kâtârî, to reappoint Katarî as caliph probably took place at the end of 69 A.H. and his death in 78 or 79.

Katari b. al-Fudjâ'â represents in striking fashion the type of Kharîjî intransigent and also that of Arab sayyâd, half-cavalier and half-brigand. Like the other Azrakis, as a result of his fanatical zeal, he proved the model army between the sources which say that Katari was in command for 13 or even 20 years are of no value. According to Wellhausen (see Bibl.), the election of Katari as caliph probably took place at the end of 69 A.H. and his death in 78 or 79.

Katari b. al-Fudjâ'â is the ancient capital of Khârazm [q.v.], situated on the east bank of the main channel of the Amû Daryâ or Oxus a short distance from modern Khâvâr. According to Yâqût, Bulguhr, iv, 221, Kâth meant in Khârazmian a wall or rampart within the steppe, even if it enclosed no buildings, but there is nothing in what we know of Khârazmian to confirm this; it is conceivable that there is some connection with Sogdian kâth, kath, "town," though this is wholly conjectural. The site of Kâth was affected by changes in the channels of the river, and was accordingly moved at various times. Little is known of Kâth beyond the discovery of the type of Kharîjî intransigent and also that of Arab sayyâd, half-cavalier and half-brigand. Like the other Azrakis, as a result of his fanatical zeal, he proved the model army between the sources which say that Katari was in command for 13 or even 20 years are of no value. According to Wellhausen (see Bibl.), the election of Katari as caliph probably took place at the end of 69 A.H. and his death in 78 or 79.

Like several other illustrious Kharîjîs, he had a real talent as orator and poet. One of his alleged orations is recorded by Dîkhâ, Bayân, ii, 126-9; 'Ībâd, ii, 195-6, Fîhirî, 125, but R. Blachère (Hist. de la Lit. arabe, iii, 734) thinks that it might have been written in the 3rd/9th century. A few pieces in which he celebrates his wife Umm Hâkîm, who was also a convinced and brave Kharîjî, have been preserved. But amongst the most famous of his poems is the fragment given in the Hamasa of Abû Tammâm (i, 333, see also i, 44, 286), and often cited with numerous variants. His poems of a politico-religious character are remarkable for the elevated style and a heroic contempt for death and place their author in the first rank of Kharîjî poets.

KATH — KATIB

Malfdisi, 287-8, calls it Shahristan, i.e., the capital of the province, and describes its splendid bazaars and Friday mosque and its community of scholars, whilst commenting unfavourably on the filthiness of its streets, which were probably often waterlogged because of the numerous canals or arlfs. The city had been dominated by the ancient citadel, with its triple enceinte and palaces, of the Afrighids called Fil or Fir (the latter form in Biruni), but this fortress and the older city itself were gradually undermined by the river waters and in the early 4th/10th century had to be abandoned. The vestiges were, however, still visible in 384/994 to Biruni [q.v.], himself a native of the būrān or envoirs of Kath (al-Aṭṭār al-bāḥtīya, ed. Sachau, 35). A new town had therefore to be built further eastwards, away from the encroaching river. The Ḥudād al-Islām (completed 732/942), tr. 121, cf. 370-1, spells the city's name as Kāth and calls it "the gate of the Turkistān of the Ghūz and the emporium of the Turks, Turkistān, Transoxania and the Khazars". The author mentions amongst its products textiles and mailed or quilted coats, and names one of its exports as snow; its people, he says, are celebrated for their warlike qualities and their zeal as ghāzis or fighters for the faith against the pagans.

The end of Kath’s great days as the political centre of Kharaizm came in 385/995 when the Afrighids were overthrown by the Ma’mūnīd amirs of Gurgandj [q.v.], long the political and commercial rival of Kath; Kāth was now eclipsed and sunk into a subordinate position (on these events, see Kharaizm and Kharaizm-akins). Ibn Batṭūṭa passed through al-Kāth, as he calls it, in 732/1332-3, and describes it as a small place and as being the only settlement on the road from the city of Kharaizm (sc. Kunya-Urgenç, older Gurgandj) to Bukhārā (Ribka, iii, 20, tr. Gibr, iii, 549-50). During the early 8th/14th century, Kāth and Khīwa, one day’s journey from it, fell within the Čaghatayid Khanate; and in 773/1372 Kath was devastated by Timur during his warfare on the Kaṭi family’s materials and other sources written and oral in compiling the Tarikh al-fatḥāsh some time after 1073/1664.

The Tarikh al-fatḥāsh may have been begun by an earlier Kaṭī (also called Māhmūd) in 925/1519, but Levzioni has argued that the attempt to link the work with the reign of Askia al-Haḍīḍī Muhammad I arises from the 19th-century manipulation of the text by (or at the behest of) Ahmadu Lobbo [q.v.]. The historicity of the earlier Māhmūd Kaṭī and the precise history of the text itself remain problems as yet unsolved.

Bibliography: The Tarikh al-fatḥāsh was published with a French translation by O. Houdas and M. Delafosse, Paris 1913-4 (Publ. de l’Ecole des Langues Orientales Vivantes, V série, vol. X). Problems of the work’s authorship and textual history have been studied by J. Brun, Notes sur le Tarikh el-Fattash, in Anthropon, ix (1914), 590-6; J. O. Hunwick, Studies in the Tarikh al-Fattash: (1) Its authors and textual history in Research Bulletin (Centre of Arabic Documentation, Ibadan) v (1969), 57-55; N. Levzioni, A seventeenth-century chronicle by Ibn al-Mukhdhir; a critical study of the Tarikh al-fatḥāsh, in BSOAS, xxxiv (1971), 571-93; idem, Māhmūd Kāṭī fut-il l’auteur du Tarikh al-Fattash?, in Bull. IFAN, xxxvi/l (1971), 665-74. (J. O. Hunwick) KATI'A, pl. kaṭa'ī', a Muslim administrative term designating, on the one hand, those concessions made to private individuals on state lands in the first centuries of the High Caliphate (pāya'), and, on the other hand, the fixed sum of a tax or tribute, in contradistinction to taxation by proportional method or some variable means. The verb kaṭ'a' is also used to mean “to impose”, normally followed by kaṭ'a'um'. (C. Cahen) KATIB (a.) pl. kūhitb, secretary, a term which was used in the Arab-Islamic world for every person whose rôle or function consisted of writing or drafting official letters or administrative documents. In the Middle Ages this term denoted neither a scribe in the literary sense of the word nor a copyist, but it could be applied to private secretaries as well as to the employees of the administrative service. It can denote merely a "book-keeper" as well as the chief clerk or a Secretary of State, directly responsible to the sovereign or to his vizier. The use of kāṭib is therefore essentially allied to the institution of the diwān [q.v.], which mainly derives from the administrative traditions of the Sasanid and Byzantine empires.

i. In The Caliphate

There were probably already secretaries in Arabia at the time of the Prophet. A "merchant republic" could not do without its accountants, and the function of "documents" in the Kūrān confirms that writing was used. The recension of the Kūrānic text could not have been effected without the help of men capa-
ble of writing down the message conveyed by the Prophet. This explains why the lists of kātib which had been handed down to us generally begin by referring to the secretaries of the Prophet. Finally, the lists of fighting men with the right to an allowance, which were instituted from the reign of Caliph ʿUmar, could have been drawn up only by secretaries.

However, it was only after the first conquests and after the establishment of the capital at Damascus that administrative services, chancery and finances developed, as much in the capital itself as in the provinces controlled by the central authority. It is known that in the first years of the Umayyad caliphate they continued to use the language of the conquered country; Greek in Syria and Pahlavi in ʿIrāq and Iran. This implies that the secretaries working in these offices, whether converted to Islam or not, were autochthonous. Moreover, the rôle played by the Christian administrators in Damascus at the time of the first Umayyad caliphs is well known; Sādūn, the father of John of Damascus, was in all probability chief of the Treasury in the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik.

When the diwān were arabicised at the time of the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik, the secretaries were still recruited from the local population, among whom the Muslims were becoming more numerous. This Arabicising and Islamicising movement, far from pushing the indigenous peoples out of public service, confirmed their position. The development of bureaucracy in its different aspects compelled the Umayyad rulers and then the ʿAbbasids to use the manāḥil. They most certainly had an excellent knowledge of Arabic, but had picked up from their forefathers a whole administrative tradition connected in particular with calculating the taxes due from the different types of land, irrigated or unirrigated. The land tax (see ʾkharāj) instituted by Muslim law seems really to have been very closely inspired by the previous financial system and the administrative practices adapted by the nascent Muslim state were also inherited from the states which had supplanted it.

Only when a scribe made a career on account of other qualities and capabilities did his functions begin to gain in importance which was independent of his person. Such a kātib was, e.g. Ziyād b. Abīhī. His high intelligence and great talent for organisation had drawn people's attention to him as scribe and registrar (Tabārī, I, 2655). When later he made himself responsible for the security and the government of ʿIrāq, he introduced there, with the help of a group of kātib whom he himself taught and controlled (Dihāshīyār, Wuzaraʾ Cairo 1357/1938, 22), a system of administration which was considered exemplary. As in Sasanid times, the rank and position of the secretaries begin to be marked by certain privileges, and discernible in a certain standard of dress, residence and food and also in social intercourse. This improved situation, however, was mostly acquired through the relationship of dependency. The kātib had to submit himself to his master and comply with his moods. A beautiful hand, a faultless orthography and a correct text after dictation were postulated. In accuracy, offences against the language, errors in writing or understanding might result in loss of position (J. Latz, Das Buch der Weisheit und Staatssekretäre von Ibn ʿAbdās al-Ghāṣīrī, Anfänge und Umwandlungen, Bonn 1958, 38–46). The scribe as such played a subordinate rôle.

In reality, little is known of the secretaries who were the direct ṣaʿīd of the Umayyad caliphs. During the Umayyad period the caliphs, who had no viziers in their employ, administered the central services directly by means of secretaries of state. Certain of these had the privilege of presenting the letters to the sovereign and of thus playing a political rôle. Of these the one about whom most is recorded is the mawdūd Sālim, the secretary of the caliph Ḥishām [q.v.], to whom is attributed a treatise about the muqaddima, which is probably the oldest one of its kind written in Arabic and proves the strength of the Iranian political traditions. But the personal secretary of the last caliph, Marwān II [q.v.], called ʿAbd al-Hamīd [q.v.], is equally well-known for his literary activity and is thought to have been one of the founders of Arabic prose.

Out of this situation two types of clerks and secretaries began to develop, according to function, talent and character: on the one hand there was the secretary who, in his quality of expert official and linguist, gave the written documents the form as required by the orders received; on the other hand there was the secretary who, on top of that, exerted on his own account an influence on the contents, being his master's adviser and right hand. While the latter was preparing the way for the functions of the later vizier, the former became the main representative of literary culture (adīb). Already during the period of the first ʿAbbāsids this public secretary was considered the adīb par excellence. The undeniable subtle sense of linguistic expression and its nuances, already natural to the Arabs, had found a vast field of activity in the governmental and administrative correspondence, continuously increasing with the growth of the chanceller's activities within a complex system of government. Official documents were increasingly often judged by the elegance of the wording and the allusions and references hidden behind this. Peculiar distinction was thus imparted to the writings because they presented instructions, enactments, orders or notices in a form which aroused surprise and admiration in the receiver. It is evident that specialists in this branch were called upon, and also that the kātīb needed the qualities not only of a diplomatic stylist but also of an encyclopaedist in order to cope with these and similar requirements. It was essential for him to possess what was later formulated and commented upon by the well-known critic, vizier and head of a chancellery Diyarʾ al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿAḥīr (d. 657/1259) [q.v.] in eight concise phrases at the beginning of his al-Maḥāf al-sāʾir (2nd fasl): 1. a thorough knowledge of the ʿarabiyya, its grammar and 2. its vocabulary; 3. a familiarity with the proverbs, the accounts of the Ayyād and similar stories; 4. wide reading in all branches of prose and poetry; 5. sound knowledge of the theory of state and administration; 6. absolute familiarity with the Kurʾān and 7. the traditions going back to the Prophet; 8. command of prosody and poetry (see G. E. von Grunebaum, Der Islam im Mittelalter, Zürich-Stuttgart 1963, 123 ff.).

In the ʿAbbāsīd era, when the seat of central administration had been moved to ʿIrāq, the secretaries of Iranian origin undeniably played an ever more important rôle. The typical example of these Iranian mawdūd who, according to certain accounts, thronged the courts of the first ʿAbbāsids caliphs, was the famous Ibn al-Muqaffāʾ [q.v.]. He did not have a position in the central administration, but at the caliph's wish drew up a memorandum in which he showed his
perfect knowledge of the problems of government which prevailed at that time of change. He also composed a treatise for the courtiers on the art of pleasing the sovereign, a treatise directly inspired by Iranian or Indo-Iranian literature and one which highlighted the personal nature of relations existing at that time between the secretaries and the sovereign.

If in the 'Abbasid era (as indeed already in the Umayyad one) the kutāb were for the most part non-Arab, they did not form a closed corps. The kātib needed a solid training as much in the art of letterwriting as in the art of finance. At an early stage, families of kutāb began to arise, although it was not necessary to be the son of a kātib to practise this profession. Thanks to their own intelligence and aptitude, sons of merchants and land-owners appeared as directors of important services in central administration and even as viziers. Yet the kutāb in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries had a class-consciousness which could be seen in their costume (the gown called a durrā'sa) and also in a certain intellectual orientation. Al-Dhābiṣ, in particular, in a famous risdla stigmatizes the arrogance of secretaries and their sympathies towards Iranian traditions; he even accuses them of lukewarmness towards Islam. In this discussion on the secretaries, in spite of the obscurity surrounding the question, were certainly supporters of the ḥārāṣiyya movement [q.v.]. Brought up on Iranian literature and admirers of the Mu'tazili thinkers, they were apt to consider that their culture did not need the Islamic "leaven" in order to develop, and, ought, on the contrary to be inspired by ancient (notably Persian) models.

Despite this tendency to restrict the influence of the religious message of Islam, they were none the less faithful servants of the caliphate. It seems that no real accusations of treason could be brought against the famous Barmakids [see BĀRAMIKA]; they were guilty only of having too great authority and of having practised a policy of conciliation with regard to certain opposition factions, which soon the caliph thought would be dangerous. But from the end of the 3rd/9th century onwards, the kutāb had financial responsibilities which grew as treasury difficulties were increasing for the caliphs. At the same time they often belonged more or less secretly to the Shi'i movement which used them to control the caliphate. Their loyalty was not as great as it was before, state secretaries of Christian religion or origin being excepted.

Nevertheless they played a large part at the end of the 3rd/9th century in working out the formula of government by the caliph which was then put into practice, but not without many risks, and which could never be finally worked out in detail. If the kutāb of Shi'i views were trying to diminish the might of the caliph with the intention of seizing power for themselves and disposing of the resources of the treasury, the others were striving to strengthen the authority of the caliph, while at the same time subjecting it to the control of the chiefs of the departments.

In the era of the great amirs, the kutāb were eclipsed by the military chiefs who virtually laid hands on the government. They were no less indispensable to the running of business and to the administration of finance, which demanded technical knowledge, than to the drawing up of official documents such as letters. In the epistolary field, where in that time there was the most excessive affectation of mannerism, the secretaries drew up documents which were useful propaganda instruments. There are thus preserved different collections of official correspondence which appeared as examples of baldāja and are often precious documents for historians. The most famous is one left by the Sabian secretary Ibrāhim al-Šābī [q.v.], and see also 12666. But there were also among the secretaries genuine specialists in financial affairs, whose merits were often compared with those of the "drafters of documents" [see in particular, al-Tawhīdī, Kātib al-Imām, i. 96-7].

The rôle of secretaries in Baghdad in the Saljuq period is not very clear. What at least is known is that the central services were, for the early part, under the control of the sultans, just in the same way as it was before, during the Buwayhid period. But the caliph had in his service his own team, more or less important, of secretaries, as in the Buwayhid period. These secretaries were always predominantly Iranian in origin, yet in the period of the Saljuqs the function of the kutāb tended to merge with that of the 'alamād insofar as all officials of the state were formed in the same establishments, the maṭrāṣas. The taste of the former kutāb for Iranian literature and the sympathies of the secretaries in the Buwayhid period for Mu'tazili thought faded away and from the 5th/11th century onwards, the secretaries, confronted with foreign elements of Turkish origin, belonged to the same social sphere as the men of religion but had slightly different preoccupations. During this period, the kādīs came to fulfil functions previously reserved for the kutāb, to become involved in governmental affairs and to draw up chancery documents. At the time of the Mamluks, this tendency to unify the two spheres became much more accentuated; secretaries and men of religion constituted what were called 'the men wearing turbans'.

There is an abundance of literature referring to the secretaries, and this is of three distinctive types: the didactic treatises on the training required for secretaries; the collections of anecdotes relating to the secretaries; and the polemical treatises. It is clear that in certain works, these three types could exist together.

The didactic treatises are the most important. The oldest is probably the Risāla išā 'l-kutāb of 'Abd al-Hamid [q.v.]. Later came al-Risāla al-'aḍm, attributed to Ibrāhim b. Muḥammad al-Šaybānī and written in the middle of the 3rd/9th century (published by. M. Kurd 'All, Rasā'îl al-balāgha, the Kitāb al-Kutāb wa-ṣīfat al-dawād wa-l-balām, composed in the same period by 'Abd Allāh al-Baghdādī [see D. Sourdel, Le "Livre des Secrétaires de 'Abdalāh al-Baghdādī", in BEO, xiv (1952-4), 128-92] and the Adab al-kātib of Ibn Kutayba [q.v.], which, although it contains solely philological advice, has a very instructive introduction (G. Lecomte, L'Introduction du "Kitāb adab al-kātib" d'Ibn Qutayba, in Mélanges Louis Masugnon, iii, Damascus 1957, 45-64). As for the Kitāb al-kharāj wa-sīmat al-kitāb of Kūdāmā b. Dja'far [q.v.], this is a good work which deals with the various technical questions, a knowledge of which was essential for the secretaries. The different treatises on the land-tax and the first geographical works were also intended for secretaries. The Adab al-kutāb of al-Šīr (d. 335/946), edited in Cairo in 1341/1923, specially teaches calligraphy, and the formulae of protocol; the Kitāb al-kutāb of Ibn Durüstāwī, edited in 1327, deals only with orthography and calligraphy whilst the Risāla fi ʿilm al-kutāb of Abū
Hayyan al-Tawla'i [q.v.] is equally concerned with calligraphy. Among the collections of anecdotes, besides the *Kiābd al-Wasāra* wa'l-*kultūb* of al-Dījahbīyār [q.v.], edited in Cairo in 1357/1358, the *Īdāb al-*kultūb* of Ibn al-Abbār (d. 688/1289), edited in Damascus in 1961, deals with circumstances in which the secretaries of different periods were out of favour. One polemic treatise against secretaries was written by al-Dījahīs (see C. Pellat, *Une charge contre les secrétaires d'État attribuée à Gāhis*, in *Hespéris* (1956), 29-50.

Finally, in a later period encyclopaedic works appeared, intended in the first place for chancery secretaries. The model is the famous *Ṣubh al-'aṣrā fi ṣinā'at al-*insāb* of al-Kalājahṣandī (d. 821/1418).


**ii. In Persia.**

From the fall of the Il-Khāns to the end of the Safawids.

A characteristic change of the kātīb's position, already noticeable under the Il-Khāns, took place in the successor states of Mongol Persia. The Mongolian and Turkish terms remained to some extent the same as before, although not necessarily with the same meaning. New terms were of course also introduced, partly for institutions that continued as such or were slightly modified. Fluctuating usage, in which obsolete and current expressions were used simultaneously, makes understanding of the technical terminology difficult. It goes without saying that here only the most important outlines can be sketched of a development which has not yet been studied sufficiently.

The great number of secretaries in the Dījālārid administration should be related to two different facts: the tripartite division of the administration into a military, a civilian and a religious section on the one hand, and the specific ethnic composition of the army, most of the soldiers being Turks or Mongols, on the other. Following the Il-Khānid tradition, there thus existed, especially in the military administration, a class of secretaries especially knowledgeable in Turkish or Mongolian. It was their task to translate into these two languages original documents probably written in Persian, and in Īrāq also in Arabic. Though counted among the kuttāb, they were called by the Turkish term bīkīfī, probably to distinguish them from the Persian-speaking secretaries. The most important secretaries in the military administration was called bīkīfī-yi aḥkām-i muğulū or kātīb-i muğulūn-nīwās. But the continuance of Il-Khānid usage brought about the fact that even the secretary of the governmental financial administration, who served under the *mustauffi al-mamālīk* or state treasurer, was counted among the bīkīfīyān, with the title of sūlāh bīkīfī. However, the local financial secretaries who served under him did not belong to the bīkīfīyān. It is still dubious whether the last-mentioned were in fact of Turkish or Mongolian origin, or whether they were local inhabitants who has mastered Turkish or Mongolian. The first place among the Persian-speaking kuttāb was held by the *muṣnūg al-mamālīk*, who was in charge of the dār al-inṣāb (the "State Chancellery"), a subsection of the Great Dīwān (dīwān-i ʿālā, dīwān-i bursur) directed by the grand vizier. In the different sections of the *muṣnūg al-mamālīk*'s chancellery, two classes of kuttāb were employed: the *muṣnūg* were the main task for them was to draft documents, and the so-called muḥārīrīn charged with preparing fair copies; among the latter very skilled calligraphers were found. The archives formed a separate department of the dār al-inṣāb.

The nomination of secretaries was probably reserved to the grand vizier. The *kuttāb* in general, and the *muṣnūg al-mamālīk* specifically, were expected to be trustworthy, to be masters of protocol and to possess both stylistic and calligraphic qualities. In the religious administration, mainly concerned with the maintenance of the religious law and the interests of pious foundations, a number of kuttāb were also to be found, e.g. the kātīb-i dār al-ḥādī (secretary of the supreme court) and the muʿarrīkī-bī ṭuḥādī wa-ḥalālāt, an archivist who kept a permanent register of legal evidences and contracts of sale.

We may draw conclusions about the organization of the chancelleries in Timūr's time from the situation under his successors. In their time, specific linguistic expressions continued to indicate the difference between the various groups of kuttāb. Under Ḥusayn Bāyqarā, the secretaries of the so-called "Turkish dīwān" had the title of bākhšī or nissāsānān-i ṭurk. This dīwān dealt with affairs concerning the army and the Turkish subjects. Distinct from them were the vaṣīrān or nissāsānān-i tāḏīk, the Persian speaking kuttāb, who were the secretaries of the dīwān-i māl, the "Persian dīwān", responsible for finances and the affairs of the non-Turkish population. On no account could a kātīb of the Turkish dīwān be called vaṣīr. It seems that relations had been similar under the Turcoman dynasties, as may be deduced from a remark of Ḥasan Rūmī, a bīšābūkīhīhī chronicle, who says that one of his ancestors had served as bākhšī under the Ak-Koyunlu.

Under the Safawids also, the head of the State Chancellery was called *muṣnūg al-mamālīk* (under the Timūrids, as well as having this title, he is said to have also been called sāḥib-dīwān-i inṣāb). The Safawid administration was characterized by a duality in the civil service—the State Chancellery and the Treasury—, which had already existed before. Each single department of the Safavid treasury (*daftar-i khanā*), which was headed by the *mustauffi al-mamālīk*, consisted of the financial section proper and a chancellery. The *laḵšāniyāt*, head of one of the most important subdivisions of the daftar-khanā, corresponded to the Il-Khānid and Dījalārid *ūlāk bīkīfī-yi mamālīk*. He was the paymaster of the troops of the provincial governors and also of the court and provincial officials, and had an imposing chancellery at his disposal. On the other hand, the dār al-inṣāb, the State Chancellery of the *muṣnūg al-mamālīk*, was in charge of the state correspondence such as diplomatic letters and all kinds of charters. When under Abbās I a special royal administration (the *sarkār-i kāha-yi shāhī*) was set up at the side of the already existing governmental administration, a special chancellery had of course to be created.
for this purpose. A number of duties were transferred from the munshi al-mamlik to the head of the new chancellery, the madilis-niwis. In the course of the 11th/12th century, the madilis-niwis surpassed the munshi al-mamlik both in rank and sphere of competence. Moreover, the madilis-niwis enjoyed to a much greater extent the confidence of the ruler. Only in so far as the number of the subordinate khattāb was concerned was the munshi al-mamlik superior to the madilis-niwis.

A handbook of administration, the Tadhkirat al-mulūk, shows that in the early 12th/18th century, 28 khattāb were subordinate to the munshi al-mamlik who prepared drafts, and 27 munshi-yi dlwdn were subordinate to the head of the new chancellery. The latter was assisted by three assistants. In this chancellery a further six khattāb were also employed, among whom was a registrar and a nāma-niwis, who was most probably responsible for the fair copies of the diplomatic letters (nāma or makhūb). Thus ten khattāb were subordinate to the madilis-niwis. The daftar-khdna too was influenced by the division of the administration into a governmental and a royal demesnial sector. Although the division within the daftar-khdna was not complete, the interests of state and crown were assigned to different sub-

...
of 'umdat al-mulk also suggests that it was given to him on his appointment to the office of the chief 'abdar. (Insha'-i Mahrū, 192-3). However, the title of malik al-umara? attached by Mahrū to the name of this dabir need not be taken seriously, for he does so in the case of several other high officials.

It is remarkable that when Iltutmish had to issue an important proclamation nominating his daughter Radilya as his successor, he assigned the task to his mudkhir (Tabāqāt-i Nāṣirī, ed. Nasṣūn Lī, 185). This means that the Correspondence Department was for some time called the dīwān-i ishrāf (as Ḥabibullāh, Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, Lahore 1945, 223, suggests), or indicates the continuation of the tradition of the Ghāznawīs under whom the mudkhir (as stated by Bosworth, 94-6) later varied after a variety of matters connected with the king's affairs.

The dabir-i khas had many dabirs, calligraphers and clerks under him. Some who performed specific duties had corresponding designations, e.g. the khāṣṣa-nisīs and the shab-nisīs (Insha'-i Mahrū, 160, 164, 166). The khāṣṣa-nisīs was the secretary attached to the court or on court duty (cf. the muñshi-badrat of Uthbī, in Qureshi, op. cit., 86n). The shab-nisīs was evidently the secretarial officer on night duty in the palace. The dāwāddār was the keeper of royal inkpot and ink-stump (Tabāqāt. Nāṣirī, 242). The relationship of the dāwāddār with the dīwān-i inshā? is not clear. The dabir-i sarā' has been described by Qureshi (op. cit., 65) as the registrar of the palace. The dabir-i sarā' invites comparison with Ibn Baṭṭútā's kutūb al-bāb in his account of the sultan of Delhi's court (Rihla, iii, 219), rendered by Gibb, Travels, iii, 659, as "the scribes of the door", and by Māshhūr, 153, as "the gate secretaries".

It seems that the chief dabir and his staff were highly paid (as they had been in the Ghāznawī days). The following statement in the Masālik al-ḥāḍīr fī mamālīk al-amṣār of Shāh Bihār, the secretary of the sultan of Delhi's court (Rihla, iii, 219), rendered by Gibb, Travels, iii, 659, as "the scribes of the door", and by Māshhūr, 153, as "the gate secretaries", is true:

The princes had their own dabirs (Āmr Khusraw, Famīliyād al-Furāt, 127, cited in K. A. Nizami, Some aspects of religion and politics in India during the 13th century, London 1961, 214). The same practice obtained during the Mughal period, see below.

During the period of the sultanate of Delhi, the dīwān-i inshā? was counted as one of the four principal ministries of the central government (Barani, Tārīkh-i Firād-Shāhī, 153). The duties of the chief secretary and other officers of this ministry were the same as under the Ghāznawīs. They composed fath-namas, royal letters addressed to other kings, important letters or proclamations issued in the king's name, and the like. Important documents received at the court, such as a letter from a foreign dignitary or an 'ard-dāght from a minister or a high noble, were read out to the sultān by the dabir-i khas or one of the dabirs (Affl, 223-4). The practice common among the Mughal emperors of having important documents drawn up by any high minister (not by the chief secretary alone) was unknown in the pre-Mughal period. Thus 'Ayyu al-Mulk Mūltañī, who was a great muñshi but never an office-holder in the dīwān-i inshā?, drafted numerous state documents during the reigns of Muhammad b. Tughluq and Fīrūz Shāh; particular mention may be made of the manifesto issued by Fīrūz Shāh to the religious classes, the officials and nobles, and the common people of Lakhnau (Bengal) when launching an invasion of the territory (Insha'-i Mahrū, passim; for the manifesto, see pp. 15-17). Similarly Āmr Khusraw, one of the greatest masters of style in Persian inshā?, appears never to have occupied a position in the dīwān-i inshā, but one may assume that his services were utilised in drafting important documents by contemporary sultans from Kaykūbād (accessed 868/1270) to Ghīyāth al-Dīn Tughluq Shāh (died 725/1325). The fath-nama written by Āmr Khusraw on the occasion of Balban's victory over a rebellious governor of Lakhnau is given in Ḥāfiz-i Khusrawī (v, 4-14); Āmr Khusraw claims this as his first fath-nama, and since he was not till then in the service of the court of Delhi, it is not clear if he was commissioned to draft the document.

The Indian Mughals followed a more active foreign policy than did the sultans of Delhi, and sent out and received many more embassies than their predecessors. It is therefore all the more surprising that for a long time they did not have a proper chancellery and a secretary of this free rank. We do not come across frequent mentions of munshīs (e.g., Ḥān-i Akbarī, 1, 4; Tūzuk-i Diwāngīrī, Aligarh 1862-64, 185; 'Abd al-Hamīd Lāhāwī, Pādhān-Nāma, i, 148, s.v. dabir), but for a long time there is no mention of a correspondence department. (The position has been recognized both by I. H. Qureshi, Administration of the Mughal Empire, Karachi 1966, 82, and by Momin Ibrahim, The Mughal contribution to Persian epistemology, Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, 1956 (unpublished), chapter 1). From the time of Shāh Ẓahār wanders "frequent mention is made of the dār al-inshā?" (Momin Ibrahim). Ibrahim also opines that the bureau of correspondence was attached to the office of the baḥshāh which "handled the administrative side of the secretariat only".

This lack of concern for a correspondence department becomes to some extent understandable when we consider the fact that it was common practice with the Mughal emperors to assign the drafting of important documents to ministers and dignitaries other than the official muñshīs. Thus Akbar's royal letters were drafted mostly by Abu 'l-Fadl, who did not occupy an official position as a secretary, and occasionally by other distinguished personages attached to the court (e.g. Akbar's letter to Shāh 'Abhās I, drafted by Āsāf Kháñ Mirzā Dījā'far, see Bayāt 1905, Oriental Public Library, Bankipore, fol. 133b; for other sources and a full discussion see Riazul Islam, Calendar of Documents on Indo-Persian Relations (unpublished), Document no. A.41). In one instance, two drafts were prepared for Akbar's reply to 'Abd Allāh Kháñ Uzbek, one by Abu 'l-Fadl and the other by Hind Hāzn 'l-Fath Gīlānī (see Bhagland, Dārs-i Inshā?, B.M. Or. 1702, fols. 201a-202a; for a full discussion see Calendar of Documents on Indo-Persian Relations, Document no. TX.330). The practice of having important letters drafted by high officials other than the muñshī continued under Shāh Ẓahār, even though by this time a dār al-inshā? had come into being. Shāh Ẓahār's letters to foreign potentates were drafted mostly by Sa'd Allāh Kháñ, chief dīwān (i.e. the wazir) of the empire (Māskhābd-dīs Sa'd Allāh Kháñ, ed. Nāzir Husayn Zaydī, Lahore 1968, passim; Riazul Islam, Calendar of Documents on Indo-Persian
Relations, section on Shah Jahan, passim). Indeed there is a petition from Shaykh Abu l-Fath Kabil Khan, munshi of Awarzgib 'Alamgir, complaining that this work was being appropriated by the imperial diwan (Addb-i 'Alamgiri, ed. Abd al-Ghafur Cawdhr, Lahore 1971, 834).

The head of the dár al-insād was known variously as mir munshi, dārāghā-i dár al-insād and munshi al-mamlākī. As the same officer, Muhammad Sharif Kābil Khan, is mentioned in the Ma'āthir-i 'Alamgiri, (Bib. Ind. 1872) as dārāghā-i dár al-insād on p. 140 and mir munshi on p. 190, it can be assumed that the two designations stood for the same post. It is remarkable that Shaykh Abu l-Fath Kābil Khan, though generally called munshi al-mamlākī (see the MSS of his Addb-i 'Alamgiri) is nowhere alluded to as such in the Ma'āthir-i 'Alamgiri or the Alamgiri-Nāma; nor indeed is his brother Muhammad Sharif Kābil mentioned as munshi al-mamlākī in the Ma'āthir-i 'Alamgiri.

Some idea of the status and emoluments of a Mughal mir munshi may be had from the fact that the annual stipend given to Abu l-Fath Kābil Khan on retirement was Rs. 5,000 (Ma'āthir-i 'Alamgiri, 26), and that his brother Muhammad Sharif Kābil Khan, who became dārāghā-i dár al-insād in 1685/1675, had the rank of 1000/70 (i.e., 1000 personal rank, 30 troops) when he was dismissed from the office in 1685/1670 (Ma'āthir-i 'Alamgiri, 190). Thus neither the rank nor the salary of the post seems to have been high. But the post, with its privilege of tabarrub ("proximity") to the person of the emperor, gave an immense influence to the incumbent, so that Muhammad Sharif was able to amass twelve lakhs of rupees in cash alone in five years—a circumstance which eventually brought about his fall (ibid.).

As pointed out earlier the Mughal princes used to have their own official munshis. Indeed, Abu l-Fath Kābil Khan made his career as the wālsūkhā munshī (a prince's secretary) of Prince Awrangzīb; he served the Emperor Awarzgib 'Alamgir for only a very short period (Ma'āthir-i 'Alamgiri, 140, 190, for some other instances, see ibid.; Khāt Khan, Muntakhab al-Lubāb, I, 259). The Hindus produces many munshis and Hindu munshis wrote numerous insād books, the well-known being the Inshā-dī Hīkarān of Dīhāngīr's reign. From the period of the Afghan Sūrs onwards they attained increasing proficiency in Persian epistolography, and soon came to occupy a strong position in secretarial and clerical cadres. The most celebrated of the Hindu munshis were Candr Bhan Brahman whom Shāh Dīhāngīr gave the title of Rāy-i Rāyān, and Ānand Rām "Mukhlīs", mir munshī of the Emperor Muhammad Shāh (Jadunāth Sarker, Mughal Administration, Calcutta 1935, 227-9; Momin Ibrāhīm, op. cit.; Riazūl Islām, Calendar of Documents on Indo-Persian Relations, Intro., 56).


(Riazūl Islām)

KĀTĪB CELEBI, appellation of Mūṣṭafā b. ʿAbd Allāh (1017-67/1609-57), known also (after his post in the bureaucracy) as wālsūkhā shāhī (Khalfā, historian, bibliographer and geographer, the most conspicuous and productive scholar, particularly in the non-religious sciences, of the 11th/12th century Ottoman Empire. He was born on Dhu l-Ka'da 1027/February 1609 in Istanbul, his father being a soldier. He began his education at the age of five or six, and at 14 was apprenticed to the Amadul Mūhāsēbe's office, where he learned accountancy and siyāsāt [i.e. in 1633]. In 1634 he went with the army in the campaign against Abaża Pasha (Fedleke, ii, 55), and two years later was present on the Baghdad campaign (Fedleke, ii, 83), his father dying at Mawsīl on the way back. In that year he was appointed to a post in the Sultan's Mughal office. Returning to Istanbul in 1638/1628-9, he attended
the lectures of Kâdi-zâde, which greatly impressed him (Fedhelike, ii, 182). In 1038-40/1629-30 he was present on Khusraw Pasha’s campaign against Baghdad; and in 1043/1633-4, when the army wintered at Aleppo, he took the opportunity to make the Pilgrimage. In 1044-5/1635 he took part in the campaign against Erivan. After these ten years of service with the army, a legacy enabled him to settle in Istanbul and devote himself to study, attending the lectures of various scholars, principally âırâdî Muştafa Ef. (Fedhelike, ii, 392). Having failed to receive promotion, he resigned from his post in the Finance Department and spent three years in retirement, until in 1058/1648 his writing of the Takwîm al-tawdrikh (no. 4 below) and the intervention of his patron Ābd al-Rahmân Efendi, then Shaykh al-İslâm, procured him the rank of şâhidî muallî. Many of his works were composed in the ensuing years, among them translations made from Latin texts with the help of a French convert, Shaykh Mehmed Iğlaş. He died suddenly, on 27 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1067/6 October 1657, and was buried by the Zeyrek Djaâmi‘î (photograph of his gravestone, since renewed, in Kesef-el-zunun (no. 12 below), i, introd., between cols. 18 and 19). His contemporaries described him as good-tempered, taciturn and philosophic, leading an unambitious life with no pretensions; he would mix both with ascetics and pleasure-lovers, and he neither smoked nor drank. Naturally grave, he disliked satire and there is little humour in his works. One of his hobbies was growing flowers. He is always measured in his criticisms and his relation of events; and his prose style is simple, unencumbered by grandiloquent similes and clichés.

1. Fadhlakat al-akhdar fi ilm al-tarîkh wa’l-âhkâm, or Fadhlakat al-tawdrikh, a universal history in Arabic, to 1049/1639. The muhaddîma is in four fâsiqî, of which the second deals with the significance, the scope and the uses of history; the third, which was to list the 1300 sources, is lacking in the unique MS.; the fourth deals with the rules which the historian must follow. Unique MS. (author’s draft); Bayezit 10318 (dated 1052/1642). Summary of scope in Incelemeler (photograph of his gravestone, since renewed, in Kesef-el-zunun (no. 12 below), i, introd., between cols. 18 and 19). His contemporaries described him as good-tempered, taciturn and philosophic, leading an unambitious life with no pretensions; he would mix both with ascetics and pleasure-lovers, and he neither smoked nor drank. Naturally grave, he disliked satire and there is little humour in his works. One of his hobbies was growing flowers. He is always measured in his criticisms and his relation of events; and his prose style is simple, unencumbered by grandiloquent similes and clichés.

2. Fadhelike, ii, 182. In 1038-40/1629-30 he was present on Khusraw Pasha’s campaign against Baghdad; and in 1043/1633-4, when the army wintered at Aleppo, he took the opportunity to make the Pilgrimage. In 1044-5/1635 he took part in the campaign against Erivan. After these ten years of service with the army, a legacy enabled him to settle in Istanbul and devote himself to study, attending the lectures of various scholars, principally âırâdî Muştafa Ef. (Fedhelike, ii, 392). Having failed to receive promotion, he resigned from his post in the Finance Department and spent three years in retirement, until in 1058/1648 his writing of the Takwîm al-tawdrikh (no. 4 below) and the intervention of his patron Ābd al-Rahmân Efendi, then Shaykh al-İslâm, procured him the rank of şâhidî muallî. Many of his works were composed in the ensuing years, among them translations made from Latin texts with the help of a French convert, Shaykh Mehmed Iğlaş. He died suddenly, on 27 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1067/6 October 1657, and was buried by the Zeyrek Djaâmi‘î (photograph of his gravestone, since renewed, in Kesef-el-zunun (no. 12 below), i, introd., between cols. 18 and 19). His contemporaries described him as good-tempered, taciturn and philosophic, leading an unambitious life with no pretensions; he would mix both with ascetics and pleasure-lovers, and he neither smoked nor drank. Naturally grave, he disliked satire and there is little humour in his works. One of his hobbies was growing flowers. He is always measured in his criticisms and his relation of events; and his prose style is simple, unencumbered by grandiloquent similes and clichés.
family-life and good government, curious information on animals and plants, tales, poems, proverbs, etc. See Inclesemel, 79-81; Seleqemel, 20-45. — 14. Dâser-i münâhêrî ve qürer-i münâhêrî, a collection of passages from biographical works. Unique (auto-
graph) MS.: Nurusmaniye 4949. See Inclesemel, 81-2; Seleqemel, 146-52. — 15. Dastür al-amâl fi iṣâṣa l-dhâli, a memorandum setting out the causes for the deficits in the state finances and suggesting remedies. Edn.: Istanbul 1280 (appended to a memorandum setting out the causes for al-khalal, a mention in ZDMG, xi (1857), 111-32. See Inclesemel, 82-4; B. Lewis, in Ist. St., ii (1962), 78-81. — 16. Radjam al-râjâm bi-lín wât-lqîm, a collection of curious questions in fîth and of odd fâsîfat; apparently lost. See Inclesemel, 84-5. — 17. A râk of the tafrîr of al-Baydawi [q.v.]; perhaps never completed, no. MS. known. See Inclesemel, 85. — 18. Hüsân al-hidâya, a râk of the Muhammedîya of All Kûshî [q.v.]; apparently lost. See Inclesemel, 85. — 19. Dîjamâ al-mûtûn min dîjâj l-jûnûn, abbreviations of and comments on 27 works which the author taught: a compendium of “general knowledge” for the man of culture. Unique MS. (in part autograph): Topkapî Sarayi, Emamet Hazînî 1763. See Inclesemel, 85-6; Seleqemel, 266-7. — 20. Muḥâṣṣar Dîjamâ al-mûtûn, an abbrevi-ation of the commentary of the above, no. MS. known. See Kâshî al-jûnûn, Flügel, no. 3952. See Inclesemel, 86 and n. 3. — 21. Miṣâḥ al-hâbih fi bûṣîyâr al-abâhâh, a discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the author’s further details in the Tarihi, iii, 124-31; Brockelmann, ’Othmânî miṣâhîfe, 165-70; tr. G. L. Lewis, pp. 135-47), with some discussion of various questions which at the time were causing violent controversy (see Naîmî, vi, 229-30 [sub anno 1066]); I. H. Uznçarshî, Osmanîs Tarîkl, iii, (Ankara 1951, 364-6), with the au...
Bahram u Gul-andam. Towards the end of his life he undertook to compose a khamsa in imitation of Nizami of Gandja, but did not complete it.

Notwithstanding Nawá’s lavish praise of Káštibí, and the lengthy accounts of him given by Dawlàtsháh and Browne, he is a mediocre poet. DiamÍ rightly describes (in his Baháristád) his verses as šútur gurba, “camels and cats”, i.e., uneven and unequal in quality. His poetry is characterized by excessive use of rhetorical artifice, imitation (mainly of Amír Khusráw and Hasan of Díhil), commonplace and bizarre ideas, and clumsy and immature diction. Perhaps because of these failings, very few of his verses have been published.


**Káštibí (A.) “shoulder”; *ším al-káštib or al-akáštib* denotes scapulomancy or omoplastoscopy, i.e. divination by the use of the shoulder-bones. This art forms a part of the practices of physiognomy. It is universal in scope, inasmuch as it provides for the foretelling of what will happen in the different regions of the earth. The points of which the bones or parts of the bones are girded are pointed according to the signs revealed by it. From this point of view the *ším al-akáštib* is to be linked with the practice of cleromancy of the *dífr* (q.v.) and the *maláthím* (cf. T. Fahd, *La divination arabe*, 219 f.).

How was this skill practised? Three methods are known to us. The first is to lay the *scapula* on the ground before cooking it, to examine it and to deduce from it indications of future events (war, fertility, drought) according to the shades of colour on it. It may be yellowish, leaden, red or greenish and the meanings of these colours are applied to the regions of the sun. The special lines and shapes which then appear are examined by the physiognomists and they deduce from them signs of universal events, but rarely of individual cases (cf. Y. Mourad, *La physiognomie arabe*, Ar. text, 12). “Neither the age nor the sex nor the colour of the sheep are important... There is no fixed moment for the ceremony of divination. It is performed at any time and in any place.” (Letter from P. Anastase al-Karmali to Alfred Boisnier, *Manique babylonienne et manique hittite*, Paris 1935, 51). No writings of *‘Alí b. Abi Tálib*, thought to have been the originator of scapulomancy, have yet come to light.

Finally, according to P. Anastase, “To-day there is no family or tribe which knows this science, but it is studied in specialist books. There is”, he writes, “a special terminology which is not found in Arabic dictionaries, even the most extensive” (ibid.).


**Al-Káštibí**, a large oasis in Saudi Arabia on the southern shore of the Persian Gulf.

1. Geography and demography. The oasis fronts on Táfrût Búy, named after the island facing its centre. Although Al-Katif was for centuries a seaport of considerable importance, it is now, due to the shallowness of its waters, used only by small craft. Most of the maritime traffic had been diverted to the oil-shipping port of Ra’s Tannura (Ras Tanura) on the narrow peninsula which forms the north side of the bay and to the commercial port of al-Dammám (q.v.) at the southern extremity of the bay.

The oasis stretches about 22 km. from north to south along the coast of the bay. In the far north the town of Sa’wá and its girdle of date palms are cut off from the bay by Śábkhát Díwán (śábkhá = “salt flat”), from the main body of the oasis by Śábkhát Sa’wá and the sands of al-Djâbdjâb, and from the inland village of Um’m al-Sáhik by the sands of al-Dawâghér. In the centre of the oasis is the town of Al-Katif proper, popularly called Al-Káštibí after the old Ottoman (not Portuguese) fort razed in recent times. The more important villages in its vicinity are al-Kudayh and al-Diishsh, and from the south with the flourishing town of Sayhát on the coast.

The sands mentioned above and other sands hem in the oasis on its inner side from north to south and in many places are encroaching on the palm groves. A remarkable string of *‘ayns or springs lies along the north-south axis just west of the eastern edge of the sands. Many other *‘ayns* are scattered throughout the groves between the sands and the bay.

The island of Táfrût fronts the five villages, the largest of which are Táfrût near the centre and Dárín at the southern tip of the island. Dárín, mentioned in a verse by al-’Ashár, was the name commonly given to Al-Katif (ms. Nurussamaniye 2412, 42 fol.; Şéhid ‘Ali Paşa, 1812, 51 fol.; Bursa, Hasan Celebi, 282 fol. 84*89*; cf. M. Plessner, *Deux manuscrits d’Istanbul attribués à Al-Katif*, in *Islamica*, iv (1931), 557). The introduction states that Al-Katif translated this treatise from the Greek; it was attributed to Hermes the Sage.

Apart from this risâla and the anonymous one from Cairo, no other writings on scapulomancy have appeared, despite the affirmation of P. Anastase that “there is an entire literature on the science of scapulae which would require deep study” (apud Boissier, op. cit., 53). He himself had only a copy of the risâla attributed to Al-Katif (ibid., 51). No writings of *‘Alí b. Abi Tálib*, thought to have been the originator of scapulomancy, have yet come to light.

There is no fixed moment for the ceremony of divination by scapulomancy. It is performed at any time and in any place.” (Letter from P. Anastase al-Karmali to Alfred Boisnier, *Manique babylonienne et manique hittite*, Paris 1935, 51). No writings of *‘Alí b. Abi Tálib*, thought to have been the originator of scapulomancy, have yet come to light.

Finally, according to P. Anastase, “To-day there is no family or tribe which knows this science, but it is studied in specialist books. There is”, he writes, “a special terminology which is not found in Arabic dictionaries, even the most extensive” (ibid.).

to the island in ancient times. A causeway now joins the island to the mainland.

The great majority of the people of al-Katif consists of Di'a'ari Shīʿa. The suggestion, sometimes made, that traces of Karmatian doctrines survive there seems to be completely baseless. It is to be hoped that ampler details of the history of this ancient Di'a'ari community and the related Di'a'ari community of al-Bahrayn [q.v.] can some day be uncovered.

2. History. The finding of ancient South Arabian and Aramaean inscriptions bears witness to the great antiquity of al-Katif as an inhabited oasis. Unfortunately, the extensive use of the land by the current dwellers impedes the carrying out of thorough archaeological operations. H. von Wissmann has argued persuasively for the identification of al-Katif as the site of the renowned city of Gercha described by Strabo and other classical sources, but this identification is not yet proved beyond doubt.

In the early 4th century A.D. the Persians under Shāhārū II established themselves in al-Katif and along the adjoining Arabian coast, the hinterland of which was then known as al-Bahrayn. This occupation, interrupted at times by the Lakhmids, did not end until three centuries later. For a sketch of the events of that time see the article on ʿAbd al-Kays, then the dominant tribe in al-Bahrayn. The subtribe of Djaḥīlma b. ʿAww inhabited the oasis of al-Katif but kept its capital at nearby al-Zāra, the location of which is uncertain. The population also included Magians, Jews, and Christians (many members of ʿAbd al-Kays were Christians before Islam). The persistence of Christianity is illustrated by the fact that a Nestorian synod was held at Dārīn as late as 56/767.

As Islam spread eastwards in the Peninsula, al-ʿĀli? b. al-Ḥaḍramī reached al-Bahrayn in 8/629-30, and ʿAbd al-Kays sent an embassy to the Prophet in Medina. During the ridda some of ʿAbd al-Kays rebelled; in 11/632-3 Abu ʿl-Huṭam b. Dūbayʾa seized al-Katif, but in the next year he was defeated and killed by the forces of al-ʿĀli? The Muslims then forced the Karmatian garrison of al-Zāra to capitulate, after which they crossed over to the island of Dārīn (Tāʾrīt). The rebellion against the caliphate continued until 19/640, but it is not known whether al-Katif was involved in the later stages.

In 67/886-7 the Khāridjī Naḍja b. ʿAmir al-Ḥaḍramī won a victory over ʿAbd al-Kays at al-Katif and made the oasis his headquarters, only to be overcome not long afterwards by his fellow-Khāridjī Abū Fudayk.

The history of al-Katif for the next two centuries is not free from obscurity. In 286/899 the Karmatian Abū Saʿīd Ḥasan b. Bahram al-Djaḥnābī [q.v.] invaded the oasis and put many of the inhabitants to the sword, thereby inaugurating an independent Karmatian state in eastern Arabia with its capital in the oasis of al-ʿAbs? to the south. The Karmatians suffered a temporary setback four years later when Ibn Bānū, the governor of al-Bahrayn, inflicted severe losses on them in a battle at al-Katif, but they soon recovered the oasis and regained power.

The tribe of ʿUkayl, which in the late 3rd/9th century was moving into the region, in time took over supremacy there from ʿAbd al-Kays. In al-Ḥamdānī's time (early 4th/10th century), however, the inhabitants of al-Katif were still described as beings that time see the article on ʿAbd al-Kays, a chief named Ibn Miṣmār, Ibn Ḥawkal (mid-4th/10th century) lists al-Katif as one of the Karmatian cities.

In 378/988-9 al-ʿAšfar and his tribesmen of al-Muntaṭik waged war against the Karmatians and plundered al-Katif, carrying off abundant booty to al-Ḥasra.

The Persian traveller Naṣīr-i Khusrū in 433/1041 met an Arab dignitary in al-Katif whose ambition was to drive the Karmatians, "men without religion", out of their capital al-ʿAbsa. Seventeen years later Abu ʿl-Bahlīl al-ʿAwwānī b. al-Zadjiḍānī, master of the islands of al-Bahrayn, who was loyal to the ʿAbhāsids, defeated the Karmatian adherents among ʿUkayl in a naval battle off al-Katif. The final destruction of Karmatian power in this region came at the hands of the ʿUYūnīds [q.v.] of ʿAbd al-Kays, whose base was in al-ʿAbsa.

Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Jewish communities in the East between 554/1159 and 569/1173, gave the number of Jews in al-Katif as 5,000, a figure no doubt exaggerated (the Rabbi does not seem to have reached al-Katif itself). He also reported that the pearl fisheries there were controlled by a Jewish official.

About 988/1201-2 Abū Bakr b. Saʿīd, the Salghurid Atāšeg of Fārs, took over al-Katif and al-ʿAbsa. By the first half of the 7th/13th century the ʿUYūnīds were yielding to pressure from the Salghurids and by the new dynasty of the ʿUsfurids of ʿUkayl, which was usurping authority in al-ʿAbsa.

From the 9th/14th century, Hormuz on the Persian side of the Gulf rose to prominence in trade and politics. In 731/1330-1 ʿUbūd al-Din Ṭahāntān, King of Hormuz, is said to have occupied al-Katif and other places on both sides of the Gulf. In the following year, however, Ibn ʿAbdītūtā found that al-Katif was ruled by a family founded by one Ḍarawān of ʿUkayl, a family described by al-Salīḥī in the 11th as "remnants of the Karmatians". Ibn ʿAbdītūtā characterized the various clans of Arabs living in al-Katif as "extremist Rāṣīdīs" (the common term among Sunnis in the Gulf for Shiʿīs).

In the mid-9th/15th century the Djaḥrids, a branch of the ʿUsfurids, became dominant in al-ʿAbsa. The Djaḥrids were helped by the fugitive prince Salghur of Hormuz secure the throne of his homeland, in return for which Salghur granted Adiwa, on payment of tribute, control over al-Bahrayn and al-Katif, whose profits from trade made them the richest possessions of Hormuz.

After the Portuguese conquest of Hormuz in 913/1507, the Djaḥrids kept their hold on al-Katif for a time. The Djaḥrid Mukriḳ made the pilgrimage in 926/1520, bringing with him pearls, amber, aloes wood, and other costly products; he is said to have distributed 50,000 dirhams to the poor in the Holy Cities. On his return he discovered that the Portuguese were invading the islands of al-Bahrayn, and he met his death in resisting them. The King of Hormuz, subject and ally of the Portuguese, sent an underling to besiege al-Katif. The final blow to the Djaḥrids came from Shaykh Rāshīd b. Muḥammad of al-ʿAbsa in 931/1524-5.

The chief of al-Katif swore allegiance to Sulaymān the Magnificent in Baghdad in 941/1534, and in 958/1552 Ottoman forces built a new citadel in al-Katif. After Portugal lost Hormuz to the British and Persians in 1301/1622, al-Katif became a more important centre for Portuguese trade in the Gulf. The finest Arabian horses were exported from there to India, being brought to the port by Bedouins from the interior. Large quantities of pearls from the waters of al-Bahrayn were shipped from al-Katif, as many of the fishers came from the oasis. The Portuguese paid for the horses and pearls with cloth from Sind
and Cambay and with silver money. Another item for export was dates, inferior in quality to those of al-Basra, but better and more lasting when dried. In 1036/1627 the Portuguese admiral Ruy Freges came to the rescue of al-Katif when it was threatened by Persia.

The Ottoman grip on this distant part of Arabia proved weak, particularly as the Al Humayd, the paramount chiefs of the tribe of the Banū Khālid, gained strength and expanded their dominion. The Banū Khālid had special ties with al-Katif, where nomads of the tribe owned date groves at Ṭānik and numbers of them came there to camp during the harvest season. Barrāk b. Ḡurayr Ṭāl Humayd expelled the Ottoman governor from al-ʿĀhsa' in 1074/1664-5. As one of the principal seaports for the Banū Khālid (the other being al-ʿUmayr farther south), al-Katif won favour from merchants for its moderate customs duties and the protection it provided for their persons and property.

In 1202/1788 the Banū Kaḥb of southern al-Ṭrāk plundered al-Katif, which was just recovering from a devastating plague that had made its way south from al-Baṣra.

The Banū Khālid could not withstand the onslaughts of the Al Suʿūd (q.v.), the paladins of the reform movement of the Wahhābiyya (q.v.), who routed the army of the tribe in the battle of Ḡurayr-ml south of al-Katif in 1204/1889-90. Two years later Suʿūd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzzīz Āl Suʿūd captured the strongholds of Sayhāt and Ṭānik in al-Katif and meted out harsh treatment to the Shiʿī inhabitants, whom he looked upon as the worst of heretics. The payment of many pieces of gold induced Suʿūd to spare the port (al-furda) and the people who had taken refuge there. In this fashion, the Al Suʿūd subdued all this part of eastern Arabia and incorporated it in their realm. During the reign of Suʿūd, the ḥādīh he assigned to al-Katif was an immigrant from Persia (a Shiʿī converted to Sunnism?).

The Sublime Porte delegated Muhammad ʿAll, its Viceroy in Egypt, to deal with the threat to Ottoman suzerainty posed by the Al Suʿūd and the Wahhābiyya. The Viceroy's son, Faysal Pāsha, took the Al Suʿūd's capital, al-Dirīyya (q.v.) in 1233/1818, after which Ibrāhīm sent a detachment on to al-Katif in search of supplies. When Captain Sadleir, the emissary of the British government in coming to congratulate Ibrāhīm, reached al-Katif in 1234/1819, the detachment was preparing to pull out. Accompanying it on its way westwards, Sadleir became the first Western explorer to traverse the whole breadth of Arabia.

Although the chiefs of the Banū Khālid were in charge once more, the most striking figure in the region of al-Katif in the next few years was the celebrated seadog Ṭāḥā b. Ḍāibār, who finally lost his life in 1242/1826 in a naval battle off al-Katif against the Al Khālīf of al-Bahrāyn, against whom he had long been waging war.

After the Turco-Egyptian evacuation of central Arabia, Turki b. ʿAbd Allāh reintroduced the rule of the Al Suʿūd, and the chiefs of al-Katif gave him the ḥālima in 1245/1829. Four years later he ordered his son Faysal to al-Katif to suppress dissident elements in Sayhāt supported by the Al Khālīf. While there, Faysal received news of his father's assassination in al-Dirīyya, and as the new Imām he hastened back to the capital.

Muḥammad ʿAll again adopted a forward policy in Arabia in 1254/1838. Faysal was defeated and carried off to Egypt as a prisoner. A Turco-Egyptian force was quartered in al-Katif. Ibn Bīshār describes the administration as "[benevolent] rain at first, but in the end hail and thunderbolts". The force, however, stayed only two years. The new head of the Al Suʿūd, ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭūhunayyān, appointed Faysal's slave Bilāl b. Sālim al-Hārṣ as his first representative in al-Katif in 1258/1842. In the following year, Faysal escaped from Cairo and returned to Arabia, where this second reign of his lasted for the next twenty-two years. The probably of his government was illustrated by his anger over what he at first considered the unjustified action of his Amir of al-Katif in having the leading Shiʿī there beaten to death, though he later pardoned the Amir. Faysal in at least some of his campaigns was joined by levies of the people of al-Katif.

In 1288/1871 Midhat Pāsha, the Ottoman Vālī or governor of Baghādā, dispatched an expedition that landed at Ra's Tannūra and quickly moved on to al-Katif. During this final Ottoman occupation, al-Katif formed one of the three ḥālimā of the misnamed Sandjak of Najd (the Sandjak, with its capital at al-ʿĀhsa', consisted of territory lying east of Najd proper). But ʿAbd al-ʿAzzīz b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān, who was restoring the fortunes of Al Suʿūd, swooped down on the Sandjak in 1331/1913 and drove out all the Ottoman garrisons, including the one in al-Katif. Since then the oasis has belonged to the domains of the Al Suʿūd.

In 1357/1938 oil was first discovered in Saudi Arabia at al-Zahrān (Dhahran) not far south of al-Katif. With the expansion of operations a new oilfield was found straddling the oasis, after which it was named the Qatif Field. Large numbers of the towns and villages there worked for the oil company or in business connected with the oil industry. With production and revenues from oil soaring, the oasis is enjoying new prosperity and undergoing a reshaping of its economic and social life. It still lies half-hidden by its cloak of millions of palms, which produce abundant harvests of dates, a crop supplemented by fruits and vegetables, the variety of which has been diversified by great improvements in the irrigation and drainage systems and by the introduction of modern agricultural techniques.

son of Ahmed Agha called kattrdlj (the muleteer) on account of his profession. Kattrdlj Mohammed spent his childhood on the family farm in Aglasun and when he was 19, in 1029-30/1620-21, he joined his father’s caravan journeys. He later separated from his father to operate his own caravan between Ayfön [q.v.] and Civril and later, after his father’s death, he took over his business (Hikmet Turhan Dağlıoğlu and Nurı Katircioglu, Katircioglu kimdir?, in Isparta Tarihi Un Mecmuasi, iii, no. 25 (Isparta 1936), 356, 357). Katircioglu kattrdlj came to be known in the region as the muleteer and the people of Isparta sent him to relay their complaints and wishes to a tax-collector who had perpetrated great injustices and irregularities. The tax-collector, however, instead of taking an understanding attitude inflamed the people further by throwing Katirdjl-oghl into prison. Thereupon the people rebelled, freed him from goal, removed the tax-collector and took the administration into their own hands. Katirdjl-oghl let the course of events carry him along. For a while he disappeared and then, in 1057/1647, appeared again operating with the brigand Kara Haydar (Ewliya Celebi, Seyhâlat-nâme, Istanbul 1314/1867-6, ii, 416 ff.). After Kara Haydar’s capture in 1059/1649, he gathered around himself the scattered groups of brigands and, joining forces with Gürdlj ‘Abd al-Nabi, marched on Üsküdar with the intention of procuring his pardon. However, in the clash with government troops, ‘Abd al-Nabi’s hesitancy led to his defeat. He was compelled to retire first to Söğüt (Na’imâ, iv, 428) and then in the direction of Isparta. Through the medium of İsâ Agha who was at that moment in the town of Çay, he sought a pardon; and through him he received a conciliatory letter from the Grand Vizier Kara Murâd Paşa indicating that he would be pardoned on condition of procuring his pardon. He came to Istanbul towards the end of 1059/1649 and, after an audience with Mehemmed IV, he received the long-desired pardon and, moreover, was appointed sadîq begi of Beyşehir (Wedjîl, Ta’rîkh, Süleymaniye, Hamidiye Library 917, f. 36; Kara Celebi-zade ‘Abd al-Aziz Efendi, Dîyâ-ı rwatıfî-ı abarî, Istanbul University Library, Turkish manuscripts, 3272, f. 38; Na’imâ, iv, 452). He was later appointed beglerbegî of the people of Isparta and sent against Abaza Hasan Agha. In 1061/1651 he was appointed governor of the eyallet of Shahrizur, but refused the post and stayed in Karâmân. Although this was an act of disobedience, the Grand Vizier was more concerned with the removal of his rival Ispîrî Mustafâ Paşa and did not worry him, pretending not to have known of his actions. Shortly afterwards Katzîrdjl-oghlî was appointed to the governorship of his native sadîq of Hamîl. However, the intervention of Murâd Paşa, who was kapudan-i derya [q.v.], prevented a clash between the two men. After this, Katzîrdjl-oghlî approached the Grand Vizier and, tendering his obedience, received a pardon (ibid., vi, 17, 32). In 1065/1655 he was ordered to the Crete campaign and achieved great distinction in the fighting there between 1065/1657 and 1069/70/1659. In addition of procuring his pardon, he was given the title of beglerbegî of Karâmân. He was appointed beglerbegî of Anadolu on 3 Rabî’ al-Akhîr 1078/22 September 1667 and died in action at the siege of Candia on 13 Rajab 1079/17 December 1668 (‘Othmân Dede, Ta’rîkh-ı Fâdîl Ahmed Paşa, Süleymaniye, Hamidiye Library 909, ff. 44, 45, 62; Râşîjîd, Ta’rîkh, Istanbul 1282/1665, i, 179, 216; Silâbdar Mehmmed Agha, Ta’rîkh, Istanbul 1528, ii, 447, 492, 493). Katzîrdjl-oghlî had a son called Shapîrî-Bâshı Husayn Agha, whose descendants still survive today.

Bibliography: in addition to the works mentioned in the text: ‘Abd al-Râhîm ‘Abdul Paşa, Wekbî-yî-nâme, Topkapı Sarayi, koguslar kismi, 915; Nurî Khanyevi, Ta’rîkh-i İyri, Istanbul University Library, Turkish manuscripts, 2536; ‘Othmân Dede, Dîyasî al-tawârîkî, Köprüli, 237; Mehmmed Khalîfe, Ta’rîkh-i Ghiyâtî, Istanbul 1340/1921-2; Kâtîb Celebi, Fedâiye, Istanbul 1286/ 1869, ii; İsmail Hakki Uzunçarşı, Osmani tarihî, iii/1, Ankara 1952; Richard Hartman, Qayradschîglo, ein Sûfeîî aus der Osmanîschen Geschicichte des 17. Jahrhunderts, in Islamica, ii/2 (1926), 237-70; Dağlıoğlu and Katircioglu, Katircioglu, in Isparta Tarihi Un Mecmuasi, iii, no. 25 (Isparta 1936), 26-7, 41-4; Fehmi Aksu, Seri hahmene scicilleri, in ibid., iv, no. 42 (1937), 601-3; M. agatay Ulûçay, Sarnhanda ekytáshî ve halk hare-keleleri, Istanbul 1944; Hafize Tuncer, Katircioglu Mehmed, unpublished graduation thesis, history seminar library, Istanbul University, no.618, 1951; J. von Hammer, Histoire, xi. (Cemâlzı Orholu) KATL (a.), killing, putting to death, used in the two principal meanings of the word, sc. the crime of murder and the punishment of execution.

1. AS A CRIME

(i) In the Kur’ân unlawful slaying is forbidden in a series of verses, which date from the second Meccan period to nearly the end of the Medina period. The passages may be arranged chronologically as follows (cf. Th. Nöldeke-Dr. Schwally, Geschichte des Qorâns, i, and H. Grimme, Mohammed, ii; when the exact order in the particular periods cannot be ascertained, the passages are here arranged in the order of the sûras and verses):—XVII, 33, 35 (second Meccan period; according to ibid., iv, 452); XVIII, 94, 4, later than VI, 152): “Kill not your children for fear of being brought to want; We will provide for them and for you; verily the killing them is a great sin . . . Neither slay the soul which God hath forbidden you to slay unless for a just cause; but whosoever shall be slain unjustly, We have given his soul to him as a (third Meccan period; similar to XVII, 33, 35); IV, 152 (second Meccan period):—(and the servants of the Merciful are those) “who slay not the soul, which God hath forbidden you to slay unless for a just cause; but whosoever shall be slain unjustly, We have given his soul to him as a . . . .” "Kill not your children for fear of being brought to want; We will provide for them and for you; verily the killing them is a great sin . . . Neither slay the soul which God hath forbidden you to slay unless for a just cause; but whosoever shall be slain unjustly, We have given his soul to him as a (third Meccan period; similar to XVII, 33, 35); IV, 152 (second Meccan period); (and the servants of the Merciful are those) “who slay not the soul, which God hath forbidden to be slain unless for a just cause . . . for he who does this commits sins (or: will bring retribution upon himself); his punishment will be doubled on the day of the Resurrection and he shall remain in it covered with ignominy for ever; except him who does this commits sins (or: will bring retribution upon himself); his punishment will be doubled on the day of the Resurrection and he shall remain in it covered with ignominy for ever; except him who...
look upon him again . . . ; but if anyone kill a believer deliberately ('amd) his reward is hell in which he shall remain for ever and Allâh wrathful against him and curse him and shall prepare a great punishment for him". (The true interpretation is undoubtedly this, that every Muslim who kills another Muslim with 'amd is condemned to eternal hell-fire and that Allâh will not accept his repentance, a view which is ascribed to Ibn 'Abbâs, Ibn Mas'ûd, Zayd b. Thâbit and al-Dhahîk). The view held by the majority of the traditions was to be cast off, which tones down the literal wording of the passage, either by adding with Mujâhid "unless he repents" or by holding, as has become usual, that Allâh will not leave a Muslim eternally in hell, and can even remit entirely the threatened punishment of hell-fire; but this is only the result of speculation and combination with other passages in the Korân (e.g. XI, 108-10; XXXIX, 54) and is therefore to be rejected; IV, 33 f. (from about the same time; similar to IV, 93); LX, 12 (probably dates from soon after the treaty of al-Hudaybiyya; similar to XVIII, 33; 3).

There are two further passages, in which it is asserted that Allâh forbade the Jews to kill: II, 78 ff. (from about the first half of the year 2 A.H.) and V, 35 (probably of the year 6 or 7; according to Grimm, to be dated before the battle of Badr).

There are also a number of verses in which killing is not exactly forbidden but is more or less strongly deprecated and represented as a mark of the unbeliever, just as committing no murder is a sign of the believer, e.g., LXXXI, 8 f. (first Meccan period); II, 28 (probably third Meccan period; according to Grimm, Medinan, before the battle of Badr); VI, 138, 147; XVI, 61; XL, 26 (same time); VIII, 30 (after the battle of Badr); V, 33 (shortly before the capture of Khaybar). In numerous passages in this connection the unbelievers are reproached with the slaying of prophets, e.g. II, 58, 81, 85 (from the first half of the year 2 A.H.); IV, 154 (after the outbreak of open war with the Jews of Medina); III, 177, 180 (probably soon after the battle of Uhud); XX, 108 (shortly before the war with the Banû 'l-Nadir?); V, 74 (later Medinan period).

(2) Supplements to the Korân passages from the Sîra, accounts of the life of Muhammad. In the so-called ordinance of the community, which dates from the first Medinan period, it is laid down that no believer may kill a believer on account of an unbeliever; in another passage it is said: "If anyone kill a believer and is convicted, then vengeance for bloodshed must be done, unless the wali of the man slain waive it". In all probability Muhammad had in mind in the murderer a non-Muslim member of the community (Froechsch, op. cit., 73): this agrees with the development given above. In the bayâ'a, the initiation into the community, the initiate had to pledge himself, among other things, not to commit an unlawful act of slaying (cf. Korân, LV, 12). Once Muhammad cursed a murderer [see kisâs]. In the so-called first Ka'ba oration (of the year 630), the genuineness of which is not absolutely certain, however, on every point and which seems doubtful on this particular point, there appears the by no means exactly defined conception of Katl shabah 'amd (see below, 5c); Muhammad is also said to have declared that all blood-guilt attached to a Muslim dating from the period of paganism was to be cast off, which extends the corresponding passage of the ordinance of the community. Finally, it is to be mentioned that the Sîra knows of several cases of deliberate and of unpremeditated slaying; so far as they are liable to be punished, they are dealt with in the article kisâs.

(3) Comparison of the views of authoritative circles in the Muslim community in the older period as preserved in Hadîth. It is obvious that in the Hadîth also the slaying of a Muslim is strictly forbidden; by the adoption of Islam (and of monotheism at all) life and property are inviolable. The life of a Muslim is to Allah like the cessation of the world or the cessation of the world is even less to Allah than this"; "if someone is killed in the east and another in the west approves of it, he is guilty of the person's blood"; "man is a work of Allah; cursed be he who destroys Allah's work". The first murder which introduced killing into the world is the subject of special condemnation: Cain is accessory to every later murder. Murder is punished in the next world as well as on earth; on the Day of Judgment cases of the shedding of innocent blood will be judged first. As to the punishment itself, a whole stratum of hadîths reflects the already mentioned view of Ibn 'Abbâs and others regarding the eternalness of punishment in hell for slaying with 'amd; e.g. "whoever sheds blood in an unlawful way, for him there exists no way for escape"; "whosoever contributes, though only by a word, to the slaying of a Muslim must despair of the mercy of Allah". In several passages the deliberate murder of a Muslim is considered equivalent to unbelief (hadîth in which a warning is simply uttered against murder being a sign of the unbeliever are, of course, not dealt with here). It is even said: "if two Muslims attack one another with swords and one kills the other, both go to hell (unless it was a case of legitimate self-defence), the slayer for his deed and the slain because he wished to kill the other" (see e.g. al-Bukhârî, Diyâî, bab 2); and: "if all the inhabitants of heaven and earth together had killed someone, they would all go to hell". In these two passages it is not exactly demonstrable that eternal punishment in hell is meant, but it is very probable. In several of the traditions mentioned, Ibn 'Abbâs appears as the authority. Such hadîth were naturally rendered harmless by "interpretation" by the representatives of the other view, if they were not entirely suppressed, which did happen to not a few. Thus the description of deliberate murder as unbelief is sometimes interpreted to mean that it is a very grievous sin and sometimes taken as a reference to the refusal of the protection of Islamic law, which occurs in both cases, to the life of the slayer or of the unbeliever. This was not found sufficient, however, but traditions were put into currency to prove the contrary, namely that Allâh would accept the repentance of a murderer,
even if he had committed several murders; one of these traditions is provided with a grotesque story, the object of which is quite apparent, as corroboration. In one tradition the hadāfa, especially the liberation of a slave, is represented as a means to save the murderer from the merited punishment of hell, obviously by someone who demanded it even in the case of kātīl with *ṣamīd* (see below sub 6a). It is even asserted in public controversy against the views of the other side that after the Day of Judgment no Muslim will go to hell and that, on the contrary, all sins will be forgiven them. The killing of a muṣḥad, a non-Muslim under the protection of the Islamic state, is threatened with punishment in the next world (e.g. al-Buṣāri, Diyālitā, bāb 30; al-Dārirmi, Siyar, bāb 60; the Kurān is silent on the question); but, as might be expected, the view is very rarely expressed that this punishment is eternal. The prohibition of suicide, which we do not find laid down in the Kurān, is given in the Haddith, and the suicide is threatened with eternal punishment in the next world.

As an appendix to the above we may briefly mention the connection of several kinds of animals with kāl, which is also dealt with in tradition. Muḥammad had, as is related, recommended the slaughter of dogs but later withdrew the order, although the dog always remained subject to certain exceptional regulations (cf. Kāl); the sunna further orders the killing of the saṣag, a kind of lizard, but if possible it should be done with one blow: on the other hand the killing of ants and of cats is forbidden (among the authorities for this last tradition is Abū Hurayra); on the killing of snakes cf. Guillaume, *The Traditions of Islam*, 116 f.

As regards the value of the traditions just quoted, the genuineness of none of them can be proved; while the falsity of those, which seek to save the murderer of a Muslim from hell, is apparent, it is also probable of those which hold the contrary view.

(4). The controversy regarding the punishment of the murderer of a Muslim centres round a passage in the Kurān, which in itself could and must form a foundation for it, and is in part at least independent and original. The passage is: (fi 'l-fi'l). A statement of the prevailing Hanafi views

rise of the Fikh-schools; therefore there is no ikhkād of the mādhkhād on this question; this view has found its way into all textbooks of Fikh and of doctrine.

(5). A statement of the prevailing Ḥanafi views on killing. Katīl in the fikh is the act of a man whereby the life of a fellow-man is brought to a close (the death need not immediately follow the act). It may be qualified by any of the five "legal categories": duty or necessity (adwātib), e.g. the killing of the murtad; recommended (mādāhib), e.g. when the gāhī kills his unbelieving kinsmen if they insult Allāh or his Prophet; permitted (muṣāhib), e.g. when the Imām kills the unbelieving prisoner of war, in the case when the reasons for killing him exactly balance those for granting his life; killing in self-defence is also allowed, i.e. in defending oneself against an illegal attack on one's life, person or property, in defending oneself or someone who comes to help, if the attack cannot otherwise be averted (on further questions there is ikhkād, also on the question whether a man who surprises another in adultery with his wife or endeavouring to see into his harem, and kills or mutilates him, is acting legitimately or not; one tradition on the subject is interpreted in different ways); disapproved (mahārīb), e.g. when the gāhī kills his unbelieving kinsmen without the same intention, the manner, and the interval as in the above; prohibited (haraḍ), e.g. when the Imām kills the unbelieving prisoner of war, in the case when the reasons for killing him exactly balance those for granting his life; killing in self-defence is also allowed, i.e. in defending oneself against an illegal attack on one's life, person or property, in defending oneself or someone who comes to help, if the attack cannot otherwise be averted (on further questions there is ikhkād, also on the question whether a man who surprises another in adultery with his wife or endeavouring to see into his harem, and kills or mutilates him, is acting legitimately or not; one tradition on the subject is interpreted in different ways); disapproved (mahārīb), e.g. when the gāhī kills his unbelieving kinsmen without the same intention, the manner, and the interval as in the above; prohibited (haraḍ), e.g. when the Imām kills the unbelieving prisoner of war, in the case when the reasons for killing him exactly balance those for granting his life; illegal killing as the result of actions in themselves legal may take place in five ways:

(a) as *ṣamīd*, i.e. someone wilfully makes another the direct object of an action in general fatal, so that the other dies as a result; according to one view, the intention of killing is necessary for the conception of *ṣamīd*, which, however, is always presumed in the case of any act generally fatal in its result, which is illegally inflicted on another. Thus for example, any one, who strikes a blow at the hand of another with an instrument adapted in general for killing, but inadvertently hits his neck and kills him, is ceteris paribus unanimously regarded as equally guilty with the man who strikes another in the neck with the same instrument, wilfully intending to kill him and slays him. The killing is a sin (mādāhib), and in general is punished by kisād, or else the slayer is bound to pay the heavier diya and to lose any possible legacy from the deceased to himself;

(b) as ḥabī (or ḥaḍā), i.e. there is no intention of committing an act illegally on the other as in the case of (a), while the action itself is premeditated: two kinds are distinguished, according as the ḥabī (mistake or misadventure) which shows that the killing is not wilful, is in the intention of the doer (fi 'l-ḥaṣa) or in the carrying out of the action (fi 'l-fā'il). The former is the case when someone treats another as a wild beast or a harki, (an infidel not enjoying the protection of the Islamic state, against whom the ḥidād is to be waged) the killing of whom is not illegal, and kills him; the latter when someone unlucky hits another, while shooting at a target or at a harki, so that he dies, or strikes at the hand of another person but inadvertently hits the neck of a third person and kills him; this killing is not sin but brings with it (without kisād) the obligation upon the ḥabila of the killer to pay the smaller diya and to lose any claims to any inheritance from the deceased as in (a); besides the obligation of the killer to perform the hadīfā;

(c) as ḥabb (or ḥab) *ṣamīd* = similar to *ṣamīd*, i.e. someone intentionally makes another the direct object of some action, not always but sometimes fatal, and death results. Actions which experience has
shown not to be fatal at all are thus quite excluded, such as striking the head with a reed pen; if anyone dies as a result of such an action as this, it is an unfortunate accident, which is not followed by any penal consequences. This killing is a sin and brings with it (without *kiṣās*) the obligation upon the *ādkila* of the slayer to pay the heavier *diya* and to lose any possible inheritance from the deceased as in (a), and in addition the slayer is bound to perform the *kaffāra*. This category only exists in cases where death actually results; in cases of bodily injury, which by the way, are similarly classified, the action is regarded as *ṣawīd*.

(d) as *dāri madāra 'l-khaf* (or *madad ārā 'l-khaf* or *qā'im maḥām al-khaf*) “equivalent to *khaf*”, i.e., the factor of deliberation is lacking in the action (and also the intention of directing the action illegally against another) in the circumstance of (b) and (c), for example: someone falls upon another in his sleep or falls from a roof upon him and kills him; the legal results are the same as in (b);

(e) as *batil bi-sabab* “indirect killing”, i.e. someone brings about the death of another without doing anything directly against him; e.g. he digs a well and someone falls into it and dies as the result; sometimes this category is treated as a subdivision of (d); but it is a matter of indifference, whether the act, which indirectly results in the death of another, is deliberate or not, intentional or unintentional; even if the action has been planned in some very cunning way, such as setting a savage beast on another person with the intention of causing his death, it does not alter the situation. The legal consequences are in any case limited to the obligation upon the *ādkila* of the doer to pay the lighter damages, larger if the killing *on *fiṣāh* usually discuss very fully the question what acts are to be considered direct causes of death and which are *batil bi-sabab* and in which there can be no question of a causing of death so that no legal consequences result.

Two cases are especially dealt with in the *fiṣāh* books: (a) The causing of a premature birth or abortion and (b) killing through giving false evidence.

(a) If in causing an abortion or premature birth, the embryo—which must be sufficiently developed to be of human form—is brought into the world dead or dies after the birth or the mother dies, it is not a case for the application of *kiṣās*; there is in any case no *batil bi-sabab* in the mother whose killing is dealt with under the above rules and the embryo before completion of birth is legally not in full possession of its powers but is usually regarded as a limb of the mother. Hence we have the following law: if the head of a child appears out of the mother's womb at birth and the child cries (and is therefore certainly alive) and then someone cuts off its head, it is not a case for *kiṣās* and only the punishment prescribed for producing an abortion is to be inflicted. Different amounts are to be paid for the embryo according to the different cases, and if it comes alive into the world and then dies the person who causes its death is liable to *kaffāra*; he, also loses any inheritance that might have come to him.

(b) If anyone is killed on evidence which shows that a crime deserving death has been committed and then the witnesses recall their evidence or in other ways it is proved that their testimony was false, *kiṣās* cannot be executed on the person; instead of *diya* must be paid, the heavier if the false evidence was deliberately given, the lighter if otherwise.

(e) Different views also prevail as to the amount to be paid for the killing of an embryo.

(f) On causing death through false witness: if the false evidence was deliberately given, according to al-Ṣāḥīfī and the better-known opinion of Mālik, *kiṣās* can be executed on the witnesses.

Notes on the question of the *diya* in general: it is not a case for the application of *fiṣāh*; it is considered the better by the Ijāla. The qualification of the various actions generally differs considerably and the Hanafis often make use of *ṣīhsan*, exercise of discretion. In the Mālikī and Hanafi view no *kaffāra* is to be performed for *ṣawīd*; al-Ṣāḥīfī, on the other hand, demands it if the *kiṣās* is not executed and both views are given on the authority of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal.

(b) On *khaf*: that *khaf* is not a sin is more exactly meant to mean that it is neither permitted nor forbidden, but that this killing is rather *ʃ̣aʿl al-ṣāḥīfī*, “action of a thoughtless person”, and is to be judged in the same way as the act of a mentally defective person or of an animal. Except in the Hanafī *madhhab*, categories (d) and (e) [sub 5] are not distinguished from *khaf* which also was the earliest Hanafī view (ZDMG, lvii, 358) and *batil bi-sabab* has generally the same legal consequences as *khaf*; we thus have three kinds of *batil: batil bi-sabab* and *khaf*, of which *shabah* *ṣawīd* is considered to be composed of *ṣawīd* and *khaf*.

(c) On *shabah* *ṣawīd*: this category is also called *ṣawīd khaf*, *khaf* *ṣawīd or khaf* *shabah* *ṣawīd*; in contrast to it, *ṣawīd* is also called *ṣawīd maḥām* and *khaf* also *khaf* *maḥām* (pure *ṣawīd* or *khaf*); the application of *kiṣās* is said to be permissible by al-Ṣāḥīfī if the killer, for example, repeats the blow with an instrument not normally adapted for killing so frequently that the person attacked dies; the act is then considered *ṣawīd*; one of the two opinions handed down on the authority of Abū Yūsuf and al-Shaybānī is to the same effect while the view that became predominant in the school was to the contrary. Mālik allows *kiṣās* in *shabah* *ṣawīd* in general.

(d) On *batil bi-sabab*: Mālik, al-Ṣāḥīfī and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal demand *kaffāra* in addition, if the placing of the cause of the death was illegal.

(e) Various views also prevail as to the amount to be paid for the killing of an embryo.

(f) On causing death through false witness: if the false evidence was deliberately given, according to al-Ṣāḥīfī and the better-known opinion of Mālik, *kiṣās* can be executed on the witnesses.
(b) No definite punishment is laid down for the case of a request to kill someone; such a request does not mean the exculpation of the slayer; only if the person requested is a minor or a slave claims may be made from the 'ażila of the minor, or from the proprietor of the slave.

c) A forces B to kill C; then, according to Abū Hanīfa, the kisās is executed on A, according to Mālik and Ahmad b. Hanbal on B; as to al-Shāfi‘ī’s view, there is no doubt that A is liable to kīfā; as regards B both possible views are transmitted, of which the one that ultimately became predominant in the school makes him also liable to kisās. Mālik further makes A also liable to kīfā if the compulsion comes from a person having authority, or from a master to a slave.

d) A holds B and C kills him while he is held; in this case Abū Hanīfa and al-Shāfi‘ī make C liable to kisās and A to ta‘ṣīr, which is more definitely defined as imprisonment. According to Mālik, both are to be regarded as culprits and therefore liable to kīfā if the holding was necessary to facilitate the slaying and B was not able to escape after being held. Ahmad b. Hanbal’s opinion is given in two versions; according to the one, kisās is executed on C and A is punished with imprisonment for life, according to the second opinion, A and C are both liable to kīfā.

ii. AS PUNISHMENT

The punishment of death may be described quite generally as ḥatl; in the following account cases in which it is applied are given seriatim; in contrast to ṭaţal and ṣalb (cf. below) ḥatl is also used in the narrower sense of execution with the sword.

1. In the cases of illegal killing described in detail above, the nearest relative of the dead man, who in this capacity is called wâli al-dam, is entitled to kill the culprit in retribution if certain definite conditions are fulfilled. This punishment is called kisās or ḥawād, names which also cover retribution exacted for wounds which are not fatal; for further information, see kīfā.

2. There are special regulations regarding sorcerers (sāḥir), about whom there are also various traditions. Mālik, al-Shāfi‘ī and Ahmad b. Hanbal recognise sorcery (ṣīhr) as an actual force. Abū Hanīfa disputes this; but there is a consensus of opinion that it is forbidden to study it; it is even held. Atunad b. Iljanbal’s opinion is given in two versions; according to the one, kisās is executed on C and A is punished with imprisonment for life, according to the second opinion, A and C are both liable to kīfā.

The more important laws of the Shari‘a are the following. Only such persons as are adults in full possession of their faculties and who are able to be dangerous to travellers are to be considered highway robbers. According to Abū Hanīfa, highway robbery can only take place in the open country, according to Mālik, al-Shāfi‘ī and Ahmad b. Hanbal in the town also. Mālik gives the Imam—and this is certainly the correct interpretation of the passage in the Kur‘ān, which is also found in the commentaries—absolute freedom in the choice of punishment, even in the contingency of a cumulative application, whatever form the robbery may have taken; but if the person concerned has killed someone (in this connection killing implies a murder to which kīfā might be applied), he must at least be executed with the sword. The other Imāms grade the punishment to fit the different forms of robbery on the highway; according to Abū Hanīfa, the criminal is put to death if he has caused the death of his victim; if he has also robbed him (and in such a way, it must always be understood, that the hadd for theft can be carried out; see sāriq), he may be further punished by cutting off his hands and feet on alternate sides and with crucifixion (ṣalb) which in that case takes the place of killing with the sword; if he has only committed a robbery, we have only the cutting off of hands and feet on alternate sides; according to al-Shāfi‘ī and Ahmad b. Hanbal, he is killed, if he has killed his victim; if he has also committed a robbery, he is crucified after being put to death; if he has only committed a murder, he is punished by cutting off his hands and feet on alternate sides; if he has only made the neighbourhood unsafe, then, according to Abū Hanīfa, al-Shāfi‘ī and Ahmad b. Hanbal, he is put in prison; whether this must be done in another place is a debated point. In Abū Hanīfa and Mālik (also in some Shāfi‘is, but their view is rejected by the school) crucifixion consists in the criminal being tied alive to a cross or a tree and his body ripped up with a spear so that he dies, and this is certainly the more original form; according to al-Shāfi‘ī and Ahmad b. Hanbal, he is first killed with a spear, then his corpse is ignominiously exposed on a tree or cross. All these punishments are hadd and a right of Allāh; therefore any renunciation by the wâli al-
dam of the šiğas is of no avail even though it is he who has the right to carry out the ũadī. If the criminal refuses the zakāt before or after the battle of Uhud), 487 (soon after the battle of Uhud), IV, 136 (of the same period) threaten the eternal punishment of hell for all those who apostatises and the consensus of opinion excludes the minor; a woman (and also a minor) is imprisoned and punished by adopting Islam; on the whole of this cf. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, ii, 215 f., Eng. tr. ii, 199 ff.

How exactly one becomes an unbeliever and therefore a murtadd is disputed in particulars, especially the question how far this is the case with irreverent utterances regarding Allah or one of His prophets; there are various specific statements regarding the latter, which threaten the death penalty to non-Muslims and in part allow a Muslim no remission of punishment if he recalls the words.

For further information, see MURTADD.

(6). There is no law in the Kur'ān for dealing with a man who omits the salāt (ritual prayer) (tarīkh al-salāt), where its performance is, on the other hand, often strictly enjoined and the local hadith on the subject can be found—quite apart from any question of genuineness. The Sharī'a lays down the law as follows. Anyone who does not perform the salāt, as in duty bound, without denying its obligatoriness (anyone who does this is a murtadd) and has no—even invalid—excuse for this, then according to Mālik, al-Shāfiʿī and the more popular of the two views credited to Ahmad b. Hanbal, if he does not alone, i.e. makes good his omission and says he will never commit the fault again, he is to be executed with the sword. This punishment is also sometimes described as hadīd. According to Abū Ḥanīfa, the culprit is imprisoned till he again performs the salāt. In all these views he is considered a Muslim, while the other view attributed to Ahmad b. Hanbal deals with him entirely as an unbeliever, i.e. a murtadd; but these regulations are modelled on those for apostasy (cf. the remarks on the Aḥī al-Ridda above).

There are two more cases in which the suppression (bišdā) of the enemies of orthodox Islam is prescribed; killing, of course, plays the main part and therefore we must discuss this aspect of the process here.

(7). Firstly, the fighting of the bugāṭ is prescribed. It is said in Kur'ān, XLIX, 9 (late Medinan period): "If two parties of the believers contend with one another, make peace between them; but if one oppresses the other (bugāṭ—from which bugāṭ is the plural of the active participle), fight against the party which oppresses until they again obey Allah's command; and if they do this, make peace between them with equity and act with justice" (this refers to a quarrel among the Anšār). Opposition is often forbidden and disapproved of elsewhere. But Muḥammads at, 15, rate did not now the latter conception of bugāṭ, although its development begins at a point closely connected with this. Some traditions on the
bughāt are in agreement with the legal enactments. The Shari'a understands by bughāt, who are guilty of breaches of the law are punished like them—on the one hand, and unbelievers on the other). If they do not attack the orthodox community, they need not be attacked; otherwise their suppression is a duty of the Imām (the head of the Islamic community) and a fard al-kifāya for the Muslims (see FARD). This punishment is also sometimes called badd. In general, the rule is that only participants in the actual battle can be killed during the fighting. Fugitives, wounded, those who surrender and prisoners, as well as women and children, cannot be put to death. According to Abū Ḥanīfa, the Imām may kill a prisoner if he knows that he would again join the bughāt if spared; according to him, a captured slave who has been fighting by the side of his master can also be killed.

(8) Regarding Dīhād [q.v.], there are also traditions regarding the following regulations. If the unbelievers with whom war is being waged are not among those from whom the dīżaya can be taken—and this directly in all these cases by the Imām). Anyone who kills a prisoner without authority is only punished with iṣlaḥ.

Every unbeliever who does not pay the dīżaya or does not belong to a people which has a treaty with the Muslim community or is not a musta'min [see gīżas] is khalāl al-dam (to be killed with impunity) and may at any time be killed by any Muslim without his being liable to kīfas or to pay any dīya or perform haffāra. This enactment is only the natural consequence of the dīhād law and Muhammad himself not infrequently made use of it.

The views of the Shi'is on all the points dealt with above agree almost entirely with one or other of the Sunni views.

(10) The infliction and execution of the death penalty was in practice very often in strong contradiction to the regulations laid down in the Sharī'a [see 'adilā; Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreide Geschriften, ii, 200, etc.]. The historians afford many examples for the actual practice and do accounts of European travellers; on the conditions in the empire see Polak, Persien, 1, 328 ff.; on those in the Ottoman empire of the 18th century see Mouradgea d'Oppsson, Tableau Général de l'Empire Ottoman, esp. vi (1854), 244 ff.; for Turkey the Känûnûms [q.v.] are also useful (cf. M. Ullmann, Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte, i, 13 ff.). Among the published sources quoted there are of special importance: Digeon, ii, 245, 262; v. Hammer, Staatsverfassung, i, 125, 133, 143-50; TOEM, iii (1328), Appendix i, 27 ff., i, 1-4, 7, 9; MTM, i/4, 341 ff. and from the Känûnum itself (edited there; 19-21, 32-4).

Bibliography: The fiqh-books, the works given in the article Kafādā, especially Juynboll, Handbuch des islamischen Gesetzes, 284-905, etc., and the literature there given; the articles MURDER and EXECUTION in T. P. Hughes, A Dictionary of Islam. Besides the articles already referred to, the article Qafād and those dealing with the Arabic expressions not explained above should be consulted; and see further Bahnasl, al-'Uţšābā fi 'l-fikād al-islāmi, Cairo 1961; L. Bercher, Les délustes et les peines de droit commun prévues par le Coran, Tunis 1926 (excellent work); R. Alva Kral, Droit penal islamique, escale maestica, Tanger 1939; Menis, De bepaalde straffen in het Hanbālīsche Recht, Leiden 1936; Anderson, Homicide in Islamic law, in BSOAS, xiii/4 (1951), 811-28; Grätz, Probleme der Todesstrafe im Islam, in Z. f. vergl. Rechtswiss., lxxi (1957); 83-122; A. Törki, Stellung des "Religionskrieg", insbesondere des Islam, in Stud. Isl., xxx (1969), 39-71; J. Schacht, An introduction to Islamic law, Oxford 1964, ch. xxiv; R. Brunschvig, Justice religieuse et justice laïque dans la Tunisie des Deys et des Beys, in Stud. Isl., xxiii (1965), 27-70. (J. SCHACHT)

KATRÁN (bāran, katrān) is 1. tar obtained by dry distillation (lias'id "vaporisation") of organic substances; 2. the residuum left after the distillation of tar, i.e., liquid pitch; 3. cedar-oil (in Dioscorides xelīs, Ar. kādriya) extracted from cedarwood. The substance is obtained from several kinds of coniferous trees, especially the Cedrus Libani (Ar. shadīdar al-sharbīn), but also from the Oxycedrus L. and various kinds of cypresses. The substance was already widely used in antiquity for many technical and therapeutic purposes and was not unknown in ancient Arabia; scabby animals were smeared with kārand (see the references in M. Ullmann, Die Médizin im Islam, 1970, 217). On the mention of kārtān in Kurān, XIV, 50, see A. Jeffery, The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an, 241 ff. Katrān smells strongly; as a medicine, it is hot and dry in the third degree; applied to the skin it kills lice and ticks, and is beneficial against scratches, itching, leprosy, and dropsy. It is also of value against the sting of venomous serpents and promotes the growth of flesh in ulcers.

Katran, a Persian poet. The recorded details of his life are meagre. 'Abdi gives his full name as Ḥakīm Ṣāraf al-Zāmān Katran al-'Adudī al-Ṭabrīzī. History refers to him as Ṣūfī. Katran dated his death by Hidayat and others is wrong). Nafisi suspects that Adudi is a corruption of Azdi (p. 473). Two more Katsinas emerge with Leo Africanus (ca. 1513) "Cases", a rather poor country, and "Gandjarayi" (Wangara), identified with Katsina-Laka (N.W. of Zaria) and associated with Muslim learning. Katsina attracted the celebrated ʿālīm, al-Maghli (d. 916/1504), who taught Kūrān and fiqh: Muhammad al-Tāzkhīt (known as Ayda-Abdāh, d. 935-6/1529); and Makhluf ... al-Bībālī al-Marrākushi (d. 939-40/1533).

The coming of the Wangara (especially under Muhammad al-Koray, d. 946-7/1541-2) signalled a shift in succession (matrilineal to patrilineal), leadership (Wangara Muslims displace Durbawa pagans), in religion and in ethnic composition. Bīrnī-Katsina (the walls of which date from 926/1518) was distinguished for its tobacco and leather; it contained over 800 principal quarters (each of which generated its own peculiar artisan and ethnic quality), a circuit of about eight miles, stretching to nearly 14 miles (1853), and a metropolitan population of 300,000. Katsina waxed and waned within the shadow of stronger powers (Mali, Songhay, Bornu, Sokoto), achieving its pinnacle of power in the 17th and 18th centuries. Here, in Barth's phrase, "... that state of civilisation which had been called forth by contact with ... Arabs seems to have reached its highest degree ... the Hausa language ... attained the greatest richness of form and the most refined pronunciation, and the manners of Katsena were distinguished by superior politeness from those of the other towns of Hausa". During this "golden age", Katsina emerged as the entrepôt of Hausaland and gave birth to some of the most renowned scholars of Sūdānī Islam: Shāykh al-Shuyūkh al-Bakrī of Yandoto (ca. 900/1600); the poet Muhammad al-Kashnawī ( Ibn al-Sabbāgh, Hausa: Dan Marīna, d. 1665); the jurist Ṣūfī ... al-Barnāwī (Hausa: Dan Masanī, d. 1678/1669); the numerologist and astrologer (who entered the learned circle of the Egyptian historian ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Jabarti) al-Hāj Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Fulānī al-Kashnawī (d. 1154/1741); the astronomer, mathematician and astrologer Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Kashnawī (ca. 1145/1732); and al-Tāhir b. Ibrāhīm al-Fulānī, who wrote a scholarly treatise on the treatment of haemorrhoids (d. 1190/1776?), and seems to have emanated from the long line of scholars in the Yandoto tradition of al-Bakrī.
With the rise of Sokoto and the submission of Katsina (1807), the ruling lineage sought refuge in a new city, Katsina-Maradi (Niger Republic). The abandoned city, which became an imārat in Sokoto's gift, underwent a rapid decline. The British administration (from 1906) encouraged an economy of groundnuts and cotton. The scholarly tradition of Katsina, though but a shadow of its former brilliance, gained fresh impetus with the establishment of Katsina Training College (1921), and through its walls passed two of Nigeria's most famous sons, Sir Ahmadu Bello and Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa.


J. R. WILLIS

KATTĀN, Arabic word denoting both flax and linen.

The Arabs already knew and esteemed linen fabrics in pre-Islamic times. In this early period these were usually khudāfī, i.e. Coptic stuff, since they were imported from Egypt. Until the later Middle Ages Egypt remained famous for its flax and its linen fabrics. The Geniza documents, which mainly date from the 5th/11th century, contain copious documentation on the flax trade. From these documents it appears that flax was mainly grown in Upper Egypt. There were many kinds of flax: S. D. Goitein has found no less than 22 varieties, mostly called after particular localities, mentioned in Geniza documents. Consequently, the prices of flax varied a great deal. In Fāvūm times the price of 1 kufur of flax varied a great deal. In this period Egypt exported great quantities of flax to Tunisia and Sicily and even to southwestern Persia.

The Muslims inherited from the Byzantines a flourishing linen industry, which was located in Lower Egypt. The most important centres were Tinnsa, Damietta, Dabik and Shata, but linen was also manufactured in many small towns and villages surrounding these places. In all these towns, Coptic weavers produced white and coloured linen, hayab and qharb, two kinds of very fine linen, and dibb, brocaded linen; Arab writers also mention gold-embroidered linen. The fabrics, and garments made from them, were exported both to Muslim and to non-Muslim countries. The Egyptian linen industry began to decline in the first half of the 7th/16th century, when the factories of Tinnsa, Damietta and Dabik were closed; their decline was probably the consequence of the increasing import of European textiles.

Another region which produced flax and had a linen industry was the Persian province of Fās. There the towns Shīrāz, Kāzarūn and Tawwadj had in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries linen factories which were famous for their products. Shīrāz, Djjānnabā and the small towns of Dariz and Furdj exported linen fabrics to other provinces of Persia. In Egypt linen was the staple textile for many centuries, as is borne out by hundreds of inventories of trousseaux found in the Cairo Geniza. During the flourishing period of the Egyptian linen industry its products were used not only for making garments, but also as table-cloths, for tents and even for the covering of the Ka'ba.

**Bibliography:** R. B. Serjeant, Materials for a history of Islamic textiles up to the Mongol conquest,


(E. ASHTOR)

AL-KATTĀNī, the name of an important and celebrated family of Fās, belonging to the Sharifian branch of the Idrisids [q.v.]. The Kattāniyyūn are descended in effect from Muhammad, the son of Idrīs II, the one who shared out his kingdom amongst his brothers. They accordingly held power in Fās until they had to flee, but returned in the 10th/16th century. Their family house was situated in a quarter named after a certain Ibn Šawwāl, and fronted a steeply-sloping street; for this reason, one of their first biographers, Muhammad al-Tālib Ibn al-Hādījī (d. 1273/1857), who was a ḥāfi in Marrakṣīg and in Fās, gave to his work on them the title Naṣm al-durr wa ḫaṣaṣṣat Ibn Šawwāl.

Morocco owes to this family a remarkable succession of scholars, jurists and literary men, the latter mainly distinguished in the biographical field. Above all, the family attained its greatest fame at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, notably through the intellectual and moral influence which it exercised in the region of Fās, in Meknès and in other large towns of Morocco as the founder of a religious order.

Amongst the best-known members of the family one may mention: 1Umār b. Ṭāhir al-Kattānī (d. 1309/1892-3), author of a work on the families of Fās converted to Islam. Abu ʿAbd Allāh Djiṣār b. Idrīs al-Kattānī (1240-1323/1824-1905), known both as a scholar and also for his disinterested conduct, of numerous works on his family.

Muḥammad b. Djiṣār, son of the preceding, b. at Fās 1275/1858-9. Drawn to the east, he went to live in Medina ca. 1910 after having twice made the pilgrimage; he then returned to his native town in 1926 and died there ca. 1927. He threw special light on his family by his Salwat al-anfās wa-muhādāhat al-akhyās bi-man ubbirā min al-ʿulamāʾ wa ṭ-sulāhā bi-Fās. This work, a model of its kind, is a far-reaching survey of the ʿulamāʾ, ʿulāmāʾ, teachers and holy men of the city of Fās. It is at the same time a treatise on the cult of saints and a source of prime importance for the religious history of Fās, its development, its topography and its topography.

The last of the great and well-known Kattānīs, who had to shoulder the responsibilities of head of the family during the years in which Morocco came to independence, is the Šaykh ʿAbd al-ʿĀṣad Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Haṣy. Like his predecessors, he was an erudite scholar and the possessor of a fine library. He had travelled in the east and studied there. He wrote a great number of books and articles, amongst which may be mentioned a family history al-Maṣāḥīr al-sāmiyya fi ʾl-nisba al-ṣāliḥa al-kattāniyya and a Fihris al-šahāris, published in 2 vols. at Fās in 1346/1927-8. He was Keeper of the Library of the Karawiyīn before the Protectorate, and he took part in compiling the first catalogue of the books scattered about the various places of this ancient city when an inventory was decided upon in 1915. However, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Haṣy not only kept up his noble family tradition of Islamic scholarship, but he
also retained with them, as an Idrisid sharif, a violent hatred of the reigning Alawi dynasty. He was imprudent enough to be involved with el-Glaoui in the plot which in August 1953 ended in the deposition and temporary exile of Sidd Muhammad. When the latter returned to power and Morocco received its independence, Muhammad 'Abd al-Hayy had to go into exile in France, where he died on 28 September 1962 at the age of 77.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the article, there is a description of the flag in A. Christsen and, Sasanides, 502-4; see also idem, Kayanides, index; Carrara de Vaux, Histoire des rois de Perse, ed. and tr. Zotenberg, Paris 1900, 38 f.).

AL-KAWAKIBI, 'ABD AL-RAHMÂN B. AHMAD B. MAŠûD, a pioneer in the theory of Panarabism, was born in (?) 1849 into a family of notables long settled in Aleppo, and died in Cairo in 1902. Orphaned at an early age, he was brought up by an aunt in Antioch, where he became a pupil of his mother's maternal uncle, said to have been sometime tutor to Prince 'Abbâs Hilmi (1874-1944) [q.v.]. He also attended al-madrassa al-kawakibiyya in Aleppo. He perfected Turkish and Persian as well as Arabic, and acquired some knowledge of secular subjects but not of a European language. He led an active literary and political life, editing the official Aleppo paper Furat in its Arabic and Turkish sections from 1875-1880 [q.v.]. In 1883 he was acquitted. His property was confiscated, however, and he was forced to emigrate to Cairo in 1898 or 1899. From Egypt he toured various Muslim countries and went as far as Karâfü; his sudden death stopped another planned tour into the heart of Arabia. In Cairo he is said to have received the monthly salary of 50 guineas from the Khedive 'Abbâs Hilmi in order to win for him the suffrages of the skylâs of Aden and the Nine Provinces for the caliphate which he wished to assume.

Al-Kawakibi published two books, drafted while he was still in Syria, both of which have been convincingly shown to derive from Western models. He used two pseudonyms: al-Sayyid al-Furatî and al-Râbîlâm K. Umm al-Kurâl, which echoes the views expressed by W. S. Blunt in The Future of Islam (1882), was written in the guise of the proceedings of a secret society and was first published under a pseudonym in 1899, almost certainly clandestinely, the place of publication being given as Port Said. It was not until Rașîd Ridâ [q.v.] serialised it in al-Manâr [q.v.], April 1902-February 1903, that the book became widely known. The book makes the first sure and permanent transition in Arabic from Panislamism to Panarabism. It discusses the caliphate and argues that the problems of Islam are best solved by transferring the caliphate from the house of 'Ummân to Kurayší. An Arab caliph would be installed in Mecca and would exercise, with the concurrence of a special council of consultation (gûra), political authority over the Hidîjâ only. This caliphate would be devoid of all other political and military powers; its spiritual nature, as well as its political position of the Arabs within Islam, is of late, Sâsânid origin.

Whatever the truth, the Arabic historians frequently reproduced the legend, especially as the drafş-i Kâwûyân is associated with a glorious episode in the history of Islam. The tale goes that the emblem of the Iranian rulers fell into the Muslims’ hands at the celebrated battle of al-Kâtîsîya [q.v.], although an author like Masûdî, who calls the blacksmith here Kâbû, has the honesty to cite equally the capture of al-Ma’dâlîn or even of Niğâwûn [q.v.] (Tanbîh, ed. Saâdi, 76).

The drafş-i Kâwûyân involved here cannot have been the blacksmith’s apron, which must have become worn out in the course of the centuries, but a flag which is described by the historians differently. According to al-Tabarî, i, 2175, it was 12 cubits long and 8 wide and made out of panther skins, and Masûdî, Murađî, iv, 224 = § 1555, cf. Balâsamî-Zotenberg, iii, 395, adds that it was encrusted with precious stones and mounted on poles fitted one into the other; al-Jâhîz, Farûk, Mafâthîh, 115, says that it was made from a bear or lion skin, and al-Mâkidî, Bâdî, v, 184, from that of a kid or lion, and later, from brocade and gold; and Ibn Khaldûn, Mubaddîma, ed. Quatremère, iii, 135, tr. Rosenthal, iii, 168-9, adds that a talismanic device of numbers was woven on the flag.

There emerges from these few references that no author had been able actually to see the flag, for the simple reason—that it had long before ceased to exist. According to one tradition—to be regarded with caution—it was Dîrâ b. al-Khâẖâbî [q.v., and add the capture of the drafş] who got hold of the flag and who received in return for it 30,000 dînârs, when it was in fact considered to be worth 200,000 (Murađî, loc. cit.; cf. Tanbîh, loc. cit.). Sa’d b. Abî Wâḳâsh then sent it to ‘Umar b. al-Khâẖâbî, who had it cut up into pieces and divided amongst the Muslims (al-Thûlîbî, Histoire des rois de Perse, ed. and tr. Zotenberg, Paris 1900, 38 f.).

articles in al-Mu'aṣṣad of ʿAli Yūsuf in 1900. It is to a large extent a faithful rendering in Arabic of Della Tirannide (1800) by Vittorio Alfieri. Notes for other publications were destroyed or lost.


**KAWALA, Kawa, port on the Aegean Sea coast opposite the island of Thasos, on the frontier between Macedonia and Thrace.** In classical times, it was on this site the town of Neapolis, which served Philipps (P. Lemerle, *Philippines et la Macedoine Orientale,* Paris 1945, 529, 544). In the Byzantine period, the town was known as Christopolis, but the Ottoman sources always refer to it under the same name Kawa the Turkish I'a reign at a date which is difficult to determine; in August 1373 it was still in the possession of the grand prinicus Alexis, who had just repulsed an attack by Turkish pirates of unspecified origin and obedience (*Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum* sine acta et diplomata res veneto-graece alque Levantis illustrantius, ed. R. Predelli, ii, 164-6; Lemerle, *op. cit.,* 209 ff.). It was captured by the Venetians fairly promptly after the fall of Serres in 1383, since it was situated on the route of penetration into Macedonia.

At the time of Meḥmed II, in ca. 883/1478-9, the district of Kawa comprised the town and 11 villages, with 546 non-Muslim hearths, 23 Muslim hearths, 25 unmarried persons and 28 widows; its revenue was 34,136 aspers. The town itself was made up of 75 non-Muslim hearths, 12 Muslim hearths, 8 unmarried persons and 8 widows. The district's natural resources included cereal cultivation, silk worm rearing, and above all, silver mining, the town was made of silver. In the 12th/18th century there was a French vice-consulate at Kawa, which belonged to the viliyet of Salonika. At the end of the 19th century it was conquered by the Turks, but this was never put into practice, and a few years after the First World War, the town could not be used as anchorage for warships.

After the administrative re-organisation of 1864, Kawa was constituted a kādāt of the sanjāk of Drama, which belonged to the vilayet of Salonika. At the end of the 19th century its population increased and reached well over 10,000, the Muslim and Greek elements being predominant. In ecclesiastical administration, Kawa was subordinate to the bishop of Xanthi.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, the cultivation of cotton, and above all tobacco, constituted the district's main source of wealth (E. Beaujour, *Tableau du commerce de la Grèce et de l'Asie Mineure,* Paris Year VIII, 89, 92); under the name Kawala it was conquered by the Turks in 1912, but during the Second Balkan War, the Greek fleet seized it (July 1913); by the Treaty of Bucarest (10 August 1913), the town was ceded to Greece (Nicolai-des, *Griechenlands Anteil an den Balkanhiegen,* Vienna-Leipzig 1914, 367 ff.; E. Z. Karal, *Osmanlı tarihi* i, Ankara 1970, v, 125 ff.). He built there a school (mühendis-khane-yi khayyritte), a madrasa, a mosque, a library and a soup-kitchen ('imārāt), and assigned the revenues of the island of Thasos for the upkeep of his pious foundations (Kāmīs al-aʿlām, Istanbul 1314/1896, v, 3094-5). Today, his house is a museum.

One of the clauses of the Treaty of San Stefano (March 1878), made at the end of the Russo-Turkish War, envisaged the cession of Kawa to the Bulgarians, but this was never put into practice, and a few months later the treaty was replaced by that of Berlin (15 July 1878). At the time of the First Balkan War, Kawa fell into Bulgarian hands (November 1912), but during the Second Balkan War, the Greek fleet seized it (July 1913); by the Treaty of Bucarest (10 August 1913), the town was ceded to Greece (Nicolai-des, *Griechenlands Anteil an den Balkanhiegen,* Vienna-Leipzig 1914, 367 ff.; E. Z. Karal, *Osmanlı tarihi* i, Ankara 1970, v, 125 ff.). He built there a school (mühendis-khane-yi khayyritte), a madrasa, a mosque, a library and a soup-kitchen ('imārāt), and assigned the revenues of the island of Thasos for the upkeep of his pious foundations (Kāmīs al-aʿlām, Istanbul 1314/1896, v, 3094-5). Today, his house is a museum.

One of the clauses of the Treaty of San Stefano (March 1878), made at the end of the Russo-Turkish War, envisaged the cession of Kawa to the Bulgarians, but this was never put into practice, and a few months later the treaty was replaced by that of Berlin (15 July 1878). At the time of the First Balkan War, Kawa fell into Bulgarian hands (November 1912), but during the Second Balkan War, the Greek fleet seized it (July 1913); by the Treaty of Bucarest (10 August 1913), the town was ceded to Greece (Nicolai-des, *Griechenlands Anteil an den Balkanhiegen,* Vienna-Leipzig 1914, 367 ff.; E. Z. Karal, *Osmanlı tarihi* i, Ankara 1970, v, 125 ff.). He built there a school (mühendis-khane-yi khayyritte), a madrasa, a mosque, a library and a soup-kitchen ('imārāt), and assigned the revenues of the island of Thasos for the upkeep of his pious foundations (Kāmīs al-aʿlām, Istanbul 1314/1896, v, 3094-5). Today, his house is a museum.
Bibliography: Given in the article, but see also K. Chioious, 'laTOpia TTJ<; KapdcXa^, Kavala 1966; A. Vakalopoulos, 'Istoria tis Makdovnas, 1354-1833, Salonica 1960; S. Papadopoulos, 'Ekpaideutiki kai kiwnikia draptritita tis Eleynomou tis Makdovnas kata ton telu-taio elinias tis Tourkooxoraitias, Salonica 1970. (I. Beldiceanu-Steninher - J. G. Giannon-

KAWAR, a group of oases in the southern Sahara, in the Republic of Niger, situated between the Tibesti Mountains in the east and the Air in the west, halfway between Fezzan in the north and Lake Chad in the south. The administrative centre is Bilma, which lies at 18° 41' N and 12° 55' E. Kawar is a chain of oases 75 km. long from north to south, but only one to five km. wide, where water flows in abundant springs on the eastern edge of the Ténéré. It has naturally been utilised by the caravan route from Fezzan to Chad. Its 3,000 to 4,000 inhabitants, who are divided into 14 frequently victimised the inhabitants.

These oases do not seem to have been known to classical antiquity, despite the proximity of Fezzan and the representations of chariots engraved on the rock at Djado and Latouma.

The history of Kawar is obscure. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam mentions it first, telling of its conquest in 4966/1065 by 'Uqba b. Nafi'. Al-Iṣṭaphānī, in 549/1154, devotes a whole passage to it but his description is so confused that, with the exception of Ankalala = Kalala, the toponyms cited cannot be identified. He lays stress chiefly on its important alum mines, whose produce, he says, was exported to the Medi-

The very important Chad-Fezzan caravan route through which slaves from Hausa territory were ex-

France and of the United Arab Emirates. The Kawasim, who claim to be ghariifs, are an offshoot of the Huwala, Arabs long established on the Persian side of the Persian Gulf, some of whom have returned to their original home-

References to the Kawasim in the historical records become frequent in the 12th/13th century. In 1131-

When the German explorer C. Niebuhr passed through the Gulf in 1178/1765, he learned that Rāshid b. Maṭar al-Kāsimī of Ra's al-Khayma built a port at Bāṣīdū on the island of Kīghm which drew trade away from the British factory at Bandar ʿAbbās, whereupon the British Agent in Persia in 1139/1727 forced this ruler to make good the loss suffered by the East India Company. In 1149/1737 Nādir Shāh's forces launched an amphibious invasion of Umān, and a Persian garrison stayed in Ra's al-Khayma (still often called Djlufār) for over a decade afterwards, but by 1176/1763 the Persian admiral in the Gulf was reported to have exhausted his resources in paying subsidies to the ruler of Ra's al-Khayma.

When the British consolidating their control of India, the Persian Gulf became one of the main avenues for communications with the home country, and the transit of British vessels over its waters grew more frequent. In 1192/1778 the Kawasim seized a small British ship and held it for ransom, an incident that helped to touch off a long conflict between the


al-ΚΑΨΑΙΜ (sing. Kasiim), the ruling family of al-Shārika (Sharjah) and Ra's al-Khayma (qq.v.), two of the member states of the United Arab Emirates. The Kawasim, who claim to be ghariifs, are an offshoot of the Huwala, Arabs long established on the Persian side of the Persian Gulf, some of whom have returned to their original home-

It has naturally been utilised by the caravan route from Fezzan to Chad. Its 3,000 to 4,000 inhabitants, who are divided into 14 frequently victimised the inhabitants.

These oases do not seem to have been known to classical antiquity, despite the proximity of Fezzan and the representations of chariots engraved on the rock at Djado and Latouma.

The history of Kawar is obscure. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam mentions it first, telling of its conquest in 4966/1065 by 'Uqba b. Nafi'. Al-Iṣṭaphānī, in 549/1154, devotes a whole passage to it but his description is so confused that, with the exception of Ankalala = Kalala, the toponyms cited cannot be identified. He lays stress chiefly on its important alum mines, whose produce, he says, was exported to the Medi-

The very important Chad-Fezzan caravan route through which slaves from Hausa territory were ex-

France and of the United Arab Emirates. The Kawasim, who claim to be ghariifs, are an offshoot of the Huwala, Arabs long established on the Persian side of the Persian Gulf, some of whom have returned to their original home-

References to the Kawasim in the historical records become frequent in the 12th/13th century. In 1131-

When the German explorer C. Niebuhr passed through the Gulf in 1178/1765, he learned that Rāshid b. Maṭar al-Kāsimī of Ra's al-Khayma built a port at Bāṣīdū on the island of Kīghm which drew trade away from the British factory at Bandar ʿAbbās, whereupon the British Agent in Persia in 1139/1727 forced this ruler to make good the loss suffered by the East India Company. In 1149/1737 Nādir Shāh's forces launched an amphibious invasion of Umān, and a Persian garrison stayed in Ra's al-Khayma (still often called Djlufār) for over a decade afterwards, but by 1176/1763 the Persian admiral in the Gulf was reported to have exhausted his resources in paying subsidies to the ruler of Ra's al-Khayma.

When the British consolidating their control of India, the Persian Gulf became one of the main avenues for communications with the home country, and the transit of British vessels over its waters grew more frequent. In 1192/1778 the Kawasim seized a small British ship and held it for ransom, an incident that helped to touch off a long conflict between the
two parties in the Gulf. The British were prone to
describe an act such as this as simple piracy; the
Kawasim were inclined to regard it as consonant with
the Islamic precept for waging dhūḥād against the in-

fidel.

In the early 13th/late 18th century Wahhābī
influence burgeoned along the coast where the
Kawasim were based. Rāshīd b. Maṭar’s son Ṣaqr
acquired the title of Amir of ‘Umān under Āl Su‘ūd,
the religious and secular chiefs of the Wahhābīyya.
After his victory over the Trukids of ‘Umān, Ṣaqr’s
son Sultān turned over a fifth of the spoils for
dispatch to the Wahhābī capital al-Dir‘īyya.

Further British commercial penetration into
the Gulf brought about clashes, in a number of which
British merchantmen were captured. The British
took to using the name Kawasim in the corrupted English
form Joasnee as a generic term for all Arabs in
the Gulf who harassed their shipping. Su‘ūd b. ʿAbd
al-ʿAzīz Āl Su‘ūd deposed Sultān b. Ṣaqr for reasons
that remain obscure, but Sultān’s successor continued
harrying the British. In retaliation, a British fleet
in 1224/1809 sailed to Ra‘s al-Khayma, burned many
Kāsimī craft in the harbour, and sent troops to oc-
cupy the town for a day, during which they plundered
it and set it on fire. This British blow did not long
deter the Kawasim, who proceeded to add an Ameri-
can merchant steamer and some French ships to their
prizes. A new British expedition took Ra‘s al-Khayma in
1235/1819, and a detachment of sepoys under a
British officer held it for three months before turning
it over to Sultān b. Ṣaqr, who, having incurred the
displeasure of Āl Su‘ūd, was in the good graces of
the British. The British then imposed a general
truce for six months, covering the season
for pearl diving in the summer. This truce was re-
newed repeatedly, and the stretch of coast to which
it applied, formerly called by the British the Pirate
Coast, came to be known as the Trucial Coast. The
last limited truce, which was good for ten years,
was superseded in 1269/1853 by a treaty of peace in
perpetuity, which provided for “a perfect maritime
truce... for evermore”, which was to be watched
over by the British government.

British control over the Trucial States was strength-
ened by the exclusive agreement of 1309/1892, signed
by the Kāsimī rulers of al-Sharīka and Ra‘s al-
Khayma among others, which bound the Arab signa-
tories not to enter into any agreement or correspond-
ence with any power other than Britain.

In 1322/1904 Persia, which not long before had
taken over the former Kāsimī possession of Lindja
on the Persian side of the Gulf, tried to annex
the island of Abū Mūsā and one of the two islands named
Tunb, which the British regarded as belonging to
al-Sharīka. Thanks to British intervention, this
attempt was thwarted.

After the death of Sultān b. Ṣaqr in 1282-3/1866,
the position of leadership long enjoyed by the
Kawasim on the Trucial Coast slipped away into
the hands of their southern neighbours, Dubayy and
Abū Ṣābī [p.n.], Dubayy became the foremost
Trucial port for trade, and Abū Ṣābī under its
energetic ruler Zayyid b. Khalfā (d. 1326/1908)

built up substantial political and military strength.
Abū Ṣābī then declined somewhat during the
period when Zayyid’s four sons followed each other
as his successors, but under his grandson Shakhbūt,
oil was discovered in its territories in commercial
quantities in 1379/1959, the first such discovery
on the Trucial Coast. As the oil industry developed,
Abū Ṣābī outdistanced its sister Trucial States in
an almost incredible fashion, achieving thanks
to its small population the highest per capita income
of any country in the world. In 1386/1966 oil was
found off the shore of Dubayy, which took second
place as a Trucial Coast producer, though still far
behind Abū Ṣābī.

Towards the end of 1391/1971 the British rein-
ished the dominance they had maintained over the
Gulf for well over a century, withdrawing all their
military forces and giving up the RAF base at al-
Sharīka. Just before they left, Iran occupied
the islands of Abū Mūsā and Greater and Lesser Tunb
inside the mouth of the Gulf. The occupation of Abū
Mūsā was carried out in agreement with al-Sharīka,
but Ra‘s al-Khayma attempted to resist the Iranian
landings on the Tunbs. In 1392/1972 oil was struck
in the waters off Abū Mūsā, with the profits from
its exploitation to be divided equally between al-
Sharīka and Iran.

As the British moved out, the seven Trucial States
banded together in the new United Arab Emirates.
Abū Ṣābī and Dubayy, the richest members, acquired
respectively the presidency and vice-presidency of
the union. Sultān b. Muhammad b. Ṣaqr al-Kāsimī,
the ruler of al-Sharīka, and his distant cousin Ṣaqr
b. Muhammad b. Šālim al-Kāsimī, the ruler of Ra‘s
al-Khayma, joined the Supreme Council. Other mem-
bers of the Kāsimī family received portfolios as
Minister of Labour and Labourers, Minister of
Electricity and Water, Minister of Justice, and
Minister of State for Supreme Council Affairs.

British terminated all its existing treaties with
the Trucial States and concluded a new treaty of
friendship with the United Arab Emirates.
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KAWKAB [see nūqṭām].

KAWKAB AL-HAWA, the Compass Dial,
mediaeval fortress in Palestine whose name
has been corrupted into “Coquet” by the Frankish
authors who also cite it by the name of Belvoir.
Construced not far from Mount Tabor (al-Tār)
on a monoponty 297 m above the Valley of the
Jordan and situated 4 km to the south of the Lake of
Tiberias and 14 km to the north of Baysan [p.w.], a
watchpost in the Ghawr, it controlled the province of
the Jordan and guarded the fords into Galilee, notably below the confluence of the Yarmuk, the Dijr el-Madjarīf (Bridge of the Confluence).

The castle presents a plan of Byzantine type; it consisted of a rectangular keep enclosed in a surrounding wall 160 m by 120 m flanked by square towers, with a salient and door let into it in the midst of each front (Deschamps, 121-3), and there are ramps at the base of the openings. The northern front dominates perpendicularly the Wadī Bīrā, the three other fronts are bordered by ditches cut twenty metres into the rock.

It was reinforced in 534/1140 by the King Fulk. The Hospitallers acquired it in 563/1168 and added to the defences. In 578/1182, the troops of Saladin were repelled by the Franks on the neighbouring plateau of Kawkab, but after his success at Hittin (q.v.), the Kurdish prince contemplated the conquest of Galilee, and on the 15th Dhu'l-Kaḍa 584/5th January 1189, aided by the contingents of his brother al-ʿAdil, he approached to seize Kawkab, bastion of the Crusaders' resistance in the Holy Land.

In the reign of al-ʿAdil, Kawkab was occupied by the amir ʿṢārim al-Dīn Kāyman al-Nāṣirī; then Ilī al-Dīn Usāma received it as an inherit. He kept the castle until the day when al-Muʿazzam ʿIyaʿ, younger brother of al-Kāmil and prince of Damascus, took it from him (609/1212). In 616/1219, the Franks occupied Damietta, and al-Muʿazzam gave the order to dismantle Kawkab; the work was suspended during the diplomatic discussions between the Sultan al-Kāmil and the Legate Pegasos, then resumed, and al-Muʿazzam completed the dismantling of the place in 624/1227, so that the Franks of Frederick II might not eventually take advantage of it. At the beginning of 638/end of 1240, the Hospitallers recaptured the castle from the Ayyūbids. At the end of 638/beginning of 1241, with peace restored, Kawkab was confirmed as Frankish territory, but at the beginning of 645/summer of 1247, when al-Śāliḥ Ayyūb resumed operations, the Franks, who had not been strong enough to defend the place, had to surrender it. Under the Mamlūks, ʿAḍār al-Kawkab was part of the province of Saṣāf. In our time there is a village near the ruins of the castle which bears its name.


Kawkab, the name of several places in South Arabia.

1. The name of a sanctuary mentioned in the inscription Halāvy No. 866, 3-4, copied from a building in ʿAdeḥ by J. Halévy (mirabān Kaw-
A stone bridge with huge arches led across the Wādī Nabhān to the Bāb al-Hadīd but it was blown up by the Arabs in 1572.

Kawkābān is an ancient city dating from the Himyar period, as inscriptions found there show. Al-Hamdānī mentions a stronghold of Kawkābān on the summit of the Djabal Dhūlqār which is certainly identical with the old town of the modern Kawkābān. In troubled times its strength made it a desirable place of refuge—in 1569 the Turks burned the stronghold in vain—and for centuries Kawkābān has been important as a capital and residence of the Imāms of the principality of the same name. The latter comprised in addition to Kawkābān the towns of Shibām, Ijadja, Tawila, the Khabt Mirwāb (between Kawkābān and Harrār), the lands of Miswar, Sāri, Hofās, Milhān, Ādhir, 'Ārus, Banū Khayyāt, al-Shahihiyā Lā'a, a part of the Banū Hubaysh, the Banū Nashir and of al-Afṣam. The old dynasty of the country, which traced its descent from the Imām Ḥāḍīf of Sa'da, was able to retain its imamate even during Turkish rule and to maintain its independence from the Imāms of Sa'nā' after the Turks were driven out in 1630. C. Niebuhr (Beschreibung, 256; see the Bibliography) has given a genealogical survey of the princes of Kawkābān. When the Turks again invaded Yaman in 1733 and subjected the old town for a seven months' severe siege also passed to the Turks but only after capitulation. The last ruler of Kawkābān, Sayyid Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Rabīm, who had bravely defended the town against the Turks, afterwards lived in Sa'nā' on a pension given to him by the Sublime Porte. At Glaser's visit in 1883 his brother Seyyid Yaḥyā still lived in the old ancestral home in Kawkābān, which is remarkable for the splendid stucco-work of the interior and the rich ornamentation of its façade. The windows and doors had all sorts of varied shapes, colours and ornaments.

Kawkābān was in the early 20th century almost depopulated; although the houses, which in spite of much destruction were still standing, afforded accommodation for some 30,000 people, there were then barely 100 in the town. One gets a splendid view over the fertile fields and valleys of the country around, especially the plain of Shibām, a part of the plain of Sa'nā' and the surrounding hills.

5. Kawkābān al-Sba'a is in Ma'bīd, west of the town of Kawkābān (4), but belongs to Tawila, a small place of no special importance.
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Kawm (a.), plural akwām, akwāmin, akwāymin, people. The word occurs also in Nabataean, Palmyrene and Safaitic inscriptions in the name of the deity Šayyā' al-Kawm "support of the people", see Lidzbarski's Epithemis für semitische Epigraphik, i, Index s.v. According to some lexicographers, the word applies in the first place to men; evidence for this opinion is afforded by passages from literature where Kawm is used in opposition to ṭīṣa (women). The term does not primarily suggest the meaning of nation. A man's Kawm are his āṣa'a and his ʿašīra. In this limited sense, the word occurs also in the well-known tradition: "Who clings to a Kawm without the permission of his father (Ṣabā'a), is cursed by Allāh, the angels and the prophets" (Buḥārī, ʿAdā'í al-Madīnūn, bāb 1). Used without the article, it has the same meaning as English "people", French "gens" and German "Leute", e.g. Sūra V, 63: "People who do not understand"; cf. IX, 61 (also with the article, XII, 87). The plural has the same meaning. In a tradition it is said: "There will be people (akwām) in my commuinity, who will proclaim licentiousness regarding women and wine" (Buḥārī, ʿAqībā, bāb 6).

In the Kurān the term is chiefly used in connection with the prophets, Muhammad's predecessors: the people of Ibrāhīm, Lūt, Nūh (e.g. VII, 116; II, 91; XXII, 43; XXVI, 105, 160; XXXVIII, 11), i.e. their unbelieving contemporaries. In this sense it is also used in connection with Muhammad himself: "Whyme declare Him a lie, though He is the Truth" (VI, 66). The same use of the term is to be found in the Ḥadīth, e.g. Buḥārī, Anbiyyā', bāb 3, 9, 31, 54 etc.

Kawm is, however, also used in a sense that comes nearer to the modern conception of "people", e.g. in the tradition referring to one of the festivals: "Every Kawm has its festival, and this is ours" (Buḥārī, ʿIdayn, bāb 5). Al-Kawm with this sense has sometimes an emphatic meaning, e.g. Aḥmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, vii, 72, where Ṭūfayl, one of
Aisha’s brothers, relates a dream which he had. He dreamt that he passed by some Jews and said to them: ‘Verily, you would be the people of one language, but you pretend that ‘Uzayr (Ezra) is the son of Allah’. They answered: ‘And you would be the people, it was not that you say: Mad sha’ Allah wa-ma sha’ Muhammad’, etc.

In Atchin (Atjeh) the term has acquired a peculiar form and use: kawm has here the genealogical meaning of “all those who descend from one man in the male line”, see Snook Hurgronne, The Achkenese, Index s.v. kawm.

For special meanings of the word see Dozy, Supplément, s.v.; and see also GÖM. (A. J. Wensinck)

KAWMIYYA (A.), nationalism.

1. In the Arab world east of the Maghrib.

The term derives from kawm, a term of tribal provenance used to denote a group of people having or claiming a common ancestor, or a tribe descended from a single ancestor. One’s kawm is simply one’s people, either genealogically determined or mythologically and folklorishly depicted. In this century, kawmiyya refers to the movement of nationalism among the Arabs of the Ottoman dominions in the Fertile Crescent that were conquered by the Allies in the Great War. The use of the term has spread since the Second World War to other parts of the Arabic-speaking world. After the mid-20th century, kawmiyya became the expression of a purported economic, political and social Arab revolution. Essentially, though, al-kawmiyya al-’arabiyya is the term widely used for the movement of Arab nationalism. Arab intellectuals since the last war have tried to formulate theoretical and philosophical foundations as well as historical and ideological premises for this nationalism. Most active among them were Syrian, Lebanese and Iraqi politicians, teachers, journalists, writers and publicists. Prominent among the more recent exponents and advocates of Arab nationalism have been the Ba’th (Baath) party, founded in 1943, and its antecedents among smaller radical Arab youth movements in Iraq and Syria in the nineteen-thirties. In 1955, Djamal Abd al-Nasir (Nasser) of Egypt took up the banner of kawmiyya in connection with his drive for hegemony in the Arab Middle East.

Briefly, the advocates of Arab nationalism argue the existence of an Arab nation (umma ‘arabiyya) which, though actually divided into separate states, ought to be united in a single, organic sovereign political entity. What binds the members of the Arab nation together is a common faith, Islam, a common language, Arabic, a single culture, Islamic, and a shared history. Economic and other practical grounds for unity have, until recently, rarely been formulated or proposed. Religious sentiment, common identity and an aspiration to political unity, that is, have been the fundamental ingredients of the movement of Arab nationalism, Arabism and Pan-Arabism—all aspects or variants of kawmiyya—in this century.

In a “Memorandum respecting Pan-Arabism” to the then British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, dated May 27, 1936, Gilbert Mackereth, HM Consul in Damascus, opined:

There is no doubt of the existence of an Arab movement, but there is considerable doubt regarding its potentialities. (F. O. 377/1936, Public Record Office).

Even in 1936 one of the movement’s objectives was Arab unity, the creation of an Arab state which would comprise the whole of the Arab nation. But its exponents at that time were confined to Iraq, Lebanon and Syria, all of them new states under British or French mandate. It was also a period when advocates and leaders of the movement were engaged in defining the Arab nation geographically and ideologically. Egypt was still distant from the concerns of kawmiyya, occupied as she was with the question of her relations with Britain. The Arabs in the Peninsula were strongly anchored in an Islamic perception of things political and in a basically tribal social ethos, neither concerned nor particularly interested, nor in need of a secular national identity.

However, 1936 provided a fresh external stimulus to the Arab movement of kawmiyya in the form of the Palestine problem, involving an Arab-Jewish antithesis in Palestine under the British mandate. Yet, forty years later today, the movement’s aspiration of unity remains unfulfilled, and the same ambivalence regarding the meaning, importance and existential form of kawmiyya continues to plague it. Instead of one Arab nation-state, there are several Arab states.

As elsewhere in the world, the only definition basic to the several existing Arab states is a territorial one. Kaumiyya, as an all-encompassing concept of Arab nationalism, is a self-contradictory, unrealistic doctrine. Not only because the Arab nation is dispersed in several states, but also because it is difficult anywhere in the world to have a complete, or perfect, nation-state, i.e. one where the state is co-extensive with one nation. Nor is there a satisfactory criterion of nationality based on race, language and religion, or culture and history. Yet kawmiyya, like nationalism elsewhere, remains a potent doctrine and a powerful political myth. Even though the only absolutely clear division between countries is territorial, there is some substance to the “idea of the nation” to the extent that there is a deeply felt urge or need to identify with a group. To this extent also, kawmiyya must be viewed as a psychological concept.

The most powerful basis of kawmiyya among the Arabs in the last thirty years has been an emotional one, deriving from an idealised religious culture, Islam, and a more recent historical experience under Ottoman rule and European influence. In societies where for many centuries identity was religiously determined or based, and ethnically distinguished in a mosaic of co-existing religious and ethnic communities, corporate loyalties are scarce and difficult to develop. Kaumiyya may be viewed as a compensatory movement among the Arabs on two levels. Firstly, as a reaction to prolonged Ottoman domination, under which the question of national identity within the umma—community of believers—did not arise. Secondly, as a response to territorial-political arrangements that were imposed by European powers upon the dissolution of the last Muslim empire in 1920, kawmiyya provides a potential integrative force against the fragmentation of political reality.

Because Arab societies did not experience a movement for the secularisation of political identity, life and perceptions comparable or parallel to that of Europe beginning in the Middle Ages, the very concept of the nation-state and the movement of nationalism remained an extrapolation, the transposition and extension of an essentially religious-based political culture. Their members have always
been conscious of their Islamic identity. Kawmiyya has been an attempt to make them conscious of their Arab identity. The tradition of communal, ethnic and religious differentiation has been an obstacle to the integrative assumptions and aspirations of kawmiyya. More recently, the proliferation of sovereign independent territorial Arab states has been a powerful trend. Consequently, nationalist ideology drifted into being a rationalisation of primordial Islamic sentiments and became particularly useful as a rallying sentiment against external threats or enemies. Kawmiyya, in short, has so far failed to give the Arabs, politically organised in several states, a secular identity separate from their Islamic-based one.

One precondition of kawmiyya emerged in the 19th century, namely, the historical consciousness or recognition of a difference, an exclusiveness, from others, i.e. from non-Arabs. This occurred with the rapid, forceful European military, economic and political penetration of the East, and the impact of the political ideas and institutions which this brought with it. The revival of the Arabic language, notions and schemes of religious reform, the over-apologetic and intellectually weak defence of Islam against the onslaught of European modernity were all consequences of this re-awakening of the shahada. It provided the requisite mythological and other justification for first, Islamic, and later Arab, opposition to alien rule, preparatory to demands for self-determination. Modern reform in the Ottoman State itself, leading to the adoption of nationalist doctrines by the Turkish ruling classes—a radical departure from the integrative universalism of the ummah—eventually provoked movements of Arab separatism, culminating in the British promotion of an Arab Revolt in the Hijaz against the Ottoman sultan-caliph in the First World War. More important was the development of fairly modern state administrations in several of the Arab provinces, providing the foundations of and habituation for local-national autonomy. The rise of native élites concerned with the development of secular institutions of government, administration, legislation, adjudication, education and the economy, gave added impetus to this trend. The experience in several Arab states was not, however, uniform, giving rise to disparities and differences between them, which in turn, rendered the unity aspirations of kawmiyya more difficult to realise.

Kawmiyya presupposes the existence of an Arab nation, its solidarity, exclusiveness—and its unity. But all these assumptions are founded on an essentially religious basis; on Islam the faith, on Arabic, the language of its Holy Book, on the sharī'a, its revealed sacred law, and on the history of its glorious conquests and empire. It also overlooks the ethnic and sectarian diversity that existed under an Islamic universalism. The particularism of modern nationalism therefore remained opposed to the universalism—and tolerance—of its source of inspiration, so that the efforts of the advocates of kawmiyya have been mainly directed at reconciling the difference and seeking (unsuccessfully so far) a symbiosis between 'urūqa (Arabism, which is at the heart of kawmiyya) and din (religion). The best they have been able to achieve has been to translate the solidarity of the Islamic umma into the unity of the Arab nation. But in order to do that they had first to construct a special role for the Arabs in Islam in counter-distinction to that of other, non-Arab, Muslims. This was the major preoccupation, for example, of 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Kawākiḥī [q.v.] (d. 1902) and Shaykh Muhammad Rāghil Rīḍā [q.v.] (d. 1935) earlier in this century. More recently, 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Bazzāz (d. 1971) tried to argue that there was no contradiction between Islam and Arab nationalism. Theoretically, the relation between religion and state did not constitute a particular problem in Islam. As a religious movement, Islam founded a state and acquired an empire by conquest. The modern fusion of Islam and Arabism therefore is not surprising. Moreover, just as the unity of Islam and the solidarity of the faithful has been a doctrinal tenet but only a political myth, so also Arab unity today is a potent myth of kawmiyya though politically non-existent. It is a prescriptively ideological, substitute reality. The urūqa of kawmiyya's Pan-Arabism has been as elusive and problematic as the ideal of Pan-Islamism before it, or for that matter, the ideal of other, non-Muslim pan-movements, e.g. Pan-Germanism, Pan-Slavism or Pan-Hellenism.

Nationalism is, by definition, a secular concept or idea. Behind it, in Europe at least, lay a formid-able array of philosophical speculation about secularism and authority in the state, from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Enlightenment, and all of it supported, distorted and confused by a pre-Christian classical tradition. Kawmiyya, on the other hand, has not managed to free itself from its Islamic antecedents and foundations because there has been no comparable philosophical, speculative basis to Arab secularism. Elements and manifestations of the latter have, however, struggled through the surface of Arab societies, and have become discernable in the conduct of their public affairs by powerful rulers or chiefs who were able to command the traditionally-perceived personal loyalty of their subjects or followers and had centralised administrations at their disposal.

Even though the concept is arbitrary, and despite its limited scope, one can argue that kawmiyya in the sense of a feeling of Arabness within the wider Ottoman-Islamic dominion first expressed itself in the rejection of the Ottoman caliphate some seventy-five years ago. It suggested not only that the Arabs were different from the Turks but, more significantly, that they were entitled to have an Arab caliph. This was accompanied by incipient secret organisations among Arab officers in the Ottoman army before and during the Great War, demanding the recognition of Arab rights to decentralisation and local autonomy within the Ottoman empire. These early agitations culminated in the dynastic, separatist revolt led by Sharif Husayn of Mecca in the Hijaz (1916-18) in the First World War. His son Faysal's short-lived Arab Kingdom in Damascus (1918-20) constituted the basis of the myth of modern Arab nationalism and a justification of kawmiyya. The mandate arrangements imposed by Britain and France in the Fertile Crescent, however, transformed the movement for a time into one of the newly-created Arab states demanding a greater measure of and, ultimately, full, independence from, those two European powers.

The unity-variant of kawmiyya re-emerged after 1936, but remained the preoccupation of Arab nationalists in the Fertile Crescent, dependent on external circumstances, i.e. Europe, affecting British and French control in the region, and events in Palestine, provided the impetus for the adumbration of regional schemes of Arab unity (e.g. the
Fertile Crescent, and Greater Syria of the Hashimites). At the same time, Christian and Muslim Arab intellectuals sought to define the Arab nation and formulate a nationalist ideology. The writings of Costi (Kuşṭaţin) Zurrāy, Edmund Rabbath, Abd Allāh al-‘Alāyīlī and others were all in this vein. But it was the Second World War and its consequences that accelerated the movement of kawmiyya and inflated the number of its advocates as well as followers. With all the Axis powers and Allies on account of the strategic importance of their territories, the Arab countries were encouraged by Britain at one point to strengthen their ties in some form of union. The Arab League, an organisation of sovereign independent Arab states, was the result in 1945.

Whereas the stimulus for kawmiyya in the First World War was dynastic and non-ideological, in the Second World War and after it became ideological and, purportedly, secular. The leading writer on the question, Sāti‘ al-Huṣrī, became the main exponent of a romantic, idealist conception of kawmiyya in an attempt to exorcise religion from the nationalist idea. Borrowing from Rousseau, Hegel and Mazzini, he promoted the spiritual conception of the nation as a moral and psychological construct, the independent personality of the state, its sanctity and moral obligation for every Arab. In effect, however, the superimposed alien, European conception of the nation on the Islamic umma, and made the romantic feeling of kawmiyya the embodiment of the sanctity of the national personality. Islam was rendered the “national culture” of the Arabs rather than just their religion. It incorporated the real Arab spirit, and at the same time provided a substitute for the old religiously or communally-based identity of the Arab rulers, regimes and societies.

Others also wrote in a similar romantic vein in trying to define kawmiyya. ‘Alāyīlī, for instance, emphasised an internal consciousness among the Arabs of their “complete social existence”. Al-Bazzi asserted there was no contradiction between “true nationalism and true religion”. In the nineteen-fifties, Abd al-Latif Sharara called kawmiyya an emotion. The nation, he argued, is a human not a geographical reality. It is a wider concept than the state, the people or the fatherland. The feeling of being an Arab therefore transcends territorial boundaries, particularly since man is “mind, soul, or spirit more than he is body”. Michel ‘Alfāq, the Christian co-founder of the Baath party, declared kawmiyya “is love above everything else!”. Its revolutionary variant is a “psychic current”; and the Arab nation therefore constitutes one political, economic and cultural entity, regardless of its existential divisions.

After 1948, the Arab-Israel conflict radicalised and at the same time divided the movement of kawmiyya. By 1949, old Arab régimes were being overthrown, mass movements with ideological pretensions like the Baath and Nasserism from Egypt proclaimed the inevitability of wīda, Arab unity. Subsequent parallel events in Iraq and the Sudan in 1958, in the Yemen in 1962, in South Yemen in 1967 and in Libya in 1969, brought fresh adherents to radical kawmiyya, which became prominent for its opposition to the West and its projection of the economic and social reform of Arab society. While the rejection of and struggle against the state of Israel in the region provided a common foe for kawmiyya, the radicalisation of its aims by military régimes in several Arab states purporting a new kind of Arab socialism polarised their rulers. For a decade at least (mid-1950s to the mid-1960s), kawmiyya was re-defined to exclude conservative, reactionary Arab rulers, régimes and societies.

The practical manifestations of a radical kawmiyya in this period was greater inter-Arab conflict and a struggle for Arab leadership between its protagonists, Egypt, Iraq and Saudi Arabia. Nevertheless, new and older Arab states enshrined the Islamic-Arab identity of their nations or peoples in their formal constitutions. A period of inter-Arab subversion and civil war (e.g. the Lebanon, 1958; the Yemen, 1962-67) heightened the struggle for the leadership of kawmiyya. All the same, the traditional divisions beneath the sentiment of Arab nationalism persisted in their tribal, ethnic and communal form, as they erupted in the Yemen and South Yemen, Iraq and the Lebanon.

Nasser failed to integrate the Arab nation by propaganda, revolution or force. Likewise, the Baath party failed to achieve unity or socialism in its homogenous territory of Syria, in Iraq or in Jordan. The Arab socialism of both Nasserism and Baathism as the new expression of kawmiyya failed to unite the disparate and far-flung parts of the Arab nation; its foremost champion, Nasser of Egypt, suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of the umma’s arch-enemy, Israel, and ended up a totally-dependent client of the communist Soviet Union.

The disappearance of Nasser from the Arab scene and the concatenation of events leading up to the October 1973 war against Israel, together with the emergence to prominence of very rich though otherwise weak oil-producing Arab states, have all given kawmiyya a new lease of life but with a different emphasis. Gone are the Pan-Arab illusions of the Baath and the Prussian pretentions of an Egyptian leadership. The solidarity of the Arab nation as constituted in several independent states on the basis of mutual interest, the perception of a common economic-political-cultural threat of a common enemy, Israel, and the prospect of an Arab regional economic bloc to rival that of the industrial West, are now the more prominent and vaunted features of kawmiyya. A concerted policy against the “other”, the “outsider”, seems to be its practical expression whenever possible. But since the richest of the Arab states, the financiers of this new edition or version of kawmiyya, are also socially and politically the most traditional, socialism is no longer the current policy of Arab nationalism. Even if it were, it and kawmiyya are once again the expressions of the solidarity of the umma, the Arab-Islamic nation, whose prospects of power, prestige, dignity and glory will vindicate the righteous and virtuous universalism of the Islamic tradition and heritage. The re-fusion of ‘umma (Arabism) and din (religion) has been made more effective by the infusion of māli (wealth). The use of the latter in the struggle against Israel and Imperialism, and for the restoration of the rights of the Palestinians, is now the quintessence of the solidarity of the Arab nation and of kawmiyya. The struggle, however, between the latest protagonists of this new version of Arab nationalism for leadership and hegemony will continue; the complex economic, social and communal problems will persist. But the sentiment of kawmiyya in its latest form will be mobilised in the confronta-
nation with alien intruders in the umma's territory, e.g. Israel, foreign exploiters of the Arab nation's wealth, and those who seek its political subjugation. Intercne strugles which may foreshadow and cause the annihilation of particular groups, as in the case of the Jordanian crushing of the Palestine guerrillas in 1970-71, or the communal clashes in Lebanon in 1958 and 1975-6, or the ethnic conflict between Kurds and Arabs in Iraq, or the tribal-cum-ideological civil wars in the Yemen, South Yemen and 'Umân, will persist or occur from time to time; distrust between rulers and subjects or between Arab régimes may not disappear, but the sentiment of *kawmiyya* is not a doctrine or ideology that relates to the social, economic or political order of the Arab nation, the rights and duties of its citizens, or the relations between governments and their subjects. Rather it is a psychological need of those who still find it difficult to accept the burden of a corporate loyalty to their respective states when other primordial loyalties exist to project a comforting collective difference from the outside world. It has a soothing modernising effect that glosses over the reality of the fundamental distinction and dichotomy in political behaviour of the Muslim versus the non-Muslim. Minorities subscribe readily to it because it affords them the living in urban centres. New financial power may hardly give it a thought, for the time being at least—or need it.

Modern media and communications have decidedly enhanced the sharing in the sentiment of *kawmiyya* among greater numbers of Arabs, especially those living in urban centres. New financial power may well lead to the kind of cooperative economic endeavour—which has so far eluded the Arabs—that may reduce and finally abolish social, economic and political differences between Arab states and societies, thus inducing an organic integrative unity between them. Like Consul Mackereth forty years ago, however, one must still conclude that there is no doubt of the existence of an Arab movement, i.e. *kawmiyya*, but there is still considerable doubt regarding its potentialities in the directions suggested here.


In the Maghrib the term *kawmiyya* occurs as a plural of *kâumi* (goumi, "goumier"), a member of a *kawm* (goum), to mean a contingent of cavalry levied from a tribe (Dozy, *Supplément*, s.v.), a practice continued by the French. In the sense of nationalism, nationality, its use has been affected by the common employment of French as the language of politics. This gives "nationalisme" as a term in place of both *kawmiyya* and *walamiyyin*, whose translation as "patriotisme" tends to be reserved for an earlier, more traditional sentiment (cf. Ch.-A. Julien, *Avant-propos to B. Slama, L'Insurrection de 1864 en Tunisie, Tunis 1967, ix*). On the other hand, in Morocco the term *Haraka al-kawmiyya* founded by el-Ouezzani (al-Wazzânî) in 1937 is translated as "Le Mouvement populaire" to maintain the distinction from its rival, *al-Hisb al-walami* (or *Hisb al-Walamsîyin*), "the 'nationalist' party", founded by Allal el Fassi ("Allâl el-Fâsî") (R. Le Tourneau, *Evolution politique de l'Afrique du Nord musulmane, 1920-1962*, Paris 1962, 209-10). The specific distinction achieved here in Arabic, however, is indicative of a more fundamental distinction between the two terms, which might be represented as the familiar distinction between Arab nationalism as the nationalism of a people without a national state, and the nationalism of each Arab country. It must nevertheless be seen in its North African context. In Tunisia and Morocco it has been fairly straightforward: both these countries could claim to exist independently of France. In Algeria on the other hand, the country and the nationality of its peoples were both French. Instead there was discrimination on the grounds of religion. The Senatus Consulte of 14 July 1865 decreed that Algerian Muslims (and, until the Décret Cré- mioux of 1870, Algerian Jews) should be French subjects and therefore of French nationality, but, because of the religious law under which they lived, not French citizens unless and until they renounced that law for the French civil code. The distinction thus made for the Muslim population on the basis of its Islam became the starting-point not only for a separate treatment but also for an attitude on the part of the European population, which by 1900 considered "nationalisme musulman" the equivalent of "Islamisme" and even of "cléricalisme" (Ch.-R. Ageron, *Les Algériens musulmans et la France, 1871-1919*, Paris 1968, 918-20). That this should be considered nationalism at all was seen by Ferhat Abbas (Farhat 'Abbas) in the 1930s as an obstacle to the political and economic emancipation of the indigène in a French society (Ch.-A. Julien, *L'Afrique du Nord en marche*, 3rd ed., Paris 1972, 99-100). At the same time, however, it was elevated to the dignity of a word under the name of *kawmtiya* in the writings of Ben Badis (Ibn Badîs [q.v.]), the leader of the Salafîyya in
Algeria between the two world wars, drawing upon the thought of Muhammad ʿAbduh and the ideas of Arab nationalism represented by Ṣaḥib ʿArslān. For Ben Badis the Muslim population of Algeria was distinguished by its kawmiyya, its "national identity", based upon Islam but including equally the Arabic language and the Algerian homeland. This gave rise to a ḍīnissiya kawmiyya, an "ethnic nationality" to be distinguished from the ḍīnissiya ʿ statiyya, the "political nationality" of France. (cf. M. M. al-Diazaʿīrī, Les Algériens musulmans en Algérie de 1925 à 1940, Paris and the Hague 1967, 396-9). The active expression of this national identity was nationalism under the name of waṣāniyya, "patriotism", a sentiment never extinct (cf. Ageron, Les Algériens musulmans, 920-2), now on a par with the waṣāniyya, the nationalism, of Algeria's neighbours. This formula, adopted in principle by ʿAllāl Ḥadjī, ultimately became that of the FLN (Front de Libération Nationale) (cf., e.g. M. M. al-Diazaʿīrī, Taʿrīḥ ʿal-Dījasʿīrī, Jerusalem n.d., 453), being developed in the sense of the New Left in the French writings of Frantz Fanon (cf., e.g. L'An cinq de la révolution algérienne, Paris 1959, trans. A Dying Colonialism, London 1970). Since the independence of Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia it has survived into the argument over historical and cultural identity, for the adjective kawmi, culturally rather than the political sense, in which its "national identity", ultimately became that of the FLN (Front de Libération Nationale) (cf., e.g. G. Ayache, Le sentiment national dans le Maroc au XIXe siècle, in Revue Historique, cccl (Oct.-Dec. 1968), 393-410; M. Lacheraf, L'Algérie, nation et société, Paris 1965; Y. Lacoste, A. Nouschi and A. Prenant, L'Algérie, passé et présent, Paris 1960; M. Sahli, Décoloniser l'histoire, Paris 1965; also J. Berque, Le Maghreb entre deux guerres, 2nd ed., Paris 1970, 421-48, with reference to a geographical area. British Museum, Ms. Add. 11745, p. 289). In modern times waṣāni means exclusively fatherland or motherland, in which sense it is synonymous with mīkān. Niẓḥād merely defined race, not nationality, and in modern times the compound niẓḥād-parastī is used in a pejorative sense to mean racialism; aḥl (and its plural aḥlīl), "people", meant those dwelling in a defined area but not specifically a nationality, though aḥliyyat is used in modern legal language to mean nationality. Lastly there is the term mīlāt, which was first used with reference to a religious group or community, and later people, and finally, in the 19th and 20th centuries, came to be used to denote a political nation (cf. ġāmiʿa-i milāt, "League of Nations", and milāt-i mutāfaqī, "United Nations"). The term, however, is not entirely free from certain ambiguities. In colloquial Persian milāt also means "the people" (i.e. the lower classes); this presumably is connected with the late 19th- and 20th-century usage of mīlī to mean "popular", in phrases such as ʿulūmat-i mīlī, "popular government", and ʿāḥābā-i mīlī, "Popular Front". It also, however, means "private" as opposed to "governmental", but in contemporary Persian mīlī hārdān means "nationalise". The supporters of the Persian constitutional revolution were known as milīyān, "nationalists" (i.e. those who supported "popular" government). The term, however, was not generally applied to nationalists outside Persia and is now virtually obsolete. Milīyāt was used by Mirzā Husayn Khān Sipahsālār Muṣḥīl al-Dawla in the second half of the 19th century to mean "nationalism", which he alleged had been brought into existence by the French Revolution (see F. ʿAdamiyyat, Fikr-i ʿAsād, Tehran 1961, 60), but it did not achieve widespread currency in this sense and normally means nationality.

Although there was no term to express nationality in the early centuries or in mediaeval times, there was a concept which did imply a consciousness of...
distinct identity, defined historically and geographically, which can be described by the modern term *irānīyya*, "being a Persian". This was associated with and experienced in a sharing of a common cultural and literary background. It did not imply a consciousness of political nationality or a territorial and ethnic nation, although it carried with it the memory of the old Persian empire. This memory, after the decline of the Shīʿaʾibiyā movement [740–838], was kept alive by the poets, but in the modern period the details became blurred and historical accuracy was lost, legend triumphing over history. The literary tradition expressed in and through New Persian, the emergence of which as a literary language had been one of the achievements of the Shīʿaʾibiyā movement, in no small measure held together the Persian people during long years of political decay. It constituted a common bond and kept alive their common feeling and pride in their heritage. Linguistic frontiers, however, did not coincide with ethnic frontiers. Arabic continued to hold an immensely important place as the language of religion, and large numbers of those within the geographical frontiers of Persia spoke Turkish, Kurdish, or some local dialect.

Under Muslim government Persia became part of a wider world in which Islam was the bond. Under the Abbāsids the concept of the universal empire was revived, but in a new guise. So far as an identity was recognised, it was the world of Islam. With the fragmentation of the caliphate, the minor dynasties did not foster the rise of national feeling since they were hostile to the centralisation of government. Slave armies, too, were a bar to the growth of national feeling. Even where political organisations had a wider scope, as they did under the Šāhīds, Mongols and Timūrids, they meant little to their subjects, and the nomadic tradition of their leaders constituted a new obstacle to the development of national feeling. There was thus little opportunity in medieval Persia for the development of nationalism based on a more or less defined territory, inhabited by a group of persons in close contact with each other, inspired by the idea of a common government, holding certain interests in common and possessing a certain degree of common feeling and common characteristics. On the whole, government had been "unrighteous" and so far as aspirations of future good government united the people these were of messianic and universalist not nationalist character. As for common interests, these too, so far as they transcended the craft, the quarter or the tribe, tended to be religious, while as for common characteristics, the reality was that there was more to divide than to unite. First there were ethnic differences, which did not coincide with territorial or provincial boundaries: the dichotomy between Arab and *Aḏjam* (non-Arab), which had prevailed in the early centuries had been succeeded by that between Turk and *Tādžik* (non-Turk); secondly there were religious and sectarian differences, between Muslims and non-Muslims and between Twelvers and Shīʿis; thirdly there was a separation between the settled population and the semi-settled, the rural population and the townspeople, the military classes and the rest. These lines of cleavage, so far as they were not religious, were social and economic, not political. The nearest approach to political difference was, perhaps, to be found in the intellectual field, between those who were influenced by the old Persian theory of state as against those who subscribed to Islamic conceptions. But even in this field the position was not clear-cut. After the Islamic conquest the former ruling classes, so far as they were not wiped out, were converted to Islam and many of them entered the bureaucracy and served the new rulers (a pattern to be repeated after later conquests). The desire to get rid of alien rule was, therefore, if not absent, at least weaker than might otherwise have been the case.

With the rise of the Šāfawīs in the 10th/16th century, Persia emerged for the first time since the Islamic conquest as a territorial state. A sense of separateness from the rest of the Islamic world and of national unity vis-à-vis the Ottoman empire was deliberately fostered by the adoption of ʿĀshari Shīʿism as the official religion. The conflict between the two empires was nevertheless largely expressed in terms of religion: in terms of Sunni-Shīʿī strife rather than of Turko-Persian hostility. What was new was the broad territorial segregation of the two sects, which was not, however, paralleled by a separation of ethnic groups. Under the Šafawaii, Shīʿism, which had earlier largely been the refuge of the dispossessed and under-privileged, became the banner of Persian nationalism; but since for the Shīʿa the true king was the Hidden Imām, and temporal rulers, so far as they were "unrighteous", were usurpers, this nationalism could not easily be associated with a sense of national identity. The attitude of the Shīʿa towards the government was thus ambivalent and opposition movements tended to be of a messianic nature. Popular Shīʿism however retained some of its former functions: the Muharram plays still offered the people an outlet into which they could project their own sufferings. Although the Šafawi period to some extent paved the way for the rise of political nationalism, it was not until the late 19th century that patriotism began to be separated from religious sentiment and national loyalties began to take the place of the older religious loyalties.

By the turn of the 18th century, British progress in India had begun to give rise, in some circles, to apprehension lest British commercial activity in Persia might lead to political domination (cf. Rustam al-Ḥukamāʾ, *Rustam al-Tawḥīḍ*). At the same time, unfavourable comparisons began to be drawn between conditions in Persia and those in other countries (cf. *ibid.*, 395). By the second decade of the 19th century the danger of foreign domination was clear for all to see, and the intrusion of western European countries and Russia was intuitively felt as a threat to Muslims and the lands of Islam. As in Turkey, modernisation began in response to military pressure. The Russian advance in the war temporarily concluded by the Peace of Gulistān (1813) brought home to the Persian government that the Persian army could not withstand Russian attack unless it was modernised (though none of the subsequent attempts at modernisation were pushed with vigour or persistence). Nationalism, patriotism and modernism in Persia thus became closely interwoven. Meanwhile, government officials who visited foreign countries as representatives of the government, merchants, and others who travelled abroad began to ask the reasons for Persia's backwardness. Some came to the conclusion that this was due to a lack of justice and orderly administration, and that it was respect for law which guaranteed the modernism and progress of western Europe. As these opinions spread among a wider circle, a movement of protest against corruption and injustices gradually developed. This movement, which took its inspiration from the example of western Europe, had overtones of
patriotism and nationalism, but it was not, in the beginning, anti-foreign, though it was to become so later partly as a result of the events connected with the Tobacco Régie and Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh's attempts to bolster up the finances of the country by the grant of concessions and the contraction of loans. As the movement became anti-foreign, so its Islamic colouring became more marked—patriotism was still largely a religious sentiment. Nevertheless, so far as it was a protest against bad government and demanded, as a remedy administrative reform, it was modernist and its supporters were nationalists in the sense that they aimed at some measure of self-government or government by the people, though they saw this primarily in terms of restrictions on the arbitrary power of the shah and not in the exercise of responsible power by elected representatives of the people.

In 1811 Abābas Mīrzā sent two students to England "to study whatever would be beneficial for him and his country". Five more were sent in 1815 to study engineering, medicine, artillery, mathematics and natural sciences. Two of these attained to high office: one, Mīrzā Dī'ātār Mūshār al-Dawlā, who studied engineering, became head of the council of state set up by Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, and the other, Mīrzā Muḥammad Šāhīb Shīrāzī, who studied English, French, Latin, natural sciences, history and printing, became official translator to the government and subsequently a minister. He wrote a diary in which he described British parliamentary government and institutions (Safar-nāma, ed. Ismā'īl Rā'īn, Tehran 1969-70) and appears to have had a great admiration for freedom and liberty as he saw it in England. He also visited Russia and Turkey. Writing of the tanzimāt, he castigates obscurantist mulūdīs, who opposed them. Abū'l Ḥasan Shīrāzī, who was sent to England by Fath 'All Shāh, wrote in his Haṣrat-nāma of the justice and security prevailing in England, and compared conditions in his own country in unfavourable terms with what he had seen in England. Khusraw Mīrzā, the son of Abābas Mīrzā, who was sent with a mission to Russia in 1829 to apologise for the murder of the Russian envoy Grebulevsky in the previous year by a fanatical mob, wrote in his diary, "It would be a pity if when we see with our own eyes the progress and order which our neighbour has achieved in a short time, we should not think [how we could achieve similar progress], but go about with our eyes closed in foreign parts." (See further, Fikr-i Azadī, op. cit., 21 ff.) Another Persian to describe in his diary British parliamentary institutions was Mīrzā Khānlār Khān Pīqām al-Mulk, who went as a secretary to the Persian mission in England in 1864-5 (see Dimukhrāšī-i Inglīstān in Sulṭān, i/2 (Bahman 1323/1944), 96-104).

It was not, however, until the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh that modernism and nationalism began to make strides. The Amir Niẓām Mīrzā Taqī Khān Amir Kābir, his first sād-i ʿāpam, who had visited both Russia and the Ottoman Empire, initiated various military, financial and administrative measures designed to strengthen the power of the central government. He founded the Dār al-Fumān, which was the first school to teach modern sciences, in order to train officials for the new army and the new bureaucracy. He also attempted to decrease the power of the religious classes. His reforms proved largely abortive. More important in the spread of modern ideas was Mīrzā Husayn Khān Sipahsālār Mūshār al-Dawlā. He studied in France, and served in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bombay, Tiflis, and Istanbul. From 1871 he held various ministries in Tehran including that of sād-i ʿāpam for some three years from December 1871. His letters from Turkey discuss European politics, freedom movements in the Ottoman Empire, the spread of education and civilization in Europe, and governmental reform in Persia. He considered an assembly composed of representatives of the people, freedom, the rights of the individual and equality before the law prerequisites for life in the modern world. Writing of the Greek revolution, whose nature he recognised, he wrote, "The nationalist principle established by the French empire that every nation should be governed by its own people and not be a prisoner to the government of another people has spread to these parts." (Fikr-i Asādī, op. cit., 60.) In another letter he wrote that foreign states measured a nation's progress, education and power (isbahād) by four things: (i) the existence or otherwise of a well-ordered press carrying full reports of foreign and internal news; (ii) its encouragement of crafts, industries and trade; (iii) the quality of its foreign representation; and (iv) its possession of a powerful, disciplined army equipped with modern weapons able to defend the country against any eventuality (ibid., 69). He believed that the backwardness of a country brought about foreign intervention, and both his father and Amir Kabīr in their advocacy of modernisation were concerned to prevent foreign intervention. But they were in a difficulty: modernisation was, in existing circumstances, hardly possible without foreign capital and expertise. This, indeed, was the justification of the abortive Reuter concession (see Mahmūd Farhād Muṭtāmid, Sipahsālār-i ʿāpam, Tehran 1947, 151 ff.). There was at the same time another and contrary trend and, also inspired by a kind of nationalism, which was opposed to modernisation. Many believed that development would involve foreign influence and that as long as the country's resources were not developed Persia would be left to manage her own affairs. The attitude to the spread of communications was also ambivalent because of a fear that it might facilitate external attack.

Among those who were associated, or in contact, with Husayn Khān and who played an important part in fostering the demand for modernisation were Mīrzā Yūsuf Khān Mustaṣḥār al-Dawlā, Majd al-Mulk Sinākī, Malkam Khān, and (through him) Djamāl al-Dīn Afghānī [q.v.], and Mīrzā Aḥā Khān Kirmānī. They were concerned both to forward the strength, liberty and prosperity of Persia and to ensure that the people had a greater share in the government of the country. Majd al-Mulk in his Risāla-i majdīsiyya, written in 1871-2, attacking the negligence of the shah and the state of the administration, states that the power of great nations was based on the people (ed., Saʿīd Nafīsī, Tehran 1941-2, 11), and demands an assembly to assure the prosperity and order of the kingdom (37). Mustaṣḥār al-Dawlā, who became chargé d'affaires of the Persian legation in Paris, and Amir Kabīr in their visits London during the three years he spent in Paris, wrote in 1888-9 to Muṣaffar al-Dīn, then wali ʿādī, stating that Persia could only escape disaster by the promulgation of reforms and new laws; only this would enable her to regain respect among civilized nations. In his essay Yāh halīma, which achieved wide circulation, he describes the strong and orderly military administration, prosperity, wealth, industry, education, security and freedom prevailing in France and England. He cites the old
Islamic tag, "No government (sulān) without wealth (māl), no wealth without development (′imārāt), and no development without justice", and asks why Persia was so backward in spite of the fact that Islam was based on justice. His conclusion is that the secret of European progress was the supremacy of the law and that this was lacking in Persia. He then discusses the French constitution and the benefits deriving from it, and finally argues that whereas the ġarī'āt of Islam had been forgotten by the Muslims in their political conduct, the rights of man guaranteed by the French constitution were, in effect, the very rights which any Muslim should enjoy (Tabriz 1907, reprinted in Raḥt 1909).

In the latter years of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, disgust at the abuse of power by the ruling class and the obscurantism of sections of the religious classes spread and the reaction to Persia's humiliations at the hands of European powers grew (though this was not to be a major factor in Persian nationalism until after the grant of the constitution). Unfavourable comparisons were increasingly drawn between Persia and Western European states while a small minority questioned the exercise of unfettered power by the shah. Many believed that Western Europe held the secret of progress (though few had any clear idea of what this might be); they believed that the adoption of western systems of government would both secure this "secret" and ensure reform and thus enable Persia to resist the encroachment of foreign powers, which the corruption of its government was facilitating. Malkam Kān = Nāṣir al-Dawla, a Persian Armenian from Džulf (Iṣfahān), educated in Paris and minister in London from 1872 to 1889, was the great exponent of this point of view. His writings, influenced by John Stuart Mill and Mirabeau, became more radical as time passed. In tracts and essays and in the Persian paper Kānān, which he founded and edited in London in 1890, he inveighs against internal disorder, corruption and despotism and the external pressure exerted on Persia "from St. Petersburg and Calcutta": The only answer to these evils in his view was political progressive and constitutional reform (which he was at pains to show were not contrary to the ġarī'āt). At first Malkam Kān appears to have believed that reform "from above" was possible. He presented an early essay, Kīābā-i khābīb, probably written between 1859 and 1860 in imitation of the Turkish lânsūlmāl, to Mirzâ Dža'far Mūḥār al-Dawla (who, as stated above, had been one of the first students to be sent abroad by the government) and urged him, as an elder statesman and because of his knowledge of foreign countries, to show it to Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh and explain the truth to him. He goes on to assert that the Persian state was down-trodden by neighbouring states and afflicted by various miseries, especially corruption. He warns that conditions in the outside world would not remain static: the Indian Mutiny would not go on for ever and Russia would not always remain preoccupied with the injuries she had suffered in Europe: claimants to the Persian provinces would arise. Two waves, one from St. Petersburg and the other from Calcutta, were advancing on Persia. Ministers, Malkam Kān alleges, considered the antiquity of Persia to be a protection against all calamities: however much they were warned that the advancing waves would submerge them, they would say, "we have been thus for 3,000 years and we shall survive this flood also". But, Malkam Kān points out, conditions had changed: Persia could no longer withstand the power of neighbouring states. Europe had made important technical advances of which Persia had been deprived and great progress especially in financial administration, while Persia lagged hopelessly behind. He then sets out his ideas for reform based on a separation of legislative and executive powers (Madžīmā-i ʿalārā-i Malkam Khān, ed. Muḥammad Muḥīṯ Tabāštānī, Tehran 1943-9, 1 ff.).

In another essay, Dastghā-i divān, devoted mainly to the need for financial reform, Malkam Kān warns his readers of the fate of Turkey and states that "The Persian government in the face of the encroachment of foreign conquest was in no way different from the Ottoman government. Protection of the Christians was a secondary problem: the essential problem was that the ebullience of European power had made impossible the survival of uncivilised states" (ibid., 74 ff.). In a later essay entitled Tānsīm-i lāshkār wa madžīm-i ʿidārā-yā intīṣām-i lāshkār wa madžīm-i lānsūlmāl, Malkam shows himself to be one of the few writers who realised that reform of one branch of the administration could not be carried out in isolation. He pours scorn on the idea that it would be possible to have a European arsenal without a European tax administration and reiterates the need for a government based on law (ibid., 98 ff.). By the time of the assassination of Nāṣir al-Dīn the threat to Persian independence was seen by Malkam to be increasingly serious, and he appealed to all, whether Persians, Āḏarbāyjānīs, Kurds or Afghans, to sink their differences and unite to base the rule of the shah on a new unity (ibid., 182 ff.). In an essay entitled The call to justice, presented to Muṣṭafār al-Dīn in 1905, Malkam Kān again warns of the threat to Persian independence posed by the progressive states of the world and urges the establishment of a legislative assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. Distinguishing between freedom and licence, he seeks to interpret freedom in terms of the Islamic principle of "enjoying the good and forbidding evil" (ibid., 194 ff.).

Mīrzâ Akā Kān Kirmānī (1853-87), who spent a great part of his life abroad, was a prodigious reader, among others, by Rousseau and Montesquieu. He uncompromisingly rejected Islam and saw Mazdak as the prototype of European socialists, anarchists, nihilists, and communists (Ṣīh Makteb, quoted by F. Ādāmiyyat, Andīḡah-ye Mīrzâ Akā Kān Kirmānī, Tehran 1967, 238). Like Malkam Kān he regarded the adoption of Western sciences, industry, and political structures as a fundamental condition to progress. He held that the Persian people must forget their past and lay completely new foundations for their national life if they wished to retain their independence and enjoy power and respect in the world. Pointing to the example of the Caucasus, which had been lost to Russia, India, "which was held prisoner by five thousand English soldiers", and Turkey, "which was forced to submit to the slightest whim of the English ambassador", Mīrzâ Akā Kān warned that Persia would be made into a colony if she failed to advance in knowledge or to develop her own resources. "Today", he wrote, "we, the subjects of Persia (raʾīyāt-i Īrān), are trampeled underfoot by internal tyrants and criticised, blamed and despised by foreign governments and civilised peoples. Tomorrow we shall be trampeled on by the hoofs of the transport animals of their military forces and captives of their soldiers and we shall be in danger for 5,000 years and we shall survive this flood also". While he was in favour of the adoption of European learning
and technical skills, he condemned the aggression of European powers against other nations (Hasht bihisht, quoted by F. Adamiyyat, op. cit., 231-2). He, like Mankind Khan, aimed at a national awakening and advocated modernisation in order to stem the encroachment both of foreign powers against the national frontiers and of the shah and his government against the freedom of the people. Influenced by earlier writers, especially Ebrahim al-Din Mirza-yi Khurshid Khan and Mirza Fatih 'Ali Akhundzada (Akhundov), who, although he spent the greater part of his life in the Caucasus in the service of the Russian government, was an ardent Persian patriot, the nationalism of Mirza Akka Khan Kirmani looks back to pre-Islamic Persia, and tendencies towards anti-Arabism as well as anti-Semitism in general are to be found in his works (see further F. Adamiyyat, op. cit., 252 ff.).

The themes of Mankind Khan and Mirza Akka Khan Kirmani were taken up by others, including Mirza Akka Fursat Shahrza, who in a series of essays describes freedom, equality and knowledge as the key to progress and attributes the miserable condition of Persia, which he compares unfavourably with India, to ignorance and despotism (Ma'salik al-ilm wa 'an siyasat, Bombay 1904-5, ii, Tehran 1907-8), Malik al-Mutakallimin, who emphasises the need to develop Persia's resources and, pointing to the example of Japan, advocates the establishment of factories (see M. Malkizada, Zinadgani-i Malik al-Mutakallimin, Tehran 1946, 91 ff.), and Persians living in the borderlands such as Mirza 'Abdi al-Rahim Nadjiirzhada (Tilbaev) in his Ma'salik al-Mu'khhimin, and Zayn al-'Abidin Maraghah in his Safar-nama-i 'Ibrahim Be. All of these made a significant contribution to the intellectual ferment culminating in the movement for constitutional reform in the early years of the 19th century (on the nature of this movement see further A. K. S. Lambton, The Persian constitutional revolution of 1905-6, in Revolution in the Middle East, ed. P. J. Vatikiotis, London 1972, 173-84. See also Kam'iyiya, Persia and Dastur, Iran).

Those who prepared the way for the constitutional revolution were drawn largely from the upper ranks of the bureaucracy, the religious classes and the merchants. As the movement spread, it became articulated largely in a demand for "equality" and "liberty", neither of which was defined in legal terms. Both were seen broadly as freedom from tyranny and envisaged by the majority within a temporal framework designed to permit the unhindered operation of the Islamic ethic and the living of the good life in accordance with the sacred law. The underlying intention was to seek to ensure justice and to limit extortion. The shah's neglect of abstract principles of justice was felt to have led to an impoverishment of the people and a growth of foreign influence and intervention in the affairs of the country. Largely for this reason the movement became a nationalist movement in that it was a demand by the people for a greater share in the government of the country and a protest against the placing of the material resources of the country under the control of foreigners (which, in view of the interpretation placed on freedom, was inevitably seen as an attack as much on Islam as on Persia).

The situation, however, was complex: both sides looked to foreigners: the constitutionalists to Britain (though the 1907 convention with Russia was a great surprise and disappointment to them), and the reactionaries to Russia, with the ruling classes of which they felt, perhaps, a greater affinity than with the mass of the Persian people. Although the support which the reactionary party and Muhammad 'Ali Mirza as wall 'Abd and later as shah received from Russia in their attempts to frustrate the efforts of the revolutionaries inevitably gave an anti-Russian aspect to the constitutional movement, it was predominantly a "popular" rather than an anti-foreign movement. Among the anjumans, the popular political societies, it was a movement of resistance to oppression and a demand for the right of the people to manage their own affairs (see further A. K. S. Lambton, Secret societies and the Persian revolution of 1905-6, in St. Antony's Papers, No. 4, Middle Eastern Affairs No. 1, London 1958 and The political role of the anjumans 1906-11, in St. Antony's Papers, No. 16, Middle Eastern Affairs No. 3, London 1963). The bond which united them was not a concept of territorial or ethnic nationality or memory of "good" government but rather Islam: the true king was, for them, the Hidden Imam.

With the humiliations suffered by Persia after the suspension of the constitution in 1911 and the disorder prevailing during the Great War, there was a swing away from "popular" nationalism towards nationalism coupled with anti-imperialism and socialism and also "romantic" nationalism. Abu 'l-Kasim 'Arif (d. 1934), the poet of the constitutional revolution, extolled patriotism and freedom, but Abid Pishawari (1844-1930), who had been one of the first poets to write in praise of patriotism and nationalism, wrote increasingly against anti-imperialism, while Muhammad Ibrahim Farrukhi (1888-1939) linked patriotism with socialism. In general poets and writers turned increasingly towards a glorification of pre-Islamic Persian. A literary movement to deepen national thought and pride (in stimulating which the writings of orientalists played a considerable part), began in Berlin, where a number of Persians had taken refuge during the 1914-18 war and founded a literary magazine, significantly called Kawa after the legendary blacksmith (see Kawa). I'shqi (1853-1924), Pâr Dâvíd (1889-1956) and others reminded their readers of the spirit of ancient Persia. Sayyid Muhammad 'Ali Djam'alzâda (born circa 1895), at one time co-editor of Kawa with Sayyid Hasan Takžîda (d. 1959), and others wrote essays extolling the Persian past; and Ahmad Kasrawl (1888-1945) published a large number of political and religious tracts of a nationalist and anti-Islamic nature (see further B. Alavi, Geschichte und Entwickelung der modernen persischen Literatur, Berlin 1964).

During the war of 1914-18 and in the years immediately afterwards, there were uprisings of a quasi-nationalist nature led by Mirza Kûsî Khan in Gilân (1915-20), Khâyâbânî in A'zharbâyjân (1920), and Muhammad Ta'âl Kûhân in Khurâsân (1921), but none of them was nationalist in the wider sense or spread to the whole of the country. After the coup d'état in 1921, power was concentrated in the hands of Rûdâ Khan, who proceeded to build up the armed forces. By 1925 he had reasserted the authority of the central government over most of the country and on 31 October of that year he assumed the crown. Measures were also taken to restore Persia's position vis-à-vis foreign powers and to limit their intervention in Persian affairs. The capitulations were abolished in 1920 (see Imtiyâzât). Determined to make Persia a modern state, Rûdâ Shâh pressed forward industrial expansion and economic development and extended the scope of government. Requiring more funds to finance these developments, he turned to
the oil industry to satisfy his need. The post-war depression had brought down oil prices and with them royalty payments. In 1932 the Anglo-Persian Oil Company concession was denounced and a new agreement was negotiated in 1933 under which royalty payments were increased. Islam was deliberately weakened, and westernisation forced. The memory of pre-Islamic Persia was fostered. The traditional provincial names were replaced by numbers as a device to obliterate "the memory of the historic provinces with their persistent traditions of diversity and autonomy" and to create unity and uniformity. An attempt was also made to "purify" Persian of Arabic words and weaken the memory of her cultural debt to the Islamic empires of the past. In the beginning Rıdâ Şah's nationalism was influenced by the example of Turkey, which he visited in 1934. Later, however, he turned rather to the model of the dictatorial régimes of Western Europe, especially Hitlerite Germany. The new nationalism, which developed during his reign, appealed mainly to the military leaders, who found the ideal of the self-sufficient police state seductive, those intellectuals who provided the personnel of the bureaucracy, the younger generation brought up in the new schools, and those merchants who benefitted from his commercial policy. It was very different from the nationalism of the constitutional period (see further A. K. S. Lambton, *The impact of the West on Persia*, in *International Affairs*, xxxii/3 (Jan. 1957), 21 ff.).

In 1941 Rıdâ Şah abdicated as a result of events connected with World War II. In the ensuing years Persia suffered new humiliations. Foreign troops were stationed in the country. Their presence did not technically constitute a military occupation, but Russian troops in the north and north-west prevented orderly administration by the Persian government and did not evacuate the country after the conclusion of the hostilities until recourse was had to the United Nations. There was once more a feeling that national unity was menaced, and coupled with this there was a growing sense of frustration at the failure of successive governments to use itself a feeling of revolt against the "establishment" grew. Various groups, at one extreme the Fıdâ'iyân-ı İslâm [q.v.] and at the other the Tûda Party (who were communist-inspired), were active. Their common desire was for power and control over the sources of national wealth, but their positive policies were less clearly defined, and in any case sometimes in conflict. Finally, under the leadership of Dr. Muşaddık cohesion was given to the discontent. The movement of protest was focussed on the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company and was transformed into a campaign for liberation from supposed foreign domination. Nationalisation of the oil industry (achieved in 1951) became the immediate goal. With the alliance of Dr. Muşaddık and the religious leader Sayyid Abû'l Kâsim Kâshânî, who interpreted the protest movement in terms of Islam, it spread throughout the country as a popular movement for the defence not only of Persia but of Islam. After the reassertion of the monarchy following the overthrow of Dr. Muşaddık by a military coup d'état in 1953, "popular" nationalism once more declined to be replaced in due course by a new self-styled "positive" nationalism imposed from above, one of the manifestations of which was the celebration in 1971, after several years of planning, of what was regarded as the 2500th anniversary of the foundation of the Persian monarchy by Cyrus (see further *Iran*, History; *Hizb*, Persia; and also J. M. Upton, *The history of modern Iran*, an interpretation, Cambridge Mass. 1950).

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(A. K. S. Lambton)

iv. IN OTTOMAN TURKEY.

This word was used in Ottoman Turkish to express the new idea of nationalism which originated in Central and Eastern Europe during the 19th century. This new nationalism was not the older patriotism of Western Europe founded in a citizen's loyalty to his country, his state and its mode of government and in which a degree of individual liberty was usually involved. It was an ethnic, linguistic, and sometimes cultural nationalism, romantic and subjective in its appeal, and often illiberal. When it reached the Ottoman Empire this brand of nationalism quickly vitalised the independent ambitions of the non-Muslim religious communities (*millets*), and more slowly those of the non-Turkish Muslims.

The Ottoman Turks were not much affected by this new form of nationalism for two interconnected reasons. In the first place, the Turks of the Empire, despite a vigorous flowering of Turkish "national" self-consciousness in the 9th/15th century, had subsequently submerged themselves in Islam and assy, and were very different from the nationalism of the constitutional period (see further *IRAN*, History; *HIZB*, Persia; and also *International Affairs*, Cambridge Mass. 1960).

The Ottoman Turks were not much affected by this new form of nationalism for two interconnected reasons. In the first place, the Turks of the Empire, despite a vigorous flowering of Turkish "national" self-consciousness in the 9th/15th century, had subsequently submerged themselves in Islam and assy, and were very different from the nationalism of the constitutional period (see further *IRAN*, History; *HIZB*, Persia; and also *International Affairs*, Cambridge Mass. 1960).
influences awoke a slow response among the Turks. It was only as the non-Muslim peoples obtained independence, and when there were national stirrings among the Muslim subjects of the Empire, that a truly Turkish nationalism based on a common race, language and culture became more feasible. Among Ottoman Turks who took up the theme were the historian Abmad Wafif Paşa (1823-91) and Süleyman Paşa (1858-1932), the first Ottoman historian to write about Ottoman Turkish history. Attention was also given to the Turkish language: the first modern Turkish grammar appeared in 1851, the Kawkâdî-ı ʿOṯmānîyya of Fâlîd and Djiwedet Paşa. The first Turkish turcologist in any real sense was Nedîlj Âsim (1861-1935).

It was not, however, until the Young Turk period, and with the diminution of the Empire, that a more general interest could be aroused. A Turkish Society (Türk Dernâş) was established in 1908 to study Turkish culture in its many aspects. From this initiative shortly emerged a journal, Türk Yurdu, ("Turkish Homeland") which began to develop a political Turkishism, notably under Akçuraoglu Yusuf [q.v.]. Numerous Turkish societies, Türk Oğlukârlar, ("Turkish Heirs") were also founded to study and promote Turkish culture. Closely associated with Türk Yurdu was the greatest exponent of Turkish nationalism, Divâ (Ziya) Gökalp [q.v.]. In some of his writings he went so far as to envisage the political union of all Turks in a new Türan, but the international situation, notably the strength of Russia, gave little prospect for the realisation of this Pan-Turkist dream, save for a brief period of confusion in Central Asia following the Russian Revolution of 1917. Nevertheless, Turkish nationalism continued to develop, markedly affected by two factors, firstly the Armenian massacres of 1916, and secondly, the defection of Arab Muslims to the Allied side in the First World War.

By 1918 it was clear, however, that attempts to promote an Ottoman, Pan-Islamic or Turanian unity were either irrelevant or impracticable. Yet some basis for a national unity had to be found if what was left of Turkey was to be defended against Allied claims. National feeling was now concentrated on the rescue of the Anatolian homeland from the occupying Christian powers, particularly from the Greeks. Whilst religious feeling was still obviously important in this situation, a new emphasis appeared in Turkish nationalism—the territorial. It had obvious impact: the Turkish peasant's hearth and home, his village was at stake.

After the War of Liberation the Republic sought to justify this new nationalistic attachment by promoting historical enquiries to show that Anatolia was in fact the ancient land of the Turks. This might be interpreted as a return, in a new context, to the less romantic patriotism of earlier European inspiration, but the attachment to the land, to national folklore, popular traditions and national solidarity was romantic to a marked degree. For the Atatürkist élite, nationalism was also firmly secularist, as the abolition of the caliphate and the disestablishment of Islam in 1924 testified.

The secular, cultural and territorial nationalism of the Atatürkist period has remained the predominant form of nationalism in Turkey since the Second World War, but it has not been universally accepted. Whilst it is difficult to make clear divisions among the different schools of thought, it may be said that the secular nationalists have divided into two groups. There are those who support the liberal democratic, and strictly territorial, political system as representing the national spirit, and others who would qualify their support by insistence on the need for a greater degree of socialism to allow the full expression of national feeling. This latter group attaches itself to the left-of-centre Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People's Party). One school of thought has attempted, however, to define nationalism to include Islamic, as well as pre-Islamic, Turkish history. This group thought provision of nationalist thought organized a ready audience among the new professional, commercial and industrial middle classes, and actual promotion through the Türk Ocakları, revived in 1949 after their abolition in 1932. This modification of nationalism has appealed to many members of right-of-centre political parties, notably the former Demokrat Partisi (Democrat Party) and the Adalat Partisi (Justice Party). Important elements in the Turkish intelligentsia have sought, however, to give greater weight either to Islam or to Turkish nationalism (and to Pan-Turkism) than the usual compromises envisage. An Islamic trend which nevertheless accords a place to nationalism is represented by Necmettin Erbakan's Millî Selâmet Partisi (National Salvation Party) which in 1973 won 48 seats in the elections for the 450-member National Assembly. The party, under Alparslan Türkeş, which accords a place to Islam, is the Millîyeti Hareket Partisi (Nationalist Movement Party) which, however, won only 3 seats in the 1973 National Assembly. Territorial nationalism, Islam and Pan-Turkism are not easy to combine. This is evident in the writings of the influential Dr. Riza Nur (q.v. (1897-1942), who advocated inter aliya Turkish Republican form of government, restoration of the caliphate, and the reunion of all Turks under the leadership of those of Anatolia.

A number of nationalist associations have been established recently in Turkey, particularly in the 1960s, partly in response to increased leftist activity. Large general congresses of nationalists were held in 1967 and 1969. One association of particular significance which has emerged is the Kümüştâle Mücadele Derneği ("Friends for Opposing Communism"), which has been active in demonstrations against left-wing groups. Reviews which in recent years have supported secular nationalism include Varlık ("Existence"), Dost ("Friend"), Yeni Ufuklar ("New Horizons") and Yedi Tepe ("Seven Hills"). Turkist and Islamic nationalism have been represented inter alia by Türk Kültür ("Turkish Culture"), Türk Birliğ ("Turkish Unity") and Tökm ("Seed"). The strength of modern Turkish nationalism is difficult to assess, since every political association claims to be nationalist. Certainly, for many Turks a wholly secular nationalism is not proving to be satisfactory. [See also Hürriyya, İstiklal (Independence), İstirâkiyya and Türan.

The great Turkestan rebellion of 1916 has been called "a national liberation movement". It was certainly directed against the Russian presence, but it was unco-ordinated and had no specifically political aims. Its ruthless repression by the Tsarist government had the temporary effect of favourably disposing the Muslims to the Revolution of 1917, which they imagined would mean the end of Russian rule; and the hope thus engendered gave rise to several small movements aiming at some kind of independent state or states. Such aspirations were, however, strongly opposed not only by the new Soviet régime, but by the 2-million strong element of Russian settlers who, whether they supported the Revolution or not, were not prepared to hand over the region to Muslim rule. The Djadlds, too, always at loggerheads with the "ulamâ", now found themselves equally opposed to the new régime. By 1921, any prospect of an organised national movement with clearly defined political aims had receded, but guerilla Muslim resistance to the Soviet government continued in the shape of the so-called Basmaçı [q.v.] movement. Although violent and widespread, this movement lacked cohesion, competent leadership and the necessary resources, and by 1922 it had virtually collapsed.

By the end of 1920, complete Soviet control over the region was a foregone conclusion, and since the new régime was fundamentally opposed both to Islam and to the idea of nationalism, any chance of the emergence of a Central Asian state or states based on Muslim principles became even more remote than it had been in Tsarist times. The constitution of the so-called Bukhurân Peoples' Republic formed on the overthrow of the khanate in 1919 declared that "no published laws of the Republic may contradict the foundations of Islam", but this constitution was abrogated on the absorption of the republic into the Soviet Union in 1924, and the whole concept of Islam was thus finally removed from the Soviet political fabric. Some Central Asian intellectuals had participated to a limited extent in an attempt to achieve Muslim solidarity made from within the Communist Party by Mir Sayyid Sultan (Sultangaliyev), a Tatar Communist from Kazan. But the movement ended with his arrest in 1923 and subsequent disappearance.

As a means of combating nationalism and of solving the "national problem", the Soviet Government adopted a "nationalities policy". As applied to Central Asia this involved the classification as "nations" of the larger Muslim communities, most of whom had not previously thought of themselves as such. In 1924 the former administrative borders were abolished and the whole territory, including that of the erstwhile khanates, was divided into "republïcs" bearing the names of these "nations". Although described officially as "fully sovereign", they have never been so by any standards recognised elsewhere in the world of Islam, since the overriding authority in all matters relating to policy, justice and, indeed, every human activity rests with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union centred in Moscow. An attempt has been made, so far with only partial success, to remodel the cultures of all the Muslim peoples in the region, now numbering about 22 million, on lines described as "national in form and socialist in content". There is much evidence of passive Muslim resistance to many social and cultural institutions of the Soviet régime, but none of any organised or active opposition to it. The facts about the alleged unmasking of a nationalist plot in the Özbek Republic in 1937 have never been established.
It is hard to say how far the Soviet nationalities policy has succeeded or will succeed in the future in excluding or holding in leash the national sentiment which has contributed towards the freeing of so many non-Soviet Muslim communities from foreign or non-Muslim rule. During the past fifty years none of the features characteristic of nationalist movements elsewhere have been present in Central Asia: namely, competent and easily identifiable national leaders with some freedom of speech and action; religious and cultural freedom; aid and encouragement from abroad; native military formations trained in the use of modern weapons; and support from liberal opinion in the metropolitan country. On the other hand, by artificially creating nations and stimulating the growth of those which had previously only existed in embryo, the Nationalities Policy has brought into being organisms which, far from remaining static, seem to be gradually acquiring a real national identity. It can be said that while nationalist movements of the kind which convulsed the Muslim peoples of the Middle East and North Africa are, in the present circumstances, highly improbable, national consciousness and the desire to dispense with alien rule are still very much alive. But what kind of state or states towards which this national consciousness may be tending is still uncertain.


vi. IN MUSLIM INDIA AND PAKISTAN.

The growth of Muslim nationalism, or Muslim separatism as it is usually called, was one of the most striking developments on the Indian subcontinent under British rule. It stemmed from the Aligarh movement, an educational and political campaign aimed mainly at protecting the power of the Muslim service elite of northern India, which developed around the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College founded in 1875 by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan at Aligarh in the United Provinces. In the early 20th century, men associated with this movement made Muslim separatism a significant factor in Indian politics. In 1906 they founded an All-India Muslim League. Then, using the League as their platform, they first persuaded the government to introduce separate electorates (with special weighting to take account of their "political importance") in the Morley-Minto reforms of 1909, and soon afterwards persuaded the Congress, the organisation of Indian nationalist politicians, to accept the same principle for the next package of reforms in a pact made at Lucknow in 1916. By this time Muslim separatism would appear to have been an established fact in Indian political life, but it would be quite wrong to see its development from this point to 1947 as an ever-ascending line on a graph, because for the twenty years after 1916 it was a declining force. First, Muslim Leaguers agitated with Congressmen against the government in the Khilafat non-co-operation movement of 1919-23, then in the 1920s and 1930s many lost interest in League politics altogether: some preferred the class-based politics of the United Provinces' Zamindar Party or the Punjab Unionist Party, others the Islamic politics of the Khilafat Party, and yet others the Indian nationalism of the Congress itself. So weak did Muslim separatism become that the Muslim League held no annual sessions between 1933 and 1936. And it was not until the 1937 elections, after the 1935 Government of India Act had considerably extended the franchise and had given Indians virtual autonomy at the provincial level, that Muslims again began to support separatist politics in large numbers. From then on, the Muslim League went from strength to strength till, in part because of the rapid change in circumstances brought about by World War II, in part because of the political failures both of the Congress and of the British, and in part because of both the political skill of Jinnah and its own success as a political organisation, it succeeded in establishing a separate Muslim state on the Indian subcontinent when the British transferred power in 1947. An important point to note about Muslim separatism is that at no stage did it receive equal support from all Muslims. Their condition and their interests varied greatly in the different parts of India. There were differences of background; some, particularly in northern India, were descended from invaders or adventurers who had come from Arabia, Afghanistan, Persia and Central Asia to make their fortunes from the fabled wealth of Hindustan, but the majority were descended from Hindus who, during the period of Muslim supremacy, had been converted to Islam. There were differences in their level of islamisation; the humble Muslim villager in Bengal or Madras, who spoke the local vernacular and who followed most of the local social and religious customs, had much more in common with his Hindu neighbour than did his co-religionist living in a town in northern India whose culture and whose customs were much more distinctly Islamic. There were also differences in their distribution throughout the subcontinent; in the Punjab and in Bengal (after 1911) Muslims were a majority of the provincial population, but in no other province for most of British rule did their numbers exceed 20%. Finally, there were differences in their economic and political position; traditionally the Muslims of Bengal or Sind or Madras were cultivators with little economic strength and less political power, but the Muslims of north India, in particular those of the United Provinces, were not only wealthy, holding much land and many positions in government service, but were also accustomed to being the dominant political group in the area. These differences dictated a variety of responses to the challenges presented by the modernising tendencies of British rule to their livelihood, their religion and their political power. Indeed, for most Muslims under the British a political stance based on their faith made no sense in the context of local or provincial politics. Muslim separatism found support mainly in the United Provinces. Men from this area founded Aligarh College and the All-India Muslim League. They chiefly organised this League throughout its existence and used it to win Muslims elsewhere in India for their separatist politics. When separatism, as strong as it was because it suited their interests; when it was weak, as it was in the 1920s and 1930s, it was because it did not.
Why some Indian Muslims should have organised for politics on a religious basis has been hotly debated. Four main lines of argument have been put forward to explain this phenomenon: that the Muslims were backward in taking advantage of western education, had therefore fallen behind in the competition for jobs and economic advancement, and therefore organised as a community to protect their interests; that the British deliberately divided and ruled, encouraging Muslims from time to time to organise as a separate group in order to strengthen their imperial position; that Indian nationalism was too strongly associated with a frequently aggressive Hindu revivalism to allow Muslims to play a full and unreserved part in it; and that the Muslims had always been a separate community on the Indian subcontinent which fact was expressed in the separatist tendency of their politics. There are grains of truth in all these arguments, but as they stand they are too simple by half.

Of course, the fact that Muslims had some common religious experience must lie at the base of any explanation of why some Muslims organised for politics on a communal basis; but it is not the sole or even the chief cause of why they did so. The threats which British policy in education, in bureaucratic reform, in local self-government levelled at the Muslims in the United Provinces, making them fear that they might become backward, played a part; they lay behind the foundation of Aligarh College and the All-India Muslim League. A Hindu revivalism, which aimed to promote the Nagari script and the Hindi language and to protect the cow, was also important; early responses to the massive changes which government was bringing about in north Indian society were organised by Hindus and Muslims working in concert, but Hindu revivalism in the late 19th century helped increasingly to divert these responses into communal channels. Moreover, throughout its existence the close association of Hindu revivalism with the Congress made it hard for Muslims to join the Indian nationalist movement. This type of revivalism was not restricted to Hindus; it also developed amongst Muslims and helped to harden their consciousness of being Muslim. It found powerful expression in the writings of Hāflī, Şhībīl and şibāl, and it infused aspects of the movements for a Muslim university, for the preservation of the Turkish Khilāfāt, and for the establishment of Pakistan. Crucially important was the tendency of the British to see their Indian subjects primarily not as members of different races, nor as speakers of different languages, nor even as representatives of different interests, but as followers of different faiths. They shared out patronage along religious lines, particularly to Muslims in northern India, whom at one time they saw as the greatest threat to the empire and at another as the most important supporters of it. Such perceptions of Indian society and such policies played a vital role in the development of separatism; without them Aligarh College would never have survived its early years and the Muslim League would never have won separate electorates. Crucially important too was the fact that for much of the time the Muslim platform was a particularly rewarding one for Muslim politicians from the United Provinces to adopt; up to the second decade of the 20th century because of the attitudes of the government, and later, in the age of mass agitation and growing electorates, because these politicians had in the ʻulāmāʾ a tremendously powerful, if double-edged, weapon for mobilising mass support. They introduced the ʻulāmāʾ into politics in 1918 with the aim of making capital out of the Khilāfāt issue, but were overwhelmed by the agitation which followed. They introduced the ʻulāmāʾ again in the campaign for Pakistan, and the ʻulāmāʾ, this time subordinate to the politicians, played an important part in winning over to the Muslim League Muslims in provinces where they were a majority of the population (sc. Bengal, Sind, North-West Frontier Province and Punjab). Without the support of these Muslims there could be no Pakistan.

Such were the factors which encouraged some Muslims to organise on a communal basis in Indian politics under the British. Such, in sum, were the causes of Muslim nationalism. If, for those who followed, Muslim nationalism was mainly a religious matter, for those who led, it was a matter less of the desirability of separate Muslim political organisation or of a separate Muslim state in which they could live according to the Šārfī, than of the need to ensure that they continued to wield the power in northern India which they had wielded for hundreds of years.


Kawn wa-fasād, "generation and corruption". The expression is frequently found in the vocabulary of falsafa as the translation of the two Greek words γένεσις and φθορά, and it is also how Aristotle's De generatione et corruptione is rendered in Arabic. The references entail an analysis of cosmology, a measure of psychology and some metaphysical developments of the Fatāsīfā. The ideas in question acquired various nuances of meaning, by measure of the system and theory of each ḥaylāt, but they always harked back to the Aristotelian meaning. The term is most frequently met with in the phrase "world of generation and corruption", ʻilm al-kawn waš l-fasād, as a designation of the sublunary world, which is subject to change; by contrast, the worlds above are free of this. A few quick references are sufficient here: al-Brāhī speaks of the corruptible elements placed within nature, "the corruptible facts" (al-ḥayyāt al-mudakhawanī al-fassādā; see Commentaire sur le Peri Hermeneicus, ed. W. Kutsch and S. Marrow, Beirut 1971, 75, 191); and Ibn Sīnā, in his treatise on "The branches of the speculative sciences" (Kashīm al-ʻulām al-ḥālīyya) considers a study of kaun wa fasād as one of the objects of "natural science" (see Tis' rasāʾil, Cairo 1326/1908, 106).

First and foremost kawn evokes the idea of exist-
entalisation. This is the principal meaning it acquired in the vocabulary of *ilm al-kalām: kawn is the advent in nature of the existential thing (*kawn, plur. *kāwīn), which makes it, for the Mu'tazilī (e.g. al-`Alīfā) as well as for al-Āsh'arī, to some extent synonymous with *wujūd. But for the advocates of the (philosophical) atom (dū'ur [q.v.]) in particular, an existentialisation of corporal beings and *wujūd of all existence, superreceptible as well as perceptible. For the Falsāsī, kawn (plur. *akāwīn), the customary translation of *wujūn, was more precisely applied to beings subject to growth, without losing its primary meaning of existentialisation, with its reference to the dimension of bodies. According to Ibn Sinā, for example, *kawn can either be a synonym for *wujūd or can designate a being in *fāsād, depending on the context. M. Jean Jolivet (L'Intélectricité selon Kindī, Leiden 1971, 123; cf. Rasā'il il-Kindī, ed. Abū Rida, Cairo 1369/1950, i, 204) suggests that for Kindī *kaun, linked to *fāsād, was already defined as substantial change, "changing existence". One of al-Kindī's main texts on the subject is the brief *risāla on "The efficient proximate cause of generation and corruption" (*al-itīla fī al-falāsiyla al-harbiyya it 'kaun wa'l-fāsād'; ibid., i, 208-13).

Yet there is a noticeable difference between the ideas of al-Kindī and those of his successors. The latter's vision of the world is emansipic; *akūn are therefore the last necessary effect of *fāsād, the productive flow of being, necessarily emanating from the prime Being. For al-Kindī, *kawn, however much a matter of becoming it may be, depends for its first efficient cause on a free creation *ex nihilo, thereby being linked with the Kur'ānic meaning of *kwn *fā-yāhūn, (God said) "So be it! and it is so" (Kūrān, II, 177); cf. Rasā'il il-Kindī, i, 373-4. But whether it is a question of the creativity of al-Kindī, or the emanationism of his eastern successors, or the eternity of the world of Ibn Rūḥān, the idea of becoming, generation, (substantial) change remains linked to *kawn. Even if *akūn depend in the last resort (freely or necessarily) on the prime efficient Cause, their coming into being is nevertheless linked to the interaction of secondary causes. By this token, the heavenly bodies, subject to local movement but not to becoming, are not answerable to *kawn. Falsāsī vocabulary does not consider them as *akūn. Therefore, in his *risāla on "The prostration of distant (heavenly) bodies and their submission to respect for God", al-Kindī (op. cit., i, 253 ff.) faithful to his creativism, affirms the direct creation *ex nihilo of the Heavenly Bodies because they are not subject to generation and corruption (cf. Jolivet, op. cit., 107).

In fact *kawn, and its opposite correlative *fāsād, taken as a whole, are the object of the fourth sort of movement which Aristotle calls "substantial movement". Such is the status of the beings composed of matter and form belonging to our sublunary world, which are destined to die, to be transformed, and to reappear in new forms. The word *fāsād belongs to the Kur'ānic vocabulary, where it signifies a state that is radically bad, in contrast with good. It can be rendered as (moral) "corruption", occasionally as "état de violence" (tr. D. Masson) or as "scandale" (tr. E. Blachère). Thus "Corruption (or "scandal")" has appeared on the land and on the sea because of what men's hands have done". The moral vocabulary of *ilm al-kalām contrasts *sāliḥ with the adjective *fāsiḍ, whatever is healthy with whatever is corrupt, often using them synonymously with ḥasan/ḥabīb. In law (*fīk), *fāsād signifies the invalidity of a juridical act (see *rādo). The cosmology of the Falsāsī procedes from these moral and juridic meanings to a physical one and employs *fāsād to render the Greek φθορά. In this case, the corruption of the compound matter and form depends on an intrinsic coming into being (kawn). Therefore *fāsād, like *kawn, also belongs to the fourth sort of movement, which, says al-Kindī, is "movement which transfers a thing from its own essence (*sān) to another" (Rasā'il, i, 217; tr. Jolivet, op. cit., 121). This definition, with slight variations, is found in the works of his successors. It is because of its "intrinsic power to decay" (*kwmt fāsādah), says Ibn Sinā, that a physical compound decomposes, and this power resides in matter (e.g. Naṣīrī, Cairo 1537/1938, 188).

The problem of "generation and corruption" was linked to the production of all beings in the sublunary world, and for Ibn Sinā was especially related to the problem of a separate Intellect which acted as a "giver of forms", *wādhī al-sūwar, as well as to that of "enacting" and "receiving" causes (*kabīliyya). When later kalām (e.g. al-Ghazālī in Mabāsiya and Tahāsī, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, al-Ṭijjī, al-Dūrāšī) set forth and discussed the theses of falsāsī, they employed the expression *kawn wa-fāsād and the definitions elucidating it.

Bibliography: given in the article. References to the topic in the writings of the Falsāsī are very numerous, both in original, systematic expositions and in commentaries on Aristotle. (L. Gardet) *KAWs (s.), bow (noun of uncertain gender). The numerous types of bow attested at various times in the Islamic world are designated by expressions which include this word, in a very general sense, together with adjectives (kahs *hidjāsī, *fārisī, etc.) or nouns in annexation to it (kahs al-*hūsān, kaws al-*ridjī, etc.). Furthermore, one often finds qualities inherent in the weapon used to designate various types of bow (al-kalām, al-rāhīq, al-sūwar, etc., see below, § 3). 1. Generalities and origins

In classical antiquity and the Christian west, gallantry was especially displayed in close combat, so that the short sword and the straight sword were regarded as the noble weapons, as the poet Lucre clearly states: *Ensis habet uires, et gens quaecumque *wiorum bella gerit gladiis (Pharsalia, viii, 385-6). Arms involving the hurling of projectiles (bows, arbaleests and slings) were regarded as treacherous arms whose use was left to mercenary soldiers (Cretan archers and slingsmen from the Balearic Islands in the Roman army, Genoese crossbowmen in 14th century France). On the other hand, in the sphere of the martial arts in Islamic lands, the bow held the outstanding place, as the abundance of technical literature devoted to *rimāya (q.v.) shows. The information which we possess is only fragmentary, and comes from studies and published treatises stemming from the latter half of the last century; the principal ones are given below, in chronological order.

Hammer-Purgstall, Über Bogen und Pfeil, Vienna 1853 (a work based on the treatise of Muṣṭafā Kānī, which stresses religious and social aspects and leaves unexplored technical considerations); Schwarzlose, Die Waffen der alten Arabern, Leipzig 1886 (a lexicographical study devoted to the weapons of the pre-Islamic Arabs and based on a systematic analysis of ancient poetry); Fries, *Das Heerwesen der Araber, Tübingen 1921 (a study of the Umayyad army,
based on al-Ṭabarī, but with comparatively little information on archers); Hein, Bogenhandwerk, in Tfd., iv–v (1925–6) (a study of archery among the Ottomans made from the points of view of construction and of sporting use, and based on the Taḫkīs rasā’il al-rumūd of Muṣṭafā Kāndī); Klopfstei, Turkish archery, 1934 (deals with certain developments out of the preceding study, with more exact technical details); Faris and Elmer, Arab archery, Princeton 1945 (the first critical edition of a treatise on archery dating from ca. 1500); Zajacek published at Warsaw in 1956 a Mamluk treatise on archery of unknown authorship and included in a treatise on arms and the care of horses; Boudot-Lamotte, Contribution à l’étude de l’archerie musulmane, Damascus 1968 (the section on archery from a treatise on arms composed for Saladin by Mardī); Latham and Paterson, Saracen archery, London 1970 (a treatise by the Mamluk Taḫbūḏā, with commentary and illustrations).

The traditional items of information given in the treatises on rīmāsya generally agree that the origin of the bow goes back to a heavenly gift bestowed on Adam through the intermediary of the Archangel Gabriel. Adam then used with great profit this divinely-hallowed weapon, with its miraculous character, in order to preserve his crops from birds' depredations, and he passed it on to his descendants, amongst whom Abraham, "father of the Arabs", apparently had a great reputation as an archer. Little is known about the archers of the pre-Islamic period, or about what kind of bow they used (see below, § 3). It seems that certain tribal groups especially favoured this weapon, such as the B. Sa’d of Tamīm, whose skill at shooting was praised by various poets, including al-Kalīkh b. Ḥam. The Prophet is said to have been a skilled archer whose mastery of the bow was revealed at the battle of Uhud, and he had several bows whose names are preserved by tradition. Al-Ṭabarī, ed. Cairo, iii, 184–5, mentions three of these, taken from the B. Kaynūqā, sc. raḥiḏ, ṣawwāḥat (also called al-bayyād) and saḥīd, this last made from nabūd wood. `Abd Allāh Elendi (apud Hein) numbers the Prophet’s bows at nine, adding to the above those of al-Mukaddā and kāltām. The existence of these bows is attested, but without precise references, in LA, iii, 208. The most famous archer of the period of the Islamic beginnings is undoubtedly, according to tradition, the "Paladin of Islam" Sa’d b. Abī Wāḳqāsh, whom the Turkish archers' guilds later made their patron. Sa’d distinguished himself at Uhud with a little group of archers, whose names are preserved in the K. al-Maḏkūlī of al-Wāḳkīlī.

It is somewhat surprising to note that the word bawṣ appears only once in the Kurān, in S. al-Nāṣrīm (LIII, 9), in which it only figures, however, as a measure of distance: fa-hāna kāba bawṣayni aw adnā “[the angel] was two bow-lengths off or nearer". S. al-Anfāl (VIII, 62) nevertheless implicitly emphasizes the essential part assigned to the bow in the fight against the unbelievers: a’lādī lāhān miṣtāra bawṣayn shapes against them whatsoever force you are able to gather”. The word kawwa is here often glossed by the authors of the treatises on archery as “the force of bows”. This somewhat restrained information of the Kurān is on the other hand amply compensated for by the numerous traditions to be found all through the ḫātībī literature. From the main corpora, one may cite: Abū Dāwūd, Dīḥkād, 23; al-Buḫkārī, Dīḥkād, 75, 80; Anbāyā’, 16; Manāḥīsh, 4; al-Dārimī, Dīḥkād, 14, 23; Ibn Ḥanbal, i, 92, 124, 137, 264, iv, 50, 144, 146, 148, 154, 368, v, 32; Ibn Mādīq, Muḥaddīma, 11; Tijārāt, 67; Dīḥkād, 19; Muslim, Imārāt, 169; Faddān al-Sakha, 64, 2; al-Nāṣrī, Dīḥkād, 26; Khayvī, 8; al-Tirmidhī, Dīḥkād, 1; Manāḥīsh, 26 (see Boudot-Lamotte, Contribution, 40–5).

It is unnecessary to point out that these pieces of information contain no precise technical details which would enable us to reconstruct with any sureness the types of bow used at the time of the maḏkūlī. One possibility might be by means of the makers of bows, concerning whom no research has yet been done. One finds many times in Islamic onomastic the laḥab of "al-Kawāsīya". According to a piece of information in the Aṯḡānī, xiv, 36, al-Dīḥābī mentions (Ḥayawān, v, 233–5) two famous bow-makers, Uṣūfūr al-Āzīfī and Māṣīhā, the latter having been, according to tradition, the first man to make bows. Ibn Ṭabīḥī, ‘Umāda, ii, 222, repeats this information in order to explain the adjectives sāfāfīyya and māṣīḥīyya applied to bows. Amongst these uncertainties, one fact seems incontrovertible: that unlike the Persians, amongst whom archery had long been an ancient tradition and was one still living in Islamic times, the ancient Arabs used the bow more for hunting than for warfare. On one hand, archery was little practised from horseback, and on the other, the weapon on to the bow of the Ayām al-Ṣārāb did not require it [see Dīaysh, i]. Hence it was in Iran, and more precisely, in Khorāsān, where Abū Muslim organised his army, that new techniques, unknown to the Umayyads, were introduced in the domains of siege warfare as in that of archery. These Khorāsānians were themselves progressively replaced under al-Mu’taṣīm by Turks brought from Central Asia, accustomed to fighting on horseback, as al-Dīḥābī remarks in his well-known Risāla fit manāḥīsh al-Turk wa-ṭammāmat ḥiṣn al-khulūd, ed. Van Vloten, Leiden 1903. The coming of the Saljūqs intensified the employment of the horse-archer, whose astonishing successfulness came from the union, born in Central Asia, of the horse and the bow, whose symbolic forms may well have inspired the graphic shape of the ḫāṭr al-bayyād, these bows assumed, once need hardly point out, an extremely-mobile light cavalry force which contrasted sharply with the heavily-armed cataphracti which were used at that time in the west.

The counter-crusade begun by Saladin caused a florescence of treatises on ḥṣāḥād and ḥurāfisya in which there were treated, for the first time systematically, the techniques pertaining to each branch of weaponry (see Cahen, Tresīt, and on bows, Boudot-Lamotte, Contribution). In the Mamluk period this literature devoted to arms—often didactic in aim and utilising the form of the maghdūs—developed considerably, and amongst the topics dealt with were the manufacture and use of weapons, with archery occupying a prominent place (see Latham and Paterson, Saracen archery). After Baybars' defeat of the Mongols at ‘Ayn Ḫalīl, there was created the maṣyān, a training-ground for horse-archers. The introduction of firearms did not lead to the sudden disappearance of the bow. Indeed, the handling of the arquebus, slow and cumbersome, left the archers with a superiority in the field, at least at the outset; moreover, as Ayalon has noted [see Sārūn, iii], "To equip a soldier with an arquebus meant taking away his bow and, what was to the Mamluk more distasteful, depriving him of his horse, thereby reducing him to the humiliating
status of a foot soldier, compelled either to march or to allow himself to be carried in an ox-cart." Thus there speedily succeeded to the foot archers of the first Arab gijuns Persian mounted archers and then Turkish ones, whose participation in Islamic battles only ceased with the dawn of the modern period (the arquebus was introduced among the Mamluks in 895/1490 under Sultan Kā'ītbāy, some 125 years later than in Europe; see Ayalon, loc. cit.).

2. The treatises

The fundamental work, to which most of the authors of treatises on rimāya refer, is that called al-Wādigh by a certain Ṭabarī, whom Muṣṭafā Kāññ states is "the father of all the books written about the bow". For Kāññ, this Ṭabarī had to be the famous historian, but Ahlwardt believed, no doubt correctly (apud Ritter, 136), that it must be someone of the same name, whose complete designation was Ahmad b. Ḥādī Allāh Muṣṭīb al-Dīn al-Ṭabarī, d. 694/1295.

The intensification of gīdhād under the Ayyūbidīs stimulated the development of technical literature on archery. The oldest treatise is by a certain Murdā, or more likely, Mardī (see Brockelmann, I, 495), whose nasab is only partly known, Ibn ʿAllāh b. Mardī, and his nisba, al-Tarsusi, apparently meaning that he-originates from Tarsus. It was composed for Saladin ca. 570/1174 in collaboration with a celebrated arms manufacturer of Alexandria, Hasan b. al-ʿAbrakī, and is called Ṭabarī al-rabāḥ al-albāb fī kaysīyyat al-nāṣiḍā fi ʿl-hurūb min al-aswād wa-nashr ʿl-dām al-ʿādām fī ʿl-ʿudād wa ʿl-ʿādāt al-muʿsīna ʿalā lāb al-ʿādāt. Amongst the different weapons studied (see Cahen, Traité), bows occupy the favoured place (see Boudot-Lamotte, Contribution). Later in time (end of the 8th/14th century) but rich in its subject-matter and enjoying a wide diffusion is a didactic poem in 149 verses and the rajīs metre, accompanied by a technical commentary, attributed to Ṭaybūghā al-ʿAshrafi al-Baklamishī al-Yūnāni and called K. Ghunyat al-ṣulābī fī maṣraṣī ramm al-muṣālib (on the different manuscripts of this treatise, in various recensions, see Latham and Paterson, Saracen archery, xxvi-xxxviii). The catalogues of Arab, Turkish and Persian manuscripts further mention treatises on rimāya, so far unedited; but so far as is yet known, none of these is earlier than that of Mardī or richer in information than that of Ṭaybūghā. Accordingly, our information on the teaching of rimāya remains fragmentary and limited for the period between the Ayyūbidīs and the Ottomans. We know little about the master-archers whose teachings are handed down in the treatises, apart from the fact that, on the evidence of their nisbas, they stemmed from Khurāsān and Transoxania. One might conclude that most of them lived in the middle years of the 9th/15th century, since it was from this date that the "Abbasīs started raising large numbers of troops from Khurāsān and Transoxania. Three great figures are constantly cited, and it seems that their techniques (as will be explained in § 3 below) corresponded to three main technical methods. They are Abū Ḥāǧīm al-Bāwdārī (sc. from Ahlwardt), Tāhir al-Bakhlī and Isbāk al-Raffā. Furthermore, certain techniques are attributed to masters cited more irregularly, sc. Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Tirmīḏī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥarawī, Abū ʿl-Fath Saʿdī al-Samarkandī, Muḥammad b. Ṭārākī al-Samarkandī, Abū ʿl-Ḥasād al-Kāshī, Abū Mūsā al-Harrānī, Hayaṭwayh al-Bakhlī, and Abū Mūsā al-Kharrāz. For a detailed consideration of these, see J. D. Latham, The archers of the Middle East: the Turco-Iranian background, in Iran, viii (1970), 97-103.

The treatises show a certain resemblance in their structure, and one can broadly distinguish an introduction made up of traditions, followed or preceded by considerations on the origin of the bow and lexicographical information; a central core containing an enumeration of the basic principles (uṣūl) and secondary ones (jāmāʿ) laid down by the master-archers; whilst the close is often made up of various tactical considerations.

3. The various types of bow

The various kinds of bow are described with a great variety of names, often composed of two vocables, under the influence of lexicography; whence the oppositions kaws biğidā/kaws fārisī; kaws al-ṣuḏā/kaws al-riḏī; filk/fālis; etc.

Kaws biğidā. The type of bow used by the pre-Islamic Arabs was that of the simple, wooden bow, either short on long, depending on the cross section adopted; there is abundant evidence in the Arabic sources for this. In one passage, Herodotus seems to refer to the Arabs' use of composite, reflex bows: ʿArāzīnī ... ṭṣṣ dè pāliotona ʿeṣbīn ḫībā dāzā ṭṣṣ dhīxā maṭrakh, in which pāliotona ("stretched towards the rear") aptly describes reflex bows (see Hein, 357). It is quite possible that composite bows were known in parts of Arabia, and Herodotus may have been correct as far as he went; the composite bow was well-known in the Iranian world, and eventually became the standard weapon of the Sassanid archers. The requisite horn may have been imported, if long-horned cattle or goats were not available within the peninsula. But Herodotus is a very early source to cite for the position of the Arab bow in 8th century AD; by that time, as remarked above, the Arab bow was essentially the simple wooden one. The Arabic sources state repeatedly that the Arabs made their bows from nabī (Grewia tenax), which was apparently perfectly suitable for this; to this day, the primitive peoples of Somalia make effective bows, up to a length of 2 m, out of Grewia procera. This was regularly imported into Arabia; Persian caravans loaded with it used to leave al-Madīn/Česiphon via al-Ḥira and Yamāma for the Yemen (Agrabī, xix, 110, 116), and Mount Kasr was famous for its nabī. Further mentioned in the construction of the pre-Islamic bow were shawāb (corpus mas.) and nasāh (chāda solutina).

Kaws wāṣīfiyya. Apparently the Arab composite bow. The adjective stems not from the town of Wāṣīf on the Tigris but must be understood in its proper sense of median, intermediate, probably with reference to the components of this bow (see Saracen archery, 10).

Kaws al-ṣuḏā. "Hand-bow", as opposed to the kaws al-riḏī or arbalest (see below).

Between these two comes the Kaws al-bundūk "pellet- or stone-bow", the archetypal of the arbalest used solely for shooting birds and already known in the Prophet's time. The projectile used was a ball of hardened clay (djulāhī or bundūk). However, it should be noted that projectiles like balls or pellets can be shot from a hand bow as well as from a crossbow, and we know that hand bows were used thus from the time of Tutankhamun onwards, see JESHO (1972), 226; it was merely a matter of fitting a suitable pocket on to the string, and such pockets can be seen in Islamic miniature paintings.

Filk (also sharidī). A bow consisting of a single
Kaws al-ziydr. This was no longer a portable siege-engine, like the stone-hurler or tarrida [q.v.] and the mangonel or mangeianī [q.v.], but a siege- -machine mounted on a fixed chassis. It was used during the warfare between Saladin and the Crusaders, and corresponds to the “grand arbalest with a wheel” used in Europe for sieges and described by Viollet le Duc (see fig. 1).

**Fig. I.**

Siege-engines [see ʿiṣār], of a more or less static nature, like the stone-hurler or tarrida [q.v.] and the mangonel or mangeianī [q.v.] were, according to their importance, set up on mountings or even manufactured on the spot (as did the Ottomans later with their cannons). This necessitated the presence of specialist corps, mainly of carpenters (these last being also used to make supports for the galleries in mine-shafts), as well as the besieging troops. One should also note that certain of these siege-engines could be used to hurl pots full on incendiary naphtha or naft [q.v.].

4. The terminology of the components of the bow (see fig. 1)

**Fig. 1.**
The sources frequently liken the composite bow to the human body, and most parts of it take their name from parts of this last (e.g. šahr, baṣn, rubbs, ušukh (šahr, sur, etc.), thus the arc of the bow has as its centre or focal point the habid (lit. “liver”), and the term dimakha/daymukh is used for “arrow-pass”, sc. the side of the handle continuous with the wadīḥ (“face”), the part facing the archer as he shoots; it derives from Persian dima “cheek”.

Once the bow has been strung and held in a recurved position, each of its limbs delimits, together with the bowstring, a sector or “house” (basyā). Thus we have, with the upper limb, an “upper house” (basyā ašfāl), also called “house of shooting” (basyā al-ramy), because the shot is made according to this plan. The lower limb determines the “lower house” (basyā ašfāl) or “house of perpendicularity” (basyā al-šād), i.e. that which falls away towards the ground. At 3/4 of the way along its length, each limb makes a sharp angle of return, at ca. 60°, in the backwards direction; this bend has to be very resistant, since it bears the thrust of the recurved limb. Marḏī calls this part dustār (Persian “twisted cord, turban”), i.e. the torus, which corresponds to the Arabic terms tāšīf “edging, that which skirts the edge” and umūk. However, Ṭaybughā uses dustār in a quite different sense, sc. that of “the working part of the limb”, and this gives better sense, see the diagram of the terminology of the bow in Sasanian archery, 162.

Since each “house” has its torus, there is in effect an “upper torus” or “torus of the house of shooting” (dustār basyā al-ramy), and a “lower torus” or “torus of the perpendicularity” (dustār basyā al-šād). The torus is followed by the rigid, straight end of the limb, the “end-piece” or siya, whose extremity has a bone or ivory ferrule, abāštāf/al-wafra = “cover, or cap”. In this ferrule there is gouged out the groove or “nock” (faqr), where the loop of the bow-string (ṣayn al-watar) fits. When the string is in place, the end-piece appears like the neck of a violin; at its base and just before the bend of the torus, there may be a string-bridge whose function is to keep the bow-string constantly within the plan of the bow. As with the other parts coming in pairs, one speaks of an “upper end-piece” for that of the “house of shooting” (siya sūlā or siya basyā al-ramy) and a “lower end-piece” for that of the “house of perpendicularity” (siya sulā or siya basyā al-šād).

5. Arrow and quivers

The three main words denoting the arrow seem to convey the following distinctions: sahm (arrow made from a reed; but Ṭaybughā, in Sasanian archery, 24, says that this was of hard, solid wood)—nūskāh (Persian arrow).

Sahm is the most general term if one believes Herodotus, for whom the Arabs as well as the Persians originally used arrows made from reeds (apūd Hein, 26). According to Ibn al-Tiktaka, the Persians called the Arab arrow (generally made from wood) nabī (Fries, 53), whilst the word continually used in the accounts of battles fought in the eastern provinces of the Umayyad empire to indicate the Persian arrow is nūskāh, of whatever material it may be made (ibīd.). Leaving aside the divergencies found in certain manuscripts, the constituent elements of a wooden arrow, as they appear in the relevant treatises, are as follows (see fig. 2).

The wood (of the shaft) (šād), whose forepart (towards the head) is called the Šadr or foreshaft, and whose rear part, of wider section, is the main. The šād includes a socket (ruʾs) meant to take the head. This delicate end of the wood of the shaft is reinforced by a binding of sinews (djalz or rišāf). The part of the main which receives the fletchings (riš) is the section which is somewhat constricted and is called the waist (haḵw); it terminates in an enlargement where is made the nock (faḵ) which is meant to be embedded in the nocking-point of the bow-string (maḏin al-watar). The base of the main, which is situated just above the nock, undergoes, at the moment of release, a violent thrust which might tend to break the arrow at this point; hence it has a ligature of sinews (utra “cuticle”) which is the counterpart of that of the upper part of the šād (the djalz or rišāf). The arrow is, in this way, reinforced at both of the ends of least resistance. The two sides of the nock are called sharkeš al-fūḵ. The head (našl or zudidj), which may have two edges (ghirāḏān), has a pointed tang (sinkh) which is embedded within the ruʾs.

In the treatises on rimāya, quivers are given various, sometimes contradictory names. Thus we find: diʿba, a fairly large, leather quiver having a lid fixed by means of a cord (miyḏāhā). There are two Persian terms: tīhaḵt, a quiver made of horsehair and used by archers from the province of Gilan, and nīm, a quiver made of various skins sewn together and analogous to the preceding one.
a cylindrical quiver in which the arrows are placed with their heads downwards, as opposed to the procedure with the *dghab. Concerning the *kināna, a quiver made from skins, the lexicographical evidence is somewhat contradictory. *Lā, xiii, 321-2, gives the two senses of quiver made from skin and quiver made from wood, and Ibn Durayd, *Istihbāb, Cairo 1958, 27-8, notes that "if [the quiver] is made from skin, it is called *kināna, if made from wood, *dghaf, and if made from two pieces fastened together, *karan. The term *kināna comprises all these nuances". *Dghaf, according to *Lā, iv, 143, "resembles the *kināna, but is bigger and can hold a large number of arrows. A *hadīth seems to show that this quiver was of purely Arab origin: "Whoever takes an Arab bow and its quiver (*dghaf), God will keep poverty away from him" (*ibid.). *Kabd, a quiver made from the *nab' wood (* enorme tenax). *Karan, a quiver made from pieces of leather put together so that the air can circulate through interstices left so that the fletchings of the arrows do not deteriorate. *Wafda, a quiver made from skin entirely, with no wood in its construction (the wood originally denotes a shepherd's leather bag). Finally, one should note a metaphorical phrase for "quiver" connected with its capacity, *umma *thālūbīn (al-Suyūṭī, *Muzhir, Cairo n.d., i, 590). Another pointer to the capacity of certain quivers is provided by al-Wākidī, who in his account of the battle of Ubūt notes that an archer called Abū Ṭalḥa spread out in front of the Prophet, as a sign of his faithfulness, the contents of his quiver (*dghab), amounting to 50 arrows (*apud Fries, 54).

6. Gauntlets and thumb-rings

The very strong pressure of the bow-string on the fingers and the thumb at the time of the draw necessitates some protection here, provided by a leather gauntlet with the fingers reinforced with horn, bamboo or other hard material and held on the wrist by a thong or strap. According to the technique adopted for locking the bow-string (*abd), this gauntlet can have 2, 3 or 4 fingers, but is never a complete glove. It may be designated by the arabised Persian word *hughsīb (*hīghsīb, a doublet of *uguhsīb (*anguhsīb (*angushtāngushtān), s.v.); however, this is also the normal word for "thumb-guard", "drawing-ring", see *J. D. Latham, *Keshbēn: a Persian loan-word in Arabic, in *JRAS (1968), 65-7. The modern archer's gauntlet is a copy of this. The so-called "Mongolian" method of taking the bow-string with the thumb requires the use of a thumb-stall, *hāshīna (sometimes, but incorrectly, *khasīya'a). Good archers seem especially to appreciate rings made from hard substances like bone or ivory and corresponding exactly to the shape of their thumb, carefully carved and sometimes decorated with great artistry (see *Arab archery, 123-4; *Hein, in *Isi, xv, 18-22; Klopsteg, 67-70; Latham and Paterson, *Saracen archery, pl. 7 A-B).

7. The phases and principles of shooting

The act of shooting can be broken down into a certain number of phases, each of which is developed with detail and precision and with reference to the practice of the main master-archers, in the treatises on *ristsya. It is not possible to enter into detail here (see for this, Latham and Paterson, *Saracen archery, and Boudot-Lamotte, *Contribution), and only a brief review of these phases, treated chronologically, is given here.

(a) *Fār, act of stringing or bracing the bow. This operation needs special care, as much to avoid damaging the bow as to avoid injury. Certain particularly powerful bows require the intervention of a helper or of special contrivances, bracing mechanisms, such as the *kharkhumān "bracing-board" (from Pers. *bhar + *humān?).

(b) *Kabba, grasp, sc. the position of the left hand (for a right-handed person) on the grip or handle (mabīd) of the bow. In order to distinguish this technique from that of the *abd (see below), the authors sometimes call this more precisely *al-kabba bi 'l-chamāl.

(c) *Abd or *bafla, the ok, locking, sc. the position on the bow-string of the fletching of the right hand, and especially that of the thumb in the "Mongolian" technique of locking (al- *abd bi 'l-shām *sad 'l-watar). In order to achieve a concise and clear exposition of this, the authors of the treatises generally refer to counting by means of the fingers (see *HISĀB AL-ʾAKD). In effect, the thumb in the locking position and the fingers which, in various manners, come to lock the position in order to ensure a good draw of the string during the whole process of the draw, form a figure which is expressed by the corresponding numeral in the system of digital computation. Three locks seem to be especially favoured, sc. 63, 69 and 83.

(d) *Tafwīd, nocking. This consists of bracing the arrow's nock (fūk) on the binding of the bow-string. There must be no play there, so that when the archer draws back the arrow, together with the bow-string, he accompanies the latter in its rearwards path to the chosen anchorage-point (see below).

(e) *Madd, the draw, drawing (also nas' al-watar). This consists of bringing the bow-string back towards oneself. This technique varies in terms of the anchor-point selected, which can be at different levels: eyebrow, ear-lobe, moustache, chin, sternum, or even on the chest. This has various techniques according to the corrections which must be made in height and direction.

(g) *Iśāb or *śliā, the loose, loosing. This is the last and certainly the most important phase of shooting, which demands the archer's entire concentration, an "emptying of the heart" (*laḫāliya yi *kūhū) and a setting-aside of all other thought (mid *siwād). The master-archers insist in this attitude, which is like that of the supplicant at the time of the *takbir al-šāmā, which is expressed by the corresponding numeral in the system of digital computation. Three loose seem to be three basic išāb. In the first, called muḫqāṭlas "snatched", the archer draws rapidly and looses immediately without any break in time. In the second, called sākin "held", he draws slowly, holding the draw in order to verify that the position of the shot is good and then looses calmly. The third is called māfrūk "twisted", and involves a light, partial draw—a brief moment at rest—and then a sudden end to the draw followed immediately by the loose.

Like the religious lawyers or *fubākā, the authors of the treatises distinguish five arkhān, sc. the bow, the string, the arrow, the thumb-ring and the archer, and in the manner of *išāb, they divide the phases of shooting which have been surveyed above into *uṣūl and *fūrā'. It is thus possible to draw up the following table from the information of the chief master-archers: Abū Hāshim—4 *uṣūl, sc. *kabd, *abd, *madd, *sišāb. *Tāhir—to the 4 *uṣūl given above is added an asl called *šimād which consists of holding firmly in the left hand the grip or handle of the bow whilst the right-hand fingers make a good locking of the string, the two hands exerting equal forces.

Abū Mūsā al-Kharraz—4 usūl, sc. 'abd, khabīda, nasār, iflāt, and 6 furū', sc. 'tār, tafwīb, shooting from beneath a shield, shooting with a breastplate, knowledge of weapons for their use in combination, ways of changing weapons in the course of a battle. He also adds two moral qualities, khasla: not to shoot at anyone or anything contrary to the will of God, and to show patience.

Muhammad al-Harawi—7 usūl, sc. itdr, tafwīb, fīuffling, kabbāda, maddir, nasār, iflāt.

Finally, one may note that all these different techniques seem to come down to three main physical types, those of the three Imāms of rimāya, sc. Hashim (tall), Tahir (short and stocky) and Ishāk (medium height).

8. Training and tactical use

The proceeding considerations concern shooting mainly on a horizontal plane. The Mamluks especially developed two forms of practice shooting in a vertical plane, one up into the air (ramy al-kabak) and one downwards (kīghādī). The archer familiar with these techniques could use his weapon to maximum advantage in the various circumstances arising during battle.

Ramy al-kabak "shooting at a gourd" (Tkish. khabāb "gourd"). A pole approximately 25 feet high was erected in the maydān, with a gourd or other spherical or oval object at its end, which the mounted archer must reach when his galloping horse passed by the pole. Little is known about the origins of this shooting exercise, which must have come from Central Asia and Turkmen practice. This exercise was very popular under the Mamluks, and reached its apogee between 638/1260 and 694/1295 in the sultanates of Baybars I, Khalil, and al-Ashraf Khalil, often giving rise to splendid festivities. A description is given in the Mamluk historians Ibn Taghrībirdī, Nuḍjam, viii, 6, and al-Makrizī, Khitāt, iii, 180. On ramy al-kabak, see especially Latham and Paterson, Saracen archery, 77-8, 172, and Hassanein Rabi', The training of the Mamluk Fāris, in War, technology and society in the Middle East, ed. V. J. Parry and M. E. Yapp, London 1975, 153-83.

Kīghādī (< Tkish. bigāc "slope, incline"); the faulty transliteration of J. T. Reinaud kīghadj gives the word as it must have appeared after the passage of Tkish. ǧ to Ar. ǧ). In Ṭayybugha (Saracen archery, 78-9, 172-3) this term denotes either an exercise in which the archer, shooting parallel with his left thigh, shoots at a ground target, or else any kind of downwards shot made from horseback. According to Morier, Second journey through Persia, London 1818, 169, the word denoted shooting rearwards by a group of cavalrmen at full galop.

In open country, the archers whose function was to break, from a distance, the charge of the enemy were normally placed in the front rank. (Crossbowmen were also used for this aim, but with varying effect. If the arbalest gave an advantage of greater precision and a more powerful shot, it had serious disadvantages: heaviness, cumbersomeness and above all, a distinctly slower frequency of shooting, since a good crossbowman could only with great difficulty let off two bolts in the time during which an archer could shoot off twelve arrows. Hence the crossbow was primarily used for the defence or attacking of fortresses.) In the second rank came infantrymen sheltered behind shields and provided with weapons for cut-and-thrust in close combat (lances, swords). In the third rank were placed detachments of cavalry meant for hurling in at decisive moments [see Ḥarb. ii. The caliphate]. The Turks, and then the Mongols, gave pride of place on the battle field to cavalrymen armed with short and very powerful reflexed, composite bows. The tactic of these horse-archers consisted of drowning the enemy under a hail of arrows whilst one or both of the wings moved round to envelope the enemy's wings or rear [see Ḥarb. iv. Persia].

The "Scythian" method of shooting over the shoulder. This was a tactic stemming from the nomadic peoples of Central Asia, who were trained from childhood in riding and archery. The tactic must have been adopted, as Rostovtseff showed (see Bibl.), by the Scythians of the 8th-2nd centuries BC, and then passed to the Tatars; it made a vivid
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impression on classical authors, in whom the expression “Parthian shot” became a synonym for treachery (on the Scythians’ tactics, see Herodotus, iv, 120; Xenophon, Anabasis, iii, 3, 10). This archer avoided close combat by making a series of attacks and retreats which had a definitely demoralising effect on the enemy. Greek and Latin authors often refer to this, and especially significant in this connection is the verse of Propertius, iv, 3, 65-6, describing “the cunningly-contrived bow which lets fly against the fleeing cruppers”, plumbo cum iorlae spargatur pondera fundae| Subdolus et uersis incerpat arcus equus.

It is moreover the concept of nomadic steppe cavalrymen which is at the bottom of mediaeval representations of Centaurs galloping along and shooting arrows behind them; see on this Z. Kadar, L’influence des peuples cavaliers sur la formation des representations medievales des Centaures, in Acta Archaeologica, ii/4 (Budapest 1952), 307-18.

This method of shooting, more “Scythian” than “Parthian”, considering its ultimate origin, recurs in Turco-Mongol military traditions and is perfectly illustrated in the famous 15th century miniature of the Top Kapu Saray, 2163 Istanbul (see fig. 3). Its persistence over the course of centuries is remarkable, and is illustrated in the case of it during the modern period (long after firearms and crossbows were avoided close combat by making a series of attacks and retreats which had a definitely demoralising effect on the enemy. Greek and Latin authors often refer to this, and especially significant in this connection is the verse of Propertius, iv, 3, 65-6, describing “the cunningly-contrived bow which lets fly against the fleeing cruppers”, plumbo cum iorlae spargatur pondera fundae| Subdolus et uersis incerpat arcus equus.

This method of shooting, more “Scythian” than “Parthian”, considering its ultimate origin, recurs in Turco-Mongol military traditions and is perfectly illustrated in the famous 15th century miniature of the Top Kapu Saray, 2163 Istanbul (see fig. 3). Its persistence over the course of centuries is remarkable, and is illustrated in the case of it during the modern period (long after firearms and crossbows were avoided close combat by making a series of attacks and retreats which had a definitely demoralising effect on the enemy. Greek and Latin authors often refer to this, and especially significant in this connection is the verse of Propertius, iv, 3, 65-6, describing “the cunningly-contrived bow which lets fly against the fleeing cruppers”, plumbo cum iorlae spargatur pondera fundae| Subdolus et uersis incerpat arcus equus.
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Kaws Kuzah, the Arabic term for the rainbow, formed from kaws "bow" (Kaws in the inscriptions of Jordan; Kaws in the inscriptions of Tigrath-Pileser, Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal; Kaws in Babylonian inscriptions of the time of Darius and Artaxerxes I; Kaws, Kaysh, Kūsh, Kūsh, in the Old Testament; Kaws, Kaws, in the Nabataean; Kaws, Kaws, in Arabia), an Edomite deity known during the first millennium and later venerated by the Nabataeans (cf. Vriezen, *The Edomite deity Qaws*, 330 ll.). He was a war-god, symbolized by the bow, just as Adad berut, god of the tempest, was symbolized by lightning (D. van Buren, *Symbols of the gods in Mesopotamian art*, 165, 67), and as Dhu 'l-Khalasa, the archer-god of the Arabian pantheon, was symbolized by arrows (see T. Fahd, *Le panthéon de l'Arabie centrale avant l'hégire*, 62 ll.).

After the manner of Dhu 'l-Sharri which eclipsed him, Kaws acquired other prerogatives, those of most of the gods of the desert regions, such as the protection of the vegetation by ensuring rain, a prerogative symbolised by the rainbow. Hence in the Arabic milieu, the name Kaws was followed by kusah in order to define his specialty. Kusah, pl. of kusah, "a coloured band of yellow, red and green" (Yākūṭ, iv, 86 ll. 3-4; TA, ii, 209, l. 11 from foot) denotes the successive appearance of bands of colour in the rainbow. As the divine symbol became substituted in general usage for the divine name whose attributes it was eventually to determine, kusah sometimes came to designate the god himself. Hence it is attributed to Muhammad the saying "Do not say Kaws Kuzah, because Kuzah is the name of a demon (shayd), but say Kaws Allāh" (Yākūṭ, iv, 85-6), and Dāhib adds, "just as one says the House of Allāh, the plurals of Allāh and the lion of Allāh" (Hayyūn, ii, 28-9); here, the symbol is taking the place of that which was originally symbolised. This is confirmed by the fact that this shayd (a term applied to the pagan idols) became, in Islamic cosmological tradition, the angel in charge of the rainbow (Yākūṭ, iv, 86 l. 4).

Furthermore, Kuzah, the abridged form of Kaws Kuzah, still denotes at Muzdalifa the pick placed at the right of the imām when he occupies the place reserved for him for the Pilgrimage ceremonies; before Islam, this designated, in the same spot, the pyre where the sacred fire of Muzdalifa was kindled (cf. Fahd, *op. cit.*, 10). When considered together with Kaws Kuzah, this fire could have been one of roation or isāsah [q.v.].

In short, Kaws Kuzah is the Arabic variation of the name of a divinity whose importance is attested by a number of theophoric names found among the peoples moving round the region between Central Arabia and the Jordan, such as Kaws-malakū and Kaws-gabrī, two kings of Edom in the times of Tigrath-Pileser III (744-27 B.C.) and Esarhaddon (680-66 B.C.); Kawsbr, Kawsmlk, amongst the peoples of Libyân; Sīmiks amongst the Mineans, Kaws 'nī, Kawsy in the inscription of Tell Khulayfa (7th century B.C.); Kusadja, Kusudjahabi, Barkusu, in the Babylonian period; and Kosdaru, Kosnatanos, Kosmalachos, Kosbanos, etc. in the Hellenistic period.

The absence of such theophoric names composed with Kaws in Arab onomastics is striking and unusual, given the fact that there exist names compounded with Kaws, such as Imru' al-Kaws and 'Abd al-Kaws (explained in *Ṭamāša*, ed. Freytag, i, 85, and Batal-yūs, *Sharḥ dīwān Imri* al-Kaws, Cairo 1308, 3, as being connected with an idol called al-Kaws, on analogy with the type of theophoric names fairly common in Arab onomastics).


This god is Kaws and not Kays, for the following reasons: (1) the absence of the name Kaws from the Arab pantheon as described by Ibn al-Kalbi in his *Kitāb al-Āṣām*, the source of all writings on the question; (2) the absence of theophoric names composed with Kays in the inscriptions gathered in Arabia and in the vast region traversed by Arabs to the north of the peninsula (cf. Lancaster Harding, *An index and concordance of pre-Islamic Arabic names and inscriptions*, 921, in which only theophoric names with Kaws are attested); (3) the isolated position of the two theophoric names composed with Kays in comparison with the large number of those composed with Kaws; and (4) the existence in
Minian of a theophoric name Kysmwn (cf. Jamme, in Oriens antiquus, vi, 183-2, text no. 1211), in which kays occupies the place of imru and of *abd and not that of a divine name.

Should one therefore deduce from this transformation of Kaws into Kays, in the kingdom of Kinda, an attempt to appropriate the ancient Edomite deity by the powerful tribal confederation of the Kaysa?


(T. FAHD)

Independently of kaws kusah, other expressions are used in Arabic to denote the rainbow: Kaws Allâh, K. Rasûl Allâh, K. al-sama', K. al-ghamâm, K. al-mun, *alâ'lam al-sama', K. Kâzî. The words *husân (dust), *husânî, *husânî, and *husânîya have quite different origin. Muslim scholars include the rainbow among the *ahdâr al-uloiyya, the superior phenomena. The rainbow is usually opposite the spectator, while the sun is at his back and there is a dark cloud or wall behind drops of water; the drops may be in a cloud or formed at springs, water-wheels, in turbulent rivers where spray is formed, in the steam of baths or in water which is ejected from the mouth in a spray (see Beitr. V). Frequently reference is made to a description by Ibn Sînâ (see E. Wiedemann and M. Horten, in Bibl., among others) who was on the top of a very high hill at the foot of which lay a vast bank of mist; the sun was above the hill and Ibn Sînâ saw a rainbow on the mist below him.

Numerous descriptions of rainbows occur in literature, e.g., in the Šamásâ (F. Tuch, ZDMG, 1899, 529), who also by the Hâjjî Kâhitî and by the poet al-Wâdî (see F. Dieterici, Menâlîbî und Saîf al-Dawla aus der Edelperle des Thâ'dlibi dargestellt, Leipzig 1847, 129, 175).

The more or less strictly scientific studies of the rainbow are also numerous. Hâjjî Kâhitî (iv, No. 9,640) quotes a special *Îhim Kaws Kuzah concerning which he deals with all questions that can arise. According to him, “it investigates how the rainbow is formed, the reason why it is formed and why it is circular; further the reason for the difference in its colours, why it appears after rain at the end of a day and why it is often seen by day but only rarely at night by moonlight. It further investigates the astrological significance (al-ahdâm) of its appearance”. Descriptions on similar lines are found, for example, in the works of al-Kawsâni (*Îláâb al-Mukhâlîdî, ed. Wüstefeld, 98; Kostümchronik, tr. Ich, 201); in the Rasûlî-Îkhân al-Sâñî, Bombay 1305, ii, 52 ff. (cf. F. Dieterici, Die Naturanschauung der Araber, Berlin 1861, 87); also by al-Kârîfî in his Kitâb al-listiîbî fîmâ tadrikihi *l-ahdâm; and in the Risâla fi Kaws Kusah of al-Tukâtî (see Berlin Catalogue by Ahlwardt, No. 5691); two anonymous works have been published by Chelîko (al-Machîrî, xv (1911), 756-44). A considerable section in a meteorological work (Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue, No. 6054), and no doubt many other passages, deal with our phenomenon. The most important and most comprehensive work, however, is from the pen of Ibn Sînâ in his Sâfi'û (see Bibl.).

The descriptions of the rainbow are in general very accurate. Not only the simple rainbow but also the double and even triple are described. The first is said to be produced by the sun’s rays themselves, the second by the rays shining through the rays from the first and the third by the rays from the first two; the bows therefore are successively weaker. It is emphasised that the rainbow is not always composed of the same colours, a phenomenon which has been fully investigated by M. Pernter. It is also mentioned that the rainbow is particularly beautiful when the sun is on the horizon.

The older treatment of the theory of the rainbow goes back to Aristotle, with whose meteorological works the Arabs were acquainted. Thâbit b. Kurra is said to have translated a commentary by Alphérédus (= Epaphroditos (?) on Aristotle’s essay on the rainbow (Ibn al-Kiftî, 59). Aristotle is followed by Ibn Sînâ, Ibn al-Hayîâm, al-Karâfî etc., although in many details they make additions and corrections to his views. It is always assumed that the rainbow is produced by beams of light or visual rays which are regularly reflected on the raindrops, on very minute reflecting surfaces. Kamâl al-Dîn al-Fârîsî (1300) gave a brilliant exposition of the colour explanation, as far as was possible in the general state of knowledge in his day, when the dispersion of light was unknown. Like us he says that the light is once or twice reflected in the interior of the globule of water and then radiates out from it; thus we have the main and secondary rainbow. He also endeavours to investigate the cause of the colours although, of course, not satisfactorily. By experiment he proves the correctness of his results, which are on a much higher level than those of Theodoricus of Freiburg (about 1300).

From kusah comes a word takâsî, meaning “showing the colours of the rainbow” or briefly, “the colours of the rainbow”. It is defined by Kamâl al-Dîn as “different graduated colours in the region between blue, green, yellow, red, smoke-coloured white, that is, as regards visual perception”.

The rainbow is also given an astrological significance according to the zodiacal sign in which it appears. In the Ram it means plague and death (Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue, No. 5906, al-Kaws *alâ'lam al-Sâñî). In another manuscript, (No. 5915, 1) it is said that in September a rainbow indicates great tyranny and oppression.


**KAWS KUZA—KAWTHWAR**

**KAWSARAH** is a little island on the coast of Tunisia, being a deformation of Cossyra, more easily discerned in the form attested and favoured by Bakri, sic. Kusaha. It must have been generally pronounced Küshra, then Arabised in the written texts, by assimilation to an Arab form, as Kawṣaра.

Lacking any great strategic or economic value, Kawṣaра figures little in the historical sources, and only a few of its items of information on it can be found in the Arabic sources. At the time of the invasion of Ifrikiyā in 276/474-8 by Abū Allāh b. Sa’d b. Abī Sarb [q.v.], the inhabitants of Djazirat Şahrī (Capo Bon) gathered at Cyperna and took refuge temporarily on Kawṣaра. Half-a-century later, in ca. 317/730, ‘Abd al-Malīk b. Kāţan—who ended up as governor of Spain—devastated the island, probably operating from Egypt as his base. Kawṣaра doubtless suffered further from attacks by the Muslim fleets which began to rove the Mediterranean. In the 10th/16th century Christians and Muslims wore the same garments and spoke the same language. According to Bonnet, a Provençal merchant enslaved at Tunis, whence he had managed to escape, this language was in fact the same as that spoken in Malta. It must therefore have been an Arabic already much transformed.

The island’s resources have always been fairly slight. Its woods provided wood of excellent quality, and wild goats are said to have been hunted. In mid-17th century, according to Bonnet, “the island’s trade consists entirely of wine, charcoal and wood which the people export to Sicily and Malta” (P. Grandchamp, *Un marchand provençal*, 14).


**KAWTHWAR**, a word used only once in the *Kurān* (CVIII, 1: “Yes, we have given you al-kauṭhawr”); the short Sūra CVIII is given the name surād al-kauṭhawr. The word comes from the root K-TH which is “to be abundant” in the Rasāʾil Iḥlāṣ al-Safāʾ, which is not rare (e.g. naafal: other examples in Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, i, 34). The kauṭhawr which occurs in ancient...
poetry (see quotations in Ibn Hishām, ed. Wiistenfeld, 261, and Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qorāns, i, 92) means "abundance". Some ancient writers of tafsīr interpret kawāthar in Kurān, CVIII, 1 as "abundant goodness" (al-khāyār al-kawāthir; cf. Ibn Hishām, op. cit.; al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xxx, 180-1). This etymological meaning, however, although it did not totally disappear, gave way to a traditional interpretation. According to this the Prophet himself regarded al-kawāthar as the proper name of a river in Paradise (cf. Ibn Hishām, 261 in fine, and specially al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xxx, 179), or as a pond which was shown to him at the time of his ascension to the Throne of God, and which was designated for him (al-Ṭabarī, ibid., 180; cf. A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, Cambridge 1932, 231). This last explanation is considered most credible by al-Ṭabarī; al-kawāthar was, then, becoming something almost synonymous with baḥd (q.v.), "the Prophet's pool", at which believers quench their thirst when entering Paradise. Its existence is affirmed in several "professions of faith". But more frequently al-kawāthar will be the river which feeds the pool. According to a subsequent idea (cf. Aḥwāl al-aqāma, ed. Wolff, 107), all the rivers of Paradise flow into the baḥd al-kawāthar, also called nahr Muḥammad, as specially belonging to the Prophet.

The most ancient Sūras already mention "the spring" (ṣawār), "the living spring" (ṣawār jāriyya) which waters Paradise (LXXVII, 41; LXXXVIII, 12 and passim); the Medinan Sūras describe in more detail the "rivers" (al-anhr). In XLVII, 15, for example: "There will be rivers there, the water of which is incorruptible, rivers of milk which never sour, rivers of wine sweet for those who drink of them, rivers of clear honey. This description suggests the rivers of Paradise of Judaeo-Christian eschatology, flowing with oil, milk, wine and honey. It is of note that oil is replaced by "incorruptible water" (ghayr āsin), so precious in the deserts of Arabia (cf. J. Horovitz, Das koranische Paradies, 9). Ḥadīths and tafsīrs delight in describing al-kawāthar on this same model. But taking into consideration the general meaning of "abundance", the "river of the Prophet" presents itself as the quintessence of the rivers of Paradise. In certain versions quoted by the Tafsīr of al-Ṭabarī it is said: "Its waters are whiter than the snow and sweeter than honey", or, "And its waters are of wine". Surpassing the Kurānīc description are others endowing it with "banks of gold" or a bed of "rubies and pearls" with a perfume "more penetrating than musk" (cf. Soubhi El-Saleh, La vie future selon le Coran, Paris 1972, 36 and ref.). Rationalising or modern tafsīrs easily lend a metaphoric sense to these details.

Bibliography: given in the article. The principal traditional references to al-kawāthar are (cf. Soubhi El-Saleh, op. cit., 36, n. 6 and Annexe I): Bukhārī, viii, 201; Rīdāh, 119; Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, ii, 112; Tirmidhī, ii, Tafsīr, to CVIII, 240; Ibn Mādhja, Zuhd, 307; later, Baḥgawād, Musāb-wal-iṣām, ii, Hadīd, 145; Rasd, 248; Kāyim al-Dhau-xiyā, Ḥādī l-arrāhīā ilā biḥlī n-afrah, 131, etc. (J. Horovitz - L. Gardet).

KAWUKLU, Turkish "the man with the Kaivos", a character of the Turkish Orta oyunu theatre. Turkish kaivos indicates a rather high, variously-shaped cap, with a headband, serif, which rounded it (Ağakay, Türk dilsözlük, sans serif sanrih başlık). Such caps of varying shape, and colour according to rank were worn by officers of the Janissaries (cf. Maḥmūd Shawket, "Qīnānīlī teşkilāt ve biyālet-i ʿaskerîsîyesi, Istanbul 1935, i, 29 ff.). Other professionals too had their own special ha 모습, the writer, wezir, molād, kāšif and paşāğlıh kaivos, some with specific names: kallâwi, ḥorâsâni, midişwezes, selim, Çerf (cf. Emin Cemken, Osmanlı sarayı ve biyâifleri, Istanbul 1948). In official language, even an Arabic plural ha 모습 was formed. However, the popular mind conceived of the Kaivos wearer in a different fashion: ha 모습 büyük ama alımsız sıfırdı yok, "an imposing cap but no gentleman underneath it"; ha 모습 salâmah, "to wave one's cap", i.e., "to say yes and amen to everything"; kaivos or dakkaivos, "coaxer or wheedler"; kaivos giydirmek, "to put on a cap", i.e., "to impose upon someone".

A special kaivos appears as one of the two main characters of the Turkish popular theatre Orta oyunu (q.v.). Such theatres had existed previously, but so far as we know, the term Orta oyunu occurs for the first time in 1833. The heyday of the Orta theatre was towards the end of the 19th century; it then became known in Europe through Kūns's descriptions. The hero of the comic play was the Kaivoslu, just like Karagoz (q.v.) in the shadow-plays. The other main character, Peşkekâr, was a kind of theatre-director, corresponding somewhat to Hağfeldvâ in the shadow-play. The Kaivoslu's dress, including a colban (aşlıbe) and trousers (şahvûl) was red, even the cap (see the plates in Kūns and Gerek's publications). Often appearing as a pedlar, artisan or servant, the Kaivoslu was a clown whose comedy lay in his misunderstanding the words of the other actors, his mindless execution of orders, which he twisted and exaggerated, his moderate bragging, slyness and ready wit, and his imitation (tafīl) of foreign voices and dialects, especially those of the non-Turks in the Ottoman Empire. Dextrous juggling was also part of his performance. Only the main lines of the action were known; the Kaivoslu had to improvise all the jokes, so that his performance was a demanding one. About 40 titles of plays, some identical with those of the shadow-play, are known, and 25 names of famous Kaivoslus have come down to us. Special mention should be made of Hamdî (d. 1917), Kel (d. 1917), Kel Hamdî (d. 1914), Kel Hasan (d. 1929) and Nâşit (1899-1938) (see Gövsa, Türk meşhurları anı silahînedd, with plates). Performances by these and other Kaivoslus are still remembered by the populace. Hamdî, when asked by Kūns where he had learnt his art, answered significantly that his uncle and comrades had been his teachers. In origin, the Orta theatre was probably influenced by foreign elements; Bombarci has suggested influences from Jews, Greeks and perhaps Gypsies.

During the Reform period, this type of theatre met with serious competition from the European theatre, and many modernists wanted to forbid it outright. At the time when modern-type stages were set up, Hamdî made an attempt with the so-called saflîrî oyunlar, but without real success. Kel Hasan was more fortunate and died a rich man. In recent times, the Orta theatre has almost completely disappeared and endeavours to revive it are only occasionally heard of.

Bibliography: I. Kūns, Orta-oyunun, Budapest 1888; idem, Das türkische Volkschauszpiel Orta oyunu, Leipzig 1908; J. Horovitz, Spuren griechischer Mimen im Orient, Berlin 1905; Selim Nûhet Gereç, Türk teamaşesi, Madâha, Karagos, Orta oyunu, Istanbul 1930; Th. Menzel, Madâha, Schattentheater und Orta oyunu, ArO Monographie x, Prague 1941; Nurullah Tilgen, Orta oyunu
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KAWURD b. Čağırı Beg Dawud, called also Kara Arslan Beg on his coins and by authors like Mirkhāt and Gurg, was the founder of an independent Saldıjk amirs in Kirmān which endured for some 140 years until the irruption into the province of Oghuz from Kūsrān. The origins of Saldıjk rule in Kirmān are obscure: there are discrepancies in the accounts of the sources, and the opening pages of Muhammed b. Ibrāhīm’s local history of Kirmān are missing. Kirmān had been recovered by the Būyids after the Ghaznavid occupation of 422/1031-2 (on which see E. Merçil, Genezilerin Kirmān hâkimiyeti (1031-1034), in Tarih Dergisi, no. 24 (1970), 35-44) and formed part of the amirate in southern Persia of ʻImād al-Dīn Abū Kālidār Marzubān. After the collapse of Ghaznavid power in Kūsrān, Saldıjk bands began raiding southwards through Kūşistān and Ṭabās to Kirmān. A raid on the chief town, Bardasr or Kirmān, was repulsed by Abū Kālidār’s viceroy Muhābahdībīh al-Dawla Hībatallah al-Fasawī in 434/1048-9. Saldıjk autonomy was therefore restored, and the Būyids were able to retain their hold on the main centres of Kirmān, Kufšt, Rayy, and Bāburq. Sanjar, son of Gurg, was defeated by the Khurāsānī governor in 439/1049 and the Būyids were able to establish a new amirate, which lasted until 456/1064. The origins of Saldıjk authority are obscure, but there is evidence for a separate line of Saldıjk amirs in the province from the time of ʻImād al-Dīn Abū Kālidār Marzubān. After the fall of Ghaznavid power in Kūsrān, Saldıjk bands began raiding southwards through Kūşistān and Ṭabās to Kirmān. A raid on the chief town, Bardasr or Kirmān, was repulsed by Abū Kālidār’s viceroy Muhābahdībīh al-Dawla Hībatallah al-Fasawī in 434/1048-9 (Ibn al-Athir, ix, 349); whether Kāwurd or Ibrāhīm Ināl was the leader of this foray is unclear. However, shortly before the Būyid amirs’ death in 440/1048-9, the rebellious Daylamī commander in Bāhār, Lāshkārtān, delivered the capital into Kāwurd’s hands, and Būyid rule was thus ended (Ibn al-Athir, ix, 349-50; Muhammed b. Ibrāhīm, 2-3).

Kāwurd now began a reign of over a quarter-century in his amirate, acknowledging the supreme suzerainty of Toghrīl Beg and then, somewhat grudgingly, that of his own brother Alp Arslan. Muhammed b. Ibrāhīm gives considerable information about his internal policy. Over the ensuing years, he proved himself an energetic and capable ruler in Kirmān. He behaved as an almost independent prince, with such insignia of royalty as the ceremonial emblem on documents (incorporating the Saldıjk bow and arrow motif), and the adoption of honorific titles such as ʻImād al-Dawla, found on his coins together with his fūghra. Like the Saldıjk amirs in other parts of Persia, he took care to win over the Persian official and religious classes, assigning them administrative and judicial positions and marrying several of his daughters to local ʿAlids. He retained in his service many of the local Daylamī soldiers, but his reputation also attracted to Kirmān considerable numbers of Turkmen, to whom land grants or iṣād’s were assigned. He established a high degree of public security, taking draconian measures against those notorious brigands, the Köfūs or Kuufs [q.v.], and was active in the charitable and public works expected of the wise Perso-Islamic ruler. He built caravanserais and baths, set up markers on roads through the desert, and built guard posts at strategic points (Muhammed b. Ibrāhīm, 10). One of his guard towers, still standing on the road from Bām to Sīstān at a point between Farsīs and Gurg, was identified as such by Sir Percy Sykes, Ten thousand miles in Persia or eight years in Iran (London 1902), 416. He maintained a high standard of coinage, according to Muhammed b. Ibrāhīm, 4, a piece of information confirmed by his extant coins, comprising dinārs and dirhams, and minted at Bardasr, Lāshkārtān and Shīrāz (see on these, C. Alptekin, Selçuklǔ paralar, in Selçuklǔ araştkrlarları dergisi, iii (Ankara 1971), 440, 554-60) and the transit trade across Kirmān to Sīstān, Iran and the Persian Gulf was also encouraged.

With regard to external policy, Kāwurd mounted an expedition across the Gulf from Hormuz and seized the former Būyid dependency of ʿUmān; he sent a force under one of his sons to Sīstān; and he came, together with Alp Arslan, to succour Toghrīl Beg during the Turkmen rebellion of 451/1059 led by Ibrāhīm Ināl. The situation in Fars, where the last Būyids were clinging to the vestiges of power, was his special concern. In 454/1062 he marched against the Shabānkārā’ī Kurdish leader Faḍlīya, defeating the latter and bringing about the final crumbling of Būyid rule in Shīrāz, though it was several years before Faḍlīya’s defiance was completely crushed and Faḍlīya himself killed by Alp Arslan’s forces in 461/1069.

Kāwurd had recognized Alp Arslan’s succession to their father Toghrīl Beg as Saldıjk ruler in the east, and in 456/1064 he recognised him as supreme sultan after Alp Arslan had appeared in Kirmān. Kāwurd was nevertheless restless under this subordination to his brother, and withdrew his allegiance from Alp Arslan in 456/1067 and only restored it when the latter came again with an army. On Alp Arslan’s death in 465/1072 he determined on a definite bid for power, basing his claim to overlordship in the Saldıjk family on his long experience as a ruler and commander, combined with his rights under the old Turkish principle of seniorate, the succession right of a senior, capable male member of the ruling family or clan, as against the young Malik Shāh’s claim to succeed his father. The armies of Kāwurd and Malik Shāh met near Hamadān in Dimādā I 466/January 1074 (thus in Husaynī; in Bundārī and Ibn al-Athir, in Shābānī/April). Many of the more traditionalist Turkmen elements in Alp Arslan’s old army inclined to Kāwurd’s side, and Kāwurd counted on wholesale defections; but Malik Shāh’s slave commanders and his Kurdish and Arab contingents held firm, and Kāwurd was defeated and captured. Malik Shāh was inclined towards mercy for his uncle, who at one point offered to retire to ʿUmān; it seems to have been the vizier Niẓām al-Mulk who connived at Kāwurd’s execution by strangling, or, according to some accounts, by poisoning (the fullest account of Kāwurd’s rebellion and death is in Husaynī, 56-8; see also Bundārī, 48, Rāwandi, 126-7, and Ibn al-Athir, x, 53-4). Malik Shāh nevertheless preferred to leave the isolated province of Kirmān as an autonomous unit, and restored it to Kāwurd’s son Rūk al-Dawla Sultan Shāh within a few months.

Bibliography: the salient events of Kāwurd’s career are to be found in the general sources on Saldıjk history, see Husaynī, Ahār al-dawla al-saldıjkīyya, Bundārī’s Zubdat al-nusaha, Rāwandī’s Rāhat al-sudr, Zahr al-Dīn Nīḥāpurī’s Saldıjkānāma, Ibn al-Athir, Barhebraeus, etc. Muhammed b. Ibrāhīm’s Taʾrīḫ-i Saldıjkīyyān-i Kirmān, ed. Houtsma in Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seloucides, i, Leiden 1886, ed. M. Bāstānī Pārlīzī, Tehran 1964, cf. Houtsma, Zur Geschichte der Seljuven von Kirmān, in ZDMG, xxxix (1889), 362-402, is supremely important as a special history of the dynasty. Information from the local histories of Kirmān is given in the text and notes of Muhammed Bāstānī Pārlīzī’s edition of Ahmad ʿAll Khān Wazīrī’s Taʾrīḫ-i Kirmān
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(SAADARIYAH), Tehran 1340/1961. Of secondary literature, see Sykes, A history of Persia, London 1915, ii, 102, and Bosworth, in Cambridge history of Iran, v, ch. 1. For Kawurd’s coins, see the monograph of Alptekin mentioned above.

(C. E. BOSWORTH)

KAWUS, BANU, an Iranian dynasty which reigned in the districts of Rayyán and Rustam-dar, the coastal plain and the mountainous interior respectively, of the western parts of the Caspian province of MazaNDARAN [q.v.] in the second half of the 9th/15th century and in the 10th/16th century. The dynasty was in fact one of the two branches into which the ancient line of the BÁDUSPÁNIDS [q.v.], whose genealogy went back to SÁSÁNID times, split in the middle years of the 9th/15th century.

The BÁDUSPÁNIDS had been confined to the fortress of Núr by the Caspian campaigns of Timúr in 794/1392, but the amir Kayúmarth b. Búsútún (807-57/1404-53) later regained control of Rayyán, where he forcibly introduced amongst the previously Sunnî population there the Shi‘í faith which he had acquired during exile in Shíráz. On his death after a 50 years’ reign, his eldest surviving son Káwús (857-71/1453-67) seized power, but had to agree to a partition of the BÁDUSPÁNID territories with his brother Iskandar. Káwús kept Núr and other parts of the piedmont of Rustam-dar, whilst Iskandar received the mountainous inland districts of Kúdiúr and Láridjian. The two lines continued in parallel down to the Safawid conquest. The adhesion of the Banú Káwús to the Shi‘í traditions of much of the Caspian region was strengthened by Káwús’s own marriage to a daughter of one of the Sayyids of Amul and by later alliances with the family of Máriṣášt Şayyids.

This inaccessibility of the dynasty's policy was largely one of local warfare against rival potentates in MazaNDARAN, often with help from neighbouring rulers in Gilán; thus in 910/1504 Búsútún b. Džihángür b. Káwús (904-13/1498-9 to 1507) succeeded in taking over all Rustam-dar and Kúdiúr, with the exception of the fortress of Kúdiúr itself, from the fraternal branch of the Banú Iskandar. The line of the Banú Káwús expired through a combination of internecine strife in MazaNDARAN and of outside intervention by the Safawid Shí‘í ʿAbbás I., determined now to assert the central government’s authority in the Caspian provinces. After bringing Gilán under control, the shah charged Farhád Kháñ in 1560/1064 with the subjugation of all the principalities of MazaNDARAN. Bahman b. Kayúmarth of the Banú Iskandar, at this time master in Láridjian and Amul, was removed and his death procured by a rival, after which his territories were granted to one of the shah’s Khalíbášy amirs. Džihángür b. ʿAzíz of the Banú Káwús was besieged in Kúdiúr, captured and executed, and his territories granted to the Kúrši-Bághi Alláh-Kúlí Beg. Both these lines of BÁDUSPÁNÍD epigoni were thus extinguished.

like Balasaghun [q.v.] it was destroyed at some time during the first half of the 8th/i4th century. 


**Kaykâns**, Iranian dynasty, for the most part mythical, which owes its name to the title of kavi (see *Gr. J. Ph.*). ii, s.v.) > Pahlavi kavi (pl. kayd, or in Arabic, akâydn) born by several persons, with some variants, in both the religious and the national tradition. A. Christensen has devoted to the dynasty a monograph, *Les Kayanides*, Copenhagen 1931, to which reference should be made for all the problems raised in regard to ancient Iran. 

The main source for all the Islamic historians and writers concerned with the dynasty is the *Kitâb Siyar muluk al-Ajam* the Arabic translation made by Ibn al-Mukatta* [q.v.].* of the *Khuday-nama*, but the earliest Arabic authors give only somewhat confused information on the more or less mythical rulers who preceded the Sasanids, leading one to think that they must have used other sources, especially oral ones (see, e.g., Ibn Kutayba, *Ma'ârif*, 652 ff.). Ibn al-Kâli, cited in *Mas'ûdî*, *Murâdî*, ii, 133-4 = § 558, even considers that the Kayanids were the first kings on the earth. *Mas'ûdî* himself, without instancing the Pishdâdids [q.v.], to whom he erroneously gives the name of Khudâhân (ii, 237 = § 659), in fact makes the Kayanids the second dynasty, to be followed by that of the Ar-saids (*Aškhân* [see *Mulûk al-Ta'awif]*) and finally that of the Sasanids [q.v.]. *Tabarî* before him, and then the later historians and writers, all follow the same classification without mentioning the Achaemenids as such. Firdawswi, for his part, devotes ca. 27,000 distichs to the Kayanids. 

In the religious tradition, a dozen personages bear the title of Kay, but the dynasty proper comprises, according to Islamic authors: 

**Kay Kубâd** (Kavi Kavata), the founder. The religious tradition (Christensen, *op. cit.*, 70-1) gives no information on his ancestors and confines itself to retelling the legend of the adoption by Uzâv (Arabic, Zaww/Zab), the last Pishdâdîd king, of a newly-born child abandoned on the waters. The national tradition (Christensen, 107-8) is unaware of this story and provided a genealogy making Kay Kûbâd a descendant of Manûshchîr and, through the false reading of the presumed name of his father, the son of Zaww/Zab himself. After this latter's death, Rustom [q.v.] was deputed to search out Kay Kûbâd, who was found in a palace in the Alburz Mountains. His reign was filled with prosperity, but was partly devoted to defending Iran against the Turkomans (see *Tabarî*, i, 533-4, 597; Bal'ami-Zotenberg, i, 407; *Dinawarî*, *Tawîl*, 14; *Thâ'âlibî*, *Hist. des rois de Perse*, 150-2; *Birûnî*, *Chronology*, 104; Ibn al-Balâgh, *Fars-nama*, 14; Firdawswi, *Shân-nama*, ed. and tr. Mohl, index). 

His successors were **Kay Kà'ûs** [q.v.], in whose reign there took place the epic fights between Siyavush and Afrasiyâb [q.v.], and then **Kay KURSÅW** [q.v.], who took vengeance on Afrasiyâb. There then followed: 

**Kay LûhRâb** (Lûrâsp), descendant of a brother of Kay Kà'ûs. He founded or enlarged the town of Balikh [q.v.], and it is said to have been he who sent against Palestine Nebuchadnezzar (Bukht-Nassar [q.v.]), who destroyed Jerusalem, dispersed the Jews and carried them off into captivity (however, Ibn Kutayba, *Ma'ârif*, 652, places these events in the reign of Bahman, contemporary of Moses). LûhRâb was killed by the Turks who came to besiege him (see Christensen, 117-18 and index; *Tabarî*, i, 620; *Mas'ûdî*, ii, 121-3 = §§ 544-6; *Dinawarî*, 26; *Makûdî*, *Badr*, on *Ma'ârif*, iii, 149; *Thâ'âlibî*, 244; Hamza al-Isfahânî, 36; Firdawswi, iv, 379-537). His son and successor **brûrsâb** (Kavi Vîhtispâ, Vîhtispâ, Bûhtîsâb, Kushtîsâb, Hystaspes) quarrelled with his father, so he went to Rûm, where he married the king's daughter and accomplished various exploits before returning home, where his father passed on to him the crown. He had reigned for 30 years when Zoroaster [see ZARADUSHT] converted him to his new religion. He had to face an attack from the Turks who finally carried off his two daughters, but his son Isfandiyâr (Sandyâd) rescued them, provoking however Bûhtîsâb's jealousy over his exploits, so that he sent his son to his death in charging him to attack Rustam, who was judged to have become too independent. Although legend dwells at length on this personage, Christensen considers it justified by the non-origine historique (see *Les Kayanides*, 119-24 and index; *Tabarî*, i, 416, 645-9, 657-8, 691, 813, 869, 1053; *Mas'ûdî*, ii, 123-7 = §§ 547-50; Hamza al-Isfahânî, 36-7, *Thâ'âlibî*, 255-377; Ibn al-Balâgh, 48-52; *Birûnî*, *op. cit.*, 105; *Makûdî*, *op. cit.*, iii, 149 ff.; Firdawswi, iv, 359-751). The throne then passed to his grandson 

**Bahman** (Vahman, son of Isfandiyâr, who was also called later Ardashîr or Kay Ardashîr in order to make him the ancestor of the Sasanîd dynasty. The history of his reign is influenced by outside traditions. Al-Mas'ûdî asserts that the return of the Jews to Jerusalem took place during his reign, and according to Dinawarî, Bahman had a Jewish wife who converted him for a while to Judaism; despite this, he is considered to have strengthened the Zoroastrian faith. He was a great builder, and was also a warrior-king who killed Rustam and avenged his father (see Christensen, index; *Tabarî*, i, 649-54; *Mas'ûdî*, ii, 127-9 = §§ 550-2; Hamza al-Isfahânî, 37; *Birûnî*, *op. cit.*, 105, 111; Bal'ami-Zotenberg, i, 501; Ibn al-Balâgh, 52 ff.; *Thâ'âlibî*, 379 ff.; Firdawswi, v, 7-19). Bahman is represented as the father and the spouse of 

**Kumây** [q.v.], who gave him a son, **Dârây/Dârây** [q.v.]. Darius I, whose successor was **Dârây/Dârây** II. In this fashion, the national tradition bridges the gap which separates the reign of Bûhtîsâb from Alexander's conquests, with the Achaemenids being mixed up with other lists of rulers. Humây, also called Cîhrázâd, is mixed up with a daughter of Bishtasb, and it was for a Humây that the kernel of the Thousand and one night was put together (see *Alf Layla wa-Layla*), a point which poses difficult problems. The descendants of Bahman form a fairly confused ménage; another son is attributed to him, Sâsân, who was set aside from the succession, but the Sasanîd dynasty is attached to him by a forged genealogy and the legitimacy of the line thereby assured. 

**Bibliography:** Given in the text. (Ed.)

**AL-KAYD**, name of a fictitious star, defined in the *Mafzûl* al-Sûlûm (ed. van der Tooren, Leiden 1805, 29) as nadîm makâs fî 1'ammâm la 'yûda wa-l-šâhad bi-yûda ma'ârif bi-yûda wâdil, "an ill-
Al-Kayd

The mentioned invisible star in the heavens, having a known ephemeris from which its position can be derived. It is not mentioned in LA and TA. Although occurring in at least one oriental text printed in Europe (Anonymous Persa de Sigillis Arabum et Persarum, ed. and tr. J. Gravius, London 1648), it seems to have escaped the attention of historians of astronomy, and was rediscovered independently by Hartner [390] and Kennedy [397]; see Ruska-Hartner [1], Hartner [1], and Kennedy [1].

The earliest mention of al-Kayd so far known is found in Ibn Hibintâ’s al-Mughni (Suter, No. 31), written in 214/829 (Bayer. Staatbibl., Munich, Cod. ar. 822, fols. 67v. and 71v.), where five of al-Kayd’s six companions (see below) are also listed. According to this work, al-Kayd is “one of the stars with a tail; it appears once every hundred years and travels retrogradely, like the lunar nodes, through the zodiac, making one sign in 12 years”. Its position is found in the following way: “Subtract 90 from the number of complete (Persian) years which have elapsed since the epoch of the Yazdagird era (17 June, 632). From the remainder subtract in turn the highest multiple of 144 which it contains. Multiply the second remainder by 360 and divide the product by 144. The result will give the longitude of al-Kayd measured backward from the first point of the zodiac. Subtract it from 360° to obtain the longitude as usually expressed” (Kennedy [1, p. 45]). Thus al-Kayd has a retrograde motion of 21°/4 per Persian year. It passed through the vernal point at the beginning (1st Farvardin) of the years of the Yazdagird era 91 (25 May 722), 235 (19 April 866), 379 (14 March 1010), 523 (6 Feb. 1154), 667 (1 Jan. 1298), etc. This rule is corroborated by a number of other manuscripts containing references to al-Kayd and tables of it. Others, however, are based on slightly divergent parameters. In the case of tables computed for the Islamic calendar, the divergencies, which concern the initial longitude in year 91 of the Yazdagird era as well as the mean motion, might be due to errors of computation, but since there are tables expressed in the Yazdagird calendar which are based on a defective initial longitude, various traditions concerning the motion of al-Kayd must have been in existence.

Thus Mîram Çelebi’s table in his Commentary on the tables of Uling Beg (Aya Solya Ms. 2697, fol. 241v.) gives the longitude of al-Kayd on the first day of A.Y. 655 as 29°52′47″, while according to the rule it should be 30′ straight (cf. Hartner 1, Pl. 5 and p. 21, where the last passage, caused by misreading 600 for 655, is to be cancelled). This implies that al-Kayd passed through the vernal point some 17 days before the beginning of A.Y. 91, on Asfandarmed 14 of A.Y. 90.

Kennedy [1, 50] gives a list of al-Kayd’s yearly and daily motions as well as of its longitude at A.Y. 91 according to various Islamic authors. Now the table of Shihâb al-Dîn al-Kûm-Râshî’s K. al-lum’â fi bal al-kawakhir al-sab’a, apparently copied from Ibn al-Shâ’î, to whom the author refers, operates with the same yearly motion of -2; 29, 59, 18° (sexagesimal fractions) and the same initial longitude as Ibn Yûnis’ Hâkimî sidjî, which proves that this value for the yearly motion, corresponding to a complete revolution of al-Kayd in 144 Persian years, 4 days, has a long tradition. Accepting that this was not accidental, Hartner [1, 14] has shown that al-Kayd passed through the point of summer solstice on 8 November 324 B.C., a day very close to the one accepted by numerous Islamic authors (al-Farghani, 1, 1, 22; al-Mas‘ûdî, al-Birûnî, Ibn Yûnis, Kûshyâr al-Dîhî) as the beginning of the era of the death of Alexander the Great: Thoth 1, 425 of the era Nabhâsrat b. 12 November 324 B.C., the Indian emperor actually died on 13 June 323 B.C.); this era, also called Aera Philippic Arrihiae, operates with vague years of 365 days, as does the era of Yazdagird. Certain particulars of the Islamic version of the Romance of Alexander seem to confirm this hypothesis of an actual connexion. Here above all the figure of Khâdir [42] has to be mentioned, which has a striking similarity with the Hindu demon Rûhû. Both are put to death after having sipped from the fountain of life (in India the amrita drink), but both survive because immortalised by the drink. Khâdir, having become a maleficent demon, is fettered with heavy chains to the bottom of the sea, while Rûhû’s head, severed from his body, and his tail, now called Ketu, become the intransigent enemies of the luminaries. In astrology (see Dawzahr) those two parts of the eclipse monster are identified with the lunar nodes. As these nodes behave like planets, making (a retrograde) revolution along the ecliptic in the course of 18.6 years, they are treated as such, with their exaltations (șiî̂îqî, askî̂̄fî) in Gemini and Sagittarius, and figure in horoscopes as maleficent stars; see Hartner 2, pp. 120-131.

According to another Indian tradition, however, Ketu takes the shape of a comet (dhîmâkêtoî, “smoke-ketu”) appearing at irregular intervals as a threat to the superior world and to mankind. Obviously, it is this manifestation of Ketu from which the Arabic al-Kayd was derived, semantically as well as etymologically. This is also attested by the fact that the only information to be drawn from Islamic authors is that al-Kayd is of Indian origin. At a time not yet definable on the basis of our present knowledge, the irregular cometary Ketu was incorporated into the system of astrology and, for this purpose, had to be regularised by ascribing to it planetary qualities and a uniform motion, retrograde along the ecliptic, in accordance with its closest relatives, the nodes of the lunar orbit. Thus the Indian Ketu found its way twice into Hellenistic astrology. It is evident that various traditions concerning the motion of al-Kayd must have been in existence. The recollection of the cometary origin of al-Kayd is clearly alive for Islamic authors, as is shown by the fact that al-Kayd is often listed together with six companions called kawakhir dhamst al-adnhb, “stars with tails”, travelling the ecliptic retrogradely with the same velocity, and thus at a constant distance from al-Kayd. According to the best extant manuscripts, among which the sidjî of Djamâl al-Dîn Abîl-Kâsim b. Maḥfûz (Paris, Bib. Nat. 2486,

KAYDU, the son of Kshiti, the fifth son of the Great Khan Ögedey, was born according to Djamál al-Karšál ca. 633/1235-6. The statement, still sometimes repeated, that he took part in the campaigns in Eastern Europe in 637-8/1240-1 is due to a confusion with his uncle, Kadan. Upon the accession of the Great Khan Môngke, he was ordered to reside in the region of Kayallí [q.v.]. Upon the election of Kubilay [q.v.] to the Khánate, he took part of the latter's brother Argh Böke in the civil wars that followed. When Argh Böke surrendered to the Great Khan, Kaydu continued the struggle, remaining in open or latent hostility to Kubilay and his successor Temür Öljeytú throughout the remainder of his life. He opposed Burák [q.v.]. Kubilay's nominee to the Caghatay Khánate [q.v.] but they afterwards reached an agreement with each other and for thirty years the Houses of Ögedey and Caghatay worked in harmony under the leadership of Kaydu. The accounts of his death are contradictory. He appears to have been wounded in a battle with the Great Khan's forces and to have died shortly afterwards. His death occurred, according to Kšāhnā, in Rājab 702/February-March 1303, at a place called Kulan Bashl in the vicinity of Karakorum.


KAYGHUSÚZ ABDÁL (?-818/-819), Turkish mystic poet and writer of the 8th-9th/14th-15th centuries, generally considered the founder of the Bektaşi Darüşşüle literature. The little which is known about his life is half legendary and based on traditional writings of the order. Ahmed Sirrí Baba, the only author who gives exact dates for his life, does not mention his sources (al-risála al-ahmadíyya fi ta'rib al-tariqa al-bektashíyya, Cairo 1352, quoted by A. Gölpınar, *Türk tasavvuf Şírî anklojiyesi*, Istanbul 1972, 174). Kayghusúz seems to have been a disciple (muriç) of Abdal Mâş (whose shrine is in Elmali near Antalya), a follower of Hádîdî Bektaş of Khurásân (d. 660/1220), the patron of the Bektaşíyya, who himself was a
disciple of Bâbâ İshâk, the leader of the famous religio-social Bâbâ'î revolt of 638/1240 against the Seljuks. Kayghusuz spent several years in Egypt, at the beginning of the 9th/10th century, where, according to tradition, he founded the Bektâşî convent, which became one of the most important centres of the order. His ideological formation can be traced to Bâbâ'î and Bektâşî influences and his literary personality, particularly in language and style, owes much to Yûnis Emre, the great mystic poet of 7th-8th/13th-14th centuries, who also seems to have been exposed to the influence of the heterodox Bâbâ'î movement (q.v.).

Subtle irony, satirical humour and a strong joie de vivre characterize Kayghusuz' poetry, and his fluent, vivid, powerful prose created popular mystic works (Risâle-i Kayghusuz, Kitâb-i Maghla, Kiîb-i Dilgûşhî â Budalî-name) which are among the masterpieces of early Ottoman Turkish literature. Kayghusuz' works have not been edited. Lithographic editions are not reliable. His poems are frequently confused with those of Kayghusuz Vizeli 'Alî d- Din, a 10th/16th century popular mystic poet of the Malamatiyya order. For comparatively reliable Ms. texts of Kayghusuz Abdal see the medimnu, Nuru Osmanîye, no. 4904; Ankara General Library, Ms. nos. 169, 824 and 867, and Istanbul Belediye Library, Cevdet section Ms. no. 216. For selections, see Bibliography.

**Kaygılı, Öthmân Djamâl** (modern Turkish Osman Cemâl Kaygîli), Turkish novelist, short story writer and humorous essayist (1890-1945). He was born in an Istanbul suburb outside the city walls, the son of a local grocer. He lost his parents at an early age and, after finishing the neighbourhood high school, he was trained as an army clerk and worked in various departments of the General Staff (1906-13). Following the assassination of the grand vizier Mahmûd Şewket Paşa in June 1913, he was arrested together with many "suspects" of the opposition and banished to Sinop on the Black Sea, where he wrote his long short-story Çumâlî Şeyhînîn Khâlefi (published later in Alay, 5, February 1920). Some of his short stories, particularly Refik Kâmil Karay (q.v.), who was already a celebrity, encouraged him and induced him to become a professional writer. Released from Sinop, he continued to serve, during World War I, as an army clerk in various military units in Anatolia. Following a serious illness he returned to Istanbul in 1917 and was discharged because of disability in 1918 at the age of 28. He devoted the rest of his life to his literary work, making his living by odd jobs and later by teaching in various schools. He died in Istanbul in 1945.

Öthmân Djamâl Kaygîli began his career as a humorous writer and from 1920 onwards contributed to a great number of dailies (e.g. Şabîh, İhdâm, Aşkâm, Wâbi, Aflâbî, etc.) and periodicals, particularly Alay, Aydede, Aâbâba and his own shortlived Ayine (Ayna, 1921-23). Most of these writings, including some short stories and novels and his memoirs (Aşamcîlar serialized in Aşkâm 1936-37), have not been published in book form.

Kaygîli belongs to the school of Turkish writers and novelists who, during the last decades of the 19th and early 20th centuries, produced works which were inspired by the technique and style of traditional Turkish folklore and popular story-tellers, and were addressed to and enjoyed by larger audiences than the works of the elitist writers of the same period. Kaygîli adopts on the one hand the informal technique, free and easy style and familiar digressions of Ahmed Mîdhât, with his sympathy and understanding for the way of life of simple folk, and on the other follows Hüseyin Rahîm Gûrpinar and partly Ahmed Râsim, in their concentration on observing and describing Istanbul lower and lower-middle class life in the suburbs. He himself belonged to this world and spent most of his life in its midst. He is, however, a less brilliant and more limited and modest successor of his outstanding masters. But his emphasis on details of Istanbul folklore and the study of certain types (particularly gypsies, refugees from the Balkans (muçaris), street children, popular singers and musicians, etc.) characterise his work, which contains invaluable documentary material for Istanbul suburban life for the period between the two World Wars.

Kaygîli's main published works are: 1) Eşkıya Gûzeli, Istanbul 1925 (collection of short stories); 2) Sandalim Gelyor Yvardî (two long short-stories), Istanbul 1938; 3) Çingeneîn (a novel on the life of gypsies outside Istanbul city walls, considered his best work), Istanbul 1939 and 1943; and 4) Aşgîr Fatma (a sentimental love story), Istanbul 1944. He wrote several plays, in which he himself acted, produced puppet plays and tried to revive the Karagöz and Orta Oyuncu theatres (q.v.). His only published play is Üfârînî ("The Curer by Breathing"), Istanbul 1935. His remarkable contributions to research into Istanbul folklore have been published in articles or serialised in various Istanbul dailies. Only his studies on Istanbul slang (Istambul Argosu Lügâti, Istanbul 1936) and on the coffee-houses where popular poets-singers performed (Istambul Semai Kâşeleri ve Meydan Şairleri, Istanbul 1937), have been published in book form.

**Kâyi**, one of the Oghuz tribes to which, as claimed by some Turkish chroniclers, the Ottoman dynasty belongs. The Kâyî were considered as the noblest of the Oghuz tribes. The high prestige which they enjoyed seems to have rested on the fact that most of the rulers or şahbûs of the Oghuz people living along the Syr Daryâ (Sayyûn = Jaxartes) during the period between the 9th and 11th centuries were from this tribe. Some of the names of these kings are mentioned in the chapter of Djamâl-ı tawârîxh dealing with the legendary history of the Oghuz Turks. However, the Kâyî tribe appears to have played a major rôle in the conquest and settlement of Anatolia, and consequently there are more place-names in Anatolia called after this tribe than any other tribe. What is really remarkable, however, is that in addition to the abundance of such place-names, there were in Turkey large Kâyî organizations living a tribal existence in the Denizli, Menteşe
A small branch of the Kayl who had not emigrated to the west was left behind among the Transcaspian Turkomans, but these people surprised some European travellers when they told them that the Ottoman dynasty had originated from their tribe. The earliest chronicler to claim that the Ottoman dynasty belonged to the Kayl tribe was Yaziği-oghlu Ali, who wrote his work during the reign of Murad II (824-55/1421-51). Although this claim can be questioned, it has some probability. The use of the Kayl emblem as the official emblem of the Ottomans begins with the reign of Murad II. The Kayl emblem is seen on coins struck during his reign, as well as on the weapons belonging to his successors; many weapons on display in the Topkapı Museum bear this emblem, and such emblems are quite similar to those given in e.g., Diżmiş al-tawāridh. Through its connection with the Kayl, the son of Gün Khan, the eldest son and successor of Oghuz Khan, the Ottoman dynasty considered itself superior in nobility to other Turkoman dynasties, and to the sons of Çingiz Khan.


KAY KÄ'US, mythical second king of the line of Kayânids [q.v.] whose name contains twice over the royal title kay (Kay Õş > Kā'ūs). His history has been delineated by A. Christensen from the Iranian religious tradition and from the national tradition echoed by the later Muslim historians (Les Kayanides, Copenhagen 1931, 73-90, 108-14). This Islamic historical tradition makes him the son of Kay Ablweh > Abih (except for Bal'ami, Firdawsi and al-Tha'labi, who make him the son of Kay Kubdî [q.v.].) He was a warrior-king who, according to Firdawsi, led a coalition with the help of Mazandaran, which was inhabited by demons and protected by the white diy (diy-i sefid), who caused a hail of stones to come down on the royal army during the night. Rustam son of Zāl [q.v.] set out to deliver the king from imprisonment, and on his way became the hero of seven adventures which have become celebrated in poetry; the white diy was overcome in his sleep and the blood from his heart restored their sight to the king and his army.

This ruler protected his country, and was clement towards the weak but severe against the powerful. He enjoyed the divine favour and the heaven, the masterpiece of which was dangled pieces of meat fixed on spikes.

KAYKÂUS, name of two Saljukid sultans of Kûn (Asia Minor). KAYKA'US i. Succeeding his father Kaykhusraw I [q.v.] after the battle in which the latter perished (608/1211), he at first had to ride himself of the rivalry of his brothers Kayferldun and Kaykubadh [q.v.]. After that he had no further internal difficulties. His reign is particularly marked by the combination of a policy of peace towards the Greeks of Nicaea with interventions on the southern, northern and eastern frontiers. In the south, where Kaykhusraw had taken Anšāliya, he tried to combine interventions against the Armenians of Cilicia, carried out in favour of the Latin prince Bohemund IV of Antioch and his ally al-Ẓâhir of Aleppo, with trade treaties with the Cypriots and the Venetians. In the north, the great success of his reign was the acquisition of Sinop, a new maritime outlet, this time for the Black Sea; this port had the advantage of not belonging clearly either to Nicaea or Trebizond. There he collected a fleet, to be directed specially against the Crimeans. But when Kaykâus, after the death of al-Ẓâhir in 613/1216, tried to conquer Aleppo on behalf of his vassal of Samosata, the exiled Ayûbîd al-Afdal [q.v.], he was defeated by the Ayûbîd of Mesopotamia al-Asbaf [q.v.]. He tried to take revenge by organising an anti-Ayyûbîd coalition with the help of Mawsil, but he died before this project could be realized (618/1220). He had kept up good relations with Bahramshâh of Erzindjan and al-Mughîb of Erzurum, his neighbours in Asia Minor, and also with the caliph al-Nâşir [q.v.] whom he conciliated by adhering to his reformed futuwwa [q.v.]. He may also have encouraged the expansion of literature written in Persian, which was then beginning in his territories, and showed an interest in Şî fís in the person of Ibn 'Arabî [q.v.]. The same period is by and large the one in which began the real development of cities, architecture, mosques, madrasas, caravanserais, etc., a list of which cannot however be given here.

KAYKA'US ii. Izz al-dîn, son and one of the successors of Kaykhusraw II, who had left in Asia Minor three minor sons: the eldest, Izz al-Dîn, son of a Greek woman; the second, Rûkân al-Dîn Kilîôg Arslân, son of a Turkish woman, and the youngest who was ailing, 'Aliâl al-Dîn, son of a Georgian woman. For several years the high dignitaries, in particular the freedman Karatay, who exercised the real power, tried to maintain a kind of condominium of the three brothers, and then of the two remaining after the suspicious death of the youngest during a mission to the Mongols. But when Izz al-Dîn and Rûkân al-Dîn had attained their majority, this policy has been repelled by Kay Kā'ûs' son Siyâwûsh [q.v.], but she now spread calumnies against him in the king's presence; he had to flee for refuge with Afraşîyâb, but the latter finally killed him. Kay Kā'ûs is said to have reigned 50 years; he was stripped of the throne by Kay Khusraw [q.v.] and imprisoned till his death.
proved to be impossible. In fact, the opposition of the two princes was based on the attitudes which they represented and on the milieus which supported them. Rukn ad-Din, who exercised his prerogatives in the eastern part of Asia Minor, relied upon the Mongols with whom he was in contact, and upon their trusted official at his court, the *Parasüdna Mu'n ad-Din Sulaymán* [q.v.]. *Izzi ad-Din*, who reigned in western Asia Minor and was allied with his Greek family and the Turkmen groups on the frontier, represented the latter. A series of complicated episodes marks this struggle: at the death of Karatay (652/1254), Rukn ad-Din revolted at Kayseri and was taken prisoner, but two years later the Mongols invaded again Anatolia under the command of Bayduq. This invasion was in a way more dangerous than the one of 641/1243, because its aim was the very settlement of a part of the Mongols in Asia Minor, by which their exactions would consequently increase. *Izzi ad-Din*, defeated in a battle in which they had fallen together, was exiled at Nicea (1256), and Rukn ad-Din was proclaimed sultan at Kayseri. But when he left to pay homage to the supreme Khan, *Izzi ad-Din* reappeared at Konya (655/1257). The Khan Mongke, who wanted their common collaboration or at least peace between the Mongols and the Latins, adopted the latter's anti-Mongol attitude. But when the latter had left, they started their struggle again. *Izzi ad-Din*, menaced by the Mongols, had to flee, this time for good, to Constantinople, which his old friend Paleologus had reconquered from the Latins. But this flight turned out unlucky for him. The new Emperor, desirous to turn all his forces against the Latins and the Mongols of Russia, tried to make peace with the Mongols of Iran and Asia Minor, who in turn had just broken off relations with those of Russia. Imprisoned on the northern borders of the Byzantine state, *Izzi ad-Din* was freed by a Mongol raid, but he was only able to withdraw to the Crimea, from where he could observe the events in Asia Minor. Without having tried to recover his throne, he died there in 678/1279-80.

A certain number of Turks who had followed him remained in Dobrudja, where they still carry his name, deformed into the Gagauzes [see Dobrudja]. In Asia Minor his popularity among the Turkmen was attested by revolts made in his name and by the support which his sons were to find there later on. It is certainly not by chance either that the great Turkmen epic of the *Dânsûmdânâmâ* was in its first form dedicated to him.

**Bibliography:** Anticipating the article *salûqûdos*, the essential bibliography relative to the 7th/13th century before 1243 and to the period of the Seldûk-Mongol condominium is given here. For a larger, descriptive bibliography, see C. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, London 1968, 427-40.

a. From the end of the 6th/12th century to 1243.

Muslim Anatolian sources were only written down during the second period (in Persian), but go back to the first. The most important is Ibn Bibi, *al-Awâmîr al-Âlîyya*, facs. edn. of the unique ms. by Adnan Erzi, Ankara 1956, critical edn. started by the same and Necatî Lugal,—Vol. 1, the only one published, 1937; a somewhat abridged version was published in 1902 by M. Th. Hoursima in *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoukides*, iv; German tr. of this, with additions from the original, by H. Duda, *Die Seldschuken-geschichte des Ibn Bibi*, 1959. For this period see also in second place the anonymous *Tarîkh-i al-Seleuk*, facs. edn. with Turkish tr. by Nafiz Uzuluk, 1952.

The Arab sources are those of the *Ayyûbîd* period; see *Ayyûbîd*. Important for the present purpose is the * Zubâdî of Kamâl ad-Dîn b. al-Adîm of Aleppo*, ed. Sâmi Dahân, iii, and the *Ta'rikh Manşûrî* of Muhammed b. Nazîf ad-Hamawl, facs. edn. by P. Gryaznevitch, Moscow 1960 (unpubl. German tr. at the University of Vienna).

Use should also be made of the Christian sources in Armenian, Syriac, Greek, and occasionally even Latin. The Armenian sources include those of Armenia proper and those of Cilicia. For the period under consideration only the latter are really important, the main being the *Historien Royal* (perhaps = Sempad the Constable, ed. Akellan 1956, partial English tr. by S. Der Nersesian, complete French tr. by G. Dédéyan, doctoral thesis, Sorbonne, Paris 1973 (to be published). The Georgian sources have been sufficiently collected in M. F. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, 2 vols., i, 1849. The contributions of the Byzantine sources (above all Nicetas Akropolites, Pachymeres) have conveniently been gathered in B. Lehmann, *Die Nachrichten des ... über die Seltschuchen*, 1939.

Important is the *Chronography of Bar Hebraeus* [*see IBN AL-ŠUʕEB*] in Syriac (which is better than the Arabic version), ed. and tr. E. W. Budge, 1932. An anonymous Syriac chronicle reaching the year 1235 has been published by J. B. Chatot in the *Corpus Scriptorum Orientalium*; a translation of the part dealing with this period is still awaited.

Of special interest for the transition between the two periods are the lengthy extracts from the Latin missionary Simon de St. Quentin in *Beauvais*’ *Speculum Historiale*, recently grouped and translated by J. Richard under the title *Histoire des Tartares*, 1966.

The majority of the inscriptions which have been published in various publications have been brought together, with a bibliography, in *RCEA*; many coins have been described in S. Lane-Poole, *Catalogue of the oriental coins in the British Museum*, viii, and in Ahmed Tevhid, *Catalogue des anciennes monnaies islamiques du musée d'Istanbul*, iv, 1904. Acts of *wâls* of various periods of the 7th/13th century have been published, especially by Osman Turan in *Belleten* (1947-8). For archaeology, see articles on the various cities.


b. From 1243 to the beginning of the 8th/14th century.

To Ibn Bibi (extending to 1280) and to the anonymous *Ta'rikh* can now be added Karîm ad-Dîn Mahmûd Aşkârây, *Musâmeret til-ahkhâr*, ed. Osman Turan, 1947 (German analysis by Fikret Işiltan, 1943). Among the many Arabic sources of the period of the first Mamlûk, special attention should be given to Baybars al-Manşûrî (unpublished) for the middle of the 7th/13th century and to the *Life of Baybars* of *Izzi ad-Dîn* b. Shâddâd. The second part of the latter, the only one to be found so far, is still unpublished but a Turkish translation has been published by Şarafuddin Yaltkaya (*Baybars Tarîhi*, Istanbul 1941); the first part is extensively used
by various authors, especially by Yunmi, ed. Hyderabad 1954-5. Several Armenian authors from Greater Armenia mention the Mongols of eastern Asia Minor, but only the Historien Royal pays attention to Anatolia proper. The Greek historians to be consulted are again Pachymeros and Nicephoros Gregorais, ed. with Latin tr. in the Bonn Corpus.

To the recent general bibliography can now be added Paruk Süméns, Anadolu'da Şogunlar, in Selçuklu araştırmaları dergisi, 1 (1969-70), 1-147; Necat Kaymaz, Perdına Mu'ti'inden Sülleyman, 1970; S. Vryonis, The decline of medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the process of Islamization in the Xith-XVth century, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1971.

(C. I. CAHEN)

KAY KÃ‘ÜS b. ISKANDAR, prince of the Ziyârid dynasty in Persia and author of a well-known "Mirror for Princes" in Persian, the Kãbas-nãma.

Ünûr al-Maâlî Kay Kã‘üs was the penultimate ruler of the line of Ziyârîds [q.v.] who ruled in the Caspian provinces of Tabaristan or Mâzandaran and Gurgân in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries. His main claim to fame lies in the Kãbas-nãma, written in 475/1082-3, when he was 63 years old, for his favourite son and intended successor, Gîlân-Shãb. The little that we know of his life must be gleaned from historical sources like Ibn Isfandiyar's Ta'rikh-i Tabaristân and from the Kãbas-nãma itself. We know that he spent eight years as a boon-companion of the Ghaznavid Sultan Mawdûd b. Masûd (reigned 433-40/1041-84), accompanying him to India, and some time also with the Shaddâsid Amir Abû '1-Aswar Shawur (413-49/1022-57) in Gurgân. His claim to fame lies in the Kãbas-nãma, written in 475/1082-3, when he was 63 years old, for his favourite son and intended successor, Gîlân-Shãb. The little that we know of his life must be gleaned from historical sources like Ibn Isfandiyar's Ta'rikh-i Tabaristân and from the Kãbas-nãma itself.
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KAY K Õ U S — KAY K HUSRAW
him the devastations caused by the Turanians, and he swore to undertake a war of retaliation against them. With the help of all the nobility, he launched various expeditions, of which the first ones, despite the prowess of Gudarz, failed because of the cowardice of Burzfarrah/Fariburz. The second ones, however, were crowned with success. Kay Khusraw fitted out four armies, the main one of which was given to Gudarz, who secured a decisive victory over Turan, whilst the other ones surrounded the enemy; Afrasiyab himself took to flight, but was overtaken and killed by Kay Khusraw, who thereby avenged the death of his father.

After Afrasiyab's death, peace reigned and the king soon retired from power, handing on the crown to Luhrasb. He set forth on a great journey and disappeared mysteriously after having washed himself in a spring, whilst a group of his companions perished in a snow storm.

Bibliography: Tabarsi, i, 604 ff.; Dinawari, Tawdih, 19-23; Tha'fisibii, Hist. des rois de Perse, ed. and tr. Zotenberg, 218-43; Hamza al-Isfahâni, 36; Mas'udi, Murûdî, ii, 120-1 = §§ 543-4; Makdisi, al-Bad' wa'l-tarikh, iii, 149; Firdawsi, Shâh-nâma, ed. Vullers, ii, 670-9, 701-3, 710, iii, 1442 = ed. and tr. Mohl, ii, 466-30, 462-5, 576-iv, 273; Ibn al-Ballighi, Fârs-nâma, 44 ff. (Cl. Huart *)

KAYKHUSRAW, name of three Saljûqid sultans of Rum.

KAYKHUSRAW I, son and one of the successors of Kilij Arslân II [q.v.]. When the latter, at the age of about seventy, decided ca. 583/1187 to divide his territories among his ten sons, a brother and a nephew, Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kaykhûsraw got Sozopolis or Uluborlu, on the borders of the Byzantine territory, perhaps because he was the son of a Byzantine mother. He thus came in contact with Greek Christians on one side, with groups of Turkmen frontier warriors (îdâd) who were pushing forward in that direction on the other. When jealousy arose among the brothers and one of them, Kûtb al-Dîn, laid hands on their old father, the latter appealed to Kaykhûsraw, who restored him to his throne in Konîa. But after Kilij Arslân had died (588/1192), Kaykhûsraw proved incapable of having his supremacy recognised by his brothers. Some of them even began to conquer for themselves parts of the other's heritage. Rûkûn al-Dîn, heir to Kûtb al-Dîn who had died in 593/1197, reconquered Konîa and restored to his own profit the unity of the paternal heritage, while Kaykhûsraw withdrew to his original base near the Byzantine feudal lord Maurozomos. However, when Rûkûn al-Dîn directed his policy towards conquests to the east of Anatolia, certain Turkmens became discontented. With their help Kaykhûsraw, after the death of Rûkûn al-Dîn, who left only a minor son, reconquered, this time definitively, the whole of the reunified state of Rum (601/1205). Kaykhûsraw had locally intervened in various directions in the quarrels which were then devastating the Byzantine Empire. In 1204 the Latins had captured Constantinople and a limited Greek kingdom under Theodore Lascaris had come into existence in Asia Minor with Nicea as its capital. Lascaris was on bad terms with Maurozomos, whom Kaykhûsraw first took with him to Konîa but for whom he later obtained the cities of Khunas and Laodicca (the later Denizli) that were contested between the two states. Maurozomos is probably the personage whom Ibn Bibi calls the "Commnenos amir", who for twenty-five years played an important part in the Saljûqid state.

Lascaris and Kaykhûsraw both had a common interest in peace, but the latter's attention, in opposition to his predecessor's, was no less attracted to the interest the Saljûqid state might have in expansion in western Asia Minor. He tried to expand his territory at the expense of the remains of the Byzantine Empire, which had no defenders left between Nicea and Trebizond or Armeno-Cilicia. If he could not secure again a foothold on the Black Sea at Samsun, recently occupied temporarily by the Turkmen, he obtained on the other hand a very important success by acquiring, on the southern coast of Anatolia, Antalya, which was the first real maritime outlet the Saljûqid state had ever possessed. Shortly afterwards, however, the relations between Kaykhûsraw and Lascaris again became strained. The Latin or Greek enemies of the latter, together with the insubordination of the Turkmen, frontier warriors had undoubtedly something to do with this development. In 608/1211 the two rulers were opponents in a battle near Antioch of the Meander; Kaykhûsraw remained victorious, but was killed under obscure circumstances. There was never more to be any considerable war between the two states.

Kaykhûsraw, who had received from his father a name derived from Iranian mythology, gave analogous names to his two sons, sc. Kaykûhûs and Kaykubûd. In his time interest in Persian literature was growing, and since the Saljûqids of Iran had disappeared, their Anatolian relatives had become the representatives of the former's Iranian tradition. Hence when the Persian author Râwandi wrote the history of the Iranian Saljûqids, he dedicated his work to Kaykhûsraw.

Bibliography: see KAYKHûS's.

KAYKHUSRAW II, son and successor (in 634/1237) of Kaykubûd [q.v.].

The very power of his father was at the root of some of the difficulties that manifested themselves under his reign. Together with the Mongol invasion that took place in his days, they led to the catastrophe from which the Saljûqid state was never to recover.

He was not the successor-designate of Kaykubûd, who for political reasons had chosen as such one of the two sons he had had by his Ayyûbîd wife. But Kaykhûsraw II was the eldest son and the only one already to possess real power. His "usurpation" resulted in a series of executions which accentuated the anti-aristocratic policy of Kaykubûd. Not only his half-brothers and their mother were strangled, but many amirs and high dignitaries were put to death and the Khâdżamians who had settled in Asia Minor were forced to flee. Even Sa'd al-Dîn Köpek, his counsellor in all this, was done away with. This policy, in order to be acceptable, had to be accompanied by military successes. Like his father at the end of his reign, Kaykhûsraw II tried above all to drive away his Ayyûbîd rivals from his southeastern frontiers and perhaps to build up a bulwark in the east against the Mongols.

The death of the two powerful Ayyûbîds al-Kâmîl and al-Asrâfîravoured him. Aliyng himself with the many enemies of al-Kâmîl's son al-Sâlih, who attacked the latter in Mesopotamia and Syria, Kaykhûsraw II succeeded in taking possession (639/1241) of Âmid, the strategic key to the upper basin of the Tigris. He married a Georgian princess and, with the obligation of military help, obtained a certain suzerainty over the Ayyûbîds of Aleppo, the Armenians of Cilicia, the "Empire" of Trebizond
and even to a small extent over that of Nicaea (while negotiating with the Latins of Constantinople about a marriage), Friar Simon of St. Quentin, a missionary who was staying in Rûm at that time, where he was well received by the sultan, never tires of giving high praise to the latter's richness and power.

However, signs of interior weakness appeared among the decimated aristocratic groups and even more among the Turkmen. From the very beginning, there had been differences of attitude between the officials of the régime who were urbanised, islamised and semi-iranised, and the semi-nomad Turkmen who were much closer to their ancestral traditions than to the exigencies of a civilized state. Their number and problems had increased by the drive of the Khârazmians and Mongols. They were ripe for propaganda, which normally took a religious form, such as the maddâs [q.v.] movement which kept the best Saldjukid troops occupied for three years in central Asia Minor before being ostensibly crushed by the interventions of Frankish mercenaries. The real root of the problem remained, however, untouched.

Shortly afterwards there appeared on the frontiers of Rûm the first real Mongol army ever to be seen there under the command of Tugji.

In the winter of 1243-4, helped by treacheries previously prepared, the Mongols captured Erzûrûm and in spring they started conquering Asia Minor proper. As a matter of great urgency, Kaykhusraw II asked his Muslim and Christian neighbours, reconciled by the common dangers, for reinforcements of all possible means. The impatience of some and the panic of others induced Kaykhusraw II to face the Mongols without waiting for all these contingents to arrive, but with an already very heterogeneous army. He was utterly defeated (6 Muharram 641/26 June 1243) by the Mongols at Köse Dağ, between Erzindjian and Sivas. A few days later they took Sivas and Kayseri. The sultan, having hastily collected his treasures, fled at once to Antaliya in western Anatolia. In a certain way, he momentarily outlived his power, his vizier Rukn al-Dîn Kilidj Arslân, he always remained a puppet, first in the hands of Muhammed al-Dîn, and after his death (1277), in the hands of vizier Faḫr al-Dîn ʿAll. At his majority, he put himself personally under the protection of the Mongol Khân Abâka. But when one of his cousins, Masʿûd, son of Izz al-Dîn Kaykâdūs, disembar ked in Asia Minor from the Crimea, Abâka granted Kaykhusraw, at least theoretically, suzerainty over the Karâmanîd territory. After the death of Abâka, Kaykhusraw III compromised himself in the revolt of Kangîrây against the new Khân Ahmad. The latter, whose policy was totally opposite to that of his predecessor, then conferred the sultanate on Masʿûd and ordered Kaykhusraw to be strangled (1284). The unfortunate sultan's widow and minor sons, however, soon obtained the western half of the former sultanate from Ahmad's successor Arghun, but the only result was that Masʿûd ordered them in their turn to be put to death (1285).

Bibliography: see Kaykâdūs.

Kaykûbâd, name of three Saldjukid sultans of Rûm.

Kaykûbâd 1, ʿAlâʾ al-Dîn was the most distinguished of the Saldjukid sultans of Rûm, to whom many later sovereigns would connect themselves. Removed from power by his brother and predecessor Kaykâdūs I [q.v.], he succeeded him in 628/1230. His foreign policy made his dynasty one of the most powerful of his time. In the south he enlarged his maritime frontiers, in particular by conquering Kalkan-Oros, renamed ʿAlâʾîyya, which he made his winter residence and the place of safe keeping for his treasury. On the Black Sea, he disputed the domination of Trebizond and organised, under the command of amîr Čupan of Kastamonu, the memorable maritime expedition which assured a Saldjukid protectorate over the Crimean harbour of Sughdâk. In the east, taking profit from rivalry among the Ayyubids, he annexed with the help of one of them, al-Šâfî, the Artûkîd possessions on the right bank of the Middle Euphrates. Forging ahead of the reinforcements requested by Dâwûd-Šâh, the Mangudjaḏid of Erzindjian, he annexed the latter's principality and made it an appanage for his eldest son Kaykhusraw [q.v.]. If it had not been for the invasion of the Khârazmians, the Saldjukid principality of Erzûrûm would have undergone immediately the same fate. The Khârazmians had conquered for their prince Diaľâl al-Dîn Mangubîrt [see Diaľâl al-Dîn Khârazm-Šâh] an ill-defined empire in Iran and Georgia. But further to the west they were continuously in search of a refuge against the growing Mongol pressure. They had just taken Akhlât, the key to Asia Minor, from al-ʾAshraf and were now about to attack the whole region. Kaykâbûd, who had not been dissatisfied at seeing his rivals weakened, urgently summoned to his aid both his former enemies and his friends. The main contingent, consisting of various Syrian troops, was brought to him by al-ʾAshraf. After hard fighting the Khârazmians were crushed at Yasi-Cumen, to the west of Erzindjian. The principality of Erzûrûm was taken away from its prince, Diaľân-Šâh, who had taken the side of Diaľâl al-Dîn. Under the pretext that a Mongol raid had taken place through the territory of the Georgians, Kaykûbâd took away from them several frontier strongholds (thence, in order to restore peace, the wedding-project of Kaykûbâd with the Georgian heiress [see Kaykhusraw]), and occupied in his turn the ruined Akhlât, in which al-ʾAshraf had lost interest. The territory of the Turks now reached in the west the frontiers of the 12th century Byzantine Empire. On the other hand, with Diaľâl al-Dîn having died and with his troops fleeing before the Mongols, Kaykûbâd thought that he could realise a
profitable operation for the defence of his enlarged territories by settling the *Khir*Azarmians there.

But the Ayyūbids, favoured by the defeat of the Kh*Ir*Aramians, had intensified their grasp on Upper Mesopotamia and the two ambitious powers were from now on facing each other without any bufferstate left. Al-Kāmil, the suzerain of the Ayyūbids, to whom the Syrians had given the impression that he could obtain an easy conquest, invaded Asia Minor but was defeated (631/1233) because contingent who were opposed to the expedition served him badly in the mountain passes of the Taurus. Kaykūbād was then able to set out on a policy of penetration into the upper Tigris region. He was lucky to die (634/1237) before the Mongols had sent his infant son ʿĀlam al-Dīn Kayunmār upon the throne; but ʿAlā al-Dīn Fīrūz Khaḍījī retained possession of the young Sultan and the capital, and was shortly afterwards to ascend the throne. Meanwhile, Kaykūbād, starved for three days, was attacked by the son(s) of a Turkish *malik* whom he had put to death, wrapped in a rug, beaten and thrown into the river Jamūna to drown.


KAYKUPIYA, a palace built by the Rūm Saldjūq ruler ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykūbād I (616-34/1221-37) in the years between 1224-26, ca. 4 miles northwest of Kayseri. The place is now called Kaybūd Çiftliği, at the foot of the Kaybād Dağ; nearby is the plain of Mağbard (Mağhadīyā), where reviews of the troops took place. The road Kayseri-Boğazköprü, on which the palace was situated, was in use from pre-Roman times down to the Ottoman domination. Situated northeast of Konya in the heart of the Rūm Saldjūk territory, Kaykūbādiyya was one of the favourite residences of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykūbād I. He stayed there quite often, received at Kaykūbādiyya the submission of Malik al-Dīn Dāwūdshāh, the lord of Erzindjan, in 625/1228, and died in this palace in 634/1237. His son and successor Ghiyāḥ al-Dīn Kaykūsraw ascended the throne at Kaykūbādiyya. The palace belongs to the series of foundations and monuments erected by ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykūbād I, one of the most brilliant Rum Saldjūk rulers, at Konya, Alanya (*ʿAlāʾiyā), Kūbābādībīb, Sivas and Erzindjan. Excavations of the site were undertaken in 1961.


KAYL is recorded by Naghwān b. Sāfī (Die auf Südostasien bezüglichen Angaben Naqshān’s im Sans-Salīm, ed. A. Ahmad, Leiden-London 1916, 89) as a title of pre-Islamic Yemeni "kings". It is well...
attested in Sabaean-language inscriptions from around the beginning of the Christian era onwards; their status, however, seems to be mostly characteristic of the 5th-6th centuries A.D., while earlier it appears mostly as qul, plural *qul* (and Nashwan himself says that ḥayl derives from ḥayyl and is a derivative of the root with median w). Inscriptional evidence shows that the ḥayl was in fact subordinate to the malīk “king”. In Sabaean social organisation of the relevant period, the grouping called a ḍqṭ ḍk (cf. ḏqṭ ḍk) was constituted of a number of clans, one of which occupied a dominating position, with other clans subordinate to it. The dominant clan was the hereditary stock from which the leader of the whole ḍqṭ ḍk was drawn: as Ibn Khalidīn says (Muḥammad ibn al-Qalqashandī, ed. Quatremerre, i, 240, tr. Rosenthal, i, 270), “leadership over any group always passes from one individual to another within a single stock” (fi mansūbin wakhdin); the dominant clan was the mansib to which was restricted the potentiality of furnishing the leadership (raẓas) over the whole group. This leader was the ḥayl. In warfare, the members of the subordinate clans fought under the immediate command of the ḥayl of their ḍqṭ ḍk, though he himself was under the orders of the king as commander-in-chief.


**Kayl, *Luhraisb** [see Kaynids].

**Kaymak** [see Kimaṟ].

**Kayn,** from the Arabic root *k y n* which has the basic meaning of “to adorn, embellish”, comes by extension to denote artisan, workman (*sānī*), although current usage reserves it above all for blacksmith (*L.A., s.v. kyn*). It does not occur in the Kurān; on the other hand, it occurs in many hadīths, generally in its particular sense of “iron-smith”. The feminine *kayna* means “singing girl”. However, since the men working at this trade usually belonged to the lowest stratum of the population, *kayn* became a deprecatory term applied to sīlahīr. In the satirical poems of Dādir, his antagonist al-Farazād is sometimes called ibn al-*kayn* (Aḥḏāni, Beirut 1956, xix, 37, 41, 84), and this was regarded in the desert as such an insult that al-Aqīṭal, intending to eulogise Simāk al-Asadī, satirised him involuntarily by mentioning that one of his ancestors had been a blacksmith.

This unfavourable view of the *sānī* has continued to be current amongst the Bedouins (H. Wahba, Djastrat al-ʿArab fi ‘-l-barn al-sīhīr; R. Uzayyi, Kāmas al-ʿādat . . . al-urdunniyya. Amman 1973-4, ii, 177). They consider the artisan as an outsider, even if he and his family have lived amongst them from time immemorial; he can never be integrated into the tribe, and no Arab nomad, of however low birth, would consider marriage links with him (R. Montagne, Vie sociale et politique de l’Arabe du Nord, in REI (1932), 74).

The *kaddādīn* (pl. of *haddād “blacksmith”) are often originally oasis dwellers (Montagne, op.cit.), and sometimes belong to outcast tribes like the Nāǧīr (A. Jausser, Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab, 104 n. 2) or the Ṣulaba. They form a separate caste (Doughty, Arabia deserta, index s.v. Ṣānī), and consider themselves as unrelated, bānū *’amm* (A. Musil, The manners and customs of the Rwala Bedouins, New York 1928, 281). Their lowly status protects them from the consequences of raids, and they accordingly enjoy an almost total immunity here. During an attack on a clan in which they have chosen to reside, they stay apart from the fighting, doing nothing to defend their goods, because of the right of protection which they enjoy. If goods of theirs are carried off by mistake, they can be confident of recovering them rapidly. In each clan they have in practice a brother (*aḏḥāf*), the blacksmith of the group, who has the duty of restoring any goods seized by mistake (Musil, op. cit., 281).

It is worthy of note that *kayn* in Sabaean is free of any pejorative sense such as is found in North Arabia. It seems to be agreed that its meaning here is “the one who arranges something”, which is in accord with the etymology in Arabic. It would therefore appear to be used for a high official, superintendent or minister, whose duties are concerned with religion and the sacred. There is a sense of this supernatural aspect in the Kurān when it says “We sent down iron, in which there is violent force and also benefits for the people” (LVII, 25), and it attributes the invention and manufacture of mailed coats to David, after receiving instruction from God Himself (XXIV, 10-11, XXI, 80).

The divine origin of iron is confirmed in several hadīths. Thus according to Ibn ʿUmar, “God brought down to earth four elements: iron, fire, water and salt” (al-Ṭabarānī, Maḏjmaʿ al-bayyān, liii, 400). Finally, in the hadīṯ concerning the general prohibition of cutting down plants in the Meccan haram, an exception is made for the *sakhir*, a fragrant plant used to decorate houses and tombs, but also used by blacksans (al-Buḫārī, Saḥīḥ, ii, 2. Al-Ḍīmaʿ al-bayyān, xxvii, 185; ʿAbdīl, Bulāgh al-ʿarab, iii, 400). In each clan they have in practice a brother (*aḏḥāf*), the blacksmith of the group, who has the duty of restoring any goods seized by mistake (Musil, op. cit., 281).

The *kayn*’s position is thus ambivalent. Although an object of scorn, at the same time he enjoys certain privileges associated with sacred personages. As in the so-called primitive societies, amongst the desert Arabs the smith is a being apart. According to the Rwala beliefs, God created the first smith at the same time as the first Bedouin (Musil, op. cit., 281). The taboos surrounding him are not solely explicable by mere contempt for mechanical activity; another factor must be taken into consideration: the superstitious fear of being contaminated by the impurity of the artisan-magician, of coming into contact with this formidable power, the secret of whose divinity he holds, and which made the Sabaean *kayn* an intermediary between man and the sacred.

Was the blacksmith’s art taught to the Arabs of the North by those of the South, as alleged by the chroniclers (al-Baladhuri, Anṣāb al-ʿarabī, i, Cairo 1930, 467)? This hypothesis may be acceptable in that in Yemen today, the blacksmith is not regarded with any particular disfavour, the most despised class being that of the *anāḏīl* (barber, butcher, cupper, etc.).

**Bibliography:** In addition to references in the text, see also J. Chelhod, Le monde mythique arabe, in Jnal. de la Soc. des Africansistes, xxiv (1954), 4 ff.; Idem, L’organisation sociale au Yémén, in L’Ethnographie, N.S. no. 64 (1970), 75 ff. (J. Chelhod)

**Al-Kayn** or bānū ‘l-ʾkayn, often contracted
to Bal-Kayn (cf. Bal-Harith, etc.), the name of one or more Arab tribes. The best known is part of the tribal group of Kedā'a, and al-Kayn is here interpreted as the nickname of al-Nu'mān b. Djasr, so that the tribe is known as al-Kayn b. Djasr. The word kayn means “worker in iron”, “smith”, or possibly “slave”, and is used as a term of contempt in the Naḥṣād Diārīr u'll-Farasa'dā. There is no evidence, however, of any connexion of Bal-Kayn b. Djasr with smiths. They act as a normal Bedouin tribe, and indeed are specifically proud of their achievements (cf. verse in Ibn Khallākin-de Slane, i, 40). Among the tribes against whom they fought were the Kalb (Abū Tamānm, Ḥamasa, ed. Freytag, i, 77; Yākūt, iii, 241, iv, 49; Ibn Sa'd, iii, 27 f.; Ibn al-Aḥṣār, Usd al-Ḡāba, ii, 224; Ibn Ḥadžar, Iṣāba, ii, 45; Bahārī) (Baala'dhūrī, Ḥudūd, 283, Ghaṣṭāfān (Agdānī), ii, 194). The names of various places in their tribal grounds are known (see Yākūt, Index of tribes). One (Thādir) is between Wādī ‘l-Kurā and Taymā; most of the others appear to be further north. Among neighbouring tribes were the Kalb, Ball and Umhra. Some of the tribe may have been friendly with Muḥammad, since at the expedition of Dḥāṭ al-Salāsī in 6/629 the Muslims hoped for help from them (Wādīkī, ed. Marsden Jones, ii, 770 f.), but a contingent of Bal-Kayn fought against the Muslims at Mu'ta about the same time, and also at the Yarmūk and perhaps Fīhl (Ibn Ḥishām, 792; Tabarī, i, 1611, 2347). There is no record of their having sent a deputation to make an alliance with Muḥammad, and so the report of Sayf b. ʿUmar (Tabarī, i, 1872) that they had an ʿumūl and that some joined in the Ridda presumably refers only to a small section. The majority probably became Muslims after the conquest of Syria.

In the Second Civil War (fīna of Ibn al-Zubayr) they supported Marwān (Tabarī, ii, 478; Masʿūdī, Tantīb, 308), but a little later ʿAbd al-Malik decided against them in a dispute with the Kalb about a place called Kurākīr (Yākūt, iv, 49). There was a contingent of 600 of them in the Umayyad army sent against the Kārījīrīd rebel Bahlul in 119/737 (Tabarī, ii, 453; al-Aḥṣār, i, 50). The last that is heard of them is as being involved in intertribal fighting in Damascus in 176/792 (Ibn al-Aḥṣār, vi, 87 f.).

Two brothers from the Bal-Kayn, Mālik and ʿAṣālī, are said to have been the boon-companions of Diāḥlima al-Abrāsh of Ḥira [q.v.] and were noted for being inseparable (Ibn Khallākin-de Slane, iii, 653; Muṣafadālisyl, i, 535, 2, poem 67, 21). The best-known member of the tribe was the poet Abū ʿl-Tāmaamān, who in pre-Islamic times had been friendly with Muḥammad's uncle al-Zubayr b. ʿAbd al-Muttaṣib and also with ʿAbd Allāh b. Diḥḍān (Ibn Kūṭayba, Shīr, 229 f.; Ibn Khallākin-de Slane, i, 40; Gausins de Perceval, i, 131, ii, 232).

Al-Kallakshandī (Nihayat al-arab fī ansāb al-arab, Cairo 1958, 71) has two tribes called Banū ʿl-Kayn. Besides the one described above there is a part of Asad (ibid. Khuzayma); but it is possible that there is confusion with Asad, the great-grandfather of al-Kayn b. Djasr, since little is recorded of this tribe except the name. A group of Bal-Kayn, perhaps actually smiths, were found at the mines of Banū Sulaym at ṹārān and may have been part of the Bal (Yākūt, iii, 865). The suggestion has been made that the Bal-Kayn are descended from the Kenites of the Old Testament, e.g. by Th. Noldeke, Die Χάινα, xli, 187, but there is no convincing evidence to support this.

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(W. Montgomery Watt)

---

**KAYNA, pl. ḥaynāt or ḥyān “female singing slave”**

The Arab lexicographers do not completely agree on the primitive meaning of the term (see LA, TA, etc. s.v.), the real origin of which is unknown to them. They tend to apply it in the first place to a female slave (ama, ḡuṣriya), charged in general with various tasks; secondly, and more specifically, to the female singer who had a servile status (ama or ḡuṣriya mughammiyya). Some lexicographers are inclined to connect ḥaynā with a Vth form ḥayyān “to embellish oneself” (al-Waṣḥābī, Muwāṣṣālāt, 164, uses the expression al-imād al-muḥsamaynād “in a sense close to al-muṣafarrfīl “the elegant, the refined ladies”), others want to see it as the feminine form of ḥaym “workman”, more specifically “smith” and to give it the primitive meaning of “working woman” or “woman hairdresser”. Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Aṣad (al-Kīyān wa’l-ghaynā fī l-ṭaṣāfi al-ḥayyāh, Cairo 1968, 15-24) has devoted a thorough study to this term. Starting from a bilateral *bn*, he points out the semantic affinity of the “radicals” ḥyn, ḏn, ḥyn, and remarks the existence of cognate words in various Semitic languages. He sees a phonetic and semantic relation between ḥaywā and ḍn on one side, and ḥyn on the other, and concludes that these are loanwords from Arabic. We allow ourselves here to underline the rightness of these conclusions, without being decisive about the direction of a possible borrowing and without following P. Anastase (al-Ilkil, viii, 163) who considers ḥyn to be a derivative of ḥaywā or ḍn, while considering at the same time the Arabic ḡhāna “to sing” to be the origin of either verbs. What can be stated with near certainty is that the Assyrian kūlu has very probably become Arab ḥyn (see ḫūn). At an early period also other words are attested to indicate the female singer: kārina (Ibn Khurṣadādibīhībīb, Kūṭāb al-alwā wa’l-ma-lātā, ed. I. A. Khalīfī, Beirut 1969, 20), musīmā (which is perhaps Islamic, ibid., 17), muddīnīm and muddīnā (Asad, op. cit., 27), sa’dūb and sa’dīnā (ibid., 28) and finally ḡurāda “locust”.

According to a well-founded tradition, the first female singers among the Arabs are reported to have been two slaves called al-Djaradātī or Djaradātā fī. They are even given individual names the spellings of which take all the form CCA (al-Ṭabarī, i, 234-6; see al-Masʿūdī, Murādī, ed. Pellat, index). The name of the mythical person to whom they allegedly have belonged is also known: Muṭawīya b. Bakr al-Imlā. The continuity of the tradition is assured by the affirmation that the inhabitants of Yathrib inherited the use of ḥyān from the Ādites who had disappeared from history, (Ibn Khurṣadādibīhīb, op. cit., 20). The sources also attest female singing-slaves in the future Medina at the end of the Diāḥlima (e.g. Agdānī, ed. Beirut, xv, 34, about Ubayyī b. al-Dūlah). Mecca, which had remained outside the alleged Ādite influence, is said to have known music and singing thanks to al-Ḥārīth b. Kalada on his return from al-Ḥira (see al-Masʿūdī, Murādī, index, s.v.; Asad, op. cit., 115, 116, 118, 131, discusses this tradition). This detail confirms the origin of the ḥayna as proposed above, the more so because the sources report many traditions on the ḥyān of the Nasrids, as they do on those of the Ghassānids. According to Ibn Khurṣadādibīhīb (op. cit., 36), Djaradātī (al-Aṭham al-Masīrīn, [q.v.]) is said to have had ten ḥyān, five of whom, apparently Byzantine, sang in rumāniyya.

In Arabia, outside the main towns, some ḥyān
were living among the Bedouins, if the poets are to be believed, whose works can, however, not be credited with perfect authenticity.

As far as can be judged, the female slave singers may have been divided into two main categories, the role of one group, owned by a town or Bedouin person of standing, was to entertain their master, alone or in the company of guests, without prejudice to their preferences or the role they could have with him. The other group, quite inferior in rank, were attached to taverns or followed wandering wine-merchants, and one can easily imagine that they could give themselves to a form of prostitution. The poets (e.g. Tažaf, vv. 49-52 of the Mušalla; al-Ašša, in Rawd, No. 31, 26-7; Labīd, v. 61 of the Mušalla) associate these women with drinking-bouts, and describe them so as not to leave any doubt about their marginal activities. Nasīr al-Dīn al-Asad (op. cit., 163-253) has thoroughly studied the influence exercised by these two pre-Islamic groups of kiyān on the social and literary fields, and more particularly on al-Ašša.

From the period shortly preceding Islam, we have detailed information on some kiyān, in particular on two new "locusts", the Djaradatan of Abū Allāh b. Djal'ān (q.v.) who was engaged in the slave-trade in both sexes. Shortly afterwards, female slave-singers apparently served in Mecca as instruments of propaganda against the Prophet who had migrated to Medina, namely Fartanā and Kārib/ Kūrāyba, who were owned by Abū Allāh b. Khaṭṭāl (see al-Dūhāṣ, Tarbī, index, s.v. Fartanā; Sīra, ii, 410; Nasāb Kurāyba, 442-3; op. cit., 86-7). They are said to have been sentenced to death by Mūhammad after the conquest of Mecca for having proposed satirical songs against him (the traditions diverge however on the actuality of their punishment). Another kiyā, Sāra by name (see Asad, op. cit., 88), and owned by Abī Šayfā (Nasāb Kurāyba, 90-1), was sent to the Kūrāyba by Hāšāī b. Abī Balta'at to announce the Prophet's intention to seize Mecca (Sīra, ii, 398, 410, 411). Sentenced to death, she escaped momentarily the supreme penalty. A certain ancient kiyān can be found in chapter xv of the Hāṣ 1-funān wa-sulāwat al-mahzān of Ibn al-Ṭabbān, an author of the 5th/11th century (ms. Dār al-kutub no. 539, Fine Arts) published by Asad, op. cit., 269-72.

At the same period there existed certainly many other anonymous kiyān who were engaged in their usual activity. These slaves were surely of non-Arabic origin (e.g. the kānsa of Hashān b. Thābit was called Shīn, Ibn Khurraḍāḏibih, op. cit., 360). Thus there were probably white slaves among them, but the majority must have been black or half-caste. In some cases were perhaps still singing in a foreign language, like those of Diabāla b. Ayyaham, the others had been brought up in an Arab environment and knew perfectly well the language of the poets whose works they interpreted. The absence of reliable documents prevents however any decisive affirmation.

The information becomes less unreliable when in the 1st/7th century the development of music and singing (see Gūnā) in the holy cities of the Ḥijāz brought about a zeal for collecting traditions which we know, to be sure, only from later sources. On the other hand, however acute the later juridical disputations on the admissibility of these two pursuits, they fact paradoxically developed, in spite of some attempts to stem their spread, in Mecca and especially in Medina, where one would have expected stronger puritanical feeling. This problem is further connected with those of love-poetry [see Sufa] and humour [see al-ğayr wa'-l-ḥā'īn].

While the prohibition of wine must have entailed the disappearance of a great part of the female singers of the lower reaches of the profession, real schools can be seen growing around musicians and singers who were instructing pupils of both sexes. Among the females, free and freed women appeared, but mainly slaves who were considered that sort of education to be a means of increasing the commercial value. In order to be chosen among the young slaves, whose number was now increasing, due to the conquests, the future kiyān had of course to be beautiful and to have a melodious voice, but to be at a premium on the market they also needed talent and skill, i.e. a fairly advanced musical education and intellectual culture. From the 1st/7th century onwards the famous stories of kiyān, bought at huge prices (thousands of dinārs are mentioned), have been adopted into adab-literature, often with somewhat embellished details. Sallāma (q.v.) and Hāṣāb (q.v.) belong to them, but several others could be mentioned. Iṣbāk al-Mawsill pretends (Aḥānī, v, 150) that the singers who had thus been educated, were originally black (sud) or "yellow" (nūr), white, who did not stand out for their beauty. For, he says, his father Ibrāhīm was the first to consider the physical qualities of the kiyān important, in view of the increase in their value in the eyes of those interested. This information is belied by traditions going back to the 1st/7th century.

Aṣza (q.v.) and Djamila (q.v.) gave concerts in honour of personalities of Medina, and the latter was surrounded by a circle of her admirers, called kiyān, who constituted the choir. It was under the direction of these two artists, famous in the history of the Arabs, that the great singers of the 1st/7th century were formed [see Gūnā]. Out of these one needs only to mention Mābād (q.v.), who in his turn taught kiyān, both female musicians and singers, who were very much in demand. The best pupils of the Medinese school, like Kīmīyān, were in particular at Basra where a new school, competing with the one of Medina, was quickly to come into existence and which produced some of the most famous female singers of the court at Badādd. There were formed Badīl (Aḥānī, ed. Beirut, xvii, 32-7), kāysa of Ḥādis al-ʿAzm, ʿArūb (Aḥānī, xxi, 58-102) whose career reached from the reign of al-Maʿāmin to that of al-Mutawakkil, Mutayyam al-Ḥāshimīyya (Aḥānī, vii, 280-93) and Shāriya (Aḥānī, xv, 320-8) who was adopted by Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī and whose biography Ibn al-Muṭazz did not judge himself unworthy to write. Al-Dūhāṣ (Rasāl, ed. Hārūn, ii, 288-90), gives a detailed list of Basran kiyān, whom he prefers to the Kūfān. From that time onwards it is not always easy to make a distinction between the slaves who had become famous for having given birth to caliphs (those born from a mother who was a free woman are very few), those who had distinguished themselves as poets (like Inān (q.v.) or Fadā) and the singers proper who could at the same time share the caliph's couch or that of a very high personality, compose verses, sing their own or those of other poets and play a musical instrument (like Māḥūba). In fact, many kiyān were capable of writing short poems and of improvising occasional pieces; competing in this field with the court poets, they rivaled them in virtuosity, especially in the classical game of the
KAYNA

In an unpublished thesis (Recherches sur la poésie des qiydn, Paris-Sorbonne 1970), A. Chirane has brought forward the name of more than a hundred qiydn to whom verses are attributed, without counting several dozens of anonymous poesesses, whose preserved works represent only a tiny part of the compositions and improvisations. In general, this kind of poetry cannot be called exemplary, but is has the merit of being spontaneous and unusually refreshing. Love (qāh [q.v.]) is largely celebrated, while amorous reproofs (qāh) and lamentations over forced separations also abound. On the other hand, one finds eulogies of high-ranking personalities, elegies on the death of the master and pieces in which the qiyd, far away from their native land, express their nostalgia. Wine and descriptions find their place also, next to epigrams which were held in high esteem in these refined milieux.

These women had received a thorough education. They had to give proof of talent and vast knowledge of Arabic language and poetry. We are told that al-Rashîd, before taking a decision, instructed al-Asma‘î to examine one of them; she answered her examiner with such assurance that she “seemed to read the answers from a book” (al-Anbâ’î, Nasba, ed. ‘A. ‘Amîr, 72-3). It was due to the erudition of another qiyd, pupil of the grammarian al-Ma’ânî, that the latter had the honour to be admitted to the court (see Pellat, Milieu, 250). These slaves knew a great number of verses by heart, which was in itself normal; some, however, although everything in their daily life removed them from religion, were well-versed in the traditional sciences and had studied the Qur‘ân, as suggested by the story of a hâdî related by al-Mas‘ûdî (v, 412 = § 218-5), who gives a beautiful example of tarab [q.v.]. Besides, it is known that the Holy Book was chanted and that the hira‘â bi l-‘alâhn, favoured by the development of singing in Medina (see M. Talbi, in Arabica, v/2, 1958, 83-90), spread afterwards to other areas of the Muslim world, in spite of the hostility of the fuwahâd (see, e.g., M. Talbi, Emirat aghlabide, 307). The women who went to the schools, and who dressed in vividly-coloured robes made of dyed fabrics, as well as those who wore, on the forehead, on the palm of the hand, etc. one or several pieces in which the mukayyin, whose existence is attested with certainty. To be sure, there came into existence, first at Baṣra, then in other cities as far away as Cordoba, the very profitable profession of bayyân or mukayyin, the germ of which had already existed much earlier. It consisted in acquiring young qiyd, in forming them under strict rules and in hiring out on various circumstances their services to private persons. The bayyân organised also musical sessions in the hope that such a passion would arise among the guests that they would not hesitate to pay the most exorbitant prices in order to obtain the object of their ardour. In particular, there is mentioned the case of a certain Umâr (ed. al-Fâdî) b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-‘Asîrî, Abu ’l-‘Nafîd/Abu ’l-‘Asîrî, who dressed in vividly-coloured robes made of dyed material, while the free women wore only natural fabrics. There are also many details on the customs of these milieux, on the phrases written on the foot, on the forehead, on the palm of the hand, etc. (ibid., 136 ff.).

The monographs devoted to the qiyd and cited for instance by Ibn al-Nadîm and Ya‘kît were
probably far from having the same literary value as the works of al-Djahiz and al-Washsha3, for they were likely to contain exclusively anecdotes and verses in the same way as the Kitāb al-Aghānī, the notices of which have been usefully gathered together by F. al-Amrūsī, al-Djawādī l-muğhammānīyāt, Cairo 1945. The following titles have been brought to light: K. Kiyān al-Ḫīṣājī and K. Kiyān of Ṣbrāk b. Ṣbrākīn al-Mawṣīl (Fiṣṭīrī, 202; Ḫudābādī, vi, 50); K. Kiyān of Yūnas al-Muḥṣanī (Fīṣṭīrī, 207); K. Kāyda al-Madārīn (Ḫudābādī, xiv, 133); Aḏkār al-zawāˈdī of al-Muḍafdhā (Fiṣṭīrī, 123; Ḫudābādī, xvii, 194); K. Kiyān al-Ḫīṣājī and K. Kiyān Makha of Sulaymān b. Ayyūn (Fiṣṭīrī, 212; Ḫudābādī, xi); K. Aḥbār al-kīyaν of Abū l-Faɾaḏī himself (Ḫudābādī, xii, 99; Brockelmann, S I, 226).

To this list of works which do not seem to have been preserved, should be added, apart from the chapter K. al-Kiyāν of al-Muṣḏarī, the sections of Kiyāν, for it is said there that the Ḫidrī was trained on the spot, while the Ḫidrī, who acquired a lasting reputation moving scenes (see H. Peres, L'histoire de l'Arabie, Paris 1912, 345-51). The description de l'Afrique, being and calligraphy, and then sold them at a very high price (in one case for 3,000 dinār). The Andalusian kīyaν played also conjuring tricks and even executed exercises of skill with weapons, and formed orchestras called shīkāra after the name of the curtian which in the Orient separated in the caliph the singers and musicians (Mez, op. cit., 479).

After the fall of the Umayyads in Spain, the Mūlāk al-xawālī in their turn disputed among themselves for the most talented singers. The coming of the Almoravids and Almohads did not put an end to their activities, but from the 6th/12th century onwards, Seville had robbed Cordoba of the monopoly it had enjoyed before. A reliable evidence of this is to be found in a text of al-Tīḥāthī (d. 951/1543), Muʿattal al-xawālī fi ḫīm al-samā′, quoted by H. F. Abd al-Wahhab in his Waraḥāt, ii, 231-2, where is given a detailed account of the training of the Sevillian female singers who were sold in North Africa. In the north of the peninsula the kīyaν served to a certain extent as a link between Muslims and Christians, who both kept them in their entourages. Some still sang in Arabic, and Ibn Bassām describes in this respect moving scenes (see H. Peres, op. cit., 356-7).

On another plane, the Andalusian kīyaν are probably no strangers to the insertion of Romance words in the khārdīa of the mucamīd celebrated by al-Azdi (Ḫiḥāyat Abī l-Kdsim, 70 ff.) were also from al-Muṭaffī, or also those devoted to poetesses but which have also been lost. Useful information can finally be found in: Nisāʿ al-khulafāʿ, attributed to Ibn al-Sawī (ed. M. Dījāwād, Cairo n.d.), and in Muṣṭaqaf min aḥbār al-dawārī of al-Suyūṭī (ed. Š. al-Munajjād, Beirut 1963).

Even if some kīyaν are still mentioned occasionally after the 4th/10th century but then almost always anonymously, the tradition, judging from the sources available, is essentially based on those of the first centuries of the hidrīa who acquired a lasting celebrity. After Medina and Basra, Baghdād was the centre of the Muslim world in this respect. Al-Tawḥīdī Ṭamīdī, ii, 183 counts 480 slave (and 120 free) female singers at al-Karjāḥ (q.v.), giving the names of about 20 of them and citing the pieces of 19 of them. The Anda-

After the fall of the Umayyads in Spain, the Mūlāk al-xawālī in their turn disputed among themselves for the most talented singers. The coming of the Almoravids and Almohads did not put an end to their activities, but from the 6th/12th century onwards, Seville had robbed Cordoba of the monopoly it had enjoyed before. A reliable evidence of this is to be found in a text of al-Tīḥāthī (d. 951/1543), Muʿattal al-xawālī fi ḫīm al-samā′, quoted by H. F. Abd al-Wahhab in his Waraḥāt, ii, 231-2, where is given a detailed account of the training of the Sevillian female singers who were sold in North Africa. In the north of the peninsula the kīyaν served to a certain extent as a link between Muslims and Christians, who both kept them in their entourages. Some still sang in Arabic, and Ibn Bassām describes in this respect moving scenes (see H. Peres, op. cit., 356-7).

On another plane, the Andalusian kīyaν are probably no strangers to the insertion of Romance words in the khārdīa of the mucamīd celebrated by al-Azdi (Ḫiḥāyat Abī l-Kdsim, 70 ff.) were also from Baghdād. He describes, like al-Tawḥīdī (ibid.), scenes of tarāb, i.e. of that delicious joy to which persons who are otherwise self-controlled and conscious of their dignity have often surrendered themselves. Thus Baghdād supplied the most appreciated female slave singers (see in particular the history of the Fāṭimid Tamīm al-Muṭāzī (d. 628/978) in Mez, Renaissance, Eng. tr. 401), whatever their land of origin may have been. The passage of Ibn Buṭlān (d. 145/1062) brought forward by Mez (op. cit., tr. 161; text in Ristla fi šīrā ta-rābī wa-tāhīb al-ʿabd, ed. Hārūn, Cairo 1954, 374; taken up again by al-Šāḵṭārī, Ḫisba, 50, Spanish tr. by Chalmeta on the literary plane the kīyaν also contributed to the development of the so-called "modernist" (mudājād) poetry, both by their own contributions, the value of which was by its very nature quite varied, and by their function as inspirers of the poets. At the zenith of "Abdās civilization some of
them kept real literary salons where the participants, while listening to music and songs, vied in wit and improvisation. Countless are the poets who, inspired by biyān, celebrated their seduction or complained of their cruelty. In this respect almost all great names of mushādh poetry should be cited, whatever may be the opinion of Ibn Kutayba who, in the introduction of the Adab al-kālib, fulminates against the secretaries of the administration whose ideal it was to write "trashy verses" in praise of a kayna (see G. Lecomte, in Mélanges Massonign, iii, 51).


In the *Thousand and One Nights*, biyān are quoted in the 334th, 383rd, 436th and 896th nights. On the status of slaves, see ʿABB; on their position in society, B. Lewis, *Race and color in Islam*, New York-London 1971, and bibliography; see also SĀLIMA (R. Fellat).

**KAYNUKĀ** is a town in central Tunisia. It stretches over an area of 680,000 hectares. Its population of 34,000 inhabitants in 1956 had become unfriendly to the Prophet. From this we may infer (with Watt, *Muhammad at Medina*, 226 f.) that the document in its present form belongs to the period after the elimination of the Kurayya (end of 5/ April 627).

After the battle of Badr (Ramadān 2/March 624) Muhammad’s relations with the Jews of Medina became troubled. The Jews as a body had adopted an unfriendly attitude to the Prophet. From the religious point of view they became inconvenient; and from the political angle, as a powerful foreign body within the newly converted town, they were a great danger. When Muhammad felt his position strengthened by the battle of Badr, he must soon have determined on expelling his enemies. The Kaynukā, as they lived in the city itself, were the first he wished to be rid of. Regarding in this light, his attack on the Kaynukā (in all probability as early as Shawwāl 2/ April 624) is sufficiently explained. Special reasons for the attack given by Muslim writers have no more than anecdotal value. Sometimes this reason is said to have been a jest that a Muslim made to a Jewish woman, sometimes the Kaynukā are said to have behaved with particular arrogance. Sūrat III, 12 f. is said to refer to these incidents; according to Wākīdī (277) and Ibn Saʿd (ii/1, 19) Sūrat VIII, 58, does too. Sūrat III, 13, refers to the victory at Badr as an example of warning, and VIII, 58, speaks of vengeance against people from whom treachery is feared.

After 14 days’ siege, the Kaynukā surrendered without striking a blow; the men were bound and seemed to have feared the worst. The energetic intervention of ʿAbd Allāh b. Ubayy [q.v.], chief of the Khazraḍ and leader of the Muhāemmād, however, brought an improvement of their lot. They were allowed to settle of the relations between believers and the Khazraḍ [q.v.]. They possessed no land there but lived by trading. That their known personal names are for the most part Arabic says as little regarding their origin as the occurrence of Biblical names among them; but there seem to be no valid reasons for doubting their Jewish origin.
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47,000 during the census of 3rd May 1966, and then 56,000 in 1972. Temperatures vary considerably, ranging from a few degrees below zero in winter to 40°C and over in summer. The sirocco blows there for an average of 21 days per annum. The rainfall varies from an average of 250 mm. or 300 mm. in the town and its surrounding area to 500 mm. and over in the regions west of the governorate. It changes considerably from one year to another, ranging from drought to catastrophic floods; the flood in 1965 was particularly devastating. Work is soon to begin on the damming of the Wadi Zéroud, which will store 80,000,000 cubic metres of water, and also on that of the Wadi Merguellil, for which plans are even more advanced. This is bound to avoid these dangerous floods and it will increase the irrigable area, which at present extends to 14,000 hectares, but of which only 8,000 are actually cultivated.

Al-Kayrawan is essentially involved with agricultural pursuits and the efforts of the last two decades have resulted in a considerable development of arboriculture. In 1972 there were 3,500,000 olive-trees, and 3,800,000 almond trees were counted in the governorate; in third place came apricot trees. The areas sown with cereal crops vary much from year to year according to the promise of autumn rains. From 58,000 hectares in 1968 they rose to 95,000 in 1972; they were only 75,000 hectares in 1956, but they had reached 225,000 in 1959. The livestock in 1972 amounted to 260,000 sheep, 14,000 cattle, 20,000 goats and 11,000 camels. The industrial sector is still embryonic, but it has a group of about ten small enterprises (dyeing, spinning, woodwork, confectionery and food preservation) which employ about 1,000 people; it seems unlikely that these will be greatly expanded.

By contrast, the artisan sector continues to occupy the first place in the town’s activities. Working with wood, copper and alfa, the production of jewellery, lanterns and sieves, as well as the traditional dyeing and weaving, brings employment to 1,200 craftsmen. But what makes al-Kayrawân’s reputation is the handproduced “long-wool” carpets. Recently the National Office of Craft Industry has been created, and it has been notable for allowing newly-qualified female workers into its workshops. It has modernised the designs to a certain extent without changing the family and essentially feminine character of the craftwork. In 1972 4,500 home-craftsmen (saddâya) were counted. The production of carpets rose from 35,000 m² in 1962 to 130,000 m² in 1972, and it is likely to develop further. Yet all these enterprises do not succeed in assuring full employment, because of the high birthrate. A third of the active male population is underemployed or on short-time working.

The actual town of al-Kayrawân is composed of the native quarter, with its narrow winding streets and souks, which roughly preserve the general appearance given to them in the 18th century. This native quarter is still surrounded by its crenellated ramparts, which are built of solid brick. They are flanked at intervals by round buttresses and measure a little over 3 km. In the east and the north-east the suburbs of Gueblia, Djeblia and Zlass. In the South, between Bab al-Djallâdîn (Skinners’ Gate), which since independence has been renamed Bab al-Shuhada’ (Martyrs’ Gate) and which leads to the native quarter, and the Railway Station, the modern town is situated; here are found the administrative services, the banks, the hotels, etc. A working class district, Sîdi Saḥmân, has been built in the east and another, a group of 400 villas belonging to the more prosperous classes, is called al-Manşûra.

One of the principal monuments of the town, apart from the Great Mosque, is the Djâmi‘ al-thalâthat bîbân, the Mosque of the Three Doors, the façade of which is a beautiful example of Aghlabid architecture. It was founded in 252/866 by the Andalusian Muhammad b. Khayrun al-Ma‘ârifî, but was altered in the 9th/10th century. There is also the Aghlabid cistern at the Tunis Gate; the Zawiya of Sidi ‘Abd al-Ghayrîn of the 8th/14th century; the Zawiya of Sidi al-Šâhîb, which was first of all a simple and very old mausoleum covering the tomb of a Companion of the Prophet, Abû Zam‘a al-Balawi, and on the site of which the Murâdî bey Hâmîmât erected the present building in the 11th/12th century; and the Zawiya of Sidi ‘Umar ‘Abdâ, built in the 13th century.

1. Foundation

All the Arab invasions, which culminated in the conquest of Byzacena, were initially careful to avoid the coastal route. The invaders penetrated into the country by the region of Kaštîliya [q.v.], from where they attempted to reach the centre and the north. Avoiding the shore on the east, which was dangerous for conquering forces who were not yet adequately experienced in seamanship, and the mountains on the west, which were well suited for ambushes and surprise attacks, they had no alternative but to use the corridor which ended naturally in the region of Kâmûniya, that is, the corridor of al-Kayrawân. This town, which was first of all a military base, owed its origin to the strategy dictated by the relief of the country and from the fighting tactics of the invaders. Traditionally its foundation is attributed to ‘Alî b. Nâﬁ‘, but in fact it took place by easy stages and several military leaders contributed to its.

The battle of Sufetula (27/647-8) had practically delivered Byzacena to ‘Abd Allâh b. Sa‘d b. Abî Sarb, the Byzantines being driven back behind their second line of fortification defending the Proconsularium. It is neither impossible nor improbable that the conquerors pushed their raids on this occasion right into the region of al-Kayrawân, for they had to evacuate the country when they were charged a heavy tribute. Ibn Nâdîj (Ma‘âlim, Tunis 1320/1902, i, 30) points out that at al-Kayrawân there is a mosque dedicated to Ibn Abî Sarb which in some way commemorates his sea journey.

Later, events begin to take shape when Mu‘âwîya b. Hûdayîj led three campaigns in succession to Ifrikiya, in 34/654-5, 41/661-2, and 45/665. Three times, in fact, he made use of the same route as his predecessor and ended in the region of Kâmûniya or al-Kayrawân, where he set up his camp. In 34/654-5 Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam declares that Ibn Hûdayîj “seized several fortresses and took considerable booty. He set up a garrison camp (kayrawân) near al-Karn” (Futûh, partially ed. and tr. by A. Gateau, Algiers 1948, 57). He reappears still established at Kârn in 41/661-2 (Ibn ʿIṣârî, Bayân, ed. Colin and Lévi-Provençal, Leiden 1948, i, 175). Finally, in 45/665 he reappears yet again at Kârn (al-Mâlikî, Riyād, ed. H. Mu‘nis, Cairo 1951, i, 17-28; Ibn ʿIṣârî, Bayân, i, 16; Ibn Nâdîj, Ma‘âlim, i, 39-40). In this connection al-Mâlikî notes: “Ibn Hûdayîj had laid the foundations of a town at al-Karn (ikhlâṣa madinatu ‘ind al-Karn) before ‘Ukba had founded (al-asîs) al-Kayrawân and he settled there during the period that he spent in Ifrikiya”. Ibn Nâdîj states for his part that “on his return to Kâmûniya, Ibn Hûdayîj built dwellings in the region of al-Karn.”
to which he gave the name of Kayrawan, when the site of the actual Kayrawan was not yet inhabited or urbanised (khayr masākun wa-lā matāる māmār; Maʿālīm, i, 41). The site named al-Karn ("hill, peak") by Ibn Hudayyīt owes its name to its relief. It probably refers to the hill 171 m. high which is called today Batn al-Karn and which is situated in a tourist region 12 km. north-west of the actual town of Kayrawan on the road to Djailū (M. Solignac, Recherches sur les installations hydrauliques, in AEO x, (1952), 12, n. 10).

The primary reason for the foundation of al-Kayrawan was its elevated position, which gave it protection from surprise attacks and floods. The Kayrawan founded by Ibn Hudayyīt did not maintain its rôle as capital of Ifriqiya but it was never destroyed again; however, when it ceased to be the capital it no longer bore the name of al-Karn. In 124/742 the Khāridīī Ī'ab b. Saʿdīt was beaten there by Hanzala b. Saʿdīt, governor of Ifriqiya. Al-Karn is mentioned again at the end of the 2nd/beginning of the 3rd century (Abū ʿl-ʿArab, Tabākāt, ed. Ben Cheneb, Paris 1915, 67; al-Mālikī, Riyāḍ, i, 18). Afterwards all trace of it disappears. Neither al-Bakrī nor al-Īdrīsī cite it, and for Yākūt (Buldān, Beirut 1957, iv, 333) al-Karn was no more than a mountain in Ifriqiya.

In 596/707 the founder of the Umayyad dynasty, Muʿāwiyya, while keeping Ibn Hudayyīt as the governor of Egypt, took Ifriqiya from him and entrusted it to ʿUqbā b. Nāfiʿ. On rejoining his post he was not very satisfied with Kayrawan which was built before his time by Muʿāwiyya b. Hudayyīt (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, Futāḥ, 65). The modern site. Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, Futāḥ, 64-6; al-Mālikī, Riyāḍ, i, 57, 59, 79; Ibn ʿIdhārī, Bayān, i, 19-20; Ibn Nāḍīl, Maʿālīm, i, 7-9), however, tell us forcefully the details (verging on the miraculous) of how ʿUqbā b. Nāfiʿ, followed by his most illustrious companions, including a large number of the Ṣāḥiba, was left to search for a new site. His choice fell on a plain which was then covered with vegetation, the haunt of reptiles and wild beasts. There the new Kayrawan was founded ʿUqbā immediately donated two institutions indispensable for its spiritual and temporal progress, sc. a mosque and a government house (dār al-imāra), built opposite each other. He spent the five years of his first governorship watching over this building without undertaking any other expedition.

Abū ʿl-Muḥādīr Dinār who succeeded him greatly disliked the idea of settling where ʿUqbā b. Nāfiʿ had built it (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, Futāḥ, 68/69). We are told (Ibn ʿIdhārī, Bayān, i, 22; Ibn Nāḍīl, Maʿālīm, i, 42-3) that he set fire to the foundations of his predecessor and moved the capital two miles further along the road to Tunis, to a region inhabited by the Berbers. The new capital, of which the remains have been recently located, received the name Takīrwan (Ibn Nāḍīl, Maʿālīm, i, 42). The choice of this Berber-sounding name as well as the town's position were most probably inspired by the choice of the site chosen for the foundation of al-Kayrawan they found a hydraulic construction system which they named Kašr al-Māʾ ("the Water Castle"). This system was fed from an aqueduct which gathered the waters of the Mams, 33 km. to the west, and today called Hanghār Dwīnīs (M. Solignac, op. cit., 19-21, 126-61). ʿUqbā stopped there (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, Futāḥ, 68/69, on his return to Damascus in 53/657, and afterwards the place became an assembly point for caravans heading for the east (Abū ʿl-ʿArab, Tabākāt, 25; al-Mālikī, Riyāḍ, i, 30, 69-70; Ibn Nāḍīl, Maʿālīm, i, 52, 147; Ibn ʿIdhārī, Bayān, i, 34, 44, 259). The Arabs lifted the region out of its ruined state and gave it back prosperity by pursuing
and extending the irrigation policy of their predecessors. The wells and cisterns with which (almost without exception) all the mosques and houses were provided (Ibn Nāḍījlī, Maṣālim, i, 13; 25; al-Bakrī, Masālik, 23/53), made an appreciable contribution to the great works for which the Aghlabids are justly famed. Hence until the middle of the 5th/11th century, all the geographers boast of the fertility of that region. In all, the area chosen for the foundation of al-Kayrawān, apart from the strategic advantages it offered, was amenable to development and to the provision of an economic infrastructure necessary for the development of a large town. Only human error made this region into a steppe.

ii. HISTORY

Scarce was al-Kayrawān founded when it had to be evacuated. The disaster of Tāhādī to the south of Biskra cost the life of its chief foundér ʿUkba b. Nāfīr, and all his companions were killed to the last man. This marked the beginning of the exodus towards the east. The conqueror was the Berber Kūṣaylāy [q.v.], and he took up residence in the town, which had not been abandoned by all its Arab-Muslim population, and made it the capital of his short-lived kingdom (64-9684-9). Zuhayr b. ʿAlay al-Balawi, and especially Ḥassān b. al-Nuʿman came back later to recover it.

Four decades of peace then passed before the capital of the Maghrib was seriously threatened by the Berbers. In 124/742 it was about to be submerged by waves of Khāridjīs, but it was saved in extremis by the two unexpected victories of al-Kān and al-ʿAṣānām. Fortune failed it in 140/757-8 when the Warāṣdūmā Khāridjīs, of Šufi tendencies, seized it with the complicity of certain of its inhabitants, and for more than a year held it under their domination. They massacred in particular the Kūrašī elements of the population, who were the Arab aristocracy. It was liberated in ʿĀṣār of the following year (June-July 758) by the Ībādī ʿAlī b. Ḥāṣṣātī working from Tripoli. He took there as governor ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Rustam, the future founder of the kingdom of Tāhādī. But this was not for long; in Dhuʾ al-Qaʿdād 144/August 766, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-ʿAsānām came to bring it back into the bosom of the east, and he proceeded to fortify it under directions from the caliph al-Muṣṭaṣir. For the first time he provided it with a surrounding wall, which was begun in Dhuʾ al-Qaʿdād 144/February 767 and finished in Rādāb 146/September-October 765.

But these measures, which were imposed after the events just reviewed, did not save al-Kayrawān from further troubles. In 154/771 it was besieged by a coalition of Šufī and Ībādī Berbers. Its inhabitants were reduced to eating “their beasts of burden, their dogs and their cats” (Ibn ʿĪdārī, Bayān, i, 76). Resistance was in vain; the town was stormed after its gates had been set on fire and a breach made in its walls. This was the last ordeal to which the Khāridjīs subjected it. Yāṣīd b. Ḥāṭim al-Muḥallabī (155-71/772-88) was despatched from the east with impressive resources, and came to take it in hand again and to put an end to the convulsions of Khāridjism in Ifriqiyah.

But there arose another danger, that of the diwān. Al-Kayrawān became the gambling-stake of the rebel military leaders. In 194/810 Ibrāhīm I (181-96/800-12), in order to punish it for having treated with the army rebels, had the raujāts taken down and removed its gates. But it was guilty of the same offence again. In the meantime the gates had been put back, and in 209/824 the inhabitants opened them to Maṣṣūr al-Tunbūḥī. This time their punishment was a disgraceful one; Ibrāhīm b. al-ʿAbī (Ibn 917-38) “razed the walls of the town until he had made them level with the ground”, (Ibn ʿĪdārī, Bayān, i, 100). His successors were able to reign quite peaceably until the Shīʿī propaganda extended to Ifriqiya. The citadel of Sunnism did not support its sovereigns when they were in danger, but adopted towards them a passive or even hostile attitude. The last of the Aghlabids left his capital secretly at night, and the commander of his armies had to follow him under a hail of stones.

The reign of the Fāṭimids accentuated the differences between the city of ʿUkba and the power henceforth to be indisputably exercised by heretics. On 20th Shaʿbān 299/11th April 912, the storm broke. A rabble set the over-arrogant Kutāma against the exasperated tradesmen, and several hundred prisoners were taken (Ibn ʿĪdārī, Bayān, i, 166; Ibn al-ʿAṣārī, Kūmil, Beirut ed. 1966, viii, 53). ʿUbayd Allāh was able to calm men’s minds, but it did not prevent the people of al-Kayrawān from supporting the insurrection of the Khāridji Abū Yazīd al-Nūkkārī (332-943-7). They were deceived by him, and finally abandoned him, but it did not exempt them from punishment. Al-Muṣṭaṣir, once the rebel had been defeated and killed, seized a group of them and had them tortured and executed.

The reign of the Zīrīds before the rejection of the Shīʿī heresy, was no more readily accepted. The very arrival of al-Muʿīzīz (407-1054; 1062-6), when he carried out his first official visit to al-Kayrawān, was greeted by an attempt on his life and by a dreadful uprising (15 Muḥarram 407/3 March 1017). The people of al-Kayrawān massacred indiscriminately all whom they should be spared of being Shiʿī. The bodies of the victims were burned and buildings set on fire at will. The disturbances spread as far as al-Maṣṣūrīyya, which in turn was sacked and pillaged. Despite the efforts of the authorities to restore calm, a fresh riot broke out several months later on the occasion of the ceremonies of ʿĪd al-Fīr (1 Shawwāl 407/3 March 1017) presided over by al-Muʿīzīz. Again blood flowed freely, and the reaction of the authorities was brutal. Al-Kayrawān was delivered into the hands of the troops of al-Maṣṣūrīyya. Not a single shop escaped being pillaged and they set fire to the main business thoroughfares (ḥbār as-adwād). This was but the prelude to greater woes. The Banū Ḥilāl, although they did not devastate every town of Ifriqiya, nevertheless made a complete ruin of what remained of the grandeur of al-Kayrawān. The town was besieged from 446/1054 onwards and it was abandoned to them by al-Muʿīzīz, who retreated to al-Mahdīyya in 449/1057.

After that it is little heard of. Unlike Kāblīs, Kaʾṣaʾa, Tūẓīr, al-Mahdīyya, Sūsa or Sāfākīs, al-Kayrawān caused no concern to the Ḥaḍīdīs. No local dynasty seized power there under their reign. The nomad Arabs of the region, meanwhile, played a certain role on the political stage. They attempted, a little late, to oppose ʿAbd al-Muʿūn b. ʿAlī, the founder of the Almohad dynasty and already master of the whole of Ifriqiya. They were hewn to pieces, and their leader the Rīyāḥī Mūṭrīz b. Ziyād was defeated (556/1161, Ibn Khāldūn, ʿUbar, vi, 494). In 582/1186-7 the Almohad al-Maṣṣūrī, who had come from Morocco to suppress the danger of the Banū Ghāniyā, moved from Tunis towards al-Kayrawān where he set up camp before taking the offensive in the direction of al-Ḥamām, thus making good the first losses sustained by his army (Ibn Khāldūn,
Some years later Yāhūyā b. Ghānīyya seized the town, and with it, all Ḥiḍāyiyya. His success was as resounding as it was short-lived. Al-Kayrawān quickly returned to Almohad and then Hafsīd administration. In 669/1270 the landing of Louis IX at Carthage threw the whole country into a state of turmoil. The holy city founded by Sīdī ‘Ukba vibrated with enthusiasm for diṭḥād; al-Mustaṣṝr, thinking that Tunis was under too great a threat, even intended to move his government there (Ibn Khaldūn, Ḥabar, vi, 670). But the epidemic which raised an end to the conflict robbed him of this honour.

Several years later it again had the opportunity of playing a definite political rôle by favouring the accession of "the impostor", Ibn Abī 'Umāra (681-3/1282-3), to the throne. In bestowing on him the bay′ā it assured him, we are told (Ibn Khaldūn, Ḥabar, vi, 691), of the support of Ṣafāfīs of Ṣūsā and of al-Mahdīyya.

Its name again comes into prominence in the course of the struggle of the Sultan Abū Yāhūyā Abū Bakr against Abū Darbā (718-24/1320-24). But the most important event occurred in Muharram 749/April 1348. Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Marīnī, who had just occupied Ḥarfīyya, was beaten by the nomadic Arabs near al-Kayrawān, where he was later hemmed in (Ibn Khaldūn, Ḥabar, vi, 946, 814-6, 819). He was in fact able to get free and reach Tunis again, but this defeat was a sure mark of his decline and gave rise to the evacuation of the country.

After this al-Kayrawān did not achieve notice until the end of the reign of the Ḥafṣīds, which closed in the shadow of discredit. So it was without difficulty that Khāyar al-Dīn Ḍarbārānṣa, already the master of Algiers, stormed Tunis (18th August 1534), proclaimed the downfall of the dynasty, and among other things placed a garrison at al-Kayrawān. The following year (14th July 1535), Charles V reinstated Mawlā y al-Ḥasan on his throne under a special Spanish protectorate, but the whole of the south of the country escaped him. At that time al-Kayrawān became the capital of an independent principality governed by a marabout, Sīdī ʿArāfā, of the tribe of the Ṣuḥbīyya. In 1542 Mawlay al-Ḥasan, son of Husayn b. Muhammad al-Suhbī, held a conference with the Banū Zid, the Hamāma, and the Frāshīṣ. But it was a conference from which no concrete action emerged. Later, in 1581, just when the French protectorate of Tunisia was being established, al-Kayrawān again achieved honourable status; it became one of the most active hotbeds of the uprising led by Abū Ḥadhāḥum. It was within its bounds that the Zīs of the region, led by al-Suhbī b. Muhammad al-Suhbī, made a decision to intervene at the side of the Pasha of Tripoli. When this intervention produced no result, and any isolated army action was thought worthless, the town was finally occupied without resistance on 26th October 1581. Only the Zīs continued limited operations for some time.

iii. Historical geography

According to the vows of its founder, al-Kayrawān was supposed to "perpetuate the glory of Islam to the end of time" (Ibn ʿIdhrī, Bayān, i, 19; Abū ʿl-ʿArabī, Tabākhī, 8). To a certain extent it has fulfilled this mission. It is still a holy and venerated town, but over the centuries it has lost its rôle of a great metropolis. As described above, it has known both the peak of splendour and the depths of disaster.

ʿUkba had begun his work by marking out the site for the Great Mosque and the Government House (dīr al-imāra). The space around and within a perimeter of 13,600 cubicits, about 7.5 km. (Ibn ʿIdhrī, Bayān, i, 21), must have been apportioned out by tribes as it was in Baṣra and Kūfā which were founded in similar conditions. But there is no precise information on this matter, only a few indications. We learn, for example (al-Bakrī, Sīrāfī, 23), that the Fīhr, the Kurāṣhī clan of the founder of the town, had settled to the north of the Great
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Mosque at the time of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik (105-107/724-726). Again, in the 3rd/9th century, the districts had preserved distinct ethnic or denominational characteristics. This is indicated by Hārāt Yaḥyūb (ʿIyād, Madārīk, partial edition by M. Talbi under the title Biographies Aglabides...), Tunis 1968, 71), Raḥbat al-Kurāṣhīyyin (ʿIyād, Madārīk, 369), Darb al-Fīrāshīyyin (ʿIyād, Madārīk, 359), and a Sūk al-Yahūd (ʿIyād, Madārīk, 359).

From the outset, al-Kayrawān was built in stone, thanks to the re-used building materials which were found on the site. Its perimeter indicates that it was planned as a large city designed to group together all the Arabs of Ifriqiyya, primarily the warriors who would often then be followed by their families. Its initial population could hardly have fallen below 50,000.

Like Baṣra and Kūfah, originally it had no defensive wall and it remained an open city for nearly a century. The vicissitudes of history forced it, as we have seen, to be enclosed, from 144/762 onwards behind ramparts ten cubits thick (al-Bakri, Masālik, 24).

The reign of Yazīd b. Ḥātim al-Muhallābī (155/772-778) was particularly beneficial to it. It was he who organised the town souks and specified the type of activity within them. (Ibn ʿIṣbah, Babāris, 26). He was a man of wealth and attracted to himself poets and men of science. Al-Kayrawān was itself in process of becoming one of the most important centres of Muslim civilisation.

The town reached its zenith in the 3rd/9th century when it became the capital of an independent kingdom. A fortified chief residence for the prince, al-ʿAbbāsīyya [q.v.] was built nearby (184/998). Another, more luxurious and spacious, Raḵkāda, followed (263/877). The city had become too important, and began to disturb the authorities. It no longer needed to be defended, but it was necessary to take precautions against it, so it was deprived of its ramparts in the circumstances already described.

What were its dimensions then? Al-Bakri (Masālik, 25-6) tells us that the main street (al-Simdt), which ran along the east side of the Great Mosque, measured, from the Abū ʿl-Rabīʿ in the south to the Tunis Gate in the north, two and a third miles, that is (allowing 1,600 m. to the mile in al-Bakri) a little less than 4 km. It can be assumed that the town had the same dimension in the opposite direction. Such an area assumes a population of several hundred thousand people. This estimation is confirmed by other evidence. Again according to al-Bakri, the town numbered 48 hammāms, and a count was taken once on the occasion of the feast of al-ʿAḍḥarāʾ of 950 oxen slaughtered for the needs of the inhabitants, which represents a minimum of 200 tons of meat. Even if this is an exaggeration, it indicates a not inconceivable number. Al-Yaʿqūbī, who wrote in the second half of the 3rd/9th century, says for his part, that one rubbed shoulders with all kinds of peoples: Arabs from Kurāṣh, from Mudar, from Raʿbīʿa, from Kaḥṭān and from other tribes too; Persians from Khurāsān; finally, Berbers from Rūm (Latins) and still others (Les Pays, tr. G. Wiet, Cairo 1937, 210). Alongside the Muslim majority there were also to be found Jews and Christians. Al-Fadl b. Rawḥ (1778/779-34) had authorised the building of a church there (Pseudo-Ibn al-Raʾṣīb, Taʾrīkh..., ed. M. al-Kāḥib, Tunis 1968, 185). In the middle of the 3rd/9th century, the church in al-Kayrawān had several heads (ʿIyād, Madārīk, 132), and epigraphy shows us that until the 5th/11th century, Christians had kept the use of Latin in their funerary inscriptions.

Because of all these people, the water system organised from the reign of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik (105-107/724-726) onwards was no longer sufficient (al-Bakri, Masālik, 26). The population had certainly continued to grow under the Aghlabids, which explains the construction of new water reservoirs to meet the growing needs. The immense cistern built at the Tunis Gate by Abū Ḫabīṯ Ahmad (242-9/856-63), the remains of which may still be admired, was the most grandiose construction among the fourteen similar works.

The Great Mosque, the oldest and most prestigious religious building of the Muslim West, also followed the pattern of expansion and assumed a new aspect. It was in the 3rd/9th century that it took on its present form and proportions, except for a few details. It was Ḥāsān b. al-Nūmān [q.v.] who had renovated it. Afterwards it was enlarged towards the north and probably provided with the present minaret in the reign of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik. Yazīd b. Ḥātim reconstructed it in 157/774. In the end, Ziyādat Allāh I had it completely demolished, but probably kept the minaret and had it reconstructed (221/836), having regard for the outline, drawn up by ʿUkbā b. Nāfīʿ, of the wall of the šibā, even though it was badly orientated, having a deviation of 31° towards the south. Al-Ḥāmid al-Muḥammadī b. al-ʿAṣirān Ahmad enlarged it and embellished it again (248/862-3).

From this moment onwards, the work of its restoration and decoration changed nothing of its general appearance. The Zirid al-Muʿtāzī b. Bāḍīṣ (407-74/1017-62) endowed it with the present molūsīra replacing that of the Aghlabids and making it into a library. Other restoration and decoration works were carried out under the Hafsids and in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. The last restoration dates from 1970-2.

The development of the town favoured its intellectual advance. In the 3rd/9th century al-Kayrawān became one of the principal cultural centres of Islam. “Malik (d. 179/795) considered it, together with Kūfa and al-Madīna as one of the three great capitals of the Muslim sciences” (Ibn Nāḍīr, Malā‘īm, ii, 38). Well before al-Ṭabarī, Yahāyā b. Sallām al-Ḥāṣibī (124-200/741-815) was writing there and taught his Taṣfīr which has been partially preserved (two mss. at Tunis BN 7447, and collection of H. H. Abdul-Wahab); this was the first great monument of Muslim exegesis. Asad b. al-Furat (ca. 144-213/759-828), after following the lectures of Mālik, of the Ḥanafi Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan and a host of other oriental masters, entrusted to his Asādiyya a personal synthesis of the different teachings he had received and made many disciples who continued his tradition. His attempt would have led to a specifically al-Kayrawān school of fiqh if only his prestige had not been eclipsed by that of Saḥḥān (ca. 160-240/777-854), who was undoubtedly the grand master of the epoch. His monumental Mūdawwana, which conveys to us the teaching of Malik according to the version of Ibn al-Kāsim, became the breviary of the men of al-Kayrawān. Students from all quarters flocked to his lectures, including some from Muslim Spain, where no less than 57 students were authorised to spread his teaching. Philological activity has left us no great work, but it was sufficiently important for Abū Bakr al-Zubayrī to devote a special chapter to it in his Taḥābūt al-nabawīyyin wa-l-ṣaḥḥātayn (Cairo 1954, 254-72). Medicine was well represented by Ziyād b. Khāfūn, Iṣbāḥ b. ʿImrān and Iṣbāḥ b. Sulaqīmān (al-Bakri, Masālik, 24; Ibn Abī Usṣamīyya, ʿUyun al-anbāʿ, ed. and tr. A. Noureddine and H.
The reign of the Shi'ī Fātimids was certainly not favourable to this citadel of Sunnism. The triumphant Kutāma claimed the right of sacking this opulent city as a reward for their effort. In actual fact, it suffered little. Despite the construction of a rival city, ʿṢabrā al-Manṣūrīyya (336/947-8) near it, towards which commercial activity tended to shift, it maintained its prosperity and was able to triumph over certain natural disasters: an earthquake (299/911-2); a flood in the souls (13th Dhu 'l-Hijjah 306/17th May 910); famine and an epidemic (317/929). The positive statements of two contemporaries, Ibn Hawkal (Ṣūrat al-arḍ, Beirut n.d., 94) and al-Muqaddasī (Āhsan al-tabāsīm, ed. and partial tr. Ch. Pellat, Algiers 1950, 14-7), agree that the reliability of the water supply was actually better assured. The Fātimid al-Mu'izz actually had "a system of canals constructed which came down from the mountain and filled the reservoirs after crossing his palace at ʿṢabrā" (ibid., 15). The town was at that time crossed by 15 main thoroughfares (darb), the names of which have been partly preserved (ibid., 17) and its area had grown even larger, "a boundary of a little less than three miles"; according to al-Muqaddasī (ibid., 15), the basis of 1900 m. to the mile in al-Muqaddasīs, about 5.5 km.). It is evident that its population had considerably increased, and this was the peak of its expansion.

From that point onwards, an era of stagnation began for al-Kayrawān as for the rest of Ifrīqiya, which was followed by inexorable decline. There were several bursts of revival which just enabled it to keep a foot on the ladder of a country definitely in decline, but they could not retrieve for it its former glory. The transfer of the caliphate to Cairo (361/972) came as a severe blow to Ifrīqiya. The reserves of precious metal followed the Fatimids to Egypt and al-Kayrawān lost for ever its rôle as a capital. The first Zirids hardly ever lived there, but exhausted themselves with the interminable battles in the central and more distant Maġrib. Although it was prosperous at the beginning of their reign, it was brought under severe pressure to satisfy the demands of the master of Egypt. The vice-regent ʿAbd Allāh al-Kātib extracted no less than 400,000 dinārs in 366/976-7 from 600 of the leading citizens; some of them had to pay as much as 10,000 dinārs each (Ibn ʿIdhārī, Bayān, i, 230); this brought ruin for many.

Some decades later in 395/1004-5 the town experienced famine and a dreadful epidemic, concerning which Ibn ʿIdhārī (Bayān, i, 250-7), following Ibn al-Raḍīq, has preserved an interesting description. Each day they buried their dead by hundreds in common graves; the dwellings were empty and the services, the ovens, hamāms etc. were paralysed. The city was depopulated and a helter-skelter flight of refugees sought shelter far away, even as far as Sicily. Some years later, in 405/1014-5, the merchants were again forced to transfer their trade to ʿṢabrā. The Ṣanḥādja were also involved. Everything seemed to have conspired to stifle the Sunnī capital which, struck by so many misfortunes, saw its prosperity fade and its population dwindle. The perimeter of the city-wall, linked by a corridor to ʿṢabrā (which al-Mu'izz built in great haste when he was the hands of Arab nomads who levied taxes on a poor and wretched population. As for Raḍdāda and ʿṢabrā, they simply disappeared completely. It was the nadir of its fortunes.

The reign of the Almohads, and especially that of the Hafsids, brought back to it a relative peace and allowed the town to rise a little from its ruined state. In the 7th/13th century private enterprise gave it better ramparts. With the rise of the Marabout movement it also began to fill with ʿaṣāyiṣ (Ibn Naḍīlī, Ṭabāṣīm, iv, 227). But the population, mostly composed of urbanised bedouin elements, was henceforth much less refined. Yākūṭ (d. 620/1228) wrote: "Today all one sees are worthless bumpkins (ṣuʿūlāḥ)" (Buldān, Beirut 1957, iv, 420). The impression received by al-ʿAbdārī (al-Riḥlah al-Maqṣūriyya, ed. M. al-Fāshi, Rabat 1688, 64, 66, 82), who went there on pilgrimage in 668/1270, was not much better.
In fact, a new life at a much more modest level had begun for al-Kayrawân. In a general context of continuous regression it was, however, able to preserve a certain status, but without any measure of its past grandeur. Even so, it was respectable enough among the other towns of the kingdom and adapted itself to its new economic rôle, that of being a market town and commercial centre for the Bedouin. Its souks, although very much reduced, with their goods carried off towards the west, continued to offer indispensable products: leather, cloth and metal. It received in exchange the products of pastoral activity. Leo Africanus who visited it in 1526, that is at the end of the Ḥafṣid period, describes it in this way: “At present only poor workmen are to be seen there, for the most part tanners of sheepskins and goatskins. They sell all their leather garments in the towns of Numidia where there is no European cloth” (De description de l’Afrique, tr. A. Epaulard, Paris 1936, ii, 398). Later on, particularly at the beginning of the reign of the Ḥusaynids, al-Kayrawân recovered and gained second place in the country. Al-Wazir al-Sarrâdî (d. 1149/1736-7) noted at the beginning of the 18th century: “At this moment, after Tunis, no larger town than al-Kayrawân is known in all of Ifriqiya. Among its inhabitants are the best scholars, the most skilful people and the most astute business men” (Hualî, ed. M. H. al-Hilîa, Tunis 1970, i, 244). The impression is confirmed by J. A. Peyssonnel, who wrote: “al-Kayrawân is one of the largest towns in the kingdom. It is situated on a brackish plain, half a league in circumference, is very well populated and very commercial. It has been ruined several times but was well repaired under the Bey Hassem ben Aly . . . Much woolen cloth was made there, besides sufficient textiles and other materials special to the country . . .” (Relation d’une voyage sur les côtes de Barbarie, fait par l’ordre du roi en 1724 and 1725, ed. M. Dureau de la Malle, Paris 1838, i, 113; see also i, 160). L. R. Desfontaines, who visited al-Kayrawân in January 1784, for his part, notes that it was “the biggest in the kingdom after Tunis; it was even better built and cleaner than the latter . . . The trade of al-Kayrawân consists principally of animal skins which the inhabitants know how to put to different uses. Here are made bridles, saddles and shoes according to the fashion of the land. They also made woolen clothes called barakan. The people there have a happier life than anywhere else, being exempt from taxes in recompense for the services which they rendered to the grandfather of the present Bey” (Fragment d’un voyage dans les régences de Tunis et d’Alger fait de 1783 à 1786, ed. M. Dureau de la Malle, Paris 1838, ii, 61). V. Guérin, who spent three days there from 18th to 20th August 1861, thinks also that it was, with barely 12,000 inhabitants, “after Tunis one of the most highly populated towns of the regency”. (Voyage Archéologique dans la Régence de Tunis, Paris 1862, ii, 334). It came before Sfax, which scarcely numbered more than 10,000 inhabitants, and before Sousse, Monastir and Mahdiyya, whose populations did not exceed 5,000 or 8,000. It was, however, situated “in a real desert, almost entirely deprived of trees and even of bushes” (V. Guérin, Voyage . . . ii, 326). All told, the city founded by Sidi ‘Ukba, despite the ruining of its hinterland, showed, at least until the days of the protectorate, that despite everything it was more viable than other centres which were apparently better situated.

Its religious prestige was certainly not irrelevant to its survival. With “about 50 zaouïas and 20 mosques” (V. Guérin, Voyage . . . ii, 328), it was indubitably the 15th century capital of the country. It was then considered to be a holy town and in principle forbidden to non-Muslims. Today it has no such sacred character, and tourists have free access to its sanctuaries. As for its population, the city of Sidi ‘Ukba occupies only the fifth place in the country, but is also the chef-lieu of the most under-developed governorate of the country. It still, however, maintains a certain aura of sanctity and attracts the most illustrious visitors. And when the point of the unification of the countries of the Maghrib is brought up, there are those who find that “the capital of this federation of independent states ought to be Kayrawân, the spiritual capital of the Moslems since many centuries and thus appropriate to symbolise the return to the glory of the past of the World of the Islam” (La Presse, a Tunisian daily, of 21 Sept. 1973).

KAYS, also known by the Persian name Kish, one of the most important of the commercially-relevant islands in the Persian Gulf (Bahr 'Umán), especially following the ruin of Siraf. The island was some four farsakhs from the coast opposite the port of Huzú, and was four farsakhs in circumference; it contained a residence of the ruler of 'Umán, and was characterised by garden areas and splendid constructions. Water was supplied by means of wells, and by rain water which was collected in cisterns. Kays was famous for its pearl fisheries, as were also the surrounding islands. Yāḵūt indicates that its ruler was held in great respect owing to the size of his fleet, and he seems to have exercised a monopoly over various commercial concerns. Some intellectual activity was also observed.


( J. LASNER)

KAŠĀN, now well-known as a centre of Persian poetry. Its famous poets include the royal poet of the Safavids, Ṣādūqī, and Ḥabīb al-Din Ṣafarī, whose treatise on the theory of poetry, Masta' al-nafās, is still highly regarded. Other notable poets include Ḥabīb al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥaswāʾ, who wrote the famous quatrains on the subject of love and separation, and Ḥabīb al-Dīn Abū al-Ḵāliq, who wrote the famous quatrains on the subject of death and grief.
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KAYS B. ‘ASIM — KAYS ‘AYLAN

KAYS B. ‘Asim, a descendant of ‘Ismail, was the son of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Abi ‘Amr and the father of ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Malik. He was born in the year 68/689 and died in 134/750. He was known as a scholar and a poet. He was a prolific writer, and his works include a number of poems and other literary works. He was also known for his political and military activities. He was a member of the Banu ‘Amir tribe, and he played a significant role in the early Muslim rulers of the Islamic state. He was a close friend of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwan, the first Umayyad caliph, and he was appointed as the governor of several provinces.

KAYS ‘AYLAN, a descendant of ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Malik, was born in the year 833 and died in 293/906. He was a scholar and a poet, and he was known for his works on Arabic literature. He was a prolific writer, and his works include a number of poems and other literary works. He was also known for his political and military activities. He was a member of the Banu ‘Amir tribe, and he played a significant role in the early Muslim rulers of the Islamic state. He was a close friend of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwan, the first Umayyad caliph, and he was appointed as the governor of several provinces.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV
Kays 'Aylān does not appear to have functioned as a unit before Islam, and in the accounts of "the days of the Arabs" only the individual tribes are named. In Umayyad times, however, the alleged genealogies became a convenient basis for bringing together groups of clans so as to constitute something like a political party. This process began when small contingents from different tribes were lodged together in the cities of the empire; for Bayṣra cf. C. Pellat, Le milieu baṣrī, Paris 1953, 23 and passim. Eventually, but probably not until after the death of Muʿāwiya in 60/666, two main groups are found to be taking shape. One is known as Kalb or Yemen or the Southern Arabs, while the other is Kays 'Aylān or simply Kays, less often Muṣāwar. Because Muʿāwiyah had relied on Kalb, and his son Yazid I had a Kalbī mother, many Kaysīs supported Ibn al-Zubayr. While at first other groups are mentioned, such as Rabiʿa, gradually the polarity of Kays and Yemen came to dominate Umayyad politics. Nineteenth-century historians spoke of this as if it were primarily a continuing and expanding tribal feud, based on such facts as the great loss of life at the battle of Marj Rāḥit in 684; and it was the inability of the Umayyad rulers to reconcile the two groups which eventually led to their collapse. Recently, M. A. Shaban (Islamic History, A.D. 600-750/4.A.H. 132, Cambridge, 1971) has forcefully argued that the Kays came to be identified with the expansionist policy followed by 'Abd-al-Malik and al-Ṭadhībīdīdī, while the Yemen stood for stable frontiers and the assimilation of non-Arabs. He sees the reigns of Sulaymān and 'Umar II as an attempt to reverse the policy of expansion, and likewise that of Yazīd III. In these reigns, Kaysīs were replaced by Yemenis, but the successors of 'Umar II and Yazīd III turned back to the Kays, and the disintegration of Umayyad rule proceeded. A point in favour of Shaban's view is that after the establishment of the 'Abbāsid 'Abbāsid little is heard of the hostility between Kays and Yemen.

**Bibliography:** For genealogies, etc. see Tādī al-'Arās, s.v. kys., 'yl, Ibn Kutayba, Muʿāwiyah, ed. Wüstenfeld, 31, 38-44, ed. U.Kāshiya, 64, 79-92. For the historical role of Kays see J. Wellhausen, The Arab Kingdom and its Fall, tr. M. G. Weir, Calcutta 1927, Index, s.v. Qais, Qaisita, Kalb, Kalbīte, Yemen, Yemenite; and Naji H. Hadi, The Role of the Arab Tribes in the East under the Umayyads (University of Edinburgh Ph. D. thesis, 1973; to be published in Arabic).

(W. Montgomery Watt)

**Kays and Yaman in the Ottoman Period.**

The reader will find under Kalb b. Wābah some information on the rivalry of the North and South Arabs (represented respectively by Kays and Kalb) before and after the birth of Islam, and especially in Spain. In the course of the centuries, this hostility diminished considerably, but there was a resurgence of it, in a somewhat artificial way, in the course of the factional conflicts in Lebanon and Palestine during the Ottoman period.

In the course of the struggle for power among dominant families, coalitions were formed which used the names of Kays and Yaman to denote the political identification of the rival camps. This division preserved a kinship connotation, and kinship—real or imagined, original or adopted—was a legitimate reason for schisms and wars in Arab society. The political character of the Kays-Yaman conflict in Lebanon and Palestine during the Ottoman period is revealed through two crucial facts: (a) many adherents of each of these parties (and even some of their leading families, such as the Abū Ghosh family in Palestine) were not Arabs at all, but Circassians, Turkmens, or Kurds (b) families of allegedly Arab origin changed sides with little regard to actual descent, such as the 'Alam al-Dīn family in Lebanon (Shidyāk, i, 129), or a family split in two parts supporting opposing factions. Only powerful clans which managed to maintain their position for a long period were consistent in their factional adherence.

During the Mamlūk period, the Yaman faction in Lebanon was led by the 'Alam al-Dīn family, in opposition to the ruling Bubūts who were considered Kays. The latter faction supported the Maḥsūns when they succeeded the Bubūts in 922/1516. In 933/1528 a Yaman conspiracy against the Maḥsūn Amir Korkmaz almost succeeded, but his son Faḥr al-Dīn II re-established Yaman supremacy.

A second short tenure of power of the Yaman 'Alam al-Dīn family occurred after the downfall of Faḥr al-Dīn II in 1042/1633. This resulted in a great massacre and in civil war, but from 1045/1635 to the end of the century the Kays Maḥsūns had the upper hand. Under the Shāhābids, the successors of the Maḥsūns, the Yaman party, with Ottoman support, succeeded in gaining power once more for a short time in 1121/1709, but in a fierce battle at the village of 'Ayūn Darā, which took place in 1372/1752, the Yaman forces were utterly routed and their leaders, the 'Alam al-Dīn family, were slaughtered to a man. Thus Yaman power in Lebanon was completely crushed, and the Yaman Druzes who survived were expelled from Lebanon and sought refuge in the Hāwrān, with the exception of the Arslāns, who were allowed to retain the lower Ghārib, which was a part of their original maḥkāma. New political divisions emerging in the Lebanon after the battle of 'Ayūn Darā no longer adopted the nomenclature of Kays and Yaman; from then onwards, the factions were called after their leading families.

In Palestine, the division into Kays and Yaman is of long standing. According to al-Nā'im (i, 59) the Mamlūk Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalādūn (1293-1340) allocated the region of Dībaj al-Nābulus to the Yaman faction and the south to Kays. In the 10th-11th century again, the population of various regions of Palestine was divided into these two factions, and fighting frequently erupted (U. Heyd, Ottoman documents on Palestine 1352-1625, Oxford 1960, 85-6). In the 18th and 19th centuries factional wars under the banner of Kays and Yaman were fought primarily in the Nābulus and Nablus areas. The Dībaj al-Nābulus witnessed an open fight between the Tūkāns and the Nīmrs families between 1794 and 1823, and perpetual conflict, including incessant armed clashes, between the 'Abd al-Hādīs and the Tūkāns in the 1840s and 1850s. Throughout this period the rival camps, townsmen, fālāḥīn and Bedouin, were identified with the Kays and Yaman factions, and even families whose descent was unclear felt the need to adhere to one of them. Thus the Tūkāns, at the start of their rule, declared their affiliation to Yaman (qālān yaʿmaniyiyatāh) in order to win support from the ḥāqīqs of the nāḥiyās (al-Nā'im, ii, 415-16). At the same time, the Judaean hills were also the scene of clashes between fālāḥīn divided into Kays, led by the Samīḥān family, the Lāḥūans, the 'Arūs, and the Bāshirīths, and Yaman, led by the Abū Ghosh clan. Most of the inhabitants of the Christian villages were Yaman, while those of Christian Bāṣṭ Jālā, as well as the...
Muslims of the Hebron area, were Kays. The adherence of the Bedouins to one faction or another was determined mainly by the affiliation of the neighbouring fallâhûn or by internal division among the Bedouins themselves.

However, factional ties between the Diabal Nâbulus and the Judean hills were minimal, and in the principal engagements the parties of one region were not assisted by their counterparts from the other region. Inter-regional ties between members of the same faction were found particularly on the fringes of the two regions, and more on the Kays than on the Yaman side. Moreover, there were differences between the two areas. The Nâbulus notables led the factional war and took an active part in it, and fighting sometimes even occurred in the city. The town quarters were split along factional lines and city-dwellers joined in the village skirmishes. As against this, Jerusalem was never the scene of fighting in the factional wars, and the city notables neither led the fighting nor did they play an active part in it. Yet when there was a weak Paşâ, Jerusalem’s notables were able to turn the factional strife to their own advantage, and the leading rural families of both camps had their allies in the magâlis of the town. In general, only when a strong Paşâ ruled, an area was taken as a trace in that factional strife. However, both in Palestine and in Lebanon, the Ottomans used to support one faction (often the weaker one) against the other in order to further their own political aims. With the growing centralisation of Ottoman rule during the second half of the 19th century, factional wars in Palestine gradually subsided, although identification with Kays or Yaman and some of the customs connected with this division persisted among parts of the rural population.

The fact was usually referred to as a saff, but also as an ‘îsábâ, farîb, jâfîfa, or biwb. Affiliation to a faction was termed na’ra,  ‘âsâbiyya, shakwa, or nîkla. A member of the same faction was called  ‘âsibh and an enemy kaumâni; a one-day battle was a barâba, and if it lasted longer than one day, it was called a kaww. The head of the faction used to make an annual tour of villages loyal to him (yakhtâ ‘as-şuﬁf). These visits served as points of time in their chronology.

Each faction had its colour—Kays red, and Yaman white—which distinguished its flag and its members’ clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes, women’s veils and especially the bride’s clothes. Kays was involved in polemics with this faction, and also in those who would place Kays above the Qaisi and Yemeni, the most important poet of Yathrib. He was a member of the B. Zafar (Ibn al-Kalbî-Câskel, Tab. 181) of the Aws [q.v.], whom he defended both by words and by the sword in contests with the Khazrajî [q.v.]. Apart from some late and very dubious pieces of information, very little is known of his life, but it is known that he exacted vengeance for the murders of his father and grandfather, and this gave him a great reputation amongst posterity; these actions were, however, later subject to all sorts of legendary accretions and motifs which sometimes recall the legend of Cyrus and form a parallel to the story of Perzival (see Singer, Arab. und europa. Poesie im Mittelalter, in Abh. Pr. Ak. Wiss., phil.hist. Kl., xiii (1928), p. 7 of the reprint). In regard to the active part which he took in the political and military activities of his tribe, we have constant reference in his Dâwân to a whole series of ayyâm of the Aws, but he did not take part, apparently on account of a wound received previously, in the decisive battle of Bu’âWait [q.v.], so much celebrated in later song. He was treacherously murdered some time before the hidîra, and tradition relates that he was avenged even before he himself had breathed his last gasp. Kays was involved in polemics with almost all the Khazrajî poets of his time, notably with Hassan b. Thâbit and ’Abd Allâh b. Rawbâ, who both survived him by a considerable period of time. Although he was still alive at the time when the Prophet began his preaching, his Dâwân shows no traces of a knowledge of it, and all the later sources describing a meeting between him and the Prophet seem to be pure invention.

The oldest manuscript of his Dâwân, dated 419/1028, is the Top Kapu Saray one, and forms an appendix to the Dâwân of Hassan b. Thâbit. The recension of the poems goes back to Ibn al-Sikkit, but the definitive editor of the Dâwân seems to have been al-Suktâr. What has survived is clearly only a fragment of the original. It was published by T. Kowalski, Der Dâwân des Kais b. al-Khâtîm, Leipzig 1914; by I. Sâmârî and A. Matânî, Baghdad 1831/1962; and by Nâşir al-Dîn al-Asad, Cairo 1831/1962.

Kays is reckoned amongst the authors of the mudhâhabâtî chosen by Abû Zayd al-Kurâshî who, in his Dâmârîa (123), places him in the fourth tabâba; but Ibn Sallâm (Tabâbî, 190) does not go along with those who would place Kays above Hassan. His poetry, both in his ghazals and also in his fâhîr poems and his hikâm, reveals the two sides of life, the sedentary and the nomadic, which was characteristic of the oasis dwellers in his time. His descriptions of war and portraits of women are celebrated. What is typical of real Bedouin life, sc. the description of the riding camel, the ride through the desert and the chase, are almost entirely lacking in his poems. One might say that if Kays was highly esteemed by later generations, it was more for his chivalric character than for his poetic gifts. His poetry is nevertheless a very important source for our knowledge of conditions in Yathrib just before
the coming of Islam and for certain customs there, in particular, those concerning the blood-feud.


(T. Kowalskip)
after their leader Abu Karib (Kurayb) al-Darlr, though al-Nawbakhtl mentions, the Karibiyya as a separate group who stated that they did not know the whereabouts of Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya. According to al-Nawbahgl, Hamza b. 'Umara al-Barbarl in Medina was an extremist originally belonging to the Kariibiyya. He then claimed to be an imam and prophet, asserted the divinity of Ibn al-Hanafiyya and taught antimonalism. Hamza’s activity cannot, however, have begun until long after the death of Ibn al-Hanafiyya if he is identical with the homonymous secretary of 'Abd Allah b. Mu'awiya. A prominent role in the introduction of the theory of metempsychosis and other extremist ideas is ascribed to one of their chiefs, Abu Riyah, who decided in 736/118 that he was the party of Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya. Abd Allah therefore joined the Khidashiyya. He then claimed that before his death Abu Hashim had appointed as his successor. They later continued the imamate after Abu Hashim, affirming that the imamate continued after his death Abu Hashim and finally to Ibn Harb, who thus had become the imam until the reappearance of Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya. When his followers discovered, however, that his claim to be the Mahdi was unfounded, the bulk of them renounced him and accepted 'Abd Allah b. Mu'awiya as their imam in succession to Abu Hashim. According to some sources, Ibn Harb was converted to Sufi Kharidjism and died holding Sufi beliefs.

The party tracing the imamate through the 'Abbasid Muhammad b. 'Ali and his son Ibrahîm to the 'Abbasid caliphs is commonly called the Rawandiyya [q.v.], though some heresiographers restrict the name to those who asserted that the first imam after the death of the Prophet was his uncle al-Abbas and that the imamate continued among his descendants. This doctrine, however, probably originated only during the reign of the caliph al-Mahdi (158-69/775-83), while the name Rawandiyya already appears in historical reports of events before the year 120/738. According to al-Nawbakhtl the name is derived from a sectarian group called Harbiyya or Hârîjiyya already appears in historical reports of events before the year 120/738. Another groupmainly in the mountains of Raqlwa. Another group affirmed that Muhammad b. al-Hasan, the latter's son al-Hasan, affirming that the imamate belonged exclusively to the descendants of Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya, after the death of Abu Hashim had handed the appointment to Salih b. Mudrik. The appointment had passed to Khidash. After the execution of Khidash in 119/736 they affirmed that he was alive and had been raised to heaven by God.
After the execution of Abu Muslim [q.v.], the leader of the Abbasid movement in Khorasan, by the caliph al-Manṣūr in 137/755, from some of his supporters it was maintained that the imāmate had been transferred from the caliph al-Saffāh, al-Manṣūr’s predecessor, to Abu Muslim and that Abu Muslim was alive. They were called the (Abū) Muslimiyya.

Opposed to them were the Rizāmīyya, named after their chief Rizām b. Sābīḥ, who upheld the succession of al-Manṣūr to the imāmate, though they refused to repudiate Abu Muslim, and affirmed that the imāmate would remain in the Abbasid family until the resurrection, when a descendant of al-Abbas would be the Mahdi. Rizām is mentioned as a leader of the Rāwandī extremists in 141/758 when a riot by a group of them in the court of the palace of al-Manṣūr was bloodily suppressed. In the ensuing persecution of the extremists, Rizām sought refuge with the caliph’s son Diyaʾ al-Muʾmin and was granted amnesty.

A further schism in the ‘Abbasid ghīṣa occurred in 147/764 when al-Manṣūr deferred the succession of his nephew ‘Īsā b. Mūsā, who had been named by al-Saffāh to succeed al-Manṣūr, and appointed his own son Muhammad al-Manṣūr as his immediate successor. One party considered the action of al-Manṣūr as illegal and recognized ‘Īsā b. Mūsā as the imām of the descendants as his imāms. The other party asserted that the action of al-Manṣūr was legal, since the order of the living imām should supersede that of a dead imām and since ‘Īsā had agreed to sell his rights. They recognized al-Manṣūr as the imām after al-Manṣūr.

After his accession (158/775) al-Manṣūr induced the ‘Abbasid ghīṣa to repudiate the imāmate of ‘Abbās and his descendants and to recognize a purely ‘Abbasid imāmate beginning with al-Abbas and based on the right of inheritance. The partisans of this doctrine were known as the Hurayrīyya after their leader Abū Hurayrā al-Rāwandī (rarely al-Dīmashkī). By denying the imāmate of Muhammad b. al-Hanafīyya and Abū Ḥāšim this group left the fold of the Kaysāniyya. Extremist doctrines, such as deification or belief in their omniscience, and dispensation from the religious law for those knowing the (azilla), initiated by seven Adams. They also held that the imāmate had been transferred from Abu Muslim to the imāmate of ‘Abbās and based on the accounts of the Kaysāniyya movement. Their adoption by these Karmatī groups evidently reflects a spontaneous development in the Ismāʿīlī movement rather than a survival of Kaysānī beliefs.

In Irāk the mass of the adherents of the Kaysāniyya was absorbed by the rising tide of Imāmī Shiism. A substantial part of the religious doctrine first elaborated in the Kaysāniyya, e.g., on bādaʾ [q.v.], raddaʾ and important aspects of the theory of the imāmate, was adopted by orthodox Imāmīsm. Other Kaysānī doctrines were passed on among the ghulūt adhering to Imāmī lines of imāms. In Persia and Transoxania the Rāwandīyya and the Djanatīyya-Ḥarbīyya groups were largely merged into various syncretist sects often generically termed Khurramiyya [q.v.].

**Bibliography:**


In early Islam. — The usual name in Arabic for the Roman and Byzantine emperor. The word represents the Greek Καίσαρ and came to the Arabic through the intermediary of the Aramaic (see Fränkel, Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen, Leiden 1886, 278 ff.). The borrowing must have taken place at quite an early period, as the word in Syriac later appears almost in the form καίσαρ (see Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, s.v.). The Arabs, centuries before Muhammad, had relations with Roman and to a greater extent with Byzantine emperors. As early as the Πρίγιπους, a Roman Καίσαρ is mentioned as conqueror of Εδοράκιν (probably Caracalla, from 198 A.D. co-regent of Septimius Severus, see F. Altheim-R. Stiehl, Die Araber in der alten Welt, I, Berlin 1964, 44). In A.D. 244 an Arab from Ḥawrān reigned for five years under the name Darius Julius Philippus. In Syria at the beginning of the 6th century A.D., the Banū Ghassān replaced the Banū Sallāh as Arab allies, σύμμαχοι, of Byzantium. The chief Ghassānīd phylarch was accorded high honours and a title like patricius (bitrifrio) and allowed to wear the crown of a client king of the Byzantine emperor (see ghassānī). For the Ghassānids and all the inhabitants of north-western Arabia, Kaysār, the Persian for the Persians, for the Lakhmids and all the inhabitants of north-eastern Arabia. Among the old Arabic poets, Imra' al-Kays (q.v.) more than once mentions Kayṣar, who, indeed, played a great part in his life. For later poets also, Kayṣar—alongside Kīṣrā—is still a current symbol of power and wealth.

The word Kayṣar is used in the Kur'ān, but it occurs quite frequently in the biography of Muhammad in Hadīth collections, in commentaries on the Kur'ān and in general historical works. It is always used without the article, like a proper name, and cannot be followed directly by a genitive, from which too it is clear that the word was considered as a proper name. Heraclius, the famous Byzantine emperor of the time of Muhammad, Abū Bakr and 'Umar, is therefore called Ḥiraḫi or Kayṣar 'azīm (or malik) al-Rūm. The word Kayṣar is often omitted for example in a list of "the kings of the Romans/Byzantines (malik al-Rūm) from Augustus to Heraclius (Tabari, i, 1741-744), in a report of the capture of Amurian (838 A.D., Tabari, iii, 1234: Tafṣīl ibn Mālikī, sīḥah/malik al-Rūm), and in a report of the battle of Nakazgerd (1071, Ibn al-Aḍḥīr, x, 448-46: Armānūs [= Romanus], malik al-Rūm).

According to Ibn Sa'd (i, 43, 45 f.), Ḥighām b. 'Abd Manāf, great-grandfather of Muhammad, received from Kayṣar a letter of safe conduct for merchants from Mecca visiting Syria (see M. J. Kister, in JESHO, viii (1965), 116 f.). A great number of texts mention the letter which is said to have been sent by Muhammad through Dhiyā (q.v.) to the governor of Boṣrā and through him to the emperor Heraclius. In many versions, the emperor interrogates Abū Sufyān regarding the new prophet, and (in contrast to Kīṣrā) appears to be inclined to Ḥīṣām; only fear of his subjects prevents him from openly protesting the new religion (for references see below). 'Umar contrasts the neediness of the Prophet's existence with the luxurious living of Kīṣrā and Kayṣar (Buḫārī, Tafṣīl, 66, 5; Ibn Maḍja, Zuhd, 11). During the affair of Ḥudaybiyya, 'Urwa ibn Mas'ūd, having visited the Prophet in his camp, tells his Meccan compatriots that though he has travelled as an envoy to the kings, to Kayṣar, to Kīṣrā and to al-Nadjīfāshī, he has never seen any king so greatly honoured as Muhammad is by his Companions (Buḫārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, 15; cf. Ibn Ḥighām, 745). The following utterance of Muhammad is reported as a kind of prophecy: "If Kīṣrā perishes (variant: Kīṣrā has died), there will be no Kīṣrā after him. And if Kayṣar perishes, there will be no Kayṣar after him. By Him in whose hand my soul lies, you will spend their treasures in the way of God" (Buḫārī, Fard al-Rūm, 8, Aymān, Tafṣīl, 157; Muslim, Ḥṣāf, 75; Wākīḍī, 460). Cf. the critical remark of Mu'attīb ibn Kuṭbāy during the siege of Medina by the "Allies", "Muḥammad promises us the treasures of Kīṣrā and Kayṣar, whereas it is not safe for one of us to go to the privy" (Wākīḍī, 459 f.; Ibn Ḥighām, 357). Another prophetic utterance ascribed to Muḥammad is: "The first troops of my community who will assault the city of Kayṣar (i.e., Constantinople) shall be forgiven (their sins)" (Buḫārī, Tafṣīl, 93). Bibliography: Muhammad's letter to Kayṣar (a) without the conversation with Abū Sufyān: Wākīḍī, ed. M. Jones, Oxford 1966, 553 f.; Ibn Sa'd, ii/1, 63; Tabārī, i, 1559-61; Ibn Sa'd, i/2, 15 f.; Abū 'Ubayd al-Ḵāsim b. Sallām, Kitāb al-Amād, Cairo 1333, 253-6 (§§ 623-3); Ya'qūbī, ii, 83 f.; Tabārī, i, 1565-7; Ibn al-Aḍḥīr, ii, 161 f.; Welthausen, Städteträger des Arabischen Reiches, 1889, 98; W. M. Watt, Muslim at Medina, Oxford 1956, 345-7—Muhammad's letter to Kayṣar (b) including the conversation with Abū Sufyān: Buḫārī, chs. Tafṣīl, 102, Taṣfīr, 3, 4, Badr al-Wahy, 6; Muslim, Tafṣīl, 74; Tabārī, i, 1561-5; Ibn al-Aḍḥīr, ii, 163; Ibn Ḥadjar, Ṣaḥīḥ, Calcutta 1893, 557 f.; Abu 'l-Fīda, Muḥammad tābīt al-baṣghar, ed. and tr. Fleischer, as Abūl-fedā Hikāyat al-ḥisāb al-islām, 1940.


2. In Islamic history.—In the Meccan period, Muḥammad's sympathies were with Heraclius against Kīṣrā and echoes of the struggle between the two are recorded in Sūrat al-Rūm (Kūr'ān, XXX). But in the Medinan period this attitude was reversed, the basis of the reversal being religious, since Islam is the true religion of the "straight path" and has universalistic claims, Byzantium and its Kayṣar become the enemy of Islam and the Islamic state, which must eventually triumph and capture Constantinople itself. On this is based the new Muslim conception of Kayṣar. His dominion is part of Dār al-Ḥarb (the Abode of War), he is an infidel, and war against him is džiḥād (holy war). This hostile and contemptuous attitude towards Kayṣar was strengthened by the military victories of the Arabs over the Byzantines. Thus, the religious and military bases on which Arab respect for Kayṣar had rested in pre-Islamic times disappeared in the first century of the Muslim era; the new attitude was reflected in such designations for Kayṣar as jāḥiyā, "tyrant", or such expressions as kūl al-Rūm, "the dog of the Romans", used by Ḥūrūn al-Rashīd in addressing Nicephorus.

The image of Kayṣar among the Arabs in the four centuries or so after the battle of al-Yarmūk in 636 naturally fluctuated with the military fortunes of the two states over which Caliph and Kayṣar ruled. The first part of this period, Umayyad and early 'Abbasīd, was, generally speaking, one of Arab successes against Byzantines; but the tide turned against the Arabs with the coming of the Macedonian dynasty, and the striking successes of the Ḥāmidānīs proved ephemeral.
The Turks opened a new chapter in the relations between Islam and Byzantium, one that lasted for some four centuries from their victory at Manzikert in 463/1071, until their capture of Constantinople in 857/1453. Under the impact of Turkish military victories, the image of the Byzantine Kaysar reverted to what it had been before the period of the Macedonians. The basic factor was the conquest and Turkification of the Byzantine heartland, Anatolia, and the diminution of the dominion of the Kaysars. The Seljuk sultan Alp Arslan defeated the Byzantine emperor Romanus Diogenes at Manzikert and took him captive in 463/1071, setting the tone for two centuries in Seljuk relations with, and attitude towards, Kaysars of the Comneni, the Angeli and the Lascaris.

The Ottomans presided over the last phase of Kaysar's humiliation; their attitude to him and his dominion was the classical Islamic one, confirmed by their series of astounding victories in the Balkans. The final chapter in this drama of the Muslim-Byzantine conflict, which had lasted for some eight centuries, was written by the sultan's victory over the last of the Palaeologi, Constantine XI. Muhammad the Conqueror captured Constantinople, and added to his titles of Ghazi and Khan that of Kaysar itself, which he was able to do, since he was not caliph but sultan; the title proved unattractive for his imperial designs for the reconquest of the Byzantine territories lost by the Kaysars in Europe and Asia.


**KAYSÂRÎYYA (also KAYSÂRIYYA)**, plur. kaysârsîn, the name of a large system of public buildings laid out in the form of cloisters with shops, workshops, warehouses and frequently also living-rooms. According to de Sacy, *Relation de l’Égypte par Abd Allah*, Paris 1810, 303-4, the kaysâriyya was originally distinguished from the sâkî probably only by its greater extent, and by having several covered galleries around an open court, while the sâkî consists only of a single gallery. At the present day in any case, the term kaysâriyya is not infrequently quite or almost identical in meaning with the Persian word kârâvânâsârâ (or kârâvân), which first came into use in western Asia in the 16th century, or the likewise modern analogous names, kâbân, wakhâla (o kelele), funduq (see), and beisân. An **origin.** In the Islamic world, the term kaysâriyya is certainly of Greek origin: *kaisarîn* ("imperial", an abbreviation for ἡ καίσαρÎη ἀγώνα, the "imperial market"). As H. Thiersch has shown, the old quadrangular court (with or without cells around it) of the agora inspired the kaysâriyya, which was used on the one hand as a warehouse for goods (whence developed the marketplace) and on the other hand, without any doubt, usually also as lodgings. The expression ἡ καισαρισσία recalls the fact that the oldest of these public buildings were imperial, i.e., state institutions, while in the Muslim period they were mainly due to private initiative (foundations of royal families or high officials). Thiersch thinks (Pharos ..., 233) that the place where the idea of these buildings originated—like many other things in the new Muslim period—seems to have been Alexandria, which was especially rich in covered market-places and halls. Whether we should actually consider the Kaisarîyya (Caesareum), the temple of Caesar in Alexandria, to which the marketplace and warehouses were attached (Strabo, vii, 794), as the original in name and fact of the kaysâriyya (as does Volders in *ZDMG*, li, 302), is uncertain. A derivation of the word kaysâriyya from the name of the Palestine town of Kaysariyya (q.v.), which de Sacy (op. cit.) upheld, can hardly be supported with sound arguments. The word in any case was originally used only in those districts which, like Syria, Palestine and parts of North Africa had been under Byzantine rule. The idea was only transferred later to other lands, especially to Spain and the east. In Spanish, **alecasceria** (casceria, casceria), and in Portuguese, **alecârças**, are loanwords (cf. Dozy-Engelmann, *Glossaire des mots espagnols et portugais dérivés de l’arabe*, Leiden 1869, 73-79; D. Leopoldo de Eguilas, *Glos. etim. de las palabras españolas... de origen oriental*, Granada 1886, 126).

On the usage of the word in the Islamic world, the following references may be given. In Egypt we have especially good evidence of its use in Cairo. Al-Makrizî (d. 845/1444) in his description of the city gives a large number of kaysâriyayyus (cf. al-Khatîb, Bölûk 1270, ii, 86-91; E. Reitemeyer, *Die Städtegründungen der Araber im Islam*, 1912, 117). Later its place was gradually taken by the word wâkâla (ohâle, ohâle) and in Niebuhr’s time (1761) only the market-place in the suburb of Bölûk was still called Kisârîe. In Fâs by kaysâriyya one understands the central market (for cloth, carpets, jewels, etc.) shut off by gates and walls from the other parts of the town, and at night occupied only by watchmen (see Dozy, op. cit., ii, 432; R. Le Tourneau, *Fas*, 274, 529, in *Reisen in Marokko, etc.*); in Irbil (Yakut, i, 186); in Baghdad (see *ibid.*); in Istambul (see *ibid.*); in Edirne (see *ibid.*); in the town of Kaysariyya (op. cit.) which de Sacy (op. cit.) understands the central market (for cloth, carpets, jewels, etc.) shut off by gates and walls from the other parts of the town, and at night occupied only by watchmen. In Spain, the kaysâriyya was, as in Morocco, the centre for trade in luxury articles and cloth (see L. Torres Balbás, *Alcacerías*, in *al-And.,* iv (1949), 431-35. P. Chalmeta, *El seíor del zoco*, index). In Syria and Lebanon we have evidence of the use of the word kaysâriyya as the "name of the shops of the wholesale dealers" in Beirut (see Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, ii, 469, and K. Müller, *Die Karawanenrei, 7*, in Damascus (see Ibn Djubayr, *Rûtba*, ed. Wright and de Goeje, 288, and Seetzen, *Reisen durch Syrien etc.*, Leipzig 1854-9, ii, 269) and also in Aleppo (see Ibn Djubayr, 252; Yâkût, iii, 307; Ibn Baţûta, i, 151; J. Sauvaget, *Alep*, 79-80, 221-2). In al-Hasâ in Eastern Arabia, the quarter of the town that contains the shops is called el-Gaysâriyye (see *Der Islam*, viii, 32). In Iرک we find a square called Kaysâriyya in Mösul (see Ibn Djubayr, 235) in al-Salâmiyya near Mösul (Yâkût, iii, 113); in Irîb (Yâkût, i, 180); in Baghûd (see *Mission, 92* (the present bazaar centre); in Karbarâ (see *Mission, op. cit.*). In Persia, if, in Esfâhân (see Ritter, ix, 49; Volters, *Lexic. Persico-Lat.,* ii, 752a; and cf. also (Ispahan) Pietro della Valle, *Viaggi* (Brighton 1843), ii, 8, German tr. (Ghent 1674), iii, 5; [Dupré], *Voyage en Perse*).
accounts of its conquest exceed in number and detail those relating to Jerusalem. The numbers of its defenders were highly exaggerated in order to magnify the achievement, and one tradition goes as far as to put the figure at 930,000 of the besieged as against only 17,000 Muslim besiegers (Baladhuri, Futuh, 141, but see Barhebraeus, Chronographia, ed. Budge, 37 v, who puts the number of defenders at 7,000). The siege was begun by 'Amr b. al-'As, till he left for Egypt, and by 'Uyayn ibn Ghamm, who was probably the original commander on the spot, but whose rôle was later minimised by tradition, seeking to glorify either 'Amr or Mu'awiyah. The latter eventually took over from his sick brother Yazid and captured the city in Shawwal 9/Sept.-Oct. 640 after a siege of probably seven months, inflated in most of the Arabic sources to seven years, calculating the beginning of the siege from the opening of the Syrian campaign as a whole; 4,000 captives were taken (cf. Baladhuri, Futuh, 140-1, 212; Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, Futuh Miṣr, 57-8; Ya'kubib, Ta’rikh, 172-3; idem, Badānī, 329; Tabari, i, 2396-7, 2399, 2579; Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, lHd, ed. Amin et ali, i, 124; Baki, Muḍjam, 757; Ibn 'Asakir, Ta’rikh, iv, 395; de Goeje, Mem. sur la conquête de la Syrie, 166 ff.; Caetani, Annali, iv, 31-2, 156-62).

In face of the normal tendency of the eastern Mediterranean by the Byzantine fleet (despite periodic Umayyad successes there), Islamic Kaysariyya was held essentially as a defensive position against Byzantine descents on the coastline. During the revolt of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, the Byzantines seized the opportunity of Umayyad distraction to attack both Kaysariyya and Aṣkalan (Ascalon) and damage them: but once secure in power (Abāl Malik rebuilt and refurbished the two places, along with other coastal points such as Acre and Tyre (Baladhuri, 142). But on the whole, the Arab inclination towards seafaring (cf. Ibn al-Djawz, Mawḍalāl, Medina 1966, ii, 227) made it difficult for the Umayyad caliphs to persuade Arab warriors to settle in the coastal towns.

Kaysariyya went through a period of deterioration under the 'Abbasids, who tended to neglect Syria in favour of their eastern provinces. Ahmad b. Tūlūn (254-70/868-83) fortified again the Palestinian shore, but nothing is mentioned in the sources specifically about Kaysariyya, whose harbour had by this time filled up with sand. The Arab geographers in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, as well as Nāṣir-i Khusraw in the 5th/11th, describe its fertile district and the abundance of its agricultural products, but make no mention of its harbour (Mukaddasī, 35, 154; Nāṣir-i Khusraw, Safar-nāma, ed. Schefer, 18; Idrīsī, in ZDPV, viii (1885), ii; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 474, 475). In 364/975, the Byzantine offensive launched a year previously against the Islamic territories by the Emperor John Tzimisces reached as far south as Kaysariyya (Runciman, A history of the Crusades, i, 31). The renewed Byzantine rule, however, was short lived. But the old danger to the wealth of the city came at that time from the Bedouins of Banū Diarrāb (a clan of Tāyyī), led by their chief Mufarrīd b. Daghfal, who succeeded around 360/971, during the disturbances which marked the end of the Khshildids, in establishing himself in the coastal plain mainly around Ramla. Bedouin power continued to grow throughout the first half-century of the Fatimid rule. Between 402/1012 and 404/1014, Mufarrīd laid siege to the coastal towns and even installed in Palestine an anti-Caliph of his own (Yaḥyā b. Sa'id...
al-Anṣārī, ed. Cheikhho, 160, 201). In 414/1024, the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Zahir nominated Muntakhab al-Dawla, governor of Palestine with the special assignment of ridding the country of Hassān b. Mufarridī, who had succeeded his father as the leader of Banū Dārābī (Maqrīzī, Khitaṭ, Cairo 1270, i, 354). Although Kayṣāriyya was never famous as a great Islamic centre of learning, some names of ‘ulāma’ who lived or studied there can be found in the sources (Yākūt, Buṭṭālīn, iv, 214, 778; Ibn Taqārī Birdī, Nūdūm, ii, 204; Ibn ‘Asākir, iv, 185, 232, 460, vi, 212).

The First Crusade did not threaten Kayṣāriyya seriously. Only in 494/1101, after Baldwin I had established himself as king of Jerusalem, did the Crusaders attack the city, with the help of a Genoese naval force. After the fall of Arsurf on 27 Dūmādār Ilī/29 April, Kayṣāriyya was besieged and fell on May 17. The male population was almost completely wiped out, and the women, the bāḏī of the town and its governor were taken prisoners. Among the booty the Genoese found a green vessel which they decided was the Holy Grail; later, they brought it to Genoa, where it is still preserved in the Cathedral of San Lorenzo. As a prize for their participation in the conquest, the Genoese received a third of the town with permission to call the second cathedral of the city after their patron San Lorenzo. (On this conquest, see Ibn Khaldūn, ‘Ibrar, vi, 186, and Runciman, ii, 73-4). After the conquest Kayṣāriyya became an independent Signoria (which belonged to the Garnier family), one of the first to be established in the country (Runciman, ii, 93, 191).

The Crusaders built in Kayṣāriyya a small harbour within the borders of the large ancient one, and its Frankish population grew to about 5,000 people, a considerable size in terms of Crusader towns.

In 583/1187, after the battle of Ḥattīn [q.v.] and the occupation of Acre, Kayṣāriyya was easily conquered by Šahlī ad-Dīn’s generals, Bābral ad-Dīn Dālīrī and Gharas al-Dīn Kīliṣī (Abu Shāma, K. al-Rawdatayn, ii, 87; Ibn al-Athlī, xi, 356; al-Kāfī, Sulḥ, i, 513), but the final campaign headed by Baybars took place in 594/1198. In the Muslim sources). Under the heavy bombardment of Baybars’ ballists, the Crusaders had to enter into negotiations. On 5th March 1265 they were evacuated by ship and the sultan ordered the destruction of the fortress.

The occupation of Kayṣāriyya enabled the Mamluks to move both southwards against Jaffa and Arsurf and northwards against ‘Abīlībīh and Acre (Yāfī, Mirīd, iv, 161; Maqrīzī, op. cit., i, 526-8; Khalkashandī, Sūhī, iii, 434; Mufaḍḍal b. Abī ‘I-Fadāhī, in Pair., xii, Paris 1918, 123-32; Ibn Ḥabīb, Durrat al-Aslāḥ, in Orientalia, ii, 250; Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., v, 385).

Instead of the coastal line of fortifications, which were ultimately completely demolished, Barbar's resolved upon establishing a new line of defence along the foothills deep in the country, more defensible by the Muslim forces. The fortress of Kākūn was, therefore, rebuilt to replace Kayṣāriyya and Arsurf (Maqrīzī, op. cit., i, 557).

The site of Kayṣāriyya remained deserted for about four centuries, cf. Kalkashandī, iii, 237. In the 11th/12th century, some fishermen briefly tried to settle there. Its ruins became a source for building material, especially when Diāzār Pāšā built his mosque in Acre at the end of the 12th/13th century.

In 1884, in the wake of the Austrian occupation of Bosnia, the Ottoman government brought Muslim refugees from there and settled them in Kayṣāriyya, but the endemic malaria reduced them to a miserable condition, and during the Arab-Israeli war of 1948 the place was deserted.

The first archaeological survey of the site was carried out in 1873 by the Palestine Exploration Fund, but systematic excavations were made during the 1950s and 1960s by Italian and Israeli archaeologists. Parts of the town have been reconstructed, notably part of the Crusaders’ wall and the Roman theatre, which is used today for musical performances.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources mentioned in the article, see K. V. Zetterstên, Beirârge . . ., Leiden 1919, 238; F. M. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine, (Paris 1938), ii, 151, 162, 171, 193 II, 200; idem, Histoire de la Palestine, i-iil, Paris 1952; V. Guérin, Desor, Geogr. de la Palestine, 2e Partie, ii (Paris 1875), 382, 59; S. Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, London 1936, 267; D. Ayalon, The Mamelusks and Naval Power, in Proceedings of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, i, No. 8 (Jerusalem 1965); cf. idem, EI, art. Bahriyya; S. Runciman, A History of the Crusades (London 1971), index; S. Asaf and L. A. Mayer, Sefer Ha-Yishuv, ii (Jerusalem 1944), 54-5; cf. also the bibliography in EI, art. Kaysariyya. (M. Shuker)
name Caesarea for this town was rendered Kayşariyya in Arabic, Kayseriye in Ottoman, and Kayseri in modern Turkish.

1. History. Even before the Hittite empire, the area was a mercantile centre with a thriving Assyrian trading colony named Kanesh. As Mazaka, the site was the capital of the kingdom of Cappadocia, later of the Roman province of Cappadocia. Caesarea was first in precedence among the Christian bishoprics of Asia Minor, and as the seat of the Cappadocian fathers, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus, a centre of Christian thought and monasticism. Pillaged and devastated by the Sasanids and then rescued by Heraclius in A.D. 611, the town was again beautiful and wealthy when Mu'tawiyah forced it to pay tribute in 26/647. (Michael the Syrian, tr. Chabot, ii, 490, 441; Abu 'l-Faraj, tr. Bridge, i, 97). In the reign of Hishām (105/2572/43) Maslama led two raids on Kayşariyya and perhaps occupied the town temporarily; two of Hishām's sons also led campaigns there. In the 5th/11th century Byzantine policies and the Turkish invasions precipitated a migration of Armenian Gregorians into this Greek Orthodox area (Michael the Syrian, iii, 133).

Kayşariyya was sacked by Turkmen in 459/1067 (see Caesarea, Le premier penetration turque... in Byzantion, xviii (1948), 25). Some time after the battle of Manzikert the town, perhaps then in ruins, became part of the Dānishmend state (Michael the Syrian, iii, 173; Abu 'l-Faraj, i, 229). Chroniclers of the First Crusade who passed through Kayşariyya do not describe it. Malik Muhammad, the son of its conqueror Ghaç Dānishmend, finally restored the town (Michael the Syrian, iii, 237; Abu 'l-Faraj, i, 258). In 563/1168 Kılıç Arslan II took it from the Dānishmandids (Abu 'l-Faraj, i, 293). Frequently a royal residence for the Seljuqids. Kayşariyya again became a leading centre of trade and culture. In 641/1243 Mongol armies under Baygū massacred thousands, carried off the young into captivity, and plundered and destroyed the royal treasury and many splendid houses and buildings (Abu 'l-Faraj, i, 407; Ibn Bibīl, tr. Duda, 230 f.). In 675/1276 Baybars occupied the town without resistance, but he withdrew south of the Taurus when his appearance failed to produce the anticipated uprising of Turks against their Mongol rulers; the Mongols then took vengeance on the city (Abu 'l-Faraj, i, 457). From 747/1343 to 763/1381 Kayşariyya was under the Ereglis dynasty, and eventually became their capital; Ibn Baṭṭuta calls the town one of the largest in Anatolia. The Ereglis were overthrown by a native of Kayşariyya, Kādū Burhān al-Dīn, who ruled from Sivas. The Ottoman sultan Bayzayid took the city in 800/1398, but after Timūr defeated him, Kayşariyya fell to the Karāmān dynasty. For almost a century, the Turkmen of Karāmān and the Dhu 'l-KadrīIDS contested for this prize. The Mam líks helped the Dhu 'l-KadrīIDS to take the city from the Karāmānids in 827/1421; in 839/1436 the Ottomans helped the Dhu 'l-KadrīIDS to regain it once more. Although the Karāmānids recovered the town in 869/1465, Mehemmed II restored it to the Dhu 'l-KadrīIDS in 875/1467. The Ottomans finally brought Kayşariyya under direct rule some time after they took Kara Hisar Develi in 879/1474, but before the Mam líks-Dhu 'l-KadrīIDS attacked the city on 893/1490. The town lay exposed to Mam líks and Safavid ambitions until Selçuk I removed the threat from both these powers.

In the early 11th/17th century the region of Kayşariyya was infested by Džaládí rebels; Kara Yazidi won a victory over an Ottoman army on the plain of Kayşariyya in 1088/1670, and twice shortly thereafter, brigands dared to besiege the walled town. The urban population suffered considerably; many villagers were killed or abandoned their lands in fear, temporarily dislocating the system of land taxation. In 1027/1618 Simeon of Poland found the town quite ruined in appearance because its people so feared the Džaládí that they would not do any reconstruction work (Polonyali Simeon, tr. H. Andrews, 138 f.). In 1034/1624 the rebel forces of Abāza Hasan were scattered near Kayşariyya by the vizier Čerkes Mehmēd. In 1059/1649 Ewliya Čelebi stated that its wheat and barley were famous and perhaps occupied the town temporarily; two of Hishām's sons also led campaigns there. In the 5th/11th century Byzantine policies and the Turkish invasions precipitated a migration of Armenian Gregorians into this Greek Orthodox area (Michael the Syrian, iii, 133).

Kaysariyya under direct rule some time after they took Kara Hisar Develi in 879/1474, but before the Mamılıüs-Dhu 'l-KadrīIDS attacked the city on 893/1490. The town lay exposed to Mamılıüs and Safavid ambitions until Selçuk I removed the threat from both these powers.

In the early 11th/17th century the region of Kayşariyya was infested by Džaládí rebels; Kara Yazidi won a victory over an Ottoman army on the plain of Kayşariyya in 1088/1670, and twice shortly thereafter, brigands dared to besiege the walled town. The urban population suffered considerably; many villagers were killed or abandoned their lands in fear, temporarily dislocating the system of land taxation. In 1027/1618 Simeon of Poland found the town quite ruined in appearance because its people so feared the Džaládí that they would not do any reconstruction work (Polonyali Simeon, tr. H. Andrews, 138 f.). In 1034/1624 the rebel forces of Abāza Hasan were scattered near Kayşariyya by the vizier Čerkes Mehmēd. In 1059/1649 Ewliya Čelebi stated that its wheat and barley were famous and perhaps occupied the town temporarily; two of Hishām's sons also led campaigns there. In the 5th/11th century Byzantine policies and the Turkish invasions precipitated a migration of Armenian Gregorians into this Greek Orthodox area (Michael the Syrian, iii, 133).

Kaysariyya under direct rule some time after they took Kara Hisar Develi in 879/1474, but before the Mamılıüs-Dhu 'l-KadrīIDS attacked the city on 893/1490. The town lay exposed to Mamılıüs and Safavid ambitions until Selçuk I removed the threat from both these powers.
tragacanth, madder, blue dye made from lees of wine and sultana raisins (ii, 267, 255, 263; cf. Ainsworth, 309). Mordtmann added to these potatoes and maize as well as wine, brandy and beer (p. 142, 143).

From Saldırg times onwards, cotton and coarse cotton cloth were among the most important industrial products of Kaysariyya. Kinneir found merchants from all over Syria and Anatolia gathered there to buy cloth and raw cotton (p. 100; cf. L. G. C. Lucas, 173). Kaysariyya horses were famous; sheep, cattle, and buffalo were given particularly for the sausage and pastirma industry for which Kaysariyya was famous; in Ewliya Celebi’s time these meats were so much in demand in Istanbul that they could not be procured even in Kaysariyya itself. Hides, used particularly for the yellow morocco leather for the yellow morocco leather pastirma industry for which Kaysariyya was famous; bedestans and that tradesmen made excellent profits (iii, 180 f., 184). Inciciyan reported that for the yellow morocco leather pastirma industry for which Kaysariyya was famous; the bazaars, and Kinneir called it the trade emporium for Anatolia and Syria (Simeon, 159 n.; Kinneir, 100). Lucas called the bazaars extensive, especially the ones for cotton (i, 173) and Hamilton reported them to be extensive and rich, and full of cheap imports (ii, 267 f.). Von Schweinitz, admiring the fine bazaars, judged Kayseri to be the most important town in inner Anatolia (pp. 116 f.) and Mordtmann called it one of the most important trading places in Anatolia (p. 492); he says that trade ca. 1850 was completely in the hands of local “Cappadocian Christians”. However, in the 11th/12th century, Muslims were also active in trade in Kayseri.

The salt lake at Pelas and salt mines at Hacımuğla were in 1935 made the city a major rail centre. Of late there have also been constructed good road connections. In 1935 a huge state textile mill (currently engaged in the production of cotton and silk) was opened with 1,500 workers.

### Four Ottoman tax registers (daftar-i khadijü) have preserved roth/16th-century population statistics. In 905/1500, the town had 2287 nefer (tax-paying males), of whom 86 % were Muslims and 14 % were dhimmis (1601/1626). Early in Sulaymān’s reign there were 2367 nefer, of whom 81 % were Muslims and 19 % were dhimmis (1907/1927). Later in Sulaymān’s reign there were 3530 nefer, 81 % Muslims and 19 % dhimmis (2670/2690). In 991/1583 the town had 8251 nefer, 78 % Muslims and 22 % dhimmis (6435/6456). The urban population grew in less than a century and the rural population also grew rapidly. The anarchy of the 9th/10th century helps explain both the small population of 1500 and the capacity for rapid growth once security was restored (Başbakanlık arşivi tapu defter nos. 33, 387 and 976; cf. no. 38; Ankara tapu hadasi direstis, no. 136). In 991/1583 the city had 6015 khânes or households at 5.5 persons per khâne or 33,082 inhabitants (4 x 8251 is 33,004, so perhaps multiplying the nefer by 4 gives the numerical population of the town). The proportion of non-Muslims increased from 14 % in 1500 to 22 % in 991/1583. Armenians, who made up 82 % of the non-Muslim population in 905/1500, rose to 89 % in 991/1583, increasing at much faster rate than the Greeks. No Jews are registered in these surveys but in 1595-1596 Ewliya Celebi mentions a synagogue (iii, 183).

Official statistics cease in 991/1583. Simeon of Poland estimated that there were 500 Armenian khânes in 1626/1628; either he underestimated or the punishments for being a 16th-century city. The salt lake at Pelas and salt mines at Hacımuğla in 1935 made the city a major rail centre. Of late there have also been constructed good road connections. In 1935 a huge state textile mill (currently engaged in the production of cotton and silk) was opened with 1,500 workers.

The railway line from Ankara reached Kaysariyya in 1927, and connections to Samsun in 1930 and to Ulukışla in 1933 made the city a major rail centre. Of late there have also been constructed good road connections. In 1935 a huge state textile mill (currently engaged in the production of cotton and silk) was opened with 1,500 workers.

The salt lake at Pelas and salt mines at Hacımuğla in 1935 made the city a major rail centre. Of late there have also been constructed good road connections. In 1935 a huge state textile mill (currently engaged in the production of cotton and silk) was opened with 1,500 workers.
houses (of 10,000 in the city), i.e., ca. 40,000 people, a substantial increase in the decade (p. 58). Cuinet in 1907 estimated 50,000 inhabitants in 1904 (including 20,000 Christians, of whom three-quarters were Armenians (p. 129). The Ankara viayet endemek of 1909 estimated a population of 54,011 for the town (17,536 Muslim men, 17,168 Muslim women, 9,521 non-Muslim men, 9,786 non-Muslim women (p. 209). The population apparently doubled between 1813 and 1907.

The 10th/16th-century Muslim population of Kayseriyya included nomadic, settled and sedentarising Yörüks, Turkmen and Kurds. Afgâr nomads were numerous on the rich pastures of Uzun Yayla; in the mid-19th century they were joined by a large immigrant group of Çerkes in Turkey. Since the earliest tax records of the late 9th/15th century, the majority of the population of both the town and province of Kayseriyya have been Muslims. Large numbers of Orthodox and Gregorian Christians have inhabited the town and the neighbouring villages, often mixed with Muslims and with one another. In the town Kayseriyya, Gregorians outnumbered Orthodox by three or four times in both the 10th/16th and 19th centuries. Greek and Armenian were spoken only in a few villages; most Christians were turcophone even after efforts towards hellenisation and armenisation began under outside stimulus in the 19th century (see R. M. Dawkins, Modern Greek in Asia Minor; Inciciyan, quoted in Simeon, 161 n; Simeon, 158 and n; and Ewliya, iii, 183: "Kürdçede presumably is an error for "Ermenice". See also the periodical Mikraatika Kronika). In 1922 a congress of Orthodox Christians of Anatolia, meeting in Kayseriyya, asserted that they were Anatolian Christians of Turkish national identity, repudiated the "Greek" hierarchy, and established a Turkish patriarchate; their effort miscarried, however, because Orthodox Christians of Anatolia were included in the compulsory Greek-Turkish population exchanges (Teoman Ergene, Eski Kardiki türk ortodoksi, 18 fl., 23-42).

After the Armenian débâcle and the Greek population exchanges, the first republican census revealed that Kayseriyya's population had declined to 39,544; only 1277 Armenian Gregorians and 6 Greek Orthodox remained in the town. The population increased to 46,181 in 1935 (up 23 %), 52,467 in 1940 (up 21 %), 57,863 in 1945 (up 15 %), 65,488 in 1950 (up 34 %), 82,405 in 1955 (up 26 %), 102,596 in 1960 (up 25 %), 126,533 in 1965 (up 22 %), and 167,696 in 1970 (up 33 %). The population of the town has increased four-fold in less than half a century, a rate of growth faster even than that of the 10th/16th century (Kayseri il yılığ, 122, 124-7).

4. Culture. A Library made up of 1210/1796 by the Reis ül-kuttab Râşid Efendi preserves the original collection of 943 works (926 manuscripts, 17 printed volumes), and additions have been made (see Ahmet I. Okutan, Kayseri Ünumi Kütüphanesi Râşit Efendi kitimi Üstülâ: hadis ve hadis ilmine ait avrupa elyazma eserler kataloğu, Istanbul 1964). The town also has an İk Halk Kütüphanesi and a small museum, filled mostly with pre-Islamic artifacts.

The ancient site of the town (Eski Şehir) is located on the southern edge of the city, near the Bağtal Gâzî tomb, whose plain meets the lowest foothills of the Erdjiyas. Kayseriyya is rich in architectural monuments, which have been well listed by H. Edhem and A. Gabriel. The inner castle and a large section of the former wall have been preserved, as well as several madrasas, mosques, tombs, and kâms dating from as early as the Seljuk period. Most notable of these are the Ulû Çami, Çifte madrasa, Hamid-i evvel Camii and the complex, Hâmid Kılıç mosque, Dönür Kumbet, Kırshunlu mosque (built from a plan of Sinân), and the Vizier bâhn. A vigorous programme of preservation and restoration is under way.

A reputed tomb of Bağtal Gâzî, located beneath the courtyard of the recently rebuilt Bağtal Gâzî mosque, is visited by local pilgrims. The tomb of Djâlâl al-Dîn Rûnî's teacher, Sayyid Burhân al-Dîn, is also noteworthy. For other Muslim, Christian and mixed places of pilgrimage, see Ewliya, iii, 134-9, and Carnoy-Nicolaides, passim. Seven madrasas were reported in Kayseriyya in Seljuk times, as many as in Konya and more than twice as many as in any other Anatolian town (see A. Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri, i). In Sulayman's time, the city had 3 Friday mosques, 26 madrasî, 10 madrasas, 17 sâriyât, 3 baths, and 107 shops.

The living pattern of winter in the town and summer in vineyards on the foothills of Erdjiyas plays a significant role even today in the economic and social life of Kayseriyya. It has frequently been a theme in local poetry (see A. Satoglu, Kayseri Şairleri, and also Erciyes halkâv dergisi). The climate was considered healthy (Ewliya, iii, 182; Hamilton, ii, 268; Mordtmann, 141; and Kinneir, 104). Several 19th-century travellers called Kayseriyya filthy, and a town containing slaughtering, meat processing, leather and tanning industries could hardly have been otherwise. Some travellers called the stone houses of the town tasteful, and Moltke and von Schweinitz considered it beautiful. The beauties of Erdjiyas, with its luxurious gardens and clear streams, were obvious to those who saw them.

The people of Kayseriyya have been noted for their religious orthodoxy and for their business acumen. Hasluck maintained that the town had a "black Sunnî" tradition (513, 23n.). Carnoy-Nicolaides related a legend that no Jew could live in Kayseriyya, a reference to the supposed commercial acumen of its inhabitants (226-6). Ewliya Çelebi explained that the local people were hardworking because of the cold climate (iii, 182). Simeon of Poland was aware that they were considered "dyers of asses" (160; Carnoy, 247 f.). It is widely believed in Turkey today that the people of Kayseriyya have a special propensity for business and are hardworking and diligent.

The Kaytak are being culturally and linguistically assimilated by the Dargin. According to the census of 1926, ethnically there were 14,470 Kaytaks, and 14,469 claiming Kaytak as their mother tongue. In 1930 (estimation by Grande) there were 14,470 Kaytaks. The Kaytaks inhabit ten auls in the Kaytak district, and the southern (mountainous) part of the Dağhâdav district, in the valley of the Ulu-Chai, in the Dağhîstan A.S.S.R. Kaytak territory lies between the Dargin and Tabasaran areas.

The first mention of the Kaytak was in the 4th/10th century, by Arab authors. According to Muḥammad-Rafi, the Kaytaks paid tribute to the ghamkhal of Kazikumukh in the Lak [q.v.] country. At the end of the 8th/14th century the Mongols penetrated Kaytak territory and there is evidence that there was a strong Mongol influence on the Kaytaks. A large proportion of the Kaytak population was destroyed by Timur.

With the fall of the Golden Horde, the feudal principality of the utsmiyât of Kaytak arose as a major power in northern Dağhîstan (dubious etymology of the word utsmi from isim, “the renowned”). Its territory was larger than the area inhabited today by the Kaytaks and its population was composed of many tribes besides the Kaytaks—Laks, Dargins and Southern Kumyks. As legend has it, the utsmiyât descended from the Arab governors of Kala’ Kuraysh, who had islamised the area in the 2nd/8th century, and Kaytak was one of the first regions of central Dağhîstan to be islamised. The Kaytaks are Sunni of the Shafi'i School. In the 10th/16th century the utsmi was one of the strongest rulers in Dağhîstan, and in the 12th/18th century was economically and politically very significant, carrying on complex foreign policies, supporting at different times Turkey and Persia.

In 1802 a Russian protectorate was imposed on the utsmi Adil Khân. Direct Russian administration came to the lower Kaytak in the pre-Caspian area in 1820, and to the Kara-Kaytak in the mountain area in 1862. In 1844 the utsmiyât was suppressed.

The social structure of Kaytak utsmiyât was similar to the structure of the Avar [q.v.] society: a rather complicated feudal hierarchy—begs, lanba, u aden (free peasants), and non-free classes: qâsar (peasants submitted to servitude), rayâis (serfs), and kul, which coexisted beside the system of the “free societies” based on the joint family (tukkum). There existed an endogamous marriage system.

The dâdî of Kaytak were collected in written form in the 17th century by the utsmi Rustam Khân. The Arabic text was translated into Russian in 1868 (Sbornik Svedenii o Kavkazskikh Gortsakh, Tiflis 1868).

Due to the lack of good agricultural land, agriculture played a minor role in the traditional economy. Sheep and goat raising, with some horses and cattle, was the predominant economic activity. Handicrafts were well developed, especially the weaving of wool and silk. Kaytak women from Barghamai and Čabakhni were renowned for their embroideries. The present economy still stresses sheep raising with a transhumance system in the mountainous areas, and the raising of cattle and horses in the lower mountains and foothills.

Kaytak is a vernacular language, consisting of two dialects: Mağalis-Kaytak (in the north) and Kara-Kaytak (in the south). Dargin is used as the first literary language and second (sometimes first) spoken language. Russian is the second written language.

AL-KAYYAL (also IBN AL-KAYYAL), AHMAD B. ZAKARIYAY, Shi’i gnostic from Daskarat Bayt al-Nar near Bayhaq active around the turn of the 3rd/9th century. According to al-Shahrastani, he was originally a da‘if of some Isma‘ili imam. Having been disowned by the imam for his heretical views, he first claimed the imamate for himself and then asserted that he was the kātib [q.v.]. He gained some adherents and left writings in Arabic and Persian which were still extant in the time of al-Shahrastani (d. 458/1553). Abu ‘l-Ma‘alli states that al-Kayyal “appeared” in the year 295/907-8, perhaps referring to his arrival in Transoxania. He claimed that he was entrusted with abrogating the law of Islam and proclaiming a new law. He composed a scripture in Persian which he called his Kūth and invented an alphabet which only he could read. At the Sāmānī court in Bukhārā he gained the favour of the vizier Muḥammad b. Muhammad al-Diyāhānī [q.v.]. If the name is correctly given, al-Kayyal was still alive after 326/937 when this al-Diyyāhānī became vizier. There may be, however, a confusion with the latter’s father, Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Diyāhānī, who was vizier from 304/916-23. Al-Diyāhānī at first encouraged him to propagate his doctrine in Kishsh. When he failed to win adherents there, the vizier directed him to the countryside of Marw, where he gained a numerous following. He died after appointing a butcher as his successor. When al-Diyyāhānī died (Muhammad b. Muhammad died in 330/941-2), the movement disintegrated. Ibn Fundūq al-Bayhākī (d. 365/1170) states, however, that in Samarkand when this al-Diyāhānī became vizier. There may be, perhaps referring to his arrival in Transoxania. He claimed that he was the kātib [q.v.].

KAYTAK — KAYYIM 847

Neophytes (muridi) were in evidence in his day and his books were available there. Al-Kayyāli’s gnostic doctrine as described by al-Shahrastani elaborated correspondences between a higher, spiritual world, a lower, corporeal world, and the human body and relied on hurūf [q.v.] and allegorical interpretation of the Qur’an. It shows distinct affinities with Isma‘ili gnosticism, though no traces of the Neoplatonic cosmology introduced in Isma‘ili ism about the beginning of the 4th/10th century [cf. ISMA‘ILVIYA, Doctrine]. Indian as well as Manichean influences on his thought have been suggested. His doctrine on the imamate was refuted by the philosopher Muḥammad b. Zakariyay al-Rāzi (d. 313/925 or 320/932-3).

The term, hurūf by some modern scholars that he may be identical with Ahmad, the son of the alleged founder of Isma‘ili ‘Abd Allāh b. Maymūn al-Kaddāb [q.v.], is no longer tenable. The account of the late Isma‘ili author Idrīs b. al-Ḥasan (descendants of some Isma‘ili founds such as ‘Abd Allāh b. Maymūn al-Kaddāb [q.v.]), according to whom al-Kayyāl was a dā‘i of the Isma‘ili imam ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Isma‘ili, is fictitious and based solely on the statements of al-Shahrastani.


KAYTAK (a.), 1. “who stands up right”, then with bi, šāl li or the genitive lī, he who takes something upon himself, takes care of something or someone and hence also has authority over them. Thus we find the pre-Islamic poet al-Kūtāmī (Diwān, ed. Barth, Leiden 1902, no. 26) already speaking of a “kāyym of water”, i.e. apparently the man in charge of it, the supervisor, and the poet Bā’ b. b. Sūrāyī (Ittāsās of Abū Tāmāmā, ed. Frewy and Inge) speaks of a man who stands up right, i.e. he who provides for his, her husband. The first mentioned meaning, (supervisor etc.), is then found in all possible applications, administrator of a pious foundation, of baths, superintendent of a temple, caretaker of a saint’s grave, etc.; indeed, in al-Bukhārī, Saḥīh, Da’wūd, bāb 10 (ed. Kreifl Juynboll, iv, 189), in Muhammad’s night prayer, the expression is even applied to God as the director of heaven and earth, and this application seems also to be present in Umar b. Abī Rabī’a, ed. P. Schwarz, no. 91, where the poet swears by the “religion of the Kayym”. Here, of course, it is most probably a question of an inversion (perhaps caused by the metre) of the Kur’ānic expression al-dīn al-kāyym (see below) on the model of Bayt al-Mubaddas, etc. (cf. Wright, Grammar II, §§ 95-6, and al-Ḵastālānī, comm. on Bukhārī, Saum, bāb 67, end).

The meaning “provider, husband” of a woman is frequently found in the eschatological traditions, in which it is said that with the approach of the last day the number of women will increase in proportion to men, so much that there will only be one kāyym for every 50 women.

The adjectival meaning “commanding” (a branch of knowledge) perhaps arises out of the same sphere of conceptions as “provider”, “master”; it is found in a biographical notice of a scholar in Yāḳūt, Mu’ṣjam, ii, 225. On the other hand, kāyym, also an adjectival meaning “correct, right”, repeatedly found in the Kur’ān in the expression al-ｄīn al-kaṣāyym and similar combinations, may have to be semasiologically separated from the former meaning.

Bibliography: KAYIM — KAYIM

al-Bukhārī, al-Sabhī, Wasayyā, bāb 32 (ed. Kreifl Juynboll ii, 196), and al-Kaṣṭālānī, s.v.; Yāḳūt, iii, 856; al-Maṣkari, ii, 547; al-Ṭabarī, i, 814.
KAYYIM KAZAK


(Â. SCHAADE)

KAYYUM NÂŞIRI (1825-1902), born in the village of Yukari Şhîrdanî in the canton of Sviâzskî in the government of Kâzân, was one of the first and greatest modernist reformers amongst the Tatars of the Volga. After studying at the madrasa of Kâzân, where he learnt Arabic, Persian and Russian, Nâşirî founded at Kâzân his own school where, for the first time, such secular subjects as history, arithmetic, geography and Russian language were taught—these being at this time novelties and innovations which bordered on heresy. Kayymm Nâsiri wrote over 50 works in Tatar, Turkish, Arabic and Persian; as the possessor of an encyclopaedic mind, he combined the skills of the philologist, folklorist, historian, geographer and ethnologist. His supreme merit was to have created a Tatar literary language, based on the dialect spoken in Kâzân, which replaced the Çaghâtay or Eastern Turkish previously used by Tatar writers and which now permitted the extraordinary flowering of Tatar literature towards the end of the 19th century.

His most famous works are the Ferâûkh ul-diïlesä (Kâzân 1884), the Emnûsédî (Kâzân 1895, on the syntax of the Tatar language), the Lëhe-tiû dâdî (Kâzân 1895-6, 2 vols.) and above all, his famous Kûzân kâlindârtî, an annual publication which appeared from 1870 to 1897 and which represents the best source of information on the origins of djâdîd reformism amongst the Muslims of the Russian Empire.

In Russian language, his two basic works are Obrâtsîl narodnoy literatury Kasanskikh Tatar (“Examples of the popular literature of the Tatars of Kasan”), in collaboration with N. F. Katanov, in Investitsii Obshch. Âkadem. Nauk, Istori i Étnografii, iii (Kâzân 1896), 377-27, and Posyov’a i Obryadi Kasanskikh Tatar trosesvâkhiesya pomomo Viyânya na nîkh sunnîskogo Magometanstva (“The beliefs and rites of the Tatars of Kasan formed outside the influence of Sunni Islam”), in Zapiski Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva, vi (Moscow 1880), 243-70.

Bibliography: There have been numerous books and articles dealing with Kayyum Nâsirî in Kâzân Tatar, Turkish, Russian and French. In Russian, the most important is Kayyum Nasiri (1825-1945. Materialy nauchoy sessii posvâshcheno 120 letiyu so dnya rodeniya (“Materials of the scientific session devoted to the 120th anniversary of his birth”), Acad. of Sciences, Kâzân Division, Kâzân 1948, pp. 136 (also published in Tatar). In Turkish, there is the important study of Saadet Çâgaytâ, Abd-ul-Kâzâm Nasîrî, in Avâtçî, x/3-4 (Ankara 1952), 147-60. Finally, in French there is Ch. Lemercier-Quelquejay, Un reformateur Tatar du XIX siècle, ‘Abdul Qâyyûm al-Nasyri, in Cahiers du Monde Russe et Sovietique, iv/1-2 (Paris 19 ), 117-42 (with a complete bibliography). (Ch. Lemercier-Quelquejay)

KAZ [see KABK].

KAZAK [see KAZ].

KAZAK. The word kazak in the Turkic language can be first documented in the 8th-14th century in the meaning “independent; vagabond”. These and similar meanings, such as “free and independent man, vagabond, adventurer, etc.” are known in the modern Turkic languages too. During the turmoil under the Timurids, the word signified the pretenders in contrast to the actual rulers, and also their supporters, who led the life of an adventurer or a robber at the head of their men. At the same time, the word began also to be applied to nomad groups which separated from their prince and kinsmen and so came into conflict with the state; later it had also the meaning “nomad”, in contrast to the stationary Sart population in Central Asia. The status of kazak is also regarded as a very old social institution of the nomad Turkic peoples. The word became the name of a political unit and later an ethnic designation by having been applied in the former meanings to those groups of the Òzbek tribal confederacy that had abandoned the Kâhân Abu’l-Khayr and migrated to the north-east steppes of Turkistan. These ethnic groups formed the core of the population of the present Kazaâkstan (Kazakhstan), retaining later this name. However, it is probable that other Turkic, and probably Mongol, elements were also involved in the ethnogenesis of the modern Kazak people. The struggles with the Kalmuks in the 11th/12th century forced the three Kazak hordes to make an approach to the Russian state; in the 19th century, their name changed into the Russian казак and this in turn was incorporated into the Kazakh language to become the base of the word kazakh. Kazakh has yet been given an inner-Turkic etymology, from kas- “to flee, to escape” + suffix (nom. act.) ab, is not well documented in the linguistic sources and does not find universal acceptance. The recent etymology of the Turkic ethnic name kaz (<= qa) + the Iranian ethnic name sak, i.e., saka, is a vague hypothesis which can hardly be confirmed by historical facts.

KAZAN, a town on the middle Volga, now the capital of the Autonomous Republic of Tatarstan in the USSR, and in the 15th and 16th centuries capital of the Khanate of the same name. According to legendary accounts, the town was founded by Batu Khan in a Turkish and Muslim region which had been part of the ancient kingdom of Buhara before the Mongol invasions.

The Khânate of Kazân was founded in the first half of the 13th century by a Cingid descendant, Ulu Muhammad, son of Djâlal al-Dîn and grandson of Tòktaînîsîr, at the time when the Golden Horde was breaking up. From the start, the Khânate took an active part in the internecine wars of the Russian principalities. In 1438 Muhammad besieged Moscow and destroyed Kolomna. In 1445, his son Mahmûdîde defeated and took captive the Grand Prince of Moscow Vasili II, whom he released shortly afterwards. In the same year, Mahmûdîde seized the town of Kazân, where a prince called 'Alî Beg was ruling. In the following year, Ulu Muhammad was put to death by Mahmûdîde, and at the same time, two of his sons, Kâsim and Ya'âkîb b. Ulu Muhammad, took refuge in Russia. Kâsim remained at Kazân as an apanage of the town of Gorodok, which in his honour assumed the name of Kâsimov and became the capital of a vassal Khânate of Moscow (see KÂSIMOV) whose rulers were the aides of Russian policy. Mahmûdîde reigned till 1462; his successors were then his sons Kâhîl (1462-73) and İbrahim (1467-79). The latter waged war against Moscow, at first with success and in temporarily captivating Viatka, but in 1469 the Russians went over to the offensive and came to besiege Kazân. They compelled İbrahim to set free all the Russian prisoners in Kazân, without however managing to place their protégé Kâsim on the throne there. After his death in 1479, İbrahim was succeeded by his son 'Alî (according to certain sources, İlîkîn). In 1487, the brother of this last, Muhammad Amin, sought refuge in Russia and then appeared before Kazân at the head of a Russian army. After a three-weeks' siege, the town surrendered; 'Alî was exiled to Vologda and Muhammad Amin installed as Khân. In 1495 he was expelled from the town by an incursion of Tatars from the Khânate of Sibir, led by their Khân Mâmîk b. İbîk, who ruled in Kazân for a year, until in 1496, defeated by the Russians and at the wish of the local populace, he made over the throne to 'Abd al-Laţîf, younger brother of Muhammad Amin. In 1502 'Abd al-Laţîf was summoned to Russia and the throne given back to Muhammad Amin. The latter was at first faithful to the Russian alliance, but soon rebelled against the tutelage of the Grand Prince of Moscow, and put to death and confiscated the goods of the Russian merchants who had come to the annual fair at Kazân. He carried on the war against Moscow with success, and in 1506 the Khân even defeated a Russian army near Nîniy Novgorod. A peace agreement made in 1507 established a state of equilibrium between the two rival principalities.

Muhammad Amin died in 1518, and with him the line founded by Ulu Muhammad became extinct, 'Abd al-Laţîf being driven in the preceding year.

The Khânate now entered upon a period of anarchy marked by unceasing warfare between the partisans of an orientation towards Russia and those of a "nationalist" policy backed by the Crimean Khânate and the Noghay Horde. For more than thirty years, various Russian-supported candidates succeeded to the throne—the Khân of Kasimov Shâh 'Alî and his brother Dîjân 'Alî (sons of Awwîlîr Khan of Astrakhân)—and the Girî princes Şâhib and Şafâ, supported by their cousins of the Crimea.

The Russians were the first to take advantage of the unsettled conditions in Kazân. In 1519 the Grand Prince Vasili III placed on the throne Shâh 'Alî (first reign, 1519-21). The latter was expelled in 1521 by the Tatar nobles who asked the Crimean Khan Muhammad Girîy to appoint his brother Şâhib (half-brother through his mother of the last Khan Muhammad Amin) over Kazân. In the same year, the two Tatar princes led a grand expedition against Muscovy and advanced right to the walls of the Russian capital. The regions of Moscow, Nîniy Novgorod and Riazan were totally laid waste, and hundreds of thousands of prisoners were taken and sold at Kefe in the Crimea, but the Tatars, victorious in open warfare, failed in their attacks against Moscow and Riazan, and their great expedition ended in a half-success.

In 1524, on the death of his brother Muhammad, Şâhib Girîy returned to the Crimea as Khan there, leaving in Kazân his thirty-year-old nephew Şafâ Girîy. From now onwards, the Russian pressure became more acute, not in the shape or reprisal raids, but in that of a slow and systematic advance. In order to ruin his rivals, the Grand Prince of Moscow forbade Russian merchants to trade in the Tatar capital and founded an annual fair at the monastery of St. Makarii which soon became the successive rival of that at Kazân. Also, with the beginning of the construction of the great walls of Volsksärk at the confluence of the Volga and Sura in 1523, there began the occupation of the Middle Volga region by the Russians.

Şafâ Girîy was chased out in 1530 by the pro-Russian party and replaced by Dîjân 'Alî, but the latter perished in 1535 in a rising stirred up by the partisans of the Girîys. Şafâ Girîy was recalled and maintained himself in Kazân till 1546, despite Russian efforts to re-assert their suzerainty, until in that year he was once more driven out and briefly replaced by Shâh 'Alî. As soon as the Russian forces accompanying Shâh 'Alî withdrew, Şafâ Girîy returned to Kazân and retained the throne till his death in 1549. His successor was his twelve-year-old son Şahînumî, who in 1551 was deported to Russia, where he was baptised under the name of Alexander and lived till 1566. Shâh 'Alî was reinstalled in Kazân for the third time. In 1552 he was overthrown by a popular revolt, and the Tatars summoned to the throne Yadîgâr Muhammad, of the line of Khâns of Astrakhân. But shortly afterwards, the Russian armies of Tsar Ivan IV appeared before Kazân and took it by assault on 2 October 1552. The Khânate was then annexed to Muscovy.

The conquest was followed by the systematic occupation of the whole country by the Russians. The Tatars were expelled from Kazân. The best lands in the river valleys and round the towns were confiscated and distributed to the Russian nobles and the monasteries. Colonies of Russian peasants were settled in the most fertile areas, and, in order to prevent popular risings and incursions of the Crimean Tatars, the land was covered by a network of Russian fortresses. Because of this, from the 17th century onwards, the population of the ancient Khânate became very mixed, the Tatars forming only 40% of the people there.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, VI
Christian evangelism was actively pursued. After 1555, Kazan was the seat of an archbishopric and then a metropolitan see. Already by the end of the 16th century there was an important group of indigenous converts, Tatars, but above all, Finnic peoples, the Kryashens (in Tatar, Kryash), who although Christian conserved their usage of the Tatar language.

The Russian conquest led to a profound upheaval in Tatar society. The ancient nobility was stripped of its lands, and in order to survive, had to transform itself to a merchant oligarchy, which in turn gave rise in the 17th century to a mercantile bourgeoisie. From the time of Catherine II onwards, this class became the guiding one amongst the Tatar nation, and in the second half of the 19th century, out of all the Turkish and Muslim peoples of the Russian empire, it was from the Tatars of Kazan that the intellectual and political leaders of the Pan-Turkish movement in Russia arose.

The modern town of Kazan retains little from the time of the ancient K̄hânate. One of the towers in the citadel still today has the name of the Princess Süyümübî, wife of Şafâ Girây (she had previously been the wife of Dîn 'All and was later to be that of Şâh 'All), but the manner and date by which her name was applied to this tower is unknown, and it is equally difficult to decided in what in Tatar and what is Russian in the fabric of the tower.

From the 18th century, Kazan no longer had any military importance, and was occupied without any difficulty (with the exception of the citadel) by Pugaĉev in July 1774; at that time, the town had 2,867 houses. Even at this date, it was of more importance as an administrative and cultural centre than Nîfniî Novgorod. Kazan's university, founded in 1804, became famous above all for its Oriental Faculty (more exactly, the oriental section of the Historico-Philological Faculty). In 1855, as a result of the opening of the Oriental Faculty of the University of St. Petersburg, teaching of oriental languages was stopped at Kazan, and the library and other teaching equipment largely transferred to the capital. After 1861, the teaching of oriental languages began again at the University of Kazan. According to the 1897 census, the town had 131,508 inhabitants, and in 1911, 182,477 of whom 30,781 were Tatars.

Today, Kazan is the capital of the Tatarstan ASSR, with a population in 1970 for the republic of 3,531,258 of whom 1,526,431 were Tatars, 1,328,738 Russians, 153,493 Cuvash, 30,963 Mordvins and 24,533 Udmurts. The urban population is largely Russian: 934,387 Russians against 593,665 Tatars. The Tatars [q.v.] of Kazan now represent a people of the diaspora; 75% of a total population of 5,930,670 live outside their national territory.


**KAZARUN (Kāzirūn; lat. 29° 37' N., long. 51° 38' E.), town and district (shahristsân) of Fârs (7th uslân of Iran), bordered by the shahristsâns of Behbâhân, Shirrâz [q.v.], Firûzâbâd [q.v.], and Bûshâhîr [q.v.]. Situated on the edge of the Southern Zagros (orientation N. — S.E.; alt. of 2 to 3,000 m. to the north, of the River Fahlîyân; below 2,000 m. to the South), the shahristsân has, due to its altitude and the proximity of the Persian Gulf, a warm to very warm climate in summer, temperate to cold in the other seasons, the variations being largely due to altitude. The town is situated in a vast plain, at about 800 m. altitude, amongst chalky ridges, on the route of famous vignelous passes (Kutâl-i pr-zan, Kutâl-i-duughtâr, in the direction of Shirrâz, about 120 km. to the E.; and those of Khišt and Kumârîdî, in the direction of Bûshâhîr, about 180 km. to the S.W.). With its palm and orange groves, the bâhk of Kazarun is particularly verdant and fertile (cereals, rice, dried fruits, citrus fruit, tobacco, opium, sesame, cotton, flax, products of stock-farming, etc.); the water comes from kanâds and wells: its horsebreeding was renowned, as well as its green pasturage covered with narcissi in spring time. The tribes (Kâshkâ, Mamâsân) wander in the region and its peripheries.

According to the legend, Kazarun was founded by the mythical king Ţahmûrâ and results from the union of three villages, Nórd, Darist (Darbast), and Rûshâhân (Rûshân). Rûshâhân was founded by the Shabankara chief Abu Sa[k], founded in 858, and was later to be that of Şâh 'All, but the manner and date by which her name was applied to this tower is unknown, and it is equally difficult to decided in what in Tatar and what is Russian in the fabric of the tower.

From the 18th century, Kazan no longer had any military importance, and was occupied without any difficulty (with the exception of the citadel) by Pugaĉev in July 1774; at that time, the town had 2,867 houses. Even at this date, it was of more importance as an administrative and cultural centre than Nîfniî Novgorod. Kazan's university, founded in 1804, became famous above all for its Oriental Faculty (more exactly, the oriental section of the Historico-Philological Faculty). In 1855, as a result of the opening of the Oriental Faculty of the University of St. Petersburg, teaching of oriental languages was stopped at Kazan, and the library and other teaching equipment largely transferred to the capital. After 1861, the teaching of oriental languages began again at the University of Kazan. According to the 1897 census, the town had 131,508 inhabitants, and in 1911, 182,477 of whom 30,781 were Tatars.

Today, Kazan is the capital of the Tatarstan ASSR, with a population in 1970 for the republic of 3,531,258 of whom 1,526,431 were Tatars, 1,328,738 Russians, 153,493 Cuvash, 30,963 Mordvins and 24,533 Udmurts. The urban population is largely Russian: 934,387 Russians against 593,665 Tatars. The Tatars [q.v.] of Kazan now represent a people of the diaspora; 75% of a total population of 5,930,670 live outside their national territory.

jarība—which had ramifications as far as India and China—played a great role in the Ottoman empire in the 9th/15th century and in pre-Safavid Iran—was rich and influential (protection of sailors and merchants in the Indian Ocean; political and economic role). Because of its Sunni obedience, the order was persecuted by the Safavid Shāh Ismā'īl (q.v.).
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KAZARONI — KAZDUGHLIYYA


KAZYBEK (see SIKKA).

KAZDUGHLIYYA, the third of the great neo-Mamluk households of Ottoman Egypt. The Kazdughliyya differed from the Dhuʿl-Faqāriyya and the Kāsmiyya (qq.v.) in that it was founded and maintained in its first decades by officers of the Seven Corps of the Ottoman garrison, not by beys. Its eponym, Muṣṭafā al-Kazdūrī, is described by Dībarī as being Rūmī by origin, i.e., he was Rūmī by blood, hence free-born, and not of Mamluk origin (cf. Stanford J. Shaw (ed.), Ottoman Egypt in the eighteenth century: The Niẓāmname-i Miṣr of Cezzār Ahmed Pasha, Cambridge, Mass. 1962; 23-6 of English text, 7-8 of Turkish text). He took service as a bodyguard (sarrād) to Ḥasan Bāltīyya (the reading B. Iğhis occurring in the printed text of Dībarī is not sound), who was ʿāsīy of the Ṭabāzīn corps in 1085/1674-5, and of the Gûnûlīyya in 1093/1682, and rose under his patronage to be ḥākīy of the Janissaries. In this position he clashed with Ḥūṭūk Mḥmēd, a Janissary bāḥḥadāḥāshī who dominated the corps between 1086/1776 and 1086/1764. Returning to Egypt after two years of exile in the Ḥijāz, he procured the assassination of Ḥūṭūk Mḥmēd, and thereafter held considerable political power until his own death in 1156/1742-3. Ḥūṭūk Mḥmēd was added to the Dhuʿl-Faqāriyya (the head of which faction, Ismāʿīl Bey al-Kabīr al-Fākārī, had married his daughter), and this political connexion was continued by Muṣṭafā al-Kazdūrī and the household that he founded.

The fractional struggles of the early 12th/18th century resulted ultimately in the victory of the Dhuʿl-Faqāriyya and Kazdughliyya over the Kāsmiyya (1143/1730). This did not mean that hencforeward a united Mamluk group controlled Egypt. Rival households continued to dispute for power. Among these, the most important was the Kazdughliyya, of whom the leading amīr was Ibrāhīm al-Kazdūrī, later briefly ḥākīy of the Janissaries. He had been emancipated in 1148/1735-6, and his first important post was that of serdār in the Pilgrimage of 1151/1739. On his return, his influence grew in Cairo, and he began to build up a party against ʿUṯmān Bey Dhuʿl-Faqārī, who had been commander of the Pilgrimage. Essentially the rivalry between the two was a struggle for the riyāsā (riʿāsā), the supreme position among the Mamlūk amīrs. An attempt by the leading amīr of the Djufliyiya household, Rīḏwān, ṭākār of the Ṭabāzīn Corps, to mediate was unsuccessful, and he became a supporter of Ibrāhīm. Ibrāhīm’s faction attempted to assassinate ʿUṯmān. He was only wounded, but the houses of his party were attacked and plundered. ʿUṯmān fled to Upper Egypt, where the governor of Dijrjā was a mamlūk of his household. They made their headquarters at Asyūt, where they were supported by remnants of the Kāsmiyya and others. Defeated there, and in a second battle in the Sinai peninsula, ʿUṯmān made his way to Istanbul, where he was well received at court (ca. 1157/1744-5). He never returned to Egypt, but died in Istanbul in 1190/1776.

The allied amīrs, Ibrāhīm Kāḥīy al-Kazdūrī and Rīḏwān Kāḥīy al-Djuflī, proceeded to place their followers in key positions. For some years there were troubles with rival Mamlūk groups, but these ceased by 1161/1748. Ibrāhīm thus attained the riyāsā, nominally in association with Rīḏwān, but the latter had no further interest in affairs of state. He occupied himself with magnificent buildings, luxurious living and the patronage of poets. Both Ibrāhīm and Rīḏwān appointed three of their mamlūks to the beylık—the first entry of the Kazdughliyya into this order, which they were subsequently to monopolise. Ibrāhīm laid his hands on the revenues of Egypt and purchased numerous mamlūks, some of whom he provided with establishments and fortunes by marrying them to the widows of former amīrs. For about seven years he held unprecedented authority, during which time Cairo was quiet and free from revolts, while there was public security in the provinces. He died in his bed in Safar 1168-Nov.-Dec. 1754. Rīḏwān survived his colleague, but his power soon crumbled. The senior Kāẓdūrī amīr, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Kāḥīy, stirred up the household of Ibrāhīm against him. One of Rīḏwān’s own mamlūks, in league with the Kazdughliyya, tried to assassinate him, and Rīḏwān died of the wound while fleeing from his enemies. This event, about six months after the death of Ibrāhīm, marked the end of the Djuflīyya as a political force.

The Kazdughliyya now controlled Cairo and appointed ʿUṯmān al-Dijrjāwī, the senior bey of Ibrāhīm’s household, to the riyāsā. About this time two others of their number were promoted to the beylık, Ḥusayn al-Ṣāḥbānī and Būlāt Kāḥānī, usually known as ʿAlī Bey al-Kabīr (q.v.). ʿUṯmān Bey soon offended his colleagues by his harsh behaviour, and in 1170/1756-7 he was removed from the riyāsā, which was conferred on al-Ṣāḥbānī. The new shāykh al-balād, i.e., holder of the riyāsā (riʿāsā) now sought to attain plenary power with the support of Nṣf ʿArām, the section of the populace traditionally allied with the Kāsmiyya. He set to work to weaken and disperse his ṣhāyḫ-dāḫīyya, but his plan miscarried, and he was assassinated in Safar 1171/Oct.-Nov. 1775. The riyāsā was now conferred upon another of Ibrāhīm Kāḥāy’s former mamlūks, ʿAlī Bey al-Ghzāzāwī, sometimes called (rather confusingly) ʿAlī Bey al-Kabīr, either because of his seniority, or because the terms kāḥīr al-balād and kāḥīr al-bāṣam were used as synonyms for shāykh al-balād. In 1173/1760 al-Ghzāzāwī went to the Ḥijāz as commander of the Pilgrimage. Before leaving, he had set on foot a plot to dispose of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Kāḥāy, who was still a power among the Kazdughliyya. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān learnt of this and made an alliance with Būlāt Kāḥānī ʿAlī Bey. At a meeting of the grandees, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān reminded them of his position as head of the Kazdughliyya household, and nominated ʿAlī Bey as shaykh al-balad. While the latter was in promising to obey him, he was, in this, al-Ghzāzāwī handed over the command of the Pilgrimage caravan, and fled to Gaza. Three months later he
returned to Cairo, where he died shortly after-

'All Bey was now in control. 'Abd al-Rahmān Kāhyā, who had hoped to use him as a compliant tool, was soon undone. He was banished to the Hijāz in Dhū 'l-‘Adhā 1178/April 1765, and only returned to Egypt, a dying man, in 1190/1775, after the death of 'All Bey. The despotic ascendency of the shaykh al-balad and his dubious loyalty to the Ottoman sultan are reflected in his inscription in the mausoleum of al-Shāfi‘ī, where he assumes the ambiguous but challenging style of 'Azīz Mūsā [q.v.]; ‘All was ousted from Egypt (Muhārram 1186/April 1775) by his own mamlūk, Muhammad Bey Abu‘l-Dhahab, who succeeded to the position of shaykh al-balad, but who himself died during an expedition against Shaykh Zāhir al-Umar (Rābī‘ II 1189/June 1775).

Thereafter no single Kāzdughlī amir dominated, but three grandees competed for power: Ismā‘īl Bey, the khudayr of ‘All Bey, and two of Abu‘l-

Dhahab's mamlūks, Ibrāhim Bey al-Kābir [q.v.] and Murād Bey. In 1200-1/1786-87 the presence in Egypt of an Ottoman force under Djeza‘irli Ghāzī Hasān Pasha [q.v.] temporarily reinforced the position of Ismā‘īl Bey, who was appointed shaykh al-balad. He died of plague in 1205/1791, whereupon Ibrāhim and Murād established an uneasy duum-
virate. The disorders of the period produced a new political development—risings of the civilians of Cairo, supported and even led by members of the 'ulamā‘. The French occupation of Egypt (1798-1801) struck a fatal blow at the Kāzdughliyya, as at the entire neo-mamlūk regime. Murād Bey died during the occupation (a house of Abu‘l-Dhahab, i, 417-20; Ismā‘īl Bey, ii, 219-20); Murād Bey (iii, 167-71); ‘Uthmān al-Bardisi (iv, 42-44); Muhammad al-Alfi (iv, 42-43). For ‘All Bey al-Kābir and Ibrāhim Bey al-Kābir, see the articles (above, I, 391-2; III, 992). See further P. M. Holt, The career of Kucük Muhammad al-Kāzdughlī (1676-74), in Studies in the history of the Near East, London 1973, 231-51; W. Livingston, The rise of Shaykh al-balad ‘All Bey al-Kābir: a study in the accuracy of the chronicle of al-Jabarti, in BSOAS, xxxiii (1970), 283-94. (P. M. Holt)

KAZI-ASKER [see tyard ‘askar].

KAZI-KUMUKU [see kūmūk].

KAZIM KADRI, HUSAYN (in modern Turkish Huseyin Kâzîm Kâdri), 1870-1934, Turkish writer and lexicographer. His father, Kâdi Bey, the son of the vizier Edhem Pasha, was a civil servant and the unpopular but colourful governor of Trabzon for ten years (1892-1902) under 'Abd al-

Hamid II. After attending various schools, Husayn Kâzîm graduated from the English School of Com-

merce in İzmir. He taught in schools, briefly tried journalism after the promulgation of the Constitution of 1908 and later served as a governor in the provin-
ces, notably in Aleppo (1920) and Salonika (1921). He was elected to the Ottoman Parliament in 1912. During World War I, he returned to Beirut, where he compiled his great Turkish dictionary. He was again elected to the Ottoman Parliament in 1920 and served successively as Minister of Agriculture, of Commerce and of Wafîs, and in the same year joined Ahmed 'İzet Pasha’s unsuccessful mission to the nationalist government in Ankara. Husayn Kâzîm is the author of a great number of works of uneven value, whose topics range from language, literature, religion and politics to law, commerce and agriculture. During the ideological struggle of the post-colonial period, he joined the “Islamists” and made remarkable contributions to the move-

ment, i.e. İstiḥbâle doğrû, Istanbul 1329, Felâka doğrû, Istanbul 1331, Yurîmdî şafrâda İslâmîyyet, Istanbul 1339, 10 temmûs inâklâbinâ netâği, Istanbul 1336. He published, for the first time in Turkey, the poems of the Persian poet Ḥāfiz: Mâhâdâm Kuli Divânî, Istanbul 1340. An interesting contribution on the linguistic and literary problems of the Turkish-speaking peoples is his series of articles Turkish içânlarının teşkîlî (“The unification of the Turkish languages”); Iğîhâd, nos. 31-33, September-November 1327 rûmî/1921), where he points out the growing influence of Ottoman Turkish on the Azərî and Kazan written languages and suggests that an academy should work out a “lingua franca” for all the Turkish-speaking peoples based on Ottoman Turkish. Husayn Kâzîm published a number of booklets and articles on improving the methods of agriculture in Turkey. Of particular importance is his series of 17 articles published in Iğîhâd (nos. 155-174, July 1923-February 1925), where he expounded his theories of land reform and agricultural education in Turkey.

Husayn Kâzîm’s major contribution, however, is his comprehensive Turkish dictionary, Büyük Türk Lughâtî, in four large volumes (vols. i and ii, Istanbul 1927 and 1928, in Arabic script, vols. iii and iv, Istanbul 1943 and 1945, in Roman script: transcribed from the compiler’s manuscript by his daughter Rıkkat Kunt). In the introduction the author gives a survey of the development of “classi-
cal” Turkish written languages such as Uyghur, Çağatay, Ottoman, Kazan and Azerbaijani, with the elements of grammar. The dictionary itself covers the vocabulary of the main Turkish written languages and “words of the Koybal, Yakut, Çuvash and Kirghiz dialects with supporting examples” as stated in the sub-title. Completed during World War I, Husayn Kâzîm’s dictionary, which reflects the contemporary state of research in the field, was a landmark in turcorological studies in Turkey up to the period of the 1930s, when more up-to-date research in the universities and by the Turkish Philological Society (Türk Dil Kurumu) superseded it, although the “Turkish Radloff”, as it is sometimes called, can still be at times a useful work of reference.

Bibliography: given in the article. (F. I.)
schools in Istanbul, graduating first in his class from the Harb Akademisi in 1905, one year after Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk). He served in several important actions in Thrace, and took part in the movement to crush the counter-revolution of Sultan ʿAbd al-Hamid in 1909. Later he worked in the intelligence section of the German Advisory Group, and in World War I served as Chief of Staff to General von der Goltz on the Îrāk front. He then became commander of the 2nd Corps in the Caucasus, and fought successful battles at Erzurum and Erzincan. At the end of the war he commanded the 14th Corps in Tekirdağ. Early in 1919 he was appointed by the sultan's government to command the 5th Corps in Erzurum, but soon became instrumental in organising Turkish nationalist forces to fight the War of Independence, becoming one of the first important figures to espouse the nationalist cause. He was quickly appointed commander of the eastern front by the nationalist leadership under Mustafa Kemal, and invitations to the Erzurum Congress of the Association for the Defence of Rights of Eastern Anatolia were sent out over Karabekir's name. One of his major military successes was the defeat of the Armenians at Kars and Gönü in late 1920. In the same year he took a seat in the first Grand National Assembly as deputy for Edirne.

He resigned from the army in October 1924, when Atatürk insisted that all officers either choose a military or a political career, and the next month became a chief founder of the Republican Progressive Party (Terakkiperver Dümührüyvet Fırbaşı). The Progressives generally advocated slower and less drastic reform and secularisation than did Atatürk's Republican People's Party, and differed from Atatürk on a number of matters of political organisation, although the Progressives' programme resembled that of Atatürk in many aspects of economic, financial and foreign policy. Karabekir played an important role in it because he was considered one of the major potential rivals of Kemal, and the Progressives were opposed to the principle of an Assembly without an organised opposition. The party was dissolved in June 1925 coincidentally with the uprising of Kurdish tribes in the eastern provinces. The Progressives' urging of moderate treatment for the rebels was one factor which led to Karabekir and several others being brought before an Independence Tribunal in 1926. He was acquitted, but retired from politics and public life till after Atatürk's death in 1938. In 1939 he came out of retirement and entered the 6th Assembly as an R.P.P. deputy for Istanbul. In 1946 he was elected President of the Assembly, an office which he held until his death in 1948.


KAZIM RASHTI. SAYYID, leader of the Shaykhī sect after the death of its founder, Shaykh Ahmad Asbâhī, in 1242/1826. Born in 1213/1798, Sayyid Kāzīm Rashtī evinced deep religious feelings while still a child, and had been raised in a series of visions of increasing intensity. In the course of one such vision, at the age of fifteen, he was instructed to seek out Shaykh Ahmad Asbâhī, then resident in Yazd, and to become his pupil. Having reached the presence of the Shaykh, he soon became his most favoured disciple, and Asbâhī is reputed to have said to him, "No one understands me but you". After Asbâhī had been declared a kâfir by the 'ulūmah of Kazwîn, he went to Kirmānshāh and then left for Arab Îrāk. Kāzīm Rashtī followed him, settling in Karbalā, where he spent the rest of his life. He fell heir not only to the following of Asbâhī, but also to the polemics and hostility that certain of the Shaykhī's doctrines had aroused. Much of his activity was devoted to the defence and further elaboration of these doctrines, in particular the resurrection of the "Hurkâyan body (dâ'im-i hûrîhâyî)," the denial of the corporeal ascension of the Prophet, and the description of the ímâms as the efficient cause ('illât-i qudrî) of creation. Although in the course of oral debate with the 'ulūmah of Karbalā, led by Sayyid Ibrāhîm Kazwînī, he was obliged to admit that the apparent meaning of Asbâhī's teachings was contrary to the faith, he vigorously defended Shaykhī doctrine and defended its opponents in his many writings, Dâ'ilî al-mu'tahāyirîn being the most notable. He enjoyed good relations with Nadjîb Pâshâ, governor of Baghdad, and his house was spared when an Ottoman army sacked Karbalā in 1259/1843. After his death later in the same year, he was succeeded as Shaykhī leader by Hâdîji Muhammad Karim Khān Kirmānī. Another pupil of Kāzīm Rashtī, Sayyid 'Ali Muhammed Shârâžî, declared himself to be the "Bâb" and had his claim accepted by many former Shaykhīs.


KAZIMAYN, a town and one of the most celebrated Shi'i places of pilgrimage in Îrāk. It is a little over one km. from the right bank of the Tigris, which here describes a loop, being separated from the river by a series of gardens. Kazimayn itself is prettily situated among palm-groves. It is connected with the west side of Baghdad, about three miles away, by regular bus and taxi services, replacing the horse-tramway laid down by the governor Mîdhat Pâshâ (1869-72), who did a great deal for Baghdad. Kazimayn is now also a station on the Baghdad-Samarra railway, which runs along the right bank of the Tigris. It forms a kâdafî belonging to the muhafaza of Baghdad and administered by a kâfīm-makâm. Its population grew rapidly from 169,993 in 1947 to 235,745 in 1957; most are Shi'is. Unfortunately there are no official figures for the number of Persians among them. However, according to the 1957 census the number of Persians in Baghdad was 5,156, and in Îrāk as a whole 23,783. Access to the sanctuaries is strictly forbidden to non-Muslims as well as to all unveiled women.

The name Kāzīmāyn, i.e. "$\text{the two }\mathcal{K}\text{âlm}$", refers to the two cAlids buried here, the Imâm Īmām (Terakkiperver Diumhuriyyet Flrkasi}.
b. Dīyaʾr al-Sādik, nicknamed al-Kāzīm (d. 186/802) and his grandson the Imam Muhammad al-Djawad (d. 219/834), the seventh and ninth Imāms of the twelve Shīʿa (Iṣnāʿ Ashariyya [q.v.]). The town is also called Kāzimiyah in reference to the nickname of the Imām Mūsā b. Dīyaʾr al-Sādik. It is also known among the common people as al-Kāzīm, i.e. the city of al-Kāzīm. Finally, the name Imām Mūsā is also found. However, all these names have come into use only recently, for the town was originally called al-Mashhād al-Kāzīmi and Mashhād Mūsā b. Dīyaʾr.

There is evidence of pilgrimage to these ‘Alīd tombs as early as the 7th/13th century (Ibn Khallikān, iv, 395). At the present day Kāzīmayn is one of the four greatest sanctuaries of the Shīʿa. Its favourable position at the junction of the road to the three other Shīʿa places of pilgrimage, Samarrāʾ in the north and Karbalāʾ [q.v.] and Najaf [q.v.] in the south, accounts for the fact that many thousands of pilgrims pass through it annually, especially during the first ten days of the month of Muharram (‘Aṣkrāt Muharram), which are exclusively dedicated to the memory of the martyrs of al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Abbāl and his family. One of the four majallāḥahs, the principal spiritual leaders of the Shīʿa, lives in Kāzīmayn. The present city of Kāzīmayn was originally a part of the Kassite Empire during the reign of Kurigalzu; he built a new capital called after him Dūr-Kurigalzu, whose remains are still in existence at ‘Aḵār Kūf, about ten km. to the west of Kāzīmayn. During the Sasanian period the name Tāṣṭū Ḫurṭābūl is mentioned as denoting what was later called Maḥābīr Kuraysh. Prior to the building of Baghdad by the al-Mansūrīs, called al-Mansūr (362/974-5/75-7) [q.v.], the place was called al-Shūnū. When Baghdad was built, al-Maṣūr detached the cemetery of al-Shūnū al-Saghrū and it made a private cemetery for his family (though later non-Kuraishi were also buried there), calling it Maḥābīr Kuraysh. This cemetery is also called Maḥābīr Bāb al-Tībn, because of its proximity to that gate. His son Dīyaʾr al-Akbar (d. 1509/769) was buried there. It was only when the “two Kāzīms” were buried there that the name Maḥābīr Kuraysh was changed in later times to al-Mashhād al-Kāzīmi and Kāzīmayn. In Yākūţ’s time (623/1226), Maḥābīr Kuraysh was a fairly populous suburb surrounded by a wall. About a century later, Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi found that this place, formerly reckoned a suburb of Baghdad, was now an independent township.

The sanctuary of Kāzīmayn is one of the exceedingly splendid and rich monuments which ‘Ibrāhīm owes to the Shīʿa, and for which Persia and the Shīʿa of India supplied the necessary funds. With its domes and the pinnacles of its minarets covered with gold, it is visible to the traveller from a long way off. He who first built the ‘Alīd sanctuary at Kāzīmayn is unknown. All we know is that in 365/974, by the order of the Buwayhid Muʿizz al-Dawla [q.v.], two wooden boxes were put over the two graves, two wooden domes were erected above them, and a surrounding wall was built. The present faience-covered building is due to the Safawī Ismāʿīl I (908-30/1502-24), whose family claimed descent from the Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm (see above). The inscription published by Massingham (Mission, 99) of the year 925/1519, refers to the complete transformation of the old building by the shāh. The restoration not quite completed by Ismāʿīl was finished by the Ottoman sultan Sulaymān I, who occupied Baghdad in 941/1534. The covering of the domes with golden tiles was done, according to the inscription, in 1211/1796 by the command and at the expense of Shāh Ağa Muḥammad Khan [q.v.], the founder of the Kāḏjār dynasty. On the occasion of his pilgrimage in 1870, Shāh Nāṣir al-Dīn had the gold plating on the principal dome and on the roofs of the minarets renewed (cf. Buquet). The double cupola flanked by four minarets shows that two saints are buried beneath it. Close to this mausoleum stands an isolated pavilion under which are shown the graves of Dīyaʾr (formerly supposed to be that of Ismāʿīl) and Ibrāhīm, sons of the Imām Mūsā. The cupola of the building is modern and a gift of Salīm Pāsha (cf. Massingham, op. cit., 100). It may be noted here that there is at Hādīthā the Euphrates (between ‘Aḥnā and Hit) a small sanctuary which is said to contain the tomb of Muhammad, son of Mūsā al-Kāzīm (see Hersfeld, in Sarre-Herzfeld, ii, 321). On the tomb of a certain Ḥamza b. Mūsā al-Kāzīm in Karyat al-Bāshīya (in ‘Irāk), cf. Massingham, op. cit., 60. In the vicinity of Astarābād [q.v.] there is also an imāmīsīde (tomb chapel) where a descendant of the Imām Mūsā named Imām Kāzīm is said to be buried (cf. Melignou in ZDMG, xxxi, 352)."
KAZIMAYN — AL-KAZIMI


(M. Streuck-A. A. Dixon)

KAZIMI [see sinka].

AL-KAZIMI, ABD AL-MU‘MIN B. MUHAMMAD, Shī‘ī poet of ‘Īrāq, born in Baghdād in 1285/1865 (but according to his daughter Rabāb al-Kāzīmī, in 1286/1872), who died in Cairo on 1 May 1935. He received elementary instruction in Arabic and Persian and then continued to study Arabic literature on his own initiative. In 1308/1890 he met Dījāmāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī [q.v.] in ‘Īrāq and was influenced by his revolutionary ideas. Soon afterwards he left ‘Īrāq, but whether for reasons of political, business or poetic ambition is unclear. He travelled to Persia, India (1897) and finally to Egypt (1899), where he was welcomed by the leading literati. He became a close friend of and received financial aid from Muḥammad ‘Abdūh [q.v.] and Sa‘d Zaghīl [q.v.], and dedicated panegyrics to them during their lives and elegies after their deaths. For some time al-Kāzīmī tried in vain to obtain a pension from the Khedive ‘Abdābīl Hīlī al-Dīwānī [q.v.]; this apparently was foiled by the jealousy of Ahmad Shawkī [q.v.]. From 1919 onwards al-Kāzīmī dedicated many poems to the Central Committee of the Syrian Unity Party, and panegyrics both to Sa‘d Zaghīl and to the Ḥāǧimīte kings in Transjordan. He was an avid supporter of Arab nationalism and consequently became best known as Shī‘ī al-‘Arab (the poet of the Arabs).

The poetic diction, images and metaphors of al-Kāzīmī’s poems are derived from Bedouin life, while their structure is thoroughly rooted in classical poetic models. His panegyrics reveal him to have had a proud and forceful personality as well as being a talented poet. He tended to boast of these qualities in his poetry at times, stressing his ʿAlawī descent and panegyrics both to Sa‘d Zaghīl and Ahmad Sha‘bīl, a biographical dictionary of transmitters of Shī‘ī hadith, based on al-Amīr Mustafā al-Taḏrīsī’s Naḥd al-ridād; an abbreviation of a work on the summa, al-İbāl by Muḥammad b. Taḏrīs, and al-Ḥakī al-hakī, a refutation of teachings of the Aḥğārī school concerning hadith. Only the first of these has been printed, and manuscripts of al-Kāzīmī’s other writings are rare. Two of his sons, Shawkī Dī‘ār al-Kāzīmī and Muhammad Ṭabī‘ al-Kāzīmī, were also ‘ulamā‘ī of some note.


AL-KAZIMI, HAYDAR B. IBRĀHĪM, an ʿĪmāmī Shī‘ī of the early 19th century. Born in Kazimayn
in 1205/1790, he spent his entire life there, dying in 1265/1849. He was the ancestor of the Al Haydari, a celebrated learned family of Kazwin. Among his works may be mentioned al-Birha al-Haydariyya, concerning usul (the principles of jurisprudence), and al-Maṣūliyya al-Haydariyya, consisting of scenarios for the ta'ṣīya, the so-called Shīʿī passion play.


**AL-KAZIMĪ, MEHMED SĀLİM** (1868-1914), a Turkish political journalist of the late Hamidian and early constitutional period. Better known by his *nom de plume* ʿĀwn Allāh Kāzimī, he was born in Istanbul in 1868. He was the son of Hūsān Begg Beg, who was private secretary (mubayyin kalibi) to the sultan. His family came from Erzurum in eastern Anatolia where al-Kāzimī’s grandfather, ʿĀlī Beg, had been a derebe (q.v.). He was given a traditional education, though he learned French as well as Arabic and Persian. Finding no suitable position in the stratified bureaucracy of the period, like many well-to-do, educated young men of his day he turned to journalism. In 1889 he and his brother Sulaymān Tāwīl began to publish *Mûrûwet*, which is described as ‘an Arabic newspaper dedicated to the benefits of property and in the service of the state’ (menāfiʿi al-muhk al-dawâl garnetidir). He left the country, fearing that he was about to be arrested for an article he had written, and returned to Istanbul some time later using the alias ʿĀwn Allāh Kāzimī. He was arrested in 1901 on account of his alleged involvement in the Muṣṭafā Pāsha Faṣaḥa incident, in which ʿĀbd al-Hammād II’s secret police, suspecting Muṣṭafā Faṣaḥa of conspiracy, clashed with the general’s men. Meḥmed Sālim was sentenced to penal servitude for life and exiled to the town of Sivas. He was caught attempting to escape, and transferred to the fortress at Sinop.

Meḥmed Sālim returned to Istanbul after the Young Turk revolution of July 1908 and became the president of the Fedākhân-ī Millet Dējmīyyet, one of the many ephemeral political clubs which sprang up following the revolution. On 16 September 1908 he began publishing the *Ḥubk-ī ʿUmāmīyye* as the organ of this association. The stated aim of this paper was “to serve the constitutional administration and national unity” (ṣīrāt-i -mehrūštâyaya te ʿutkūk-ī millette khidmet etmek). The association seems to have been composed of much the same elements as the *Īṭihād see Terrâbī Dējmīyyet* (q.v.), that is to say people who had opposed the old régime, but who, feeling that their earlier sufferings had gone unrecompensed, now turned against the government. They are alleged even to have indulged in blackmail of some members of the old régime.

The government suspected Meḥmed Sālim’s organisation of illegal activities, so that on 14 January 1909 the premises of the *Ḥubk-ī ʿUmāmīyye* were raided by the police. Meḥmed Sālim was arrested, and the *Fedākhân-ī Millet Dējmīyyet* was disbanded. He was acquitted by the court, and appointed mutasarrīf of Kirkkūk (Irāq). When the counter-revolution of 31 March 1912 (o.s.)/13 April 1919 broke out he was suspected of involvement and arrested. A court martial found him innocent, and he was again acquitted. Soon afterwards he left for Kirkkūk and died there in 1914.

Apart from his journalistic writings, Meḥmed Sālim wrote about his adventures in Son Miiddfa, and San Miiddfa, Salim wrote about his adventures in 

**Bibliography:** E. G. Browne and R. A. Nicholson, 1910-13, 830, French tr. Barbier de Meynard, *Description historique de la ville de Kazvin*, in *JA* (1857). Its population according to the census of 1966 was 81,000.

### i. Geography and History

Kazvin guards the passes to the north leading through Tabaristan to Rasht and the Caspian Sea, and is situated at the junction of the roads from Rasht to Tehran and Tabriz to Tehran. From Kazvin roads also lead off to Hamadān and Kūrm. In the 19th century there were four roads leading from Kazvin to Tehran, two by muleteers and the other by those riding ʿāpūr (Safarname-ī Mīrzā Husayn Farahānī, ed. H. Frarna-Farman, 1964, 9-10). The climate is temperate with a mean maximum temperature in summer of 34.5 °C and a mean minimum temperature in winter of -5.4 °C. The annual rainfall is 399.1 mm. with frequent snowfalls in January and February. In spite of its favourable situation as regards communications, Kazvin never rivalled Ray, Nābāpur or Isfahān in the Middle Ages. The reason is partly to be found in lack of water, which placed a severe limitation on its growth. Istakhrī states that Kazvin had enough water for drinking purposes only; this was provided by rainfall and the water of one *kanāl* (*Masālik al-namalīh, Leiden 1927, 201*). Until recently the plain of Kazvin was irrigated entirely by *kanāls* and four small streams (see further Muḥammad ʿAlī Gulriz, *Mināda al-dīn al-īmāmī al-Gīlānī*). Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī states that these streams flowed in spring; in a good year their water reached the gardens of Kazvin, but rarely flowed into the town in summer, the water being used by the estates situated upstream (*Nchea, Persia* text, 222). In 1963 the Kazvin Development Authority was set up to develop the water resources and agriculture of the area (see further A. K. S. Lambton, *The Persian land reform 1926-1966*, Oxford 1969, 282).

Kazvin lies in the earthquake belt and has been

---

**AL-KAZIMI — KAZVIN**
KAZWIN

Kazwin was damaged by earthquakes on several occasions. Earthquakes in the town were recorded in 249/863-4, 858 KAZWIN, 360/963-4, and 513/1119-20 (Gulriz, 873). A second town at Kazwin was built by Musa b. al-`As, who succeeded al-Walid b. `Ukba as governor of Kufa, still held them some two hundred years later and had title deeds for them from the government. From Kazwin al-Bara` carried out raids into Daylam and Gilan and also took Zandjan. Sa`di b. al-`As, who succeeded al-Walid b. `Ukba as governor of Kufa, also made raids into Daylam, and built a town at Kazwin, Haddaij, after he became governor of most of Persia on behalf of the Umayyads, appointed his son Muhammad governor of the frontier regions. Yazid b. Mu`allab, Kutayba b. Muslim, and Naṣr b. Sayyār also appointed governors over Kazwin, as did the early `Abbāsids.

A second town at Kazwin was built by Mūsā al-Hādi beside the one built by Sa`di b. al-`Āṣ and called Madina Mūsā. He bought the nearby Rustamābād and constituted it a wāqf for the benefit of the town. Mūbarak al-Turk, a freedman of al-Hādi, also built another town at Kazwin in 176/792-3 and called it after himself. When Hārūn al-Rashīd passed through Kazwin on his way to Khurāsān, he was impressed by both the
tribulations which the local people suffered on account of the Daylamites and their efforts to combat them. Accordingly, he remitted the ta'addu of the town and substitutes instead an annual payment of 10,000 dirhams, and ordered a wall to be built round Madina Mūsā and Mubārakābād. This was not, however, completed until the caliphate of al-Mu'tazz, when Mūsā b. Būghā finished it in 254/868 (see also Gurlīz, 103 ff., who quotes a manuscript history of Kazwīn, the Kūthāb al-ta'dīn wī fī ʾaḥkām Kazwīn) by Rāshīdī, who died in 623/1226, for further details concerning the walls of Kazwīn. Hārūn al-Rašīd also built a Friday mosque in Kazwīn and constituted various khāns and other buildings into a waḥf for its benefit. During al-Kāsim b. al-Rašīd's governorship of Kazwīn, Djūrđjan and Tābaristān, it appears that there was an increase in the land held by the government, a number of local landowners placing their estates under al-Kāsim's protection by a ta'addu contract, by which they paid ʿaṣur to the public treasury and a second ʿaṣur to him for his protection. In this way they retained possession of their estates, while the ownership passed to the government (Balādḥuri, Futūḥ, 310-11, Ibn al-Fakhri, 282-3, Taʾīrīš-i gūzīda, 480 ff., Nuẓūṣ, 38). The anonymous Muḥnūnī al-tawdīlī mentions a rebellion by Kawkabi, an 'Alid, who put down Mūsā b. Būghā during the reign of al-Muʿtazz (ed. Malik al-Shuʿarāʾ, Tehran 1940-1, 365).

The population of the town at this time appears to have been mainly Arab. After Mūsā b. Būghā completed the town wall, the population increased. It consisted of various tribes or families, most of whom traced their origin back to the first Arab settlers. Among them were the Sādāt, the majority of whom, according to Hamd Allāh Mustawfī, were characterised by their humility, knowledge, piety and courtesy. He states that they supported themselves by their own work and did not demand pensions, thus implying that they held aloof from the temporal power and retained their independence. Khiṣānī, writing later, states that the people of Kazwīn were noted for their chivalry (murūʾaṣuṣ) and humanity (in-sāmniyyāt) (Taʾīrīš (in-ṣāmniyyāt) (Taʾīrīš-i gūzīda, Tehran 1959-9, iv, 654).

Kazwīn retained its importance as a frontier town during the struggles between the caliphate and the 'Alids in the Caspian provinces. When al-Muṣṭaṣim became caliph he determined to bring the Daylamis into subjection. Fakhḵr al-Dawla (thus in Mustawfī) Abū Mansūr Kūṯī, whom he sent to Kazwīn as governor, together with his sons occupied himself against the Daylamis for nearly twenty years from 223/838. In all, Fakhḵr al-Dawla appears to have held the post of governor for some forty years on behalf of the caliphs, except for two years when he governed on behalf of Ḥasan b. al-Bāḳīr, the 'Alid, who took possession of Kazwīn in 251/865-6. For a brief period Kazwīn came under Šāmānī rule when Šāmān b. Ahmad became governor in 233/845-6. In the following year, however, Fakhḵr al-Dawla Abū ʿAlī, Hamd Allāh Mustawfī's forefather, became governor on behalf of the caliph and held the town for twenty-seven years, though in 301/913-14 it was placed together with Ray, Ḏinawar, Zāndjān, Abhar and Tārum, under the general charge of ʿAlī b. Muktadir (The eclipse of the ʿAbbāsid caliphate, ed. H. F. Medlicott and J. D. S. Margoliouth, Oxford 1921, 1, 33). In 304/916-17 ʿUṭb b. Abī ʿl-Sādī (see Sāgīra) made an abortive attempt to claim Kazwīn (ibid., i, 45 ff.), but was put to flight by Asfār b. Shīrūyān [see Asfār b. Shīrāwūyān], who made himself master of Kazwīn and of an area stretching from Ṭabaristān and Gūzīda to Kūm and Ḏarāndīn. In 315/927-8 Asfār routed an army sent against him by Abī Muktadir outside Kazwīn, although it was aided by the people of the city. Asfār then seized the citadel, killed many of the inhabitants, did much damage to the city, and imposed a vast contribution of money on the inhabitants. He was later dispossessed by Mardāwīḏī and killed (ibid., i, 161-2; Masʿūdī, Murūǧ al-dhakab ed. C. Bahrīb de Meynard, repr. Tehran 1970, ix, 6, 9 ff.). Kazwīn subsequently fell to Rūḵ al-Dawla, and the district remained in Būyid hands for upwards of a hundred years. In 358/968-9 there was an outbreak of disorder in the town and Abī ʿl-Fāth ʿAlī b. Mūḥammad b. Ḥusayn, Rūḵ al-Dawla's ʿawārīn, who was sent to put it down, imposed a fine of 1,200,000 dirhams on the people (Taʾīrīš-i gūzīda, 837).

In 421/1030, Kazwīn passed into Ghazzānī hands. Up to this time Hamd Allāh Mustawfī's forefathers were apparently still governors of the town, but at this point no suitable member of the family was available for the post of governor and they became instead mustawfīs. About 424/1033-4 ʿAlī Abī Mūḥammad Đaṯfarī succeeded to the government, which he and his sons held for about sixty years. The last of this line, Fakhḵr al-ṣāfī Abī ʿAlī Shārāsṭānī b. Đaṯfārī, was very wealthy and he and his followers held much property in the neighbourhood. He died in 484/1091-2 and was survived by one daughter (Taʾīrīš-i gūzīda, 837 ff.).

The first contact between Kazwīn and the Ghuzz appears to have been in 430/1038-9 when the inhabitants, with a payment of 7,000 dinārs, bought off the Ghuzz and Fānā Khūsravī, the Daylamī, who had taken Ray in 428/1037, slaughtering many of its inhabitants (Ibn al-Āthīr, al-Kāmil, i, 269-71). Nāṣīrī Khūsravī visited Kazwīn in 438/1046, and describes it as follows: "It had many gardens, without walls or thorn hedges or any obstacle to prevent entry into them. I saw it to be a good city. It had a strong wall and embattlements. It had good bazaars, except for its chivalry and humanity (in-sāmniyyāt) (Taʾīrīš-i gūzīda, Tehran 1959-9, iv, 654)." In spite of the proximity of Kazwīn to the ʿIsāmīs stronghold Alamūt (q.v.), the Sādīqūs do not appear to have regarded it as an important governorship to be given to a powerful amīr or mašīḥ. Soon after the ʿIsāmīs were established in Alamūt, Abū ʿl-Māḥāsīn Rūyānī persuaded the Kazwīnis to decree death to anyone coming from the direction of Alamūt lest mingling with the ʿIsāmīs should give rise to disaffection within Kazwīn (M. G. Hodson, The Order of the Assassins, The Hague 1955, 83). There were also many fortresses in the mountains of Rūbdār held by the ʿIsāmīs, whence they were able from time to time to assault and trouble the Kazwīnis, as they did in 523/1129 when they killed some 400 persons in revenge for an ʿIsāmī envoy who had been lynched in Iṣfāhān whither he had gone to see Maḥmūd b. Mūḥammad (ibid., 102). During the period when Mūḥammad b. Buzurg Umīd was grandmaster (532-7/1138-62) there were raids and counter raids against Kazwīn from ʿIsāmī strongholds (ibid., 145). Somewhat later, in 560/1165, the ʿIsāmīs of Rūbdār built a fortress outside Kazwīn, whence they were able almost to lay siege to the town (ibid., 158).
During the late Seljuk period Kazwin was disputed by various maliks and amirs, including Tughril b. Muhammad, to whom it was assigned by Sandjar (Bundesarz, Zubdat al-musrara wa-nukhbat al-usra, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden 1889, 134). Under the Khwarzmshahs, renewed attacks were made from Kazwin on the Isma’ils. When Djinal al-Din Hasan succeeded his father Muhammad as grandmaster of the Isma’ils in 607/1210 he professed Islam and was known as Djinal al-Din Naw-Musalman. The people of Kazwin, knowing all too well the dissimulations and tricks of the Isma’ils, accepted his claims and demanded proof. He went to great lengths to win them over and induced them to send some of the leading men of Kazwin to Alamut and burn Isma’iili works in their presence (Diuwanyi, Ta’rikh-i Diahdngushd, ed. Mirza Muhammad Kazwini, GMS, London 1916, ii, 243-4).

During the struggle between the Khwarzmshahs and the Mongols, Kazwin from time to time changed hands, until finally the Khwarzmshahs were defeated. In 617/1220 the Mongols are alleged to have carried out a massacre of the people of Kazwin (Hamd Allah Mustawfi, Zafarnama, quoted by Browne, iii, 96-8). Many left the town, so much so that the capital was abandoned. It continued to hold this position until Shah Shihab ad-Din built a new capital in Isfahan (408 Hij.). Although Kazwin ceased to be the capital, it did not become an independent province but was administered by a waizir, darughah, haizantar and mustawfi appointed by the central government. Towards the end of the reign of Shihab Sultan Husayn it was made into a province, under a begishegii, and a certain Tahmasp Khan, a military slave (ghulam), was appointed over its A suma for his remuneration (mutadhilli) on the taxes (wujugha) of the surrounding districts and Rukn-kh, and in return he was required to keep 300 soldiers (Mirza Rafii, Dashtar al-Muluk, ed. M. T. Danishpazhuh in Rev. de la fac. des lettres et des sciences humaines, Tehran University, xvii,1-2 (Nov. 1968, 75). From the size of this contingent, it would seem that Kazwin was not one of the more important provinces.

Like various other towns, Kazwin became divided in Safavid times into two factions, the Haydari and the Ni’matt. Alessandi, who visited Kazwin during the reign of Tahmasp, mentions them, and states that four districts belonged to one faction and five to the other, and that enmity and frequent bloodshed had prevailed between them for over thirty years (Narrative of the most noble Vincento d’Alessandi, Hakluyt, first series, xlii, 224). The participation of these factions in the Mubarram and Safar ceremonies in the early 20th century is also recorded (Gulriz, 386-7).

In the Mongol and pre-Mongol period Kazwin had been a centre of orthodoxy, in spite of, or perhaps because of, its proximity to Daylam and later Alamut. Nevertheless, there was a Shi‘a quarter in Kazwin in Seljuk times as, for example, Iskandar Munshi (a hostile witness), he was “a low-class fellow” from the Darb-i Kushk quarter. He abandoned the craft of his fore-fathers, who had been mukarnis, and became a kalandar. After a period of travel and association with Nukkawis, he returned to Kazwin and became a kalandar. After a period of travel and association with Nukkawis, he returned to Kazwin, where a following gathered round him. The ‘ulama’, apprehensive at his growing popularity, charged him with heresy and he was forbidden to sit in the mosque where he had taken up his quarters. After the death of Tahmasp he resumed his activities and people again assembled round him. He was
eventually put to death as a heretic in 1002/1593-4 (‘Alamdrd, i, 473-6; see also Gulrlz, 444 ff.).

Little damage appears to have been done in the town. Don Juan, who was there shortly afterwards, describes Kazwln as follows: “The country round is most fertile: it has great orchards and extensive gardens. Its population numbers above 100,000 householders [or 450,000 souls], and, that one may know its greatness, I have for curiosity, counted many times over its mosques, and of these there are more than 500. The royal quarter and the palace both are most sumptuous, and so extensive that you may go in a straight line through the purlieus for over a quarter of a league”. (Don Juan of Persia, 40). The account given by a gentleman in Sir Antony Sherley’s suite, who arrived in Kazwln in December 1598, when it was still the capital, is rather less favourable. He states that there was nothing remarkable about the town except a few mosques and the doorway of the palace of the king, which was well built. According to him the town was a little smaller than London (Sir Antony Sherley and his Persian adventure, ed. E. D. Ross, London 1933, 153). Antony Sherley’s brother, Robert, died in Kazwln in 1627, as also did Sir Dodmore Cotton.

Father Paul Simon, the first superior of the Discalced Carmelites in Persia, writing in 1607, states that Kazwln, which was by this time no longer the capital, was a very large city, not smaller than Isfahan. There were good buildings and an abundance of commodores for subsistence and entertainment, and “everything to be found as in any of these our [Italian] cities” (A chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, London 1930, i, 119). Pietro della Valle, who was in Kazwln in 1618, found in it “nothing to satisfy the expectations of residence, and only two things worthy of observation, the gate of the king’s palace, and the grand maidan or square”. Sir Thomas Herbert, on the other hand, reported of Kazwln in 1627 that it was “equal for grandeur to any other city in the Persian Empire, Spahauw excepted”. He states that its walls were seven miles in circuit and estimates its population at 200,000 (see Curzon, i, 36). Olearius, however, some ten years later put the population at only 100,000 (The travels of Antony Jenkinson, in Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia, Hakluyt, first series, lxxii, 1886, repr. New York n.d., i, 134 n. 1), while Chardin, who was there in 1674, describes its walls in ruins, and the town as having “lost all those perquisites that set forth the pomp and grandeur of a sumptuous court”. It contained, according to his account, 12,000 houses, and 100,000 inhabitants, its chief feature being the palaces of the grandees, which, he alleged, had passed for generations from father to son (see further Curzon, i, 35-6).

Kazwln’s importance in Safawid times was due not only to its becoming, for a period, the capital but also to the attempts to increase trade with Europe through southern Russia. Antony Jenkinson mentions the attempt to manufacture velvets and other wares in Kazwln of the 1560s (The travels of Antony Jenkinson, i, 149). Arthur Edwards, who made several voyages to Persia on behalf of the Muscovy Company, wrote in 1567 that velvets and other wares were made in Kazwln but not of as good quality as could be obtained in Europe, and in 1569 that many also several artisans, such as goldsmiths and cobblers, who made the best shoes in the whole country out of segrin [shagreen], in green, white and other colours. There were also some master craftsmen who made gilded and coloured bows with arrows to match, and others who made richly gilded horse-saddles with gilded and coloured saddlebows (Sir Antony Sherley and his Persian adventure, 153). Father Paul Simon records that Kazwln was much frequented for trade, because there was an abundance there of silks, carpets and brocades (A chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, i, 119).

The disorders which took place at the end of the Safawid period brought a temporary halt to Kazwln’s prosperity, and there appears to have been a considerable decrease in the population, due in part, presumably, to the decline in trade. Maimud, the Afghan, after he had taken Isfahan, detached a force of some 6,000 men under Amân Allâh Kân to take Kazwln, which surrendered in 1722. In January 1723, however, there was a popular uprising (lâîdätâr) led by the kalântars [q.v.] of the city against the Afghans. They were attacked in every quarter and retreated to Isfahan. They are reported to have lost some 2,000 men (Sir John Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1829, i, 443-4; J. Hanway, An historical account of the British trade over the Caspian Sea, London 1762, ii, 188). In 1726 Kazwln submitted to the Ottomans on condition that the governor sent to the city was not accompanied by troops. The agreement was not kept; 12,000 men under ‘Ali Pâshâ were sent, only to be driven out shortly afterwards. Kazwln then declared for Ashraf (Hanway, ii, 245; Malcolm, i, 443-4). Hanway, writing in 1744, quotes a Persian merchant as saying that whereas formerly Kazwln had had 12,000 houses, it had then only 1,100 (i, 156).

At the beginning of the 19th century Kazwln still manufactured velvets, brocades, and cotton cloth (J. Morier, A second journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor to Constantinople in the years 1820-1826, London 1818, 203) and was beginning once more to flourish. One of the royal princes, Muhammad ‘Ali Mirzâ, then still a boy, was appointed governor by Fath ‘Ali Shâh in 1213/1798-9, and retained this post until 1221/1806-7 (Bâmdâd, Sharb-i hâl-i râdâ-i Irân, Tehran 1966, iii, 430). Kazwln’s position, at the juncture of roads from the new capital Tehran, Tabriz, the second city of the empire, and Enzeli on the Caspian Sea, gave it a new importance, both strategic and commercial. Fath ‘Ali Shâh recognized the first when he placed his governor under the orders of ‘Abbâs Mirzâ [q.v.] in 1818 with a view to facilitating his march on Tehran from Ashârbâyân in the event of his accession to the throne (Great Britain, Public Records Office, F.O. 60/13, Willock to Castlereagh, no. 9, Tehran, 7 May 1818). The main reason for the recent flourishing of Kazwln, however, was the growing importance of the trade routes through Trebizond and over the Caspian Sea. Malcolm notes its prosperity in 1801 as “the mart of all the commerce
of the Caspian" (quoted by C. Issawi, The economic history of Iran, 1800-1914, University of Chicago 1971, 262) and Consul Abbott, reporting on the trade in Persia in 1841, states that Kazvin ranked equally with Tehran in the extent of its commerce and contained perhaps as many thriving and wealthy merchants from all parts of the country as any other city in Persia (Great Britain, Public Record Office, F.O. 60/92, Report on trade for 1841. Document (with omissions) in Issawi, op. cit., 118). Mirzâ Husayn Farâhâni, who passed through Kazvin in 1884, states that it had 600 shops, 8 caravansarais, 40 mosques, 9 madrasas and 12 ice-pits (yâkghâdsî) (Safarnâma, 14 ff.). The importance of Kazvin as an entrepôt for trade is also shown by the fact that in 1890 the Imperial Bank of Persia opened a branch there, taking over the agency of the New Oriental Banking Corporation (Issawi, 346). Communications were meanwhile improved. By the 1880s single wire lines belonging to the Persian government connected Kazvin to Tehran (ibid., 153-4). Metalled roads from Kazvin to Tehran in 1899 and from Kazvin to Hamadân in 1906 were completed under a concession granted to a Russian company in July 1893, and in 1913 a contract for a service of motors till the end of 1919 on the roads from Kazvin to Rasht, Tehran and Hamadân was obtained by a Russian subject, and some cars were put into service (ibid., 201).

In spite of the commercial importance of Kazvin in the 19th century, there does not appear to have been any appreciable growth in population, though it is difficult to compare the figures given for different periods since the estimates are not necessary based upon the same criteria. Morier, writing in the early part of the century, puts the population at 25,000 (A second journey, 203), as does William Ouseley (Travels in various countries of the East, particularly Persia, London 1819, iii, 377. Cf. also G. A. Olivier, Voyage dans l'Empire Ottoman, l'Egypte et la Perse, Paris 1801, iii, 49). A later report dated 1868, gives the same figure (United Kingdom, Parliament, Accounts and papers 1867-68, Thomson to Allison, Tehran, 20th April 1868. Document on the Persian question (with omissions) in Issawi, 28), but the census taken in 1298/1880-1 and 1299/1881-2 puts the population at 64,362 (Gulriz, 391 ff.). Mîrza Husayn Khâmsî, who passed through Kazvin in 1909 and advanced from there to Tehran (Gulriz, 861 ff.), in July, with a view to exerting pressure on the nationalists, Russia sent troops to Kazvin. Most of these were withdrawn in March 1911, but in December more Russian troops were sent (Gazetteer of Persia, Simla 1914, ii, 310). In the troubled years after the suspension of the Assembly in 1911 and during World War I there was a general break-down of law and order in the province of Kazvin as elsewhere. In June 1918 the headquarters of the "Dunsterforce" was established in Kazvin, whence operations were undertaken against the Djangalls. During the reign of Rîdâ Shâh Kazvin declined. As communications improved it ceased to be an important entrepôt and many of the merchant community and considerable numbers of the population in general moved to Tehran.


ii. MONUMENTS

Most of Kazvin's mediaeval mosques have disappeared, including the early mosque of Râbi' b. Khuthaym (possibly identical to the Dîmâ'î al-Thawr or Dîmâ'î al-Tût of Muhammad b. al-Hâdîjlâdî), the Great Mosque founded by Harûn al-Rashîd, and four others mentioned by Zakariyyâ al-Kazwînî. In the 4th/10th century Kazvin consisted of an inner and outer city with two Friday mosques. The town walls, begun by Harûn al-Rashîd, eventually comprised 206 towers and 12 gates. They were rebuilt in 572/1176 by the vizier Şâd-dîn al-Manârâghî; mud brick was used throughout except for the battlements and the huge gates.

The earliest surviving Islamic building yet identified in Kazvin is the Hâdârâh or inner city, a member of the Masjîd-i Dîmâ'î, which possibly rests on a pre-Islamic structure. Its long awbâf inscriptions (a rarity in Iranian architecture) date it to between 500/1106 and 508/1114, and mention the patron, the amîr A'bî Manûr Khutamârshî b. 'Abd Allâh al-'Imâdî. This dome chamber adjoined a pre-existing madrasa built in the 4th/10th century by the Şâbîb Ismî'llî b. 'Abbâd. According to Zakariyyâ al-Kazwînî, the size of this dome was unparalleled anywhere. He relates how the masons despaired of vaulting such a huge space until a passing boy suggested that they fill the interior with straw. Although the dome chamber's ground plan, with its double openings on all sides but the kibla, resembles those of major Saldjûq mosques in central Iran, the elevation is markedly different. The model may perhaps have been a large-scale fire temple. The internal zone of transition avoids the complex trilobed squinches of central Iran in favour of a broad simple squinch with a superposed hexadecagon of similar form. The ratio of width to height is less than in other Saldjûq dome chambers. Hamd Allâh Mustawfî records that the mosque was given two faâns in 548/1153; if the north faân dates from this time (its decoration is certainly Saldjûq) one would expect a matching southern faân preceding the dome. Possibly the Saldjûq mosque even had four faâns. The present mosque is unusually large; among religious buildings in Iran, only the
The so-called mausoleum of Hamd Allah Mustawfi, which was recently restored, is of Mongol date. It has a square base, a square zone of transition with bevelled corners and a conical roof over an internal dome. The similar tomb towers in Māzar dar. The complete Šafawī monument in Kazwīn is the much-restored palace of Šahid Khumartash, now a museum; a heavily restored pīshkūh and a kiosk with some faded wall paintings survive. The last two centuries are represented by the Masjid-i Šāh, the Shāhzāda Husayn and an extremely rich and varied network of vaulstedd bazaars and caravanserais now being demolished.

**Bibliography:** A. Godard, in Āghār-i Īrān, i (1936), 192-207; D. N. Wilber, in A Survey of Persian Art, ed. A. U. Pope, Oxford and New York 1939, 996; P. Schwarz, Iran in the Middle Ages, ed. Hildesheim and New York 1969, 705-22.

(R. M. Hillebrand)

---

**AL-KAZWINI**

**ABU HĀTIM MAHMUD B. AL-BASAN**

**AL-TABARĪ, A SHAFITE JURIST, TEACHER OF AL-SHIRAZI.**

He belonged to Āmul in Tabaristan where he began his studies. In Baghdad he studied under Abū ʿAllām al-Īsfarāʿī (d. 460/1071-2) and the usul under Ibn al-Ḥākkīn (d. 401/1012-13). He taught in Baghdad and Āmul in 440/1050. Al-Shirāzī describes him as his best teacher. Of his works the following are mentioned: 1) Kūh Tadhkīra al-Tadhkīra, a synopsis of the legal work of the same name by al-Mahmūdī (d. 415/1024-25). 2) Raunak, a synopsis of the Lubāb al-Fīkh of al-Mahmūdī (Hādijī Khuṭṭaṭ, Kāfī al-Zunnūn, no. 5702). 3) Kūh al-Ḥiyal fiʿl-Fīkh (ed. J. Schacht, Hanover 1924), the only one that has survived and is one of the oldest works of the scanty Šafīite literature on legal quibbles (ḥiyal). The book, unlike the Ḥanafī works of the same name by al-Shaybānī, al-Sharrāfī, etc., was very little used for the practical purpose of getting round the Šafīite, but was rather primarily intended to point out legal quibbles which were forbidden or disapproved of, in keeping with the stricter Šafīite standpoint, which regards the ḥiyal used by the Ḥanafis as questionable.


(W. Heffen)

---

**AL-KAZWINI**

**SHAFT ISMAIIL, HIJAAZ AL-DIN ABU 'AMD ABD ALLAH MUHAMMAD B. AL-RAMĀN B. 'UMAR**

(666-729/1268-1338), Chief Kāfī in Syria and Egypt and author of two famous compendiums on rhetoric. Almost nothing is known about his early life. Most biographers mention that he was born in Mosul and that his elder brother, Imām al-Dīn 'Umar, was born in Tabrīz in 655/1255. If it is true that the two brothers were related to 'Abd al-Karīm al-Rāfi (d. 632/1235), see Brockelmann, i (d. 393, s. 167), then the Hexacop: have tapering bases which fill the spandrels between the arches of the octagon, an imaginative integration of the two levels. The exquisite decoration, mainly in brick and plaster, is notable both for a masterly floriated Kufic inscription and for a very early use of glazed ornament. A distinctive architectural and decorative style was developed in Kazwīn during the Sāljuq period and influenced buildings in the surrounding areas, such as the mosques of Kurwa and Sudjās.

The book, unlike the Īlānafi works of the same period and influenced buildings in the surrounding areas, such as the mosques of Kurwa and Sudjās.
handwriting was famous), on which he based his urduza (the ‘Ufrud al-diumdn; see the ed. published in Cairo in 1358/1399, 3, and SuyyT, Baghaya, Cairo 1326/1908-9, 66). Other indications of his literary talents come from a takrid by him on a work by Djamal al-Din b. Nubata [q.v.] and the praise bestowed by biographers and poets on his eloquence (see Matlub, 116-8, 139-52), which may have earned him the title Khafi3 Dimagh (Talqazdni, al-Share’ al-munadi, Istanbul 1330/1312-13; 3, Hadji3 Khalifa, i, 210; Mehren, 7; this title does not appear as part of his name in any of the biographies known to the author of this article though the fact that he held the office of Khafi3 is mentioned). Some assert that Kazwln knew Persian and Turkish in addition to Arabic. His competence in fitah was, according to Ibn al-‘Imad (Shahkarhd, vi, 123), reflected in a work on the usul.

In sharp contrast to the scarcity of information on Kazwln’s early career, and the isolated data on his activities as a man of letters, are the many details on his official career, the most important of which are the following: He held various teaching positions and deputised for his brother (who had been appointed kadi in 696/1297) and Nadim al-Din b. Sapr (in 705/1305, and became kadi and imam of the Mosque of the Umayyads in 706/1307, and Chief Kadi and Kadi of the Army of Syria in 724/1324, having received the appointment in person from the Mamluk sultan al-Nasir during a visit to Cairo (in 711/1312) he had distinguished himself by his personal courage in resisting the imposition of heavy taxes by one of al-Nasir’s lieutenants, but this opposition had apparently not met with disfavour from al-Nasir, who had his lieutenants imprisoned; see Ibn Hadjar, al-Darar al-kamina, iii, Hyderabad 1373/1954, 235-6). Soon afterwards, in 727/1327, he was appointed Chief Kadi in Cairo, succeeding Badr al-Din Ibn Dimama [q.v.]. This appointment marked the height of his career. No kadi was said to have gained an influence over a Turkish ruler comparable to Kazwln’s. Unfortunately Kazwln’s position was adversely influenced by the absolute life of his sons, who were charged with corruption. In the end al-Nasir was unable to ignore the numerous complaints (Makriti, Suluh, ed. M. Ziyada, Cairo 1941, i, 439-42; according to Ibn Hadjar, al-Durar, iv, Hyderabad 1350/1931, 4, he had been advised of these complaints as early as 724) and felt himself compelled to dismiss Kazwln and appoint him to his former position in Damascus, where he died soon afterwards on 15 Djamad al-Asr 739/30 November 1338.

Of Kazwln’s writings only the Talkhis al-miftah and the Idah fi ‘ulum al-badga3 appear to have survived. The Talkhis is a digest of the third section of the Miftah al-‘ulum by Sakkaki [q.v.], which in turn is based on the Asrar al-badga3 and the Dalalat al-‘idria of Abd al-Kahir al-Durjani [see ISTI]. The Idah is an enlarged version of the Talkhis. Both works, though not free from dryness and some casuistry, gained wide circulation, as is evidenced by the numerous manuscripts and commentaries that have come down to us; and their popularity to this day is shown by the existence of various printed editions (lists of manuscripts, printed editions, and commentaries in manuscript or in print in Hadji3 Khalifa, 210-11, 473-9; Brockelmann, II, 22, s ii, 15; Matlub, 169-82; 184-90). They completely superseded not only the two books by Durjani, but also the work by Sakkaki. At the same time, however, they secured a firm place for the methodical approach that had been initiated by these two authors and influen-

ced the older, unsystematic method of discussing literary theory in collections of chapters on the figures of speech (badi‘) which continued to be practised. The main differences between the presentation of Kazwln and that of Sakkaki are: (a) Kazwln’s classification of the madjda badi‘ as part of the ‘ilm al-ma‘dni (see Mehren, 30; Sakkaki classifies this group of figures under the ‘ilm al-bayin); (b) the addition of a section on the badi‘; (c) the addition of chapters on sariba, ibtidad, takhallus, and isti‘da [q.v.]. Kazwln also consulted and discussed the two books by Abd al-Kahir al-Durjani and the Kadi al-Makrzi of Zamakhshar, and borrowed from some of his other predecessors, often without acknowledging his borrowings (Matlub, 191-243). The oldest manuscript of the Talkhis carried the date 724 (Matlub, 164). The Idah, which was intended as a supplement to the Talkhis, cannot have been written before the Talkhis, but nothing further is known about the date of composition of these books or the circumstances under which they were written.

Biography: Biographies appear in all the chronicles and collections of biographies dealing with the end of the 7th/13th and the 8th/14th centuries. The most important have been quoted in the article, but reference should also be made to Tashkopi3zade, Miftah al-‘alwa3, Cairo 1968, i, 209-10. Abstracts from the Talkhis in A. F. Mehren, Die Rheterik der Araber, Copenha-

A. BONEBANKER

KAZWINI, HAMD ALLAH [see HAMD ALLAH MUSTAWFI]

AL-KAZWINI, NADM AL-DIN ‘ABD AL-GHAFAR B. ‘ABD AL-KARIM, a Shafi jurist and Sufi who died in Mubarram 665/October 1266. The most important of his writings was a work known either as al-Hawi fi ‘l-farid or al-Hawi fi ‘l-jadwa3, or simply as al-Hawi, which became a widely used textbook of Shafi’s fitah, and was the subject of nu-

merous commentaries and glosses: seventeen are listed by Hadji3 Khalifa (Kashf al-yunun, ed. Yaltkaya and Bilge, i, cols. 625-7). A versified paraphrase of the work, al-Bahdijat al-wardiyya, by Zayn al-Din ‘Umar b. Mu’affar al-Wardi (d. 749/1348) became especially popular. Al-Kazwln also wrote al-Lud5 bi ‘l-fitah, a briefier work than al-Hawi, and himself composed a commentary on it, al-‘Idah fi sharh al-ludah, and a book on mathematics is also attributed to him. In addition to his accomplishments as a jurist, he was celebrated as a Sufi possessed of wondrous powers. While travelling to Mecca for the hadj, he was seen to be working on al-Hawi in the depth of the night, with the paper illuminated by a mysterious light from his fingers. During this journey, he is related to have met Abid Hafs ‘Umar al-Suhrawardi (d. 632/1234), founder of the Suhrawardi order or Khafibi, who encouraged him to complete the writing of al-Hawi. He spent most of his life in Kazwln, where he was celebrated for his luminous fingers as well as other karimds.
AL-KAZWINI, Muhammad b. Mahmūd, the famous Arab astronomer and geographer. He was probably born at Kazwīn, probably towards 600/1203 and has been his mother tongue.

He was born at Kazwīn, probably towards 600/1203 and seems to have received there his legal education. At a moment difficult to establish he left his native town, went to Bagdad and stayed there some time in Damascus where he met, probably towards 630/1233, the well-known philosopher and mystic Ibn al-'Arabi (d. 638/1240 [q.v.]). It was apparently at this period that he visited al-Mawsīl where he met Dīn ibn al-Askarī al-Kazwīnī, and perhaps also the town of Sīnār. Al-Kazwīnī travelled also in Persia and paid a visit to the town of Dīnārāb. According to Ibn Tağhibirdī, he stayed for a long time in al-Wasit and at al-Hilla, where he fulfilled the function of kādī under the reign of the last 'Abbāsid caliph al-Muṣṭa'sin (640-56/1240-58). We do not know where he met the Arab philologist and geographer Ibn al-Gharnātī [q.v.] who went to the East in 648/1250. From al-Kūfī, one of his nisbas, it would follow that he lived for a certain time in Kūf. After Bagdad had taken by the Mongols in 656/1258, he retired from public life to devote himself entirely to scientific activities. It is quite probable that he found a Maecenas in the Persian historian and statesman al-Dūmayrī (d. 681/1282) [q.v.], from 661/1262 governor of Bagdad on behalf of Hūlugū and his successor Abākū. It is perhaps because of his presumed protection that he dedicated his cosmographical work to al-Dūmayrī. He died in 682/1283. (On his name and life, see his Cosmography; ii; 'Adīdib, ed. F. Wustenfeld, Götttingen 1848, 121, 232, 263, 293, 310, 334, 34, 389-407 and 'Adīdib al-makhlūqāt, in margins of al-Damlīr, Hayāt al-Hayānūn, Cairo 1319/1901-2; 3; S. de Sacy, Christomatia arabae, iii, 447, 448 ff.; F. Wustenfeld, in Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen, i (1848), 349 ff.; M. Reinaud, Geographie d'Abou'fida, tr. i, Paris 1848, pp. cxiii-cl; Brockelmann, GAL I, 481; M. Streck, Al-Kazwīnī, in ETI; I: Yu. Kraccovsky, Arabische geografische schriften, in iден., Izbrannye soch., Moscow-Leningrad 1957, 359-60.)

Al-Kazwīnī is the author of two works, a cosmographical one and a geographical one. The first, commonly named Cosmography, has the title 'Adīdib al-makhlūqāt wa-gharā'īb al-mauḏjūdāt "Prodigies of things created and miraculous aspects of things existing". This work is divided into two parts, the first of which treats of supraterrrestrial things, and the second of terrestrial ones. In the first part the author describes the celestial phenomena, i.e. the moon, the sun, the stars, and speaks three of the inhabitants of heaven, the angels. At the end of this part he explains the problems of chronology and of the Arabic and Syrian calendars. The second part begins with a treatise on the four elements, the meteorites and the winds, and ends with the division of the earth into seven climates and gives a description of all the known seas and rivers. Having explained the causes of earthquakes and of the formation of mountains and wells, he passes in review the three kingdoms of nature: the mineral, the vegetable and the animal. The description of the animal kingdom is preceded by that of man, his character and anatomy, and by a characteristic of human tribes. The other living beings are discussed after djims and ghals have been dealt with.

Al-Kazwīnī's Cosmography, the first systematic exposition of cosmography in Muslim literature, enjoyed great popularity in the whole of the Islamic world, as is attested by a great number of manuscripts representing several Arabic versions, by Persian and Turkish translations and by the revisions of the work. J. Ruska (Kazwini-Studien, in ISL, iv (1913), 14-66, and 236-62) has shown against Wustenfeld (see the latter's edition of the 'Adīdib, Kosmographie i. Götttingen 1849, pp. vii-xii) that there were four different Arabic versions of the Cosmography, the second of which, represented by Cod. Monac. 464, the oldest manuscript known so far, and by many others, seems to be the best. Wustenfeld however, for his edition of 'Adīdib (1848), only the most recent version (iv) which is only an 18th century recast of al-Kazwīnī's original work. This recast is represented by ms. Gotha 1508. Besides, Wustenfeld has greatly complicated his edition by rejecting several fragments of version (iv) and replacing them with fragments taken from manuscripts belonging to other versions of the 'Adīdib. Thus he has fabricated a completely new text which does not represent any of the existing versions of the work. Besides Wustenfeld's edition, there is also a Cairo edition (n.d., 8°, 416 pp.), based on a manuscript related to Cod. Monac. 464 and analogous to the edition of the Cosmography published in the margins of the edition of al-Damlīr's Hayāt al-Hayānūn (Cairo 1319/1901-2).

The manuscripts of the Cosmography are often illustrated with i.a. geometrical tables and miniatures representing plants, animals and various monsters, which have sometimes a high artistic value (on the Arabic versions, the Persian and Turkish translations and the manuscripts of these versions, see al-Kazwīnī, Kosmographie. i, ed. Wustenfeld, iii-xii; Streck, op. cit.; A.M. 'Akkād, al-Fusul, i, 123-7; Brockelmann, GAL I, 883; Krakovský, op. cit., 362-5; M. Kowalska, Eine unbekannte Handschrift Al-Kazwīnīs Kitāb 'Adīdib al-makhlūqāt, in Folia Orientalia, i, 2 (1959), 326-32).

The sources of the 'Adīdib al-makhlūqāt have not yet been studied (see on this problem Persich, Kat. d. arab. Handschr. zu Gotta, iii, 431). Going through Wustenfeld's edition one can discover some twenty odd authors whose works have been used, from al-Dībīzīs and Ibn al-Fāqīh down to Ibn al-Āthīr, the most often-quoted being the one by Abū Hāmid al-Andalusī and the anonymous treatise entitled Tuhfat al-gharā'īb (see M. Kowalska, Remarks on the unidentified Cosmography Tuhfat al-gharā'īb, in Folia Orientalia, ix (1967), 11-8). The connexions between the Cosmography and Yākūt's MaʿāDIM al-buldān are still to be established. From what has been said above, it is evident that there does not yet exist any critical edition of the Cosmography. Wustenfeld's edition stimulated a translation by H. Ethé (Leipzig 1868) which...
comprises, however, only the first part. At the beginning of the 19th century A. L. de Chezy translated the chapters on the minerals, the vegetables and the human being (see S. de Sacy, op. cit. iii, 385-316). In his Über die Ursprung und die Bedeutung der Sternnamen (Berlin 1809), L. Ideler published an annotated edition of the chapter on the stars. Of the partial editions, translations and studies of the Cosmography the following are mentioned here by way of example:


Al-Kazwini’s second work, commonly called Geography, is known from several manuscripts belonging to two different versions. The oldest, entitled ‘Adhâr al-abbâd “Prodigies of the Countries” (see Hâdîdî Khalla, iv, 186) was composed in 661/1262-3 (see Reinaud, op. cit. cxiv). The second complete and revised version is attributed to the 12th century. It is called the title ‘Adhâr al-abbâd wa-ahhâr al-abbâd “Monuments of the Countries and History of their Inhabitants” (see Hâdîdî Khalla, i, 154).

The four manuscripts of the second version served Wüstenfeld as the basis for his edition of the Geography (Cosmography, ii: ‘Adhâr al-abbâd, Göttingen 1848. Another edition, Beirut 1892, is in fact only a reproduction of Wüstenfeld’s edition.

The description of the earth in the ‘Adhâr al-abbâd follows the Ptolemaic division of the oikoumenes into seven climates. The cities, countries, mountains, rivers etc. situated in each of these climates are described in alphabetical order. The description of each city or country contains geographical and historical facts and also biographical data on famous personalities originating from them. Thus the Geography resembles the Mu’jam al-abbâd of Yâkût so far as the disposition of the material is concerned (except that in al-Kazwini’s work the material is distributed over seven different dictionaries according to the division in climates). Certain articles of the Geography, concerning e.g. various mountains, rivers etc. can also be found in the Cosmography, often with exactly the same tenor. Besides the two Arabic versions, several Persian revisions and Turkish abridgements of the Geography are known. Towards 808/1403 al-Bâkûwi gave a new version of it, which is independent of the two Arabic versions mentioned above (on the various versions and translations of the Geography and on the manuscripts of this work, see Wüstenfeld, Kosmographie, ii, pp. iii-x; Steck, op. cit., Brockelman, S I, 882-3).

As opposed to the sources of the Cosmography, those of ‘Adhâr al-abbâd have been object of some studies. Already F. Wüstenfeld had compiled a list (very incomplete, however) of the sources used by al-Kazwini (Gött. Gelehrte Anzeigen, ii, (1848), 351).

He returned to this problem in his edition of Yâkût’s Mu’jam al-abbâd (Leipzig 1860). In his preface he propounded the opinion that al-Kazwini made extensive use of this work, without mentioning this use. W. Jwaideh (The Introductory Chapters of Yâqût’s Mu’jam al-Buldan, Leiden 1959, 44, n. 1) has shown that al-Kazwini borrowed from Yâkût the preliminary descriptions of all seven climates. In 1967 M. Kowalska published the first serious study on the sources of the Geography in an article entitled The Sources of al-Qazwini’s ‘Adhâr al-Buldan, in Folia Orientalia, viii (1966), 41-88, in which she gives a detailed analysis of those sources. From this it appears that nearly 360 articles out of the ca. 600 which form the total of al-Kazwini’s geographical dictionary contain data borrowed from the Mu’jam al-buldan, and that a very considerable part (viz. 157) of these 360 articles contain nothing else but extracts from Yâkût’s work. Thus the Mu’jam al-buldan forms the principal source of the ‘Adhâr al-buldan. M. Kowalska’s study shows also that all quotations from al-Yâkûbî, Ibn al-Fakîh, Ibn Fa’dîn, Ibn Hawkal, al-Mukaddasi and from the two risâlas of Abû Dulaf to be found in al-Kazwini’s Geography, have been borrowed by the latter not from the original works of the geographers in question but from the Mu’jam al-buldan. She has also established a complete list of the fragments of al-Kazwini has extracted from other Arabic sources, from which are cited here the works of Ibrîhîm b. Ahmad al-Turtüshî (= Ibrîhîm b. Ya’qûb al-Turtûshî; see T. Kowalski, Relatio Ibrahim ibn Ya’kub de itinere slavico, Cracow 1946, 21-35), al-Bîrûnî, al-’Udrî, Abû Hâmid al-Andalusî and an anonymous cosmographical treatise of the 12th/18th century. Due to Dulaf’s Narrative, she has compiled a list of all-Kazwini’s oral informants. The author of the ‘Adhâr al-buldan owes his knowledge of West Africa to two of these informants (see M. Kowalski, Zwei wegen behaftete muslämische Reisende in West-Sudan im 13. Jh., in Folia Orientalia, iii (1961), 231-4). Although rather uncritical and lacking an index, Wüstenfeld’s edition of the Geography is nevertheless the starting-point of several partial editions, translations and special studies on the various chapters of the work. These studies are: G. Jacob, Studien in arabischen Geographen, Berlin 1892, ii, 38-9, 60-1; idem, Arabische Berichte von Gesandten an germanische Fürstenhöfe aus dem 9. und 10. Jahrhundert, Berlin-Leipzig 1927, 21-33; A. Seippel, Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici, 24-5, 44 and Adnot. crit., pp. XII-XIII, XX; G. Ferrand, La Tuhfat al-abbâd de Abû Hâmid al-Andalusî al-Garnâfî, dans JA, (1925), 235-9; M. C. Lyons, Some Aspects of Al-Qazwini’s ‘Adhâr al-Buldan, in Glasgow Univ. Or. Soc. Trans., xx, (1963-4), 63-76; M. Kowalska, Namensregister zu Qazwini’s ‘Ajqar al-buldan, in RO, xxix, (1963), 99-115, xxxi (1966), 119-34; idem, Al-Qazwini’s ‘Adhâr al-Buldan and the quotations from Abû Dulaf’s Narrative, in Atti del III Congresso di Studi Arabi e Islamici, Ravello 1966, Naples 1967, 427-35.

Al-Kazwini was the greatest of Arabic cosmographers. He was at the same time astronomer, geographer, geologist, mineralogist, botanist, zoologist and ethnographer. Like all his predecessors (who appeared already in the 6th/12th century), he was only a good compiler who neither produced a new fact nor created any new theory. Being, however, very learned and very cultivated at the same time, he succeeded in synthesizing all the facts known...
in his time about the above-mentioned sciences. His principal merit lies in his having accomplished the raising of cosmography to a literary genre of extremely high level. He was also a talented vulgariser who knew to express himself clearly and realized that erudition should not exceed certain limits, in order not to discourage the general public. His language is clear, simple and varied, although he often does not give anything but a mosaic of extracts from sources, arranged nevertheless in a skilful way. Highly appreciated by certain modern Arabists who sometimes compare him to Herodotus and Pliny (Reinaud, op. cit. p. exilv; see also Streck, op. cit. and Krackowsky, op. cit. 358-9), al-Kazwini has been judged far too severely by other scholars. V. von Grunebaum (Medieval Islam, Chicago 1947, 301-2, 304) quotes two passages from the ‘Adda‘ al-mahkamat to illustrate the decline of critical science in the 7th/13th century, and G. Wiet (Introduction à la littérature arabe, Paris 1966, 210) looks upon al-Kazwini’s Cosmography as a work “devoid of critical mind” and “lacking originality”. Accordingly, M. Kowalska (The Sources, 87-8) calls him “an amateur geographer … [who] selected the available data rather uncritically often in a quite accidental way”. She also insists that he “has plagiarized the writing of the older geographers and historians”. Indeed, the impression cannot be resisted that al-Kazwini surpassed all the other Arabic cosmographers and geographers in plagiarism. This results clearly from the way in which he unscrupulously plundered the Mu‘aqjam al-buldan as his main source.

Al-Kazwini exerted a great influence on the Arabic cosmographers and geographers of later periods. His two works have been turned to account by authors like Shams al-Din al-Din al-Majshki (d. 727/1327), Ahmad b. Hamdan al-Harrani (writing ca. 732/1332), Hamd Allah Kazwini (d. towards 750/1349), al-Damiri (d. 808/1405), Ibn al-Wardi (d. 861/1457) and several others, down to Mahmud b. Sa‘id al-Safakusi (d. after 1233/1818). On this question, see inter alia, A. M. Mehren, Manuel de la cosmographie du moyen age, Leipzig 1874, 165, 168, 179, 186-91, 198 and passim; Krackowsky, op. cit., 365, 385-6, 493, 598, 618 and 748-9.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

T. Lewicki

AL-KAZZAZ, Abd ‘Abd Allah Muhammad B. ^A‘MAR AL-TAMALT, was born in Kayrawân and spent most of his life there. Attached to the Fatimid caliphs, who held him in high esteem and loaded him with gifts, he followed them—probably for a very brief time—to Egypt and then returned to Kayrawân, where he devoted himself to teaching the linguistic sciences until his death in 412/1022-2, aged about 90. Respected by the great and loved by the people for his powerful personality, his exemplary life and his great liberality, he was venerated by his students, most of whom became prominent men of letters, such as Ibn Rashîq, Ibn Sharaf and Ibn al-Barr, whose teaching of language and grammar was authoritative in Spain, and also al-Hâtîmi, the celebrated detractor of al-Mutanabbi.

Although considered by critics an excellent poet of verses “at once natural and studied” and often referred to by Ibn Rashîq for problems of literary criticism (see refs. to al-Umdâ’s in the bibliography below), it is chiefly for his numerous and voluminous works on grammar and lexicography that al-Kazzâz seems to have commanded attention in his lifetime. The following titles are cited: (1) Kitâb al-hurar, which seems to be the same as al-Difma‘, is a vast compilation bringing together the meaning of each particle, harf, its use, its value, and its role in the sentence; (2) Kitâb al-Sagârat (published Sidon 1344/1925-6), a lexicographic work on words carrying ten or more different meanings; (3) Kitâb al-bukhâra ‘l-siyâra, published Sidon 1344/1925-6, on the anatomy of the human body, for the use of scribes and slave dealers; (4) Kitâb adab al-sultân wa ‘l-tasrifr, on patterns and triple vocalisation; (5) Kitâb al-fad wa ‘l-fâd, (6) Kitâb al-ta‘rid wa ‘l-tasrifr; (7) Kitâb ma‘yûdâ li ‘l-bashar li ‘l-darura, on poetic licence; Éd. M. Ka‘bi, Tunis 1971; (8) I‘râb al-Duraydiyya, a commentary on the poem called al-Mâshâra by Ibn Durayd; (9) Sharh Risâlad al-balâsha, on a work of rhetoric; (10) Kitâb abyût al-ma‘ânî, on the riddling verses of al-Mutanabbi; (11) Kitâb ma‘lûthiya ‘l-Dir al-Mutranabbi min al-lahw wa ‘l-ghala, on the criticisms arising from certain instructions in the poetry of al-Mutanabbi; (12) Kitâb adab al-sulâhan wa-l-‘irâda’addab lahu, in 10 volumes, probably a work on the rules of conduct for princes and those to be observed towards them. (For the mss. of these works, see Brockelmann in the Bibliography below.)

By the nature and worth of his teaching and his writings, al-Kazzaz seems to have played a determining role in the philological orientation which characterises the “Literary School of Kayrawân” under the Zirids.


Ch. Bouyahia

KECE. [see LIBÂS].

KECEPÎ-ZADE. [see pu‘AD PASHA; ‘IZZET MOLLA].

KECIBOYNUZU IBRAHÎM HÎLMÎ PASHA (b. 1760/l 747, d. 1340/1825) Ottoman Grand Vizier, November 1806-June 1807. The son of a Janissary officer, he rose through various posts in the corps to the chief command (hence he is sometimes referred to as İbrahim “Agha”). Upon the dismissal of Hüfîz İsmâ‘îl Pasha (14 November 1806), provoked by the attempt to use the troops of the Nişâm-i Dîdî (q.v.) in Rûmeli, he was appointed Grand Vizier. As sâdir against Russia (war having been declared by the Porte on 22 December), he led a refractory army of Janissaries and volunteers to Silistre (May 1807), where, however, no military
activity ensued. When news of the final rising against Selim II (the “Kabakci wakasli”), 29 May) reached the camp, the Janissaries rose in sympathy and Ibrahim fled into hiding at Rusçuk. He was dismissed on 18 June. The various governors he held thereafter are listed in SGO, ii, 154. For the context of these events and full bibliography, see S. J. Shaw, Between old and new. The Ottoman Empire under Selim III, 1789-1807, Harvard Middle Eastern Studies no. 15, 1971, and SELIM III. (ED.)

**KEFA, KAFFA, the old name of the town of modern Theodosia (Russian Feodosia), on the southeastern coast of the Crimea. In classical times its name was Theodosia, and it was founded in the first half of the 7th century B.C. as a colony from Miletus in Ionia. It is first mentioned in 390 B.C., and according to the sources, the town derived great profit from exports to Greece, having a port with a capacity for 100 ships. However, the town’s trade was harmed by attacks of the Scythian tribes living in the steppes to the north of Kefe. Kefe is recorded by Constantine Porphyrogenetus in the form Kapka as the place where the people of the Chersonese fought with the king of the Bosporus. In the following centuries, Kefe was founded. This place was known as Capkum in Roman days, and the Byzantines erected a column which bears an inscription with the date 819 A.D. (E. H. Minns, Scythians and Greeks in South Russia, repr. New York 1965, ii, 555-8; Pauly-Wissowa, Real-encyclopadie, v, 2, cols. 1921-2; for the other accounts concerning the name Kefe, see J. Buchan Teller, The Crimiea and Transcaucasia, London 1876, i, 74). With one or two exceptions, the name Kefe is not mentioned in other sources before the 13th century.

Geographical conditions linked the Crimea, and naturally Kefe, to the Kipchak steppes, and also via the Black Sea to Anatolia, and especially to Istanbul. In the development of the East-West and South-North transit trade, Kefe played a great role. Like other Crimean ports, it was dependent on Byzantium, but autonomous in its internal affairs. When the Latins captured Constantinople in 1204, it became dependent on the Byzantine kingdom of Trebizond. From the 13th century onwards, the Saldiköy of Rum became concerned with the Crimean peninsula; there were some Turkish traders active at that time in Kefe, and the Kefe-Sinope-Istanbul route was the most used in the Black Sea (G. I. Bratianu, Recherches sur le commerce génial dans la Mer Noire au XIIIe siècle, Paris 1929, 228). When Genoa and Venice obtained permission to trade in the Byzantine lands, the Genoese assumed the more active role in the Black Sea and in the region of Crimea. The Crimean ports benefited from the peace established within the steppes by the Mongols, and the Genoese, probably ca. 1266, received permission to trade and to live in Kefe with the consent of the Golden Horde Khans Mengü Timur, as well as from Urani Timur, grandson of Djold, who was the ancestor of the Crimean Khans and who had been granted the land as an appanage (Bratianu, 198 ff.; W. Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant au Moyen-Âge, repr. Leipzig 1939, ii, 163 ff.). The Genoese built city walls around Kefe and also founded some other trade colonies near it. At the time when Ibn Baṭūta visited Kefe, it could accommodate 200 ships (Rībţa, tr. Gibb, i, 142-3). Kefe had a cosmopolitan population, and was nominally dependent on the Golden Horde Khan ( decree of Timur Kuttugh dated 868/1368, cf. A. Nimet Kurat, Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Arşivi ndeki İtalyan ve Türkistan hanlarına ait norsk ve bitikler, Istanbul 1940, 149-9). Apart from the many Muslims, there were also Genoese, Greeks and Armenians and it was estimated that in 823/1420 the population in the city was ca. 40,000 (Schiltberger, Travels and Bondage, London 1879, 49, 50). Pero Tafur says that the city was as big as Seville, but twice as crowded; and since the slave-trade was important there, there were agents of the Mamluk state dispatching slaves from the Crimean to Egypt (Travels and Adventures, 1435-1439, London 1929, 132, 133 ff.). In Kefe there was a ṭudān whose task was to look after the Muslims on behalf of the Golden Horde Khān, and also a customs officer to collect the duties on commerce (Kurat, op. cit., 64, 149; Heyd, op. cit., ii, 370).

After the Giray Crimean Khānate came into existence, it began a continuous struggle with the Genoese. With the support of an Ottoman force, Hādjiđi Giray (d. 860/1456) besieged Kefe; the Genoese bought them off by agreeing to pay a tribute of 3,000 gold pieces (Heyd, ii, 383), although Hādjiđi Giray continued to exert pressure on the town.

Attempts by the Genoese to impede Ottoman trade in the Black Sea determined the Ottomans to move against Kefe. Gedik Ahmed Paşa conquered Kefe with 300 ships of varying tonnage at the beginning of Safar 880/June 1475 (‘Ashk-paşhażade, Ta‘rikh, Istanbul 1332, 213-15; Ibn Kemal, Tāvārikh-i ʿAli-i ʿOthmān, ed. Şerafettin Turan, Ankara 1954, 421-3; Heyd, ii, 401 ff.). Kefe and other Genoese strongholds were now taken directly under Ottoman sovereignty, whilst the landward parts and high plateau of Crimea were left to the Crimean Khānate. In the time of Bayezid II (886/1481-1512), Kefe became a princely sandjak and first the prince Mehmed, and then after his death, Suleyman son of Selim I, became the governors of this sandjak. During his struggle for the throne, Selim had had to stay in Kefe for a while (Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Arşivi, N.E. 95; Çağatay Uluçay, Yavuz Sultan Selim nasil paşığı oldu, in TD, ix (Istanbul 1934), 81, 89-90).

The trade of Kefe was now in the hands of Turkish Muslim traders, following the Kefe-Sinop-Istanbul and Kefe-Trebizond routes, and according to the Kefe customs record book, dated 892/1487, trade was brisker than before (see Başbakanlık Arşivi Genel Müdurlüğü, Kefe mukataası defteri, No. 5280 mukerrer).

The internal condition of the town is known from a takbir register from the reign of Suleyman I; according to this, Kefe was divided into three sections, the Ic Ka‘le (Inner fortress), the Frenk Hişarlı (the European castle) and the Ka‘le altı (the lower side of the castle); Muslims resided in Ic Ka‘le and Frenk Hişarlı, and Christians (such as Greeks, Armenians, Russians), Jews and Circassians used to stay in Ka‘le altı (Kha‘k-i-Ka‘le) (Başbakanlık Arşivi Genel Müdurlüğü; Tapu-Takbir defteri, No. 370, pp. 481-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>quarters local households holds single persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-Muslims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâk-i Ka‘le</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circassians</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21 26 2309 189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>quarters local households holds single persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frenk Hişarlı</td>
<td>10 139 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka‘le-i Birün</td>
<td>11 176 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the quarters where Muslims lived, there were 17 small mosques and 2 large ones. The taxes collected from Kefe included hemp, dyestuffs, various kinds of thread, cotton cloth, beeswax, oil, fat, rice, cheese, hardware, etc. (Kefe mukataasi defteri, No. 5280 mukerrer). Exports included various kinds of fruits, olives, and dried fruits, wheat, corn, barley, chickpeas, lentil, flour, honey, olive oil, horses, cattle, various kinds of leather, dried fish and caviare (Kânînâmâ-ı iskele-i Kefe, Taputahbr defteri, No. 370, p. 479). Above all, slaves captured in South Russia and the Kipcak steppes were sent to Kefe, which was a traditional centre of the slave-trade. The annual customs income of Kefe was 620,000 akças (Kânînâmâ-ı iskele-i Kefe, pp. 479, 483; for the pesidük duty (sc. that which was used to be taken for each slave) in 1178/1766, see Kamil Kepeci Tasnifi, No. 5277, p. 70b). In 1523-1642 there were 4,000 houses in Kefe; 3,200 of these were occupied by Muslims and the rest by the minorities, especially by Armenians and Greeks (Chardin, Voyages, Amsterdam 1701, i, 104). When Eyliyâ Celebi visited the city, the Muslims used to live in 50 districts, and Christians used to live as 120 local groups. Within the town there were 9,060 houses, 200 fountains, 105 sebils, 9 inns for ballars, 1,010 shops, 160 flour mills, 50 smaller mosques, 60 big mosques, 9 dervish tekkes, 45 schools, 10 public baths and 43 traders’ caravanserais. Among the 167 different craftsmen, the most notable were tailors, jewellers, shoe makers, and prayer-rug weavers; most of the population in the second half of the 16th/17th century were involved in the slave trade or the export of honey (Seyhadnâmâ, vii, 673 ff., 678-9, 682). In the town of Kefe, which now acquired a characteristic Turkish appearance, the most prominent buildings included the mosque of Sultan Selim I; the mosque of Prince Süleyman; the Kule Kapisi mosque, built in 1483; the Wezir Khan; the mosque of Prince Amur and the mosque of Sultan Selim I; the mosque of Prince Amur; the mosque of Prince Ece. (Kdnun-ndme-yi iskele-i Kefe, 1861, p. 31). The first half of the 11th/17th century the eyâlet of Kefe consisted administratively of the beylerbeyi of Kefe, Sughdak and Menkub, and there were 3,200 households paying the poll-tax or dijâya. This last was collected by a muhassil instead of the defterdar. The annual customs income of Kefe was 4,238,500 akças. Trade was no longer in the hands of Muslims, but in the hands of traders looking to Russia (Başbakanlık Arşiv Genel Müdürü, Halkiyeden Müdever Defterleri, No. 3722, pp. 51, 52). In the following century, the customs of the port of Kefe, plus the 1⁄3 of other taxes coming from Gökzeve, Taman, Balâkli, Kafe-i Hdid, Kef and Khâtilash in 1181/1769 produced 4,738,500 akças. Trade was no longer in the hands of Muslims, but in the hands of traders looking to Russia (Başbakanlık Arşiv Genel Müdürü, Halkiyeden Müdever Defterleri, No. 3722, pp. 51, 52). The Turks used to call Kefe “Istanbul the Lesser” or “Half of Istanbul”, because of its ethnic diversity.

During the Ottoman-Russian War of 1149-51/1736-9, Kefe in Muhabram 1149/1736 narrowly escaped attack by a Russian fleet. (Kirim tarihi veya Necati Efendi’nim Rusya sefernamesi, ed. Faik Reşit Unat, in Tarih Vesikaları, xv (Istanbul 1949), 226). The military command (Seraskerlik) of Kefe was first instituted during the above-mentioned War, and later the Seraskerlik of the Crimea, with this office held by the beylerbeyi of Kefe. The last beylerbeyi of Kefe was Abaza Mehmed Pasha who was appointed in Shawwal 1184/February 1771 (for the beylerbeyis of Kefe, see Başbakanlık Arşiv Genel Müdürü, Halkiyeden Müdever Defterleri, No. 16, p. 42). At the end of the war beginning in 1182/1768, Kefe and the Crimea were both captured by the Russians. The Muslim Turkish population started even in the opening stages of the war to migrate into the interior of the Crimea and also left by ship to other Ottoman territories. At the same time, the population of Kefe was reduced. The last beylerbeyi of Kefe was Seyhadnâmâ, vii, 673 ff., 682; Başbakanlık Arşiv Genel Müdürü, Ali Emiri Tasnifi, I. Mahmud kismi, No. 1522, III. Osman kismi, No. 563).

In the face of pressure from the Cossacks and Russians from the 11th/17th century onwards, the fortress of Kefe was strengthened in the second half of that century (ibid., vii, 674 ff., viii, 31).

Kefe, though normally a sandjak, was sometimes treated as an eyâlet also (Başbakanlık Arşiv Genel Müdürü, Kamil Kepeci Tasnifi, Ruus defteri, No. 256, p. 217, see also Mühimme defteri, No. VII, pp. 19, 22-3 and various other places). It was finally erected into an eyâlet in 1080/1670 (C. Orhonlu, Osmanlı tarihinin ait bâgâleri, Tekshiser (1593-1603), Istanbul 1970, 78), and it remained as such till 1191/1777. There was no organisation of timars in the eyâlet, but instead it had an administration which consisted of a mîl defterdar and the deputy clerks of the Dâsin; a customs superintendent with a staff of 50, an Agha of Janissaries, a dâbêğî aghâsil, and a Topçu aghâsil. There was a fleet of 5 ships under the command of the Admiral of Kefe (Eyliyâ Celebi, vii, 668). When the beylerbeyi of Kefe was occupied elsewhere, his deputy was the sandjak kâmil of Kefe (Findikli Mehmed Agha, Nusretnâmâ, simplified version by Ismet Parmak, istanbul 1963-6, i, 145, 167, ii, 417). In the
Turks [see Karaites ii] (G. Matthew Jones, Travels in Norway, Sweden, Finland, Russia and Turkey, also on the Coasts of the Sea of Azof and of the Black Sea, London 1827, ii, 219-20, 222; for the state of Kefe in 1836, see E. Spencer, Travels in Circassia and Krim Tartyar, London 1837, ii, 234-5). Although the Russians called the city Fodossia, the name of the town was still Kefe to most of its population, even as late as 1856 (E. Spencer, Travels in Circassia, ii, 235). At this period, Kefe was in the transitional stage between being a Tatar and a Russian town, but gradually gained the characteristics of a summer resort, and in the latter part of the 19th century it was a city with a population of 10,000, with an additional 3,000 to 5,000 summer visitors every year (Telfer, The Crimea and Transcaucasia, ii, 142, 144 ff.). In 1897, only 3,200 of the whole population of 27,358 were Crimean Tatars.

**Bibliography:** (other than those sources mentioned in the article): 'Abd al-Ghaffar Kiramli, 'Umdat al-tawarikh, ed. Necib Asim, Istanbul 1934, 166, 176, 178, 181, 182; Josafa Barbara and Ambrogio Contarini, Travels to Tana and Persia, ed. Lord Stanley of Alderley, London 1873, 27, 28, 29, 140; H. Grenville, Observations sur l'état actuel de l'Empire Ottoman, ed. A. S. Ehrenkreutz, Amsterdam 1784, 50; F. de Tott, Mémoires sur les Turcs et les Tartares, Amsterdam 1784, ii, 147-8; J. Buchan Telfer, The Crimea and Transcaucasia, being the narrative of a journey in the Kouban, in Gouria, Armenia, Ossety, Imeretia, Swannety, and Mingrelia, and in the Tauric range, London 1876, i, 72, 73, 74; Maria Guthrie, Travels in Circassia, London 1827, ii, 219-20, 222; for the state of Kefe in Transcaucasia, being the narrative of a journey through the Crimea, Turkey and Egypt . . . 1825-28, London 1825; A. W. Fisher, The Russian Annexation of the Crimea, 1777-1783, Cambridge 1970, 13, 14, 86, 94, 105; MartinBronovsky, Tartarische Descripto, in Zapiski Odeszkogo Obshhestva Istorii Drevnosti Opisanie Krima, Odessa 1867, Tkish. tr. Kemal Ortaaylı, Kırım, Ankara 1970; Lettres sur le Caucase et la Crimée, Paris 1859, 442-51; Ethem Feyzi Gözaydin, Kırım, Kırım Türklerinin yerel ve gelece, Istanbul 1948; Mustafa Kara, Kırım, 'Ibtüret-yi nev-i devlet, Millet Kütüphanesi, Ali Emiri-Tarikh kismi, No. 484; J. Webster, Travels through the Crimea, Turkey and Egypt . . . 1825-28, London 1839; R. Lyall, Travels in Russia, the Crimea, the Caucasus, and Georgia, London 1825; Basbakanli Arşiv Genel Müdürlüğü Mühlime Deterli, No. ii, hiküm 654, 953, 1990, 2166; Mühlime Deterli No. iii, hiküm 3, 4, 43, 78, 83, 89, 213; Mühlime Deterli, No. xv, hiküm 1026; Mühlime Deterli, No. xviii, hiküm 72, 86, 64, 196, 90, 515, 502, 926; Tapu-Tahrib defterleri, Nos. 920, 921 (concerning the village of the same name within the vilayet of Erzincan, and a station on the railway connecting Sivas with Erzincan. The present form of the name derives from Greek xókaia). The Arabic geographers and historians usually refer to it as Kâmeh (thus in Ibn Hawâkil, 192, 195, tr. Wit, 188, 190-1; al-Sulami, 39/678-9, and this time the fortress capitulated; the occupation by the Musulmans was, however, short-lived (al-Baladhuri, Futâh, 184 ff.). The Greeks lost it once again, this time to Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik [g.c.], and it continued to change hands between the two sides. In 149/666 the caliph of liquorice-fibre, are laid five bars of hazeb-wood 6-10 cm. thick and about 7 m. long. On these are put diagonally, at intervals of 40 cm., 30 bundles of reeds each consisting of two parts. Seven bars, each 15 cm. thick, cover the bundles diagonally and over these are laid 8 cross-bars consisting of 2 parts. When persons are transported, reeds are spread plentifully on this construction and one or two small shelters, made of wood and covered with mats (therge), are erected on it for the travellers. Depending on its size, the kelek has two to six oars. On arrival at Baghdad, the cargo is unloaded, and the wooden construction removed: the bags are taken out, deflated and dried; they can then be kept for about 2 years. The kelekk then loads them up on a donkey and returns home. The journey down the river Tigris may be hampered by the wind, which drives the kelek to the bank, where the traveller may have to wait several days for better weather.

Several passages of the Thousand and one nights show that the kelek was not always such a complicated raft. Just like the janof (pl. alawaf), it could be constructed of wood only; Sayf al-Muluk builds a kelek of long trunks tied together with cords (ed. Habicht, iv, 245, 246 ff., tr. Littmann, Wiesbaden, 1953, v, 265 f.). He even (ibid., 264, tr. v, 279) utilises doors of aloe and sycamore, which he ties together with cords of silk. In the manuscripts of the Thousand and one nights, the word kelek has on the other hand not always been understood by the copyists, who have often substituted for it fulk, which graphically comes near to it, although the context requires the meaning "raft". The conounding of kelek with fulk "Noah's Ark" (in the Kur'an) may have led to the assumption that kelek has the same meaning, even though this is as wrong as relating janof [lit. faltan] "deluge".

**Bibliography:** H. Kindermann, "Schiff" im Arabischen, Untersuchung über Vorkommen und Bedeutung der Termi, Bonn (thesis), 1934, in particular 89 f. and index, s.v.; Hellmut Ritter, Mesopotamische Studien. I. Arabische Flussefahr-zeuge auf Euphrat und Tigris, in Islam, ix (1930), 141-3 (illustrated); Mustafa Kara, "Deluge et Arche", in Cahiers d'Archeologie Biblique, i, 2 ed., Neuchâtel 1953. See also bibl. in EI, s.v. (H. Kindermann)

**KEMĂK, Armenian Gunmmkh or Ani, usual Syriac form Kama, modern Turkish Kemâk, a small town in eastern Anatolia on the Karâ Şû or upper Euphrates, now the centre of a kaza of the same name within the vilayet of Erzincan, and a station on the railway connecting Sivas with Erzincan. The present form of the name derives from Greek xókaia. The Arabic geographers and historians usually refer to it as Kâmeh (thus in Ibn Hawâkil, 192, 195, tr. Wit, 188, 190-1; al-Yâkâbî, Historiae, ii, 447), although Yâkût, iv, 479, confirms that Kâmeh was the more usual form.

During the Umayyad and Abbâsid periods, Kemâk was a frontier fortress, possession of which oscillated between the Arabs and the Byzantines. The first Arab attack under Habîb b. Maslama [g.c.] was a failure. A second attempt by Şâfân b. Mu'âjal was also unsuccessful, but he made another attack together with 'Umar b. al-Hubâb al-Sulamî in 59/678-9, and this time the fortress capitulated; the occupation by the Musulmans was, however, short-lived (al-Baladhuri, Futâh, 184 ff.). The Greeks lost it once again, this time to Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik [g.c.], and it continued to change hands between the two sides. In 149/666 the caliph of
al-Mansur despatched against it a successful force under al-Abbas b. Muhammad and ordered its fortification as a frontier post against the Khazars (al-Ya`kbî, loc. cit.). The Byzantines recaptured it in 177/993-4, and apart from a period during the caliphate of al-Ma'mûn, it remained nominally subject to the Emperors until the Battle of Manzikert.

On the first Turkmen raids on Kemakh came in 449/1057-8, and shortly after the Battle of Manzikert or Malâzgerd (q.v.) in 463/1071, it was in the hands of Mengüджek Ahmad, who apparently had received the area round Erzindjan, including Kemâkh, as a grant from Alp Arslan. Inscriptions on the Great Mosque at Divrîgî state that Mengüджek Ahmad had captured Kemâkh from the infidels. He made his capital and was buried there on his death in 512/1122. In 536/1142 the Mengüджek principality was divided amongst three heirs, the capital falling to Malik Mahmûd. In 622/1225, the Saljûq sultan ʻAlâ al-Dîn Kaykûbud (q.v.) annexed Erzindjan, and the last Mengüджekid Dâwd Shâh sought an alliance against him by offering Kemâkh to the amir al-ʻUmur of Erzurum al-Aghraf and to the Khârazm Shâh Djiâl al-Dîn Mankûbîrî. Both of these refused to intervene, and the Saljûq ruler annexed the region including Kemâkh (Ibn Bibî, Ed. Lugal and Sümmer, 33, 35, 69-71). It seems to have at first formed part of the domains of the Eretnâ dynasty (q.v.) and then to have enjoyed a semi-independence between the rival factions of Kâdî Burhân al-Dîn (q.v.) and Mutâhharîn, the “capital” was the Ak Koyunlu Uzûn Hasan who established Selim I; henceforth, it remained part of the Ottoman empire till the collapse of the latter. The Ottoman Kânûnî-nâmé of 922/1516, based on the Ak Koyunlu laws, gives the impression that the town derived much of its wealth from the transit trade through the Euphrates valley (O. L. Barkan, XV or XVI asırda Osmanlı imperatorluğunda ieval ekonomiinin hukuk ve mali esasları, Istanbul 1943, 184-5). In the mid-11th/17th century, according to Ewliyâ Cebeli, there was a garrison in the Kemâkh fortress of a Janissary chief and 500 soldiers, and the economy of the town depended mainly on the salt mined nearby and sold in the town and on a fine-quality cloth woven there (Seyhâhat-nâmé, ii, 375-6). In 1830, J. Brant recorded a population there of 400 Turkish and 30 Armenian households (Jnul. of the Geogr. Soc., 1836), and in 1892, V. Cuinet registered for the whole kaza of 14,547 Muslims, 3,692 Armenians and 633 Greeks (La Turquie d'Asie, Paris 1892, i, 220 ff.). After its definite incorporation into the dominions of Selim I, Kemâkh was well within the Ottoman frontiers and hence lost much of its earlier strategic importance; however, during the First World War it again became an important defensive position in the fighting against the Russians.


KEMAL [see ATATÜRK].

KEMAL, ʻAli (1867-1922), Turkish writer, journalist and politician. His father Hâdîdî Ahmed Efendi had come home as a young man from a village near Çankırî and had made a fortune as a wax-maker and had become the warden of his gild. ʻAli Rıdâ (as ʻAli Kemal was called until his student days, see below) was born in 1867 in the Suleymaniye district of Istanbul, to his father's second (Circassian) wife and grew up in a traditional conservative family atmosphere. After attending the local schools, he entered the School of Political Science (Mekteb-i Müllikîe), where he particularly enjoyed the courses of Murad Bey (known as Mîzânî Murâd, 1853-1914, the future Young Turk leader in exile, who later made his peace with ʻAbd al-Ḥamîd II, see B. Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, index). The Tercüman-i Habîbat was his favourite newspaper, where he admired the poems and articles of Muallim Nâdir, the leader of the literary opposition against the modernists, particularly against ʻAbd al-Ḥakk Hâmid and Redja’î-zade Ekrem. He also began to contribute to a student magazine Gûlşen under the pen-name ʻAli Kemâl, which gradually replaced that of ʻAli Rıdâ. While a student at the Müllîkîe, he in 1886 went to Europe, where he spent over a year in Paris and Geneva and improved his French. On his father's death in 1888, he returned to Istanbul to attend to family affairs and complete his studies. Inspired by what he saw in European universities, he attempted to set up, together with a number of his university friends, a students' association (for details see his article Mekteb-i Müllikîe dîne-i müslûmînsel cemiyetler, in İbâdâm, 20 August, 1908). The authorities became suspicious and the konak where they held their meetings was raided by the police. The students were rounded up and ʻAli Kemâl and four others (including ʻAbd al-Halîm Mendîb, a future Young Turk writer) were sent to prison, where they spent several months. Eventually ʻAli Kemâl and a poet friend of his (Farhî of
Kastamonu) were banished to Aleppo. He spent five years there, where he was officially attached to the office of the vali with a salary and was also allowed to teach literature and French in the local high school (mekteb-i ʿiddāt). Interesting details of his life and literary activities in Aleppo are given in his autobiography (see below). In 1894 he managed to escape to Paris and became a regular correspondent of the Istanbul daily İkādām, in which he published a highly popular series of letters and articles (for the controversy over the doubtful originality of some of his letters, see Hüseyin Dibahid, Cəwəoğulərəm, Istanbul 1326 rāmī 1910, 37-92). This occurred at a time when no political refugee could get anything published in Istanbul under his own name, and this privilege has been taken as an indication that ʿAll Kemāl was by no means persona non grata in the capital. While in Europe he was in regular contact with the Young Turks, but never became one of them; he disagreed with most of their ideas, and his sympathies lay rather with ʿAbd al-Hamīd to whom, as later evidence showed, he offered his services as adviser and informer (copies of his reports (jurnals) and letters to the Sultan and his agents, some in facsimile, have been published; see Ahmet Bedevi Kuran, Osmanlı imparatorluğu nda inkişaf hareketleri ve milli mücadele, Istanbul 1955, 302-9, and Asaf Tugay, İbro, Abdülhamid'in hizmeti, istanbul jurnalları, Istanbul n.d., 200-17). In 1897 he was appointed second secretary in the Brussels Embassy, reportedly as a reward for his rôle in Murād Bey’s defection (Yahya Kemal [Bayraktar], Siyası ve edebi portreler, Istanbul 1968, 78), but the Ambassador, Munir Pasha, who disliked him, never let him take up his appointment. However, ʿAll Kemāl was allowed to use the title and to draw his salary for several years (Taʿzin of 20 July 1324 rāmī 1908 and Sulayman Nazif’s biographical notes used by İbnülmin M. K. İnal, see Bibliography). From Paris he moved to Egypt and became the superintendent of the estates of two Egyptian princesses, Ahmed Djelāl ed-Dīn Paša’s step-daughter and Muhāmmad Muḥīṭār Paša’s wife. He contributed to local Young Turk papers and founded the newspaper Türk (which was Ottomanist, in spite of its title), by speculating on the stock exchange, but went bankrupt following a crash in the market. When he returned to Paris in 1908, the revolutionary officers in Macedonia, in contact with the Young Turk organisation in Europe, had begun to prepare their move against the Sultan. ʿAll Kemāl corresponded with the Palace and arrived in Istanbul a few days before the revolution of 23 July 1908. He was in the Sultan’s presence when the crisis was being discussed (Yahya Kemal, op. cit., 79). ʿAbd al-Hamīd rewarded his advisory services with a purse containing 450 gold pieces (Taʿzin, 25 July 1324 rāmī 1908; ʿAll Kemāl admitted this, but corrected the sum to 260 pieces, İkādām, 27 July 1324 rāmī 1908). The conservative journalist Ahmad Djewdet (1862-1933), who had no sympathy for the committee of Union and Progress (CUP) now getting ready to seize power, wrote ʿAll Kemāl to be the leader-writer of his İkādām. His first article Müddetên Âliye (“From the Past to the Future”) appeared on July 30 1908, one week after the Revolution. A flood of articles followed daily on politics, history, education, literature, language, etc. After an absence of twenty years from the country, he wrote with great zeal and enthusiasm, in a somewhat didactic but entertaining and very personal style which soon made him one of the most popular journalists of the period. At the same time he taught diplomatic history in the Faculty of Letters and at the Muḥākîye. His dislike of the CUP, which by the meantime employed everything (including political assassination) to influence and control the new régime, soon developed into a bitter hatred, and he began to attack daily the Committee’s policy and methods. On 12 March 1909 ʿAll Kemāl handed over his column to Dr. Riḍā Nūr, deputy for Sinop, who published his famous article of warning which was greeted as a manifesto interpreting all the grievances of the opposition: the CUP was accused of oligarchic tendencies, komplot tactics, bribery, favouritism, intolerance of opposition, etc. ʿAll Kemāl was a candidate of the Ottoman Liberal Party (ʿƏlmānîl Âhrār Fīhrāsī) in the by-election of April 1909, but was defeated by the CUP candidate. He became more violent in his accusations. Outstanding Unionists such as Hüseyin Dibahid and Bahāʿ ed-Dīn ʿAshkār attacked him in equally violent terms in CUP organs like Taʿzin and Şəbdə-yī Ummet and exposed his ambiguous relations with ʿAbd al-Hamīd. The disturbing atmosphere created by the relentless campaign of the opposition press like İkādām, Mīṣān, Serbesti, ʿƏlmānîl and particularly Voltān, led on 13 April to a mutiny of the soldiers, incited by fanatical and disgruntled elements (for a good analysis of the mutiny and its background see Sina Aşkin, 31 Mart 1908, Istanbul 1968, 22). ʿAll Kemāl hid in the house of an English friend and fled to Europe as the army sent by Young Turk headquarters in Salonika (Hareket orduusu, originally Harekât Orduusu “Operations Army”) marched on the capital. In Paris he contacted unionist leaders like Fethi (Okyar) and Dījāwīd in the hope of a compromise with the CUP. When this failed, he contributed articles to Mekhribiyet, Şerif Paša’s anti-Unionist organ abroad. He had already employed a member of the Liberal Union (Hurreyet ve ʾItiḥād) founded in November 1911. In July 1912 the group of “Saviour Officers” (Khâldskdr Dâbişan Grup) brought down the Unionist government, and the Liberals assumed Power. ʿAll Kemāl returned to Istanbul and resumed his leaders in the İkādām. But on 23 January 1913, the Unionists carried out a violent coup d’état (Bâb-ı Ali Bâskıni) and exposed his ambiguous relations with ʿAbd al-Hamīd and his son Behcėt Cemal, Istanbul 1959, 22-26). He returned to Istanbul in May 1913. The assassination of the grand vizier Muhāmmad Şewket Paša on June 11 1913 gave the CUP the opportunity to crush the opposition completely. ʿAll Kemāl, who had promised Djemal Pasha to keep out of politics, was however safe. With his support, he was allowed to publish the same year a daily paper, the Peyām, to which some leading young writers contributed (Reilik Hali Karay, Mīnâbâb Ilimshār, Istanbul 1964, 63-64) but which was suppressed on the outbreak of the World War I. ʿAll Kemāl spent the war years completely secluded from public life on the island resort of Bûyûkâda and along the Bosporus shores. He collected manuscripts and rare books and concentrated on the study of classical literature and history. After the signing of the armistice of Mudros (30 October 1918), which sealed the fate of the Unionist régime, Mihran Etendi, the editor of the daily Şəbdə invited ʿAll Kemāl to
be a leader-writer of his paper, and he eagerly accepted. By this time the three CUP Leaders Enver, Talat and Djemal had fled the country. He immediately began his violent attacks against the Unionists, daily enumerating the mistakes and misdeeds they had perpetrated before and during the War. The Allied fleet reached Istanbul on 13 November; the whole city was put under allied control, and hundreds of Unionists were arrested. The Greeks, supported by the Allies, had landed in Izmir and were advancing towards the interior. All Kemal joined the first cabinet of Damad Ferdi Pasha as Minister of Education (4 March 1919). He acted with moderation for a while, and resisted the partisan pressures of the Liberal Union (Yahya Kemal, op. cit., 87-8). In the meantime, the nuclei of the national resistance movement were being set up all over the country and the first guerrillas began to combat the Greek invaders on the Aegean coast. "All Kemal, who became Minister of the Interior in the second Damad Ferdi Pasha cabinet on May 19 1919 (the very day of Mustafâ Kemal's landing at Samsun), soon completely espoused the polity and strategy of Sultan Mehemmed VI, his Grand Vizier and their associates: sc. to ignore the violations of the armistice terms; to follow the instructions of the Allies and in the hopes of winning; to offer no resistance to invading foreign armies, although this amounted, in the eyes of the nationalists, to collaborationism. All Kemal was convinced that Mustafâ Kemal's movement in Anatolia was nothing but a resurgence of Unionist ambitions, organized and supported by the survivors of the CUP (see particularly his article Ithidâd ve Terakkî öldü, paşâmın Ithidâd ve Terakkî'yi "The CUP is dead, long live the CUP!", in Peyâm, 20 December 1919). This fundamental misjudgment of the national ferment in Anatolia caused him to mislead many of his readers and eventually sealed his own fate. On 18 June 1919, All Kemal, as Minister of the Interior, sent out to the provinces a circular against the formation of militia units and preparations for national defence, and assured the British authorities that every office and government building would be open to you at any time" (Ghâzi Mustafâ Kemal, op. cit., 487b; Rida Nûr, op. cit., 341-42; Yahya Kemal, op. cit., 94-99; Rida Nûr, op. cit., 478b; Istanbul Ansiklopedisi, Istanbul 1961, s.v.). İsmet Paşa (İnönü) then foreign minister, who with his party arrived on the very day of the incident at Izmir on his way to the Lausanne Peace Conference, publicly showed his strong disapproval of Nûr ed-Din Paşa, commander of the first army, interrogated him briefly in his headquarters. A big crowd was waiting outside. All Kemal met his death in the square where he was being taken away. The circumstances of his death, a mob lynching according to the received version, are variously reported in the sources. According to some, his death was arranged or precipitated by Nûr ed-Din Paşa for reasons of personal prestige (see Fâlî Reftî Atay, Çankaya, Istanbul 1969, 315-16; R. H. Karay, op. cit., 138-139; and Jaeschke, Türk hurûtsûs saûsâs ilkîlîsî insîlieti belgelere, Ankara 1971, 130-31). He complained of these "colleagues of the Sultan who answered: "Your loyalty has been a great consolation and a source of great hope to me. The Palace will always be open to you at any time!" (Ghâzi Mustafâ Kemal, op. cit., 22-5, English tr. 28). On 3 August 1919, All Kemal revised his Peyâm and continued his campaign, with daily attacks on the leaders of the resistance movement in Anatolia and their supporters in Istanbul. Later Peyâm was amalgamated with Mîhrân Efendi's Sabûh, becoming Peyâm-1 Sabûh (1st January 1920), with All Kemal as permanent leader-writer. All Kemal's activities and writings unified and strengthened the Liberal Union which had shown signs of disintegration. He became one of the two most enthusiastic supporters (the other being Reftî Djevdâd of the Açêmürâ) of the collaborationist policy of the Sultan and of Damad Ferdi Paşa, which was to obey the instructions of the occupying forces and to try to suppress the resistance movement. Following this line of policy, All Kemal welcomed the reinforced allied occupation of Istanbul (16 May 1919), praised the successes of the Sultan's "disciplinary" troops dispatched to fight the Nationalists, and wrote a jubilant leader (25 May 1920) on the publication of the famous fetûh (11 April), followed by the death sentences in absentia on Muşafâ Kemal and his associates. News of the Nationalists' successes made him vacillate occasionally; he would praise the bravery of the Turkish soldiers, but soon would relapse into his usual tirades with the leitmotiv of "false nationalism and the dangers of ignoring world opinion", etc. His vitriolic articles continued till as late as the end of August and early September 1922, when the Nationalists won a decisive victory and the routed Greek army was heading back towards İzmir. Only in his last three articles (8, 9, 10 September), when the Nationalist armies had reached the Aegean, did he admit his errors and terms; to follow the instructions of the Allies and in the hopes of winning; to offer no resistance to invading foreign armies, although this amounted, in the eyes of the nationalists, to collaborationism. All Kemal was primarily a journalist. His early articles in the İhdâm (from 1894 onwards), which he forwarded from Paris as a "special correspondent", are mostly compilations from the French press, with occasional personal or autobiographical digressions (see below). Some of his articles published in Young Turk papers abroad throw light on contemporary ideological differences (e.g. his answer to Açêmürâğhî Yûsûf's famous essay, both published in the Türk, Nos. 24-34, Cairo 1904, reprinted later with the same essay, Açêmürâghî Yûsûf, Ul Tars.
Siyadet, 1327 rủm iy 1911, 33-45). The thousands of articles which he published first in the İkhām and later in his own paper (Peydam which have not been collected) are of great documentary importance for understanding the atmosphere of the period and for following the development of political, social and cultural problems during the 1908-1914 period; but they should be read together with the articles of his great opponent Hüseyin Dāhid [Yaşın] in the Tanrı, the organ of the CUP. His articles of the last phrase, published in the renewed Peydam (August-December 1919) and in the Peydam-i Şahāb (1920-1922) typically reflect the frame of mind and the psychology of the Sultan’s government and its supporters in occupied Istanbul during the time of the resistance movement in Anatolia. Apart from translations from the French, serialised in newspapers or published in book form and various minor publications, ʿAlī Kemal is the author of the following works: (1) Fāris muṣḥabāhīl (a selection of his articles and letters published in the İkhām in the 1890s, 2 vols., Istanbul 1329/1913, 1331 r./1913, 1915); (2) Fitret (written in England in 1895, published in Istanbul 1329/1913). Intended to be a novel, this book consists of a series of loosely-connected essays around his hero Fitret, the product of a mixed marriage, in which the author expounds his ideas on modernism, westernisation, literature, history, and culture, and explains his views on his opponents of the Therawī-i Fünūn literary school, particularly his main adversary Hüseyin Dāhid; (3) Iki hemsīhre (Istanbul 1315/1899, 1329/1913), a long short story, with much autobiographical material from the author’s exile years in Aleppo; (4) Cóle bir şerğüzešt (Istanbul 1316/1900; 2nd ed. of Nos. 3 and 4 published together under the title Bir şerğüş-šaие keşkik, Istanbul 1329/1913); (5) Rüşdi-i İlahi (Istanbul 1329/1913), a study of the French Revolution and its impact on France and other European countries, consisting mainly of detailed biographies of Condorcet, Saint-Just, Danton and Robespierre; (6) Edibiyayat-i haksıhyye dersleri (Istanbul 1330/ 1914), a collection of 12 essays, originally serialised in the İkhām, based on a course “Realism in Literature” given at the Sorbonne in the 1890s, with occasional remarks on contemporary Turkish literature; (7) Rüşdh muṭ̄rurrih mi shārīr mi? (Istanbul 1334/1918), an informal study on the 18th century chronicler Rüşhd, prompted by Ahmed Refik’s enthusiastic article on Ahmed III and his grand vizier and son-in-law İbrahim Paşâ (Sultan Ahmed-i ‘Ebih see Dāndār), in Yeni Mejdūmu, No. 34 (1918), 149-53), in which ʿAlī Kemal compares the method and techniques of oriental historiography with those of modern western history-writing, mercilessly condemning the former. After a long exposition on Oriental and particularly Ottoman classical poetry, he concludes that Rüşhd was a mediocre historian but a remarkable poet of the Nabi school. This work is particularly interesting since it is, in a way, a recapitulation of the themes and leitmotives which ʿAlī Kemal elaborated and repeated in his previous writings, adopting all the negative judgments passed on the Turks and the Ottoman Empire by European writers and observers, and thus developing a deep complex of inferiority vis-à-vis Europe and Europeans. Here we have the clues to his cosmopolitanism, his anti-nationalism and his feeling of helplessness in face of the West, his recurrent claim that it is futile to challenge the Great Powers (Diyāl-i Mu’āṣama), and finally his constant advice for an acquiescent foreign policy and his a priori admission of the superiority of everything western (see also his articles of 12, 15, 17, 21 and 23 January and 23 March 1909 in the İkhām); (8) Omrûm, ʿAlī Kemal’s memoirs about his childhood, his school years and his exile period in Aleppo, were first serialised in the Peydam in 21 instalments from December 1329/-1913. A revised version was serialised in 32 instalments in the revived Peydam from 14 July 1335/-1919. They have not been published in book form, but a critical edition in roman script was prepared by Berna Kazak in 1954 (Istanbul University Library, unpublished No. 9976). When he was not involved in politics or in personal quarrels with his rivals, ʿAlī Kemal wrote essays on diwān-poetry, articles on contemporary literary problems, and occasionally poems which he published in the Peydam-i Edebi, the literary supplement of his paper, to which many outstanding writers (Riḍā Tewfik, Ahmed Refik, Yaḥyā Kemal, Yaṣīl Kādī, etc.) contributed. In poetry and literary criticism, ʿAlī Kemal was a disciple of Muṣʿallim Nāṣīr (1850-93), a neo-classicist and an ardent opponent of the modernist school. He admired the diwān-poetry, had a very low (and wrong) opinion of classical Turkish prose (about which, like most of his contemporaries, he knew very little), and utterly despised the three generations of literary modernists: the Tanṣi̇māt, the Therawī-i Fünūn and the “National Literature” (Millī Edebiydt) schools. He explained his views on Turkish literature in detail in a long letter which he sent in 1918 to Rüşhd Eshref (Unaydīn), who had been interviewing the leading writers of the period (Rüşhd Eshref, Dıyarır ki, Istanbul 1918, modern Turkish ed. by Şemsettin Kütûlu, Istanbul 1971). In spite of the personal cachet of his style (surprisingly much praised by the purist poet Yaḥyā Kemal, op. cit., 71-2), ʿAlī Kemal’s writing was awkward, anachronistic and empty of historical knowledge. Following the tradition of the classical Ottoman munqīš, he filled his essays with copious cliché quotations from the Arabic, Persian and Turkish verse. Like a few “recallitant” contemporary writers (e.g., Dıḥāb ed-Dīn, Shīhāb Sūleymān Nazif, ʿAlı Ekrım, etc.) he took a hostile stand against the language reform movement of the post-1905 period and completely ignored the attempts towards the turkification of the written language. His hair-splitting concern with grammatical rules did not much help to improve his style, as stated by the great contemporary stylist (and his friend and colleague) Refik Kālid (op. cit., 63). A prolific writer of great vitality, with a remarkable encyclopaedic knowledge, ʿAlī Kemal lacked the sense of history and reality. He wasted his talents in endless futile arguments, and ruined his career and himself by following his unbounded ambition, his blind obstinacy and his violent partisanship to the very end.

KEMAL, MEHMED, NAMİK one of the most prominent figures of Turkish literature in the second half of the 19th century, whose fame is due to his works in various fields, including his patriotic and political life.

I. Life. Kemal's mother was Fatima Zahrâ Kâhînân, the daughter of 'Abd al-Laçif Paşa and Mahdûme Kâhînîm. His father Mustafa 'Aşim Bey, who was well versed in history, mysticism and especially in astrology, had many a poet, scholar, and statesman among his ancestors. His ancestry goes back to Şehîd Topâl 'Oğhmân Paşa of the Mora (Morea or Peloponese), who had been Şadr-i Aşâm in the 18th century and was famous for his acts of heroism; Kemal was particularly proud of him. Kemal was born on 26 Shawwâl 1256/21 December 1840 at Tekirdağlî (Tekirdağ) and spent his early years with his grandfather. Together with his grandfather, who in Istanbul held the offices of Miḥlâdûr and Kêsdêr (M. Salâh al-Dîn, Bir Türk diplomatînlî evrâ-i siyâsîyesi, Istanbul 1306, 11) and in the provinces those of mütesellìm, muhassîlî and mumastarîf, he stayed in Gelîbûtû, Tîrkhalâ (Tîrkalâ), Afyon Karâbîşrâl (1846), Kutahanî (1848), Kars (March 1853-July 1854) and Şofya (May 1855-September 1856). When Kemal was 8 years old, his grandfather lost his life in Afyon (30/31 August 1848), and he stayed in Gelîbûtû, Tîrkhalâ, Ahvât (1848), and he married in Şofya Nesîme Khanım, the daughter of the bâdiî of Nîshâ, when he had reached the age of 16. Shortly after that he returned to Istanbul in the company of his grandfather, who was dismissed from his office of Kâyâmâm of Şofya. Following the deaths of his grandfather and grandmother, Kemal had to settle down in his step-mother Dürriyeye Kâhînîm's house in Kûhâbîyân, as the mansion of 'Abd al-Laçif Paşa had to be sold in order to pay his debts.

Since 'Abd al-Laçif Paşa was resident in Istanbul in between two appointments, Mustafa 'Aşim was able to deal with the spiritual upbringing of Kemal during these periods; another important influential factor was his grandfather, whose virtues are praised by the poets of Afyon and who was a member of the Mawlawî convent next to their house. It is probable that Kemal was instructed in sâné and in Persian whilst resident in Afyon. All the sources seem to agree on the fact that he attended the Dâr al-Mawârîf in Istanbul for about a year and a half when he was 12-13 years old (Mâhmûd Oývâd, Ma'ârîf: 'Umâmiyye Nâzâreti târîhî-ye tashkildât ve 'efkdrâtî, Istanbul 1338, 40, 97; 'Omar Fârîk Aḵûn, Namîk Kemâlî, in İ. ix, 55b). Kemal, whose spiritual life was nourished with poetry and music as well as with mystical knowledge, was schooled in the works of Muhîl 'l-Dîn Ibn al-'Arâbî when he was apprenticed to the müdrîs-poet Sayyîd Mêhem Hâmîd (1777-1854), under whose guidance he started reading Turkish diwân poems such as Nâbi and sections of the Maḥâna, while resident in Kars (Bâni Çiçek Kirzîqîğû, Namîk Kemâlî'un Karsîsî hikayesi müdrîsîn büyûk Hâmîd Efendi, in Türk Kültûrû, no. 2/2, August 1964; for this were used the works of M. F. Kirzîqû, 1835 Kasr Zafêrî and Kars Târîhî). During the time he spent in Kars he was also busy with sports like hunting and horse-riding.

We are not able to trace back the exact date of the beginning of Kemal's official career; however, we know that already in the year 1859 he was a secretary to the Bâbî-Şîrî. When Leskoştâlî Şâhîlî was appointed to be Chief Secretary of Customs (Emîlnâ Gümûşkûz'un Taşrîrât Başkâhîlî) (March 1860), Kemal was his assistant, and following the former's appointment to Tripoli as the Director of Customs (Gümûşkûz Emîlnâ) in September 1861, Kemal became a member of the Chamber of Translation of the Sublime Porte, where he stayed until March 1867, when he was appointed to be the Assistant Governor of Erzurum. Meanwhile, he was giving voluntary lessons in orthography and composition at the Dîrîmîsîyye-i Têrîsîyye-i İslâmîyye, of which he was a founder; he kept up these lessons until his departure for Paris (M. Çevîk, op. cit., 97; zbûhâr-ı Şîrîf, Türkiye müsallî tarîkî, Istanbul 1910, ii, 336; Taşwîr-i efhäuser, nos. 208, 285, March 13 and 30 1865, nos. 365, 400, 402, 403, February 13, June 28, July 6 and 10 1866). The early years of Kemal, who returned to Istanbul from Şofya at the age of sixteen, were the most exciting period of his life, on account of the reforms introduced during the Taşmirînî period. The programme of reforms was announced by the Imperial Edict of 18 Feb. 1856; on 22 Oct. 1860 Ağâ Efendi, together with Şinâslî, started to publish the first non-official newspaper, the Terdîmûmân-î akâlî, and the first non-official newspaper, the Taşwîr-ı efhäuser, which was a real step in the extension of Kemal's intellectual horizon. He took lessons in French with the bhûlâq (of the Office of Translations at the Porte (Terdîmûmân Oda), Mânûf Efendi; he moved in such literary and political circles as the Endûmân-î Şûlîr (1861), which comprised old and new style poets, the printing office of the Taşwîr-ı efhäuser, and the Sarafim Kîrîtâkhânîsî (public reading room). The alteration of the Succession Law for Egypt (Mîsr Werâîyeti Kanâna), which was decided upon at the beginning of May 1857, ordained that the Khedive should pass from father to son and not to the eldest of the khedivial family. But before this, Mustafa Fâdîl Paşa, who was by this to lose his right of succession, was advised by the Porte to leave Istanbul for some time, and had left for Europe in April 1866. In his letter to 'Abd al-Ţazlızî, which was printed in French and separately in Turkish (1866), he declares that in order to make possible the realisation of the reforms it was necessary to replace the Ministers, and in his answer to an article in the newspaper Le Nord on 1 Feb. 1867, he declares the persons having the new ideas (efhäuser-i jîddî şabîheleri) to be of the same opinion. In addition to the Turkish translation of this answer, published in the Taşwîr-i efhäuser, Kemal makes the statement that the Türkistanîn erbîb-i şabîhâbi ("Youth of Turkistan") who support M. Fâdîl, put the interest of the nation before personal interest and are ready to realise in the near future their ideals, will astound the Europeans, who accuse the Ottomans of backing down (No. 461, 23 Feb. 1867). His article on the Europeans, who accuse the Ottomans of backing down (No. 469, 24 March 1867). His article on the
Society of Young Ottomans, like Diya3, Su’awi, Agah and others, he fled to Paris. All these young men, who were together with their families, supported in their daily needs by M. Fàdid and partly by Prince Muràd assembled in Paris on 30 May. Their aim was to strive for the rights of the people, as well as to make known to them their duties, for the opening of the National Assembly and the enthronement of the Şahzâde Muràd. When on 30 June 1867 4'Abd al-

Aziz came to Paris on a state visit, he proposed to M. Fàdid that he should return to Istanbul; this he did, not in the company of the Sultan, but on 20 September. At that time, Kemàl and his colleagues started from 31 August onwards to publish the Mukhbir. But on account of the writings of Su’awi against M. Fàdid and in favour of 4’Abd al-

Aziz, they announced by way of a letter, written in April or May 1868, that the Mukhbir did not represent the Society of Young Ottomans. In this way, the Society split into two. Beginning on 28th June 1868, Kemàl and his associates started to publish the Hiirriyyet (“Freedom”) as a counterweight to the Mukhbir. But they were threatened with the discontinuation of the financial support, and were told that an amnesty and permission to return to Istanbul would no longer be a possibility if they continued to write against 4’Abd al-

Aziz and 4’Ali Pasha. Thereupon Kemàl and some of his colleagues declared in a letter dated 7 Jan. 1870 that they had no share in the writings printed in the Hiirriyyet and that they disassociated themselves from its contents. In a letter from the Ministry of Public Security dated 10 Aug. 1870, they were permitted to return to Istanbul. On October 25, Kemàl and his friends arrived back in Istanbul.

Since the articles which he published at the time of his return in the Diyozen (whose first volume came out on 12 Nov. 1872) and in the newspaper of 4’Ibre (which began publication on 15 June 1872, and of which he found himself the editor-in-chief) were regarded as against common decency, first Kemàl was appointed mutasarrif of Gelibolu (Gallipoli) (11 July 1872), and a little later the newspaper was closed (19 July 1872). On 31 July Midhat Pasha was appointed Grand Vizier and on 26 Sept. Kemàl set out for Gallipoli. When the suspension of the newspaper had been lifted, Kemàl, in a letter sent from there (No. 20, 30 July 1872), held forth on the unjustifiable suspension of this newspaper and the pressure which he and his friends had suffered to accept an office in the provinces. On 6 December came the news that 4’Asim Pasha had been appointed mutasarrif of Gallipoli (Dieridc-i hawddith, no. 2056), while Kemàl was discharged from office on 11 December (M. C. Kuntay, Namk Kemal, i, Istanbul 1944, 234; ili, Istanbul 1949, 126, 134). Returning to Istanbul (Hadika, no. 28, 22 Dec. 1872), he continued his publications in the 4’Ibre.

On 6 April 1873, the day on which the 4’Ibre was closed because it supported the demonstrations at the first performance of his play Wusat yahud Silistre at the Gedik Pasha theatre on 1 April, Kemàl and his friends were arrested and by a fermân of 10 April sent into exile. After he had lain in a narrow cell in the barracks of Maghosa at Famagusta in Cyprus, he was later transferred to a more spacious room, and, under the protection of the mutasarrif of Cyprus, he was enabled to communicate with the outside world through his visitors, whom he was free to meet. Through the help of his friends, and specially that of the Şahzâde Muràd, he and his family in Istanbul could live a comfortable life. Being granted an amnesty soon after the accession of Muràd V (31 May 1876), he and his friends set out for Istanbul on 14 June; whilst being guests in İzmir, they received the news that the General Assembly had decided to return to Istanbul. On 20 June they arrived in Istanbul. His exile in Famagusta, which lasted 38 months, was in fact his most productive period.

On 11 Sept. 4’Abd al-Hamàd came to the throne, after having taken the oath on 31 August, because of Muràd V’s illness, and Kemàl was appointed firstly on 18 Sept. a member of the Council of State (Şura-yi davul) and later on 2 Nov., a member of the General Assembly (Medjlis-i umumi), which was working on the framing of the Constitution (Kânûn-i esâsi). The Terdiyé djiemyeyeti was dissolved at its first meeting in November because it did not accept Su’awi, and the 4’Askir-i milliyye djiemyeyeti, because of the great increase in the number of its members, which worried the government. He opposed the article, added later to the Constitution, by which the Sultan was authorised to expel from the country anyone whom, as a result of a police investigation, he suspected. Shortly after the issue of the fermân dated 23 Dec. 1876, promulgating the Constitution, he was arrested on 12 Jan. 1877 on the pretext that he had disturbed the public order. From his letters, the real reason must have been the fact that he had written a verse making an allusion to the dethronement of 4’Abd al-Hamàd; there was also the search for evidence to justify the exile of Midhat Pasha from Istanbul, and fear of his possibly lending himself to causing some disturbance or of his being elected a deputy. During his detention, the Parliament was opened (19 March 1877). The inquiry into his case was closed on 10 July and on the 19th of that same month he left for Midilli (Mytilene), where he was ordered to reside. He followed closely the phases of the Turco-Russian war that broke out on 23 April, the Treaty of San Stefano concluding this war on 3 March 1878, the event of Su’awi on the 20th May, the Congress of Berlin, which opened on 13 July and the discussions in the Ottoman Parliament, which was adjourned sine die in 1878. For the realisation of constitutional government, he gave instructions by letter to his close friends about subjects they should speak during the debates in the Assembly; they accordingly made speeches and introduced bills (lâykas). His exile on Mytilene continued for about two years and a half; then on 18 Dec. 1879 he was appointed mutasarrif of the island. His struggle against the Italian fishermen, who were causing injury to local fishermen in their sponge-fishing; the fact that the Greeks, who wanted autonomy, were not paying the tax levied in lieu of military service (hödel-i askeri) with impunity; and also opposition from his adversaries among the Turkish officials—all these were reasons for his temporary dismissal (Feb.-May 1881). Having been restored to office, he held it for more than four years, after which the newspapers dated of 17 Oct. 1884 brought the news that he was to change places with the mutasarrif of Rhodes, Ağh Efendi (Tarikh, nos. 203, 207; Dieridc-i hawddith, no. 6323), and on 20 October it was made known that he had gone to Rhodes.

By the continuous efforts of 4’Azîl Pasha, who was on 5 Nov. 1885 appointed governor of the province of the Aegean Islands (the Dıenâyir-i Bahr-i Şeff), the seat of the provincial administration was transferred from Chios (Saklz) to Rhodes (Mehmed Thürreyya, Sidiill-i ’Omnân, iii, 297). So for that reason, Kemàl was transferred to Chios to be mutasarrif there. From one of his letters it appears that he took up his duties there on 6 Dec. 1887.
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During his occupation of these posts as mutasarrif, his struggles against public disorder and administrative neglect. In his capacity as a muhafer, he had the task of organizing smoke and sponge workers, and he spent much effort to strengthen the Muslim population, who were in a minority compared to the Christians. He recommended to Abd al-Hamid and to high officials, by his lâykas (memoranda), tarih (petitions) and letters, the means that had to be applied in order not to lose the Mediterranean islands. He was awarded the Riddah rubies and twice the Othmanlı nakts in 1881, 1883 and 1886. Kemal, who was first taken ill with malaria and suffered later from pneumonia, was exhausted by his tiring official duties, and especially by the shock of the seizure of the first volume of his Ottoman History ("Othmanlı tarihçesi"). He died from a combination of bronchitis and gastric and abdominal complaints, on 2 Dec. 1888 at Chios where he had lived alone since he had sent his wife and son to Istanbul. By the time of the arrival of his wife, he was already buried. By an Imperial rescript his mortal remains were transported the next day to Bolayir, in accordance with his last injunction to Ebû-İ-Diya Tewfik. The design of his tomb, which was erected on behalf of the Khaasî-i khâs, was by Tewfik Fikret.

2. Works. Kemal, like so many other personalities of the Tanzimat literature, with their intentions of spreading new ideas and introducing new genres of writing, produced works in nearly every field.

(a) Poetry. Kemal started his literary life with the writing of poetry. In one of the poetry magazines he wrote some 8 or 10 ghazels while he was fourteen years old, and he wrote for another one until his return from Soiya; in the last-mentioned periodical, we find religious, mystical and moral poetry, or that concerning his surroundings, as well as a bîfâ which he wrote at the age of sixteen and in which he satirises the banknotes affair; this bîfâ was taken over by Diyâ Paşa in his Kharabât. Only a few of these works from his childhood were included in the six poetry collections compiled later, because he was dissatisfied with them. There exists also a collection of nazîres of his. His pseudonym of Namîk was given to him by Eshref Paşa, who highly praised his merthiyes and eulogised him as the Kemâlâ bë'îmin (Saladin). It was printed, together with the Othmanlılar Dîräk-î zâtîli, as the first volume of the Dîräk-i hâkî, under pseudonyms like Khîlân-i 'Adilîn and al-Dîn Kemal. His articles concern all kinds of events taking place in his surroundings, with a rich variety of subjects. The most effective and influential were those with a political content. In these writings, remaining faithful to the principles of the Yeni Othmanlılar Dîräk-î zâtîly, he put forward the ideas which were to become the cause of the Constitution, and he strove to show the defects of nearly every institution as well as the means for its improvement. His most severe criticisms can be found in the writings he produced and published in the Tsa'îvar-i efkar and the 'Ibret at the time when he was contemplating fleeing to Europe and was in no need of an official post, but which were the cause of his being banished to Famagusta. Compared with his works in other genres, he achieved great fame by these various articles, especially those reflecting his political struggles.

(b) Historical works. His works in this field are monographs about the great men of Ottoman and Islamic history, the Tarih-i 'aşerî and the Othmanlı tarihçesi. — 1. Babirka-i şafir ("The Sword of Victory") concerns the conquest of Istanbul by Mehmed II the Conqueror, and was written in one day. He used artistic prose here, and was convinced that no one adhering to the dinâm literature could write a "parallel" to it (Istanbul 1289, 1305). — 2. Devlet-i 'Aliyye'nîn dev-i sûlûsîna dârî bir mubâledîr. In this work he treated of the conquests of the Ottoman empire since its establishment up to the end of the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent. Shortly after it was published in instalments in the Tsa'îvar-i efkar, it was printed in book-form from Jan. 1867 onwards (Istanbul 1289, 1301, 1304). — 3. Sahâb al-Dîn Eyyübî. This is a monograph about the life of the founder of the Ayyûbs and Muslim hero Sahâb al-Dîn (Saladin). It was printed, together with the Devr-i sülûlî, as the first volume of the Evrâk-i perîşân (Istanbul 1289/1872, 1894). — 4. Sî/slîre mukâsa'arî. He published this under the name of Ahmed Nâif'dî, a man who had himself taken part in the battle of 1853, and on whose mediation Kemal relied for his communications with Istanbul while in exile in Famagusta (Istanbul 1290, 1946). — 5. Kanîsîfe: this was written to recall the praise-
worthy victories of the Turkish soldiers, and contains the conquest of Kanizhe during the reign of Mehmed III, as well as the acts of heroism of Tiryaki Hasan Pasha, and was published under the name of Ahmed Nafidh (Istanbul 1297, 1299, 1304, 1335, 1942). — 6. **Onhane-i hâlâ** Emir Nevruz. This contains the life and the struggles of Emir Nevruz, who, at the time of the Mongol conquests fought for the sake of Islam and humanity; it was first published under the abbreviation **nân-bâh**, while he was in exile in Famagusta (Istanbul 1298; Mathâ-i Ebûzziya, 1302, 1305). Of the above-mentioned works, the **Devr-i istilâh** and **Saleh al-Dîn Eyâyêh**, to which were added the biographies of Mehemmed the Conqueror and Sultan Selim, were printed as one volume and published under the name **Erâkî-i perîkhân** (Istanbul, n.d. [Istanbul 1301]). — 7. Apart from the works mentioned up to here, he prepared, while in Famagusta, his **Kullîyyât-i Kemal** in a part—that up to the reign of Mehemmed the Conqueror—was published in four volumes in the **Kemal-î Kemîl** series (Istanbul 1326–7). *(K) Plays. Kemâl, who regarded the drama as a school for the improvement of morals, held the view that, because the Turkish language was not yet possible to write dramas in syllabic metre; hence all his six plays are written in prose. — i. In his foreword to his **Icli kiz**, which was published shortly after his being granted pardon under the new name of **Ali Bey**'in sergizeshtini, no permission was given for publishing this work of his was translated into French. His second novel, **Djezmi**, for which the subject matter was extracted from Ottoman, Crimean and Persian history of the 16th century, was written in parts at Mytilene and finished in 1881. Under the influence of Romanticism, Pan-Islamism is the leading idea, and is defended in **Djezmi** (Istanbul 1297, 1299, 1304, 1335 1969). *(f) Criticism. Most of his criticism, in general reflecting his ideas about diwan and western literature, and the simplicity of the language, is composed in epitary form, because it was written when he was in exile. — 1. In his foreword (mukâsadîme) to the **Bakhâr-i dâniş** he wrote that during the **Tanzîmât** period, people had refrained from translating works from Persian, because of the strong influence of Western literature, and he gave a translation of one of the famous stories written by Shaykh İnâyat Allâh in the Urdu language (Istanbul 1291, 1303, 1311). — 2. **Tâhirî-i hârarât** is a criticism of the first volume of Diya' Pasha's anthology (publ. Istanbul 1874), including examples of the best poetry of Arabic, Persian and Turkish diwan literature. It was first published as an article in instal-
ments (Medmu'a-i Ebuzziya, nos. 11, 19, 24, 17
January, 15 May and 17 July 1882), and it was later printed in book-form (Istanbul 1301, 1304). — 3. His
critical reviews of the second and third volumes of
this same work, after having been printed as
magazine articles (ibid., nos. 30-36, 24 January-
23 April 1883), published separately also (Istanbul
1301, 1312). — 4. *İfran Paşa*ya mektub was written with reference to *İfran Paşa*'s blaming the young
generation, in the preface to his work Medmu'a-i
*İfran Paşa* (Istanbul 1299), for not appreciating the
distinct literature (ibid., nos. 18, 19, 23, 24 Nov.
1884-12 Nov. 1885). — 5. *Mualla*’a-nâme, was
written with reference to R. Ekrem's Ta'lim-i ede
bîyyâbî, and was printed according to a defective
manuscript, which has been subsequently found (N.
Halil Onat, Namik Kemal'in tâlimî-i edebiyat iizerine bir risalesi, Ankara 1950); from his letters it seems
that he wrote it at Mytilene in 1878. — 6. In his
Muhâdditse-i Dielâlî, finished at Mytilene in 1878,
he expressed his opinion with regard to the new forms
of literature, which had developed after the Tânzimât,
namely the political article, the novel and the drama,
as well as his thoughts about whether some features
of his play *Dielâlî al-Din* Khâramgâh were in
accordance with the historical facts or not, and about
simplicity of the language (publ. as an article in
*Šarh*, nos. 1 ff., 1897; *Medmu'a-i Ebuzziya*, nos.
38-44, 2, 24 Nov. 1884-12 Nov. 1885). — 7. His Renan müddâlâ-nâmesi, which he finished at Mytilene in
Sept. 1883, is his criticism of a lecture called *L'Islamisme et la science*, delivered by Ernest Renan at the Sorbonne on 29 March 1883
The information given by Ahmed Midhat in his
*Uzî-i inâlabî* about his opinions on the Constitution
was criticised by Kemal (Istanbul 1385, 1397, 220) in
his letters dating 24 Aug. and 13 Sept. 1878 (*Edib-i
a'şâm Nâmîk Kemal Bey'i ğayrî-i maftûlî ahkârîndan
Ahmed Midhat Efendi*’ye yâdâlgî iki mektub, İzmir
1324). — 8. Apart from these works of his, he wrote
other pieces of criticism, which was published in
magazines but were never printed in book-form; these
include *Mes prions mu'âhddahi* about the Turkish
translation (1874) by R. Ekrem of Silvio Pellico's
his criticism on K. P. Rif'at's *Huqûk-i umûmiyye*
(Istanbul 1929), which was the latter's translation
of PradîF Dodêre’s *Principes généraux de droit politique
mu'âkddamesi*. — 12. His *Laîife* (anecdotte), also called *Pîlevîne mu'âhddahi*, relating to D. Hikmet's *Pîlevîne
Kahramânî* *Ôlümün Paşa* garnâmder (Istanbul
1878). — 13. The criticism he wrote of Mahmut
Dielâlî al-Din Paşa's *Šarh-i Şefik-nâme* (Istanbul
1299), his *Şefik-nâme* or *Râvdat al-Kâmîlin
mu'âhddahi*. — We may also include in this genre
his *Lâyîsha* (memoranda) and *Tabîrîs* (eulogies of
books). But one finds his most sincere and objective
criticisms in his private letters, some of them of
book length, and containing his frank opinions
about the work of his contemporaries and about
various controversies during that period.

[g] Other works. Apart from the works men-
tioned above he produced certain other writings:
*Tendîh al-hânîse* (Istanbul 1307); *Sengûsîyet
*Istanbul 1327*; *Rûyâ* (signed in abbreviation
nim-haf, n.p.d., Egypt 1908, Istanbul 1326, 1932);*Imtâzî-i ahâm - wafa'î-yî 'âdâh (Istanbul 1327);
*Hikmet al-hâbîb, Midîlî risâlesi* and *Medmu'a-i
siyâsî* were never published in bookform.

*Bibliography*: The above is mostly based
on the following works: Fâ'îk Reşhâd, *Edib-i
a'şâm Kemal, Ebuzziya, Kemal Bey'in terâjîme-i
hâlî (Istanbul 1326) and *Yeîî Ôlümünûlârî sâriâyî*, published in the Turkish *Tarih-i *Ahmedi* (A. Ekrem Bolâyir, Namik
Kemal (Istanbul 1933)).

Of other sources, his early life and his poetry
are clarified by S. N. Ergun (Namik Kemal
hayât ve şîirleri Istanbul 1933; Namik Kemal'in
şîirleri Istanbul 1941), while I. R. M. Kemal
In has discussed Kemal's work in his life as an
and his various periodicals (Son asir Türk saîrleri,
yatar, in Cumsuriset, 24 Dec. 1940; Ülkî, no. 101, July 1941; Namik Kemal Aîfûnda, Ankara
1949. Some of his articles have been brought
together and printed (Ebuzziya, *Muntâkahhab-i
Tâşvîr-i efâtâr, Istanbul 1304, 1311; A. Ekrem
Bolâyir, *Külîâyî-î Kemal, Istanbul 1327; M.
Nihâd Öztîn, *Namik Kemal ve îbret gazeteleri,
Istanbul 1938*). See also R. H. Davison, *Reform
in the Ottoman empire 1856-1876*, Princeton
1963, index; A. Bombaci, *Storia della letteratura
turca*, Milan 1956, index; *Enciclopedia Italiana*,
art. s.v. Most of his works were published by others
while he himself was in exile; hence because he was
not able to correct them himself, they contain
some mistakes and omissions. Among the works
which the Türk Tarih Kurumu have published
are, together with a commentary on their contents
and documentation, being prepared for the press by
the Türk Tarih Kurumu (Namik Kemal'in mek-
tuplari, i, Istanbul, Atrûpa ve Mağhosa mektuplari;
i and iii, *Midîlî mektuplari*, Ankara 1967, 1969,
1973). Because of the availability of these volumes,
only a basic bibliography is given here; see fur-
ther the general index to these three volumes.

(F. A. Tanzel)
KEMAL PASHA-ŻADE

died (Ashikpashazade, ed. Giese, p. 197) and was buried in Istanbul; his turbe (no longer extant) formed the nucleus of a maqelle (O. L. Barkan and E. H. Ayverdi, *Istanbul vakfiysleri tarih ve defteri*, Istanbul 1970, 149), and Kemalpashazade set up a waqf in favour of its mosque (op. cit., no. 864).

Kemalpashazade's father Suleyman "Beg" and his wife, *Cebelit* (called by Kabûlî navî sîn-i navîstrân in the last of five kâdîsâfs, cf. Kuûfîyyûdâ, ed. I. H. Ertaylan, 206) is said to have been muhâfîz of Amasya and taqaddum of Tokat from 896/1492-5 until after 896/1492-3 (Amasya Tacrihi, iii, 230-2, 237-8); he was buried in his father's turbe at Istanbul (of his death is unknown). Kemalpashazade's mother was the sister of Ibûn Kûpeli, kâdîasker of Tokat from 879/1474-5 until after Abd al-Rahman Efendi, then *mîderris* at Edirne. 1. H. Ertaylan, *kasidas*, cf. Shafrûdî, *i*, 303-4; Turkish tr. Medjdîl, 215).

Kemalpashazade began his adult life as a sipahi; but upon noticing the respect paid to Molla Lutfi (*g.v.*), a relatively humble *mîderris* by prominent statesmen and soldiers, he decided to embrace the career of 'ulum (this incident, recorded by Taqaddumâzâde from Kemalpashazade himself, seems to have occurred in 897/1492, or perhaps even earlier). He began his studies under Molla Lutfi, at the Dar al-mîderris at Edirne. 1. H. Ertaylan, *kasidas*, cf. Tashkopruza, xcvi/22 (1968), 77-8 and cf. Him (*this incident, recorded by Tashkopruza*).

In 896/1492, or perhaps even earlier). He began his studies under Molla Lutfi, at the Dar al-mîderris at Edirne. 1. H. Ertaylan, *kasidas*, cf. Tashkopruza, xcvi/22 (1968), 77-8 and cf. Him (*this incident, recorded by Tashkopruza*).

Dakfîr al-frafîdîk, *Shafrîdî, i*, 303-4; Turkish tr. Medjdîl, 215). Of Tokat from 879/1474-5 until after Abd al-Rahman Efendi, then *mîderris* at Edirne. His first appointment, as *mîderris* at the medrese of 'Ali Beg in Edirne, was procured for him by Mû'eyyedzade at Edirne, he *kâdî-asker* of Anadolu (and probably an old acquaintance of his father at Amasya), on the same occasion recommended him to Bayezid II as the *mîderris* in the *medrese* of 'Ali Beg in Muharem 909/July 1503 (M. T. Gökbilgin, *Edirne, 479*). He then progressed through a number of *medreses* (Usküb, Edirne, one of the Şah *medreses* at Istanbul, the *medrese* of Bayezid II at Edirne).

Presumably while still *mîderris* at Edirne, he wrote a *risâla* (sometimes erroneously termed *fawâdîd* if *fî al-ramâwîdîd, demonstration against* 'Ali Makîn 'Isâîlî's to *fard* *ʿayn* (Atsz [see Bibl.], no. 84; Brockelmann, no. 478; text published by M. C. Şehabeddin Tekindag in *TD*, xvii/22 (1968), 77-8 and cf. 55); German summary in Elke Eberhard, *Ottoman historians*). In Cairo, for some unknown reason (? a protest at the execution of Tûman Bây), the irascible Selim dismissed him, but he re-appointed him a couple of weeks later (Rabîʿ I-II/April 1517; Ferîdûn, i, 454-89). According to a mediocre record by Selim (ii, 614-6; cf. Hammer-Purgstall, ii, 529-20), Kemalpashazade's influence with Selim was such that the dignitaries, bored with the long stay in Egypt, asked him to convey the hint that the troops wished to return home. In the course of this campaign he gave a ruling in favour of the orthodoxy of Ibn al-'Arabî (*g.v.*, at col. 708f) (Atsz, no. 85; Brockelmann, no. 478).

In 924/1518 he acted as *emin* for a land-survey (tâhri) of Karaman (Barkan, *Kansunlar*, 39; cf. N. and L. Beldiceanu, in *JESHO*, xi (1968), 7, 57). Upon being dismissed, or resigning, from the post of *kâdî-asker* (in 925/1519, according to Mjefîl, 387), he again became a *mûderris* at Edirne (Dâr al-badîth, then *medrese* of Bayezid II). Upon the death of "Zenbîlî" *Ali Efendi* (932/1526) he was appointed Shaykh al-İslâm, and held office until his death on 2 Shawwal 940/16 April 1534. He was buried in the *zâviye* of Mâmûd Cebeli, outside Edirne Kaplû.

Works. Kemalpashazade was a most prolific writer, in Turkish, Persian and Arabic, in the fields of history, belles-lettres, grammar, theology and law. Over 200 works (many of them, admittedly, short *risâlas*) are attributed to him. The most important are:

Turkish: (1) History of the Ottomans, begun in 908/1502-3 and composed originally in eight books (defter), one for each reign from 'Ogîmân to Bayezid II. All survive in manuscript except Book 5 (Meşêmmed I) and the first part of Book 6 (Mûrât II). Book 1 ("Ogîmân"). ed. Şerafettin Turan, Ankara (TTK) 1970; Book 7 (Mekemmed II, largely based on Nêşîrî and Tursun [q.v.], but containing important original data), ed. Ş. Turan in facsimile (from the autograph MS, Fatih 4205, see V. L. Ménage, in *BSOAS*, xxiii (1960), 205-64), Ankara 1954, and in transcription, Ankara 1957. Book 8 reaches to 916/1510. Later, Kemalpashazade was commissioned in 908/1502-3 [see Atsiz, no. 864]. Book 9 (Selm I) resumes the last years of Bayezid II's reign but reaches only to 920/1514 (the apparent date of completion, 19 Şârâr, is expressed, by a *muşâmmâ* in fractions, a literary conceit which appears to be Kemalpashazade's invention, see H. Ritter, in *Oriens*, i (1948), 237-47. (Two mss.—Hazine 1424, Revan 1277—sometimes referred to as a *Selîmname* of Kemalpashazade are in fact by Sa'dî b. 'Âbd al-Mu'tašîl; abridged German tr. by M. T. Speiser, Zürich 1946; see M. C. Şehabeddin Tekindag, in *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, i (1970), 217-8 and (incorrect) 208-10). Book 10, extending only to Suleymân's return from the Mohacz campaign in 933/1526, was for long regarded as a separate work (cf. Hammer-Purgstall, iii, p. vi) and was published, with French tr., by Pavet de Courteille as *Histoire de la campagne de Mohacz* by Kemal Pachazadeh, Paris 1859; that this text is the fragmentary Book 10 was shown by L. Forrer (*Id.*, xxvi (1942), 187; see also, with important data on the mss., Huseyn Yurdarûdî, in *Yâksîlar Dergisi*, iii (1956), 107-15). It appears that Book 10 was never given final shape (and that Book 9 was never completed). Various portions of the work also exist in mss. under a variety of titles. In spite of its importance, especially for the writer's own times (H. Inalcik has called him "the greatest of all Ottoman historians"), it was very little used by later chroniclers. For the mss. in European libraries: Babinger, 61 ff.; in Istanbul: *Istanbul kültüphaneleri tarih-coğrafya yazmaları katalogları*, ii/2, 1944, 120 ff., and Atsz, no. 1.

dedicated to İbrahim Paşa [q.v.], on the distinctions between apparent synonyms in Persian; to judge from the numerous mss., the work was widely read. Atsız no. 103, for Arabic mss. and printed texts and Persian trans.; anon. English trans. *The old man young again*, 2 vols., Paris 1898-9; and seepars. at col. 532b. However, Kâtip Celebi records (Kaşf, Flügel no. 5878 = Yaltkaya-Bilge, i, 853) that Kemâlpasha-zâde translated it, presumably from Arabic into Turkish, for Bayezid II, born 1389; the author is more probably Ahmed b. Yusuf al-Thâfi, d. 651/1253 (Brockelmann, I, 652; and see al-Tıfâğl).

There seems to be no foundation for the assumption that Abu 'l-Su'ûd [q.v.] was the pupil of Kemâlpasha-zâde. Their names are significantly linked, however, by 'Atâ'î (p. 185), in the statement that it was they who, as *mu'allim-i evvel* and *mu'allim-i hânî* of Süleyman I, succeeded (by their *iklâhîdâd*) in reconciling the *şarâ'a* and the *hânnâ*—an achievement sometimes attributed to Abu 'l-Su'ûd alone (see also Kâtip Celebi, Mi'ân al-âbâk, 116; Eng. tr. G. L. Lewis, 128). The extent of Kemâlpasha-zâde's discourse remains to be investigated (numerous MS collections of his *fatâwâs* survive: Atsız, no. 5; Brockelmann, no. 47). As regards other fields, however, his immense reputation rests rather on his industry and on the profundity and extent of his learning than on any originality of thought.


Works. The most recent attempt at a bibliographic is by [Ciftcioglu Nihat] Atsız, *Kemalpasha-zâde* (more than the 28 noted by Atsız) were printed in the *İkdam* series, Istanbul 1316. Facsimiles of ten of his works, Brockelmann: II, 243-5. One of his letters, to Siileyman I, is published in *Kemâl Paşa-zâde*, new series no. 10, 597-602 = nos. 1-124; II, 175-8; iii, 107-113. Atsız no. 26. (7) *an Arabic-Persian dictionary* (tafslr, hadith, etc.); but valuable as it is, it is based only on the manuscript collections of Istanbul, but so that it does not supersede Djamîl al-Âzîm, *Ubad al-dâwar*, Beirut 1326, 217 f. (214 titles, with some duplications) or, for the Arabic works, Brockelmann: II, 597-602 = nos. 1-124; II, 668-73 = nos. 125-70; S III, 1306 = nos. 171-9.

A number of his *risâlas* (more than the 28 noted by Atsız) were printed in the *İkdam* series, Istanbul 1316. Facsimiles of ten of his *fatâwâs* are given in *Tilimyye sähânesi*, Istanbul 1334, 346-54; one of his letters, to Suleyman I, is published by S. Turan, in *Taşrîk Zevâkân*, new series no. 217 (1958), 221-4. See also R. Brunschwig, *Kemâl Pâshâ-zâde* ve le persan, in *Mâlises ve H. Masât*, Tehran 1953, 46-84. (V. L. Ménage)

**KEMAL REİS** (d. 917/1511), a Turkish corsair and admiral in the time of Bayezid II (886-918/1481-1512), and uncle of the celebrated Pir Reis [q.v.]. Born in Gallipoli of a Turkish family originally from Karâman, he joined the campaign of Agiboz in 974/1470 under Mahmûd Paşa. Later he settled down in that island and was raised to the rank of corsair and admiral in the time of Bayezid II.
of 'azablar ağhâst. He gained great fame through his corsair activities in the western Mediterranean, so that in 900/1495 Bayezid II took him and his nephew Piri Re'Is into the Ottoman service at a salary of 20 ahtas per day. In the following year, he conveyed to Alexandria the income of the awdâv of Adana and Tarsus for the Holy Places of Arabia; on his return he was attacked by the Knights of Rhodes in the vicinity of the island, but defeated them (Kemâl Paşa-zâde, Ta'rikh-i Alî-i 'Othman, Ali Emiri, VIII. Deuter. No. 32, i. 76a). He took part in the İnebakhî (Aymabakhi) campaign in 902/1500 and commanded the two newly-built large battle ships (küke) which were among the Ottoman fleet at that battle under the supreme command of the Admiral or Küçük Dâwûd Pasha. Kemal Re'Is's duties in this battle were to prevent the Venetians giving support by sea, and thus assist the beylerbeyi of Rumeli, Kâğıtâş Mustafâ Paşa, who was besieging the fortress of İnebakhî by land. During the sea battle near the island of Sapienza on 19th Dhu 'l-Hididja 1499/28th July 1499, the Venetians, thinking that they were attacking Kemâl Re'Is, mistooked attacked Burak Re'Is's ship, which also had on board the sandjakbeyi of Yeğenheim, Kemal Bey; Burak Re'Is managed to set the enemy ships on fire with naphtha, though he himself and his ship perished. The island of Sapienza was later renamed Burak Re'Is's island. Kemal Re'Is meanwhile took a position near the coast and prevented the Venetian fleet from landing troops behind the Ottoman forces. In the following month he secured several further victories over the Venetians, and played a great role in the capture of İnebakhî and later of Modon, Koron and Navarino by the Ottomans; for his activities in these battles see Şafâî, Felek-nâme-yi İnebakhî ve Modon, Topkapı Sarayi Kutûphanesi, Revan 1931. He was busy with corsair activities in the western and central Mediterranean during the summer of 906-7/1501, and returned to Istanbul in the autumn of that year. Among the rich booty and prisoners taken was the Duke of Catanzaro, and for the ransom of this person 5,000 gold pieces were demanded (H. J. Kissling, Sultans Bayezid II.'s Bestenungen zu Markgraf Francesco II. von Gonasca, in Münchener Universitätsschriften, Reihen der Philosophischen Fakultät, Munich 1965, i; for the emended Italian translation, see Francesco II Gonasco ed il Sultano Bayezid II, in Archivio Storico Italiano, 1967, i, 34-68; Kissling, Betrachtungen über die Flottenpolitik Sultan Bayezids II 1451-1512, in Sacculum, xx/1, 35-43). It was probably after this success that his daily allowance was increased to 50 ahtas. (Kissling, Zur Tätigkeit des Kemal-Re'is im Westmittelmeer, in WZKM, lii (1968), 155. He died during a campaign in 917/1511 when his ship was caught in a storm and sank; by that time, his daily allowance was 100 ahtas (Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Arjivi, E. 4661). Notable is his introduction of long-range cannon for the ships of the Ottoman navy.


**KEMAL TAHIR (demiir), modern Turkish novelist (1910-1973). Born on 13 March 1910 in Istanbul, his father's family came originally from Aşar village of Şebinkarahisar (in north-eastern Anatolia), where most of their relatives still live. They were known as Demircioğulları, hence the family name Demir, which however Kemal Tahir never used in his writings. His father Tahir Efendi (d. 1957), a naval officer risen from the ranks, was an aide-de-camp to the Sultan (künkârâyâşı), and also worked in the carpentry shop of the Yıldız Palace (a privileged position, as cabinet-making was 'Abd al-Ḥamid II's great hobby). He married Nurüyye Khanım, a saraylı, a Circassian girl from Adanazarı brought in the Palace and attached to the Sultan's household. Tahir Efendi was retired from the navy as lieutenant following the Revolution of 1908, but was called up again during the Balkan War of 1912 and again at the outbreak of World War I. Wounded at the Dardanelles (1915), he served, behind the front, in various military hospitals in Anatolia until he was retired in 1918, when he settled in Istanbul in his brother's home and made his living working as a carpenter on construction projects. Kemal Tahir attended various primary schools following his movements, and continued his education in Istanbul. In 1923 he entered Galatasaray (the leading high school modelled on the French lyceé), but he had to give up his studies in 1926 when his mother died and he had to earn his own living. Between 1926 and 1927 he worked as a clerk in lawyers' offices and in other odd jobs and eventually settled in journalism, working in various newspapers and magazines as proof-reader, translator, secretary and editor. In 1937 he married İrfan Hanım, a teacher.

His interest in socialist ideas and literature and his close friendship with the famous left-wing poet Nazım Hikmet, brought him into conflict with the government during the rigorous conformist period of the single-party régime. He was accused, together with his friends, of spreading subversive ideas and inciting to mutiny in the Navy (through his brother Nuri, who was a naval N.C.O.) and was sentenced by a naval court to 15 years imprisonment (1938). He spent the first two years of his term in an Istanbul prison; then he was transferred with Nazım Hikmet and to Çankırı where they were held for 16 months more. In the meantime, he was divorced from his wife. Kemal Tahir spent the years 1941-50 in the prisons of Malatya, Çorum (five years) and Nevşehir until his release following the general amnesty of 1950. He settled in Istanbul in the summer of the same year. He brought with him the drafts and sketches of half a dozen novels and several thousands of pages of notes as materials for further works.

The first five years in Istanbul were a bitter struggle for survival. Under a dozen pseudonyms, Kemal Tahir busily produced or translated a great number of detective stories and adventure novels which were serialized in various popular dailies. Semiha Hanım, his second wife, contributed to the family budget by working as a dressmaker. Following the anti-Greek riots of September 1955, Kemal Tahir was arrested with a number of left-wing suspects, as the incident was thought to be in some quarters a communist conspiracy. He was released after six months' detention. The year 1955 is a turning point in his career, as it saw the publication of two of his books (see below). The same year he set up, together with the humorist writer Aziz Nesin, the publishing house Duşan. Kemal Tahir spent the remaining years of his life revising and publishing his sister's drafts and writing new novels and developing his controversial ideas and theories on historical, political,
literary and social problems. His health declined, and he died unexpectedly on 21 April 1973, leaving many incomplete works, particularly his pet project of a historical novel on the famous 15th century rebel Şeyh Bedr ed-Din.

Like most writers of his generation, Kemal Tahir started with poetry. His early experiments were published in Abdullah Cevdet’s İstihlak and were, characteristically, poems on social themes (Bardaki Kadınlar, “Women at the Tavern”, No. 318, April 1932; Açıq Türküst, “The song of the Hungry”, No. 320, May 1931, etc.). These were followed in the early 1930s by poems of symbolist inspiration (then very popular) in the avant-garde literary review Varış. Later, under Nazım Hikmet’s influence, he returned to social themes and wrote poems in free verse which he published under the pseudonyms of Cemalettin Mahir and Ismail Kemalettin in the review Sür (1938-9).

In the meantime, he had been contributing popular short stories and novels to the weekly Yedi Gün (1935-40). But his short stories, which revealed his talent, were written in 1940 and serialised in the daily Tan in 1941 under the pseudonym Cemalettin Mahir (first edition in book form under his own name: Göl İnsanları, Istanbul 1955). These are powerful sketches of the life of peasants and working class people.

Kemal Tahir never returned to the short story, and he serialised his first novel Sağrtdere (under the pseudonym Körüdman) in 1950 (published in book form under his own name in 1955). In this first novel, he describes the everyday life, customs and manners of peasants in their own surroundings (a Central Anatolian village near Corum) and in the city where they come to find work. This is a forerunner of his series of village novels and opens an important phase in the Turkish “peasant literature”, which began to gather momentum in the 1930s. Then followed his Eski Şehrin İnsanları (“People of the Captive City”), which was serialised in the Istanbul daily Yeni Istanbul in 1952-3 and published in 1956. This work opens the series of “period novels” in Kemal Tahir’s career. It is the story of the occupation in 1920-2 and of the bitter struggle between the supporters of the Anatolian Nationalists and the men of the Sultan’s government subservient to the occupying powers. The untypical hero of the novel is a young diplomat, Kâmıl Bey, the son of a wealthy Hamidian Pasha, who has spent most of his life in Europe and who, on his return to Istanbul becomes a müllügi, a supporter of the Nationalist cause, to the indignation of his wife who typifies the collaborationist, wealthy “society” women. The hero is in strong contrast with the type of “Westernising snob” frequently ridiculed by many earlier Turkish novelists, e.g. Huseyin Rahmi.

From 1956 until his death, Kemal Tahir produced a dozen novels in these two categories. Outstanding among them are: Rahmet Yolları Kesti, (“The Rain Blocked the Roads”, 1957), written in answer to Yaşar Kemal’s best-seller İnce Memed (1955, Engl. tr. Memed My Hawk, 1961) where the brigand-hero is idealised, whereas Kemal Tahir tries to kill by ridicule the romantic-epic conception of brigands and rejects the idea that “these former deserters and criminals” can lead popular movements or can be real friends of the oppressed; and Yorgun Savaşı (“The Tired Warrior”, 1965), perhaps his best novel. It is, in a way, the epic of the generation of the officers who, after the restoration of the Constitution in 1908, went through a series of ordeals: the War in Tripoli with Italy, 1911; the Balkan Wars, 1912-13; and World War I, culminating in the collapse of the Empire, the Greek invasion of Western Anatolia and the occupation of Istanbul by the Allies. The novel tells the story how some of these “tired warriors” rushed to Anatolia to form the nucleus of resistance and fought desperately until Mustafa Kemal’s organised movement, which gradually became the master of the situation, took over. Derel Aya (“Mother State”, 1967) is a historical novel which caused much controversy in the press. It explores the circumstances which, in the late 13th century, led to the birth of the Ottoman State between the declining Byzantium and the disintegrating Seljuk power. “The generous and just State” realized by the early Ottomans, “towards which Muslims and Christians alike flocked to seek security and welfare”, as described in the early Ottoman chronicles, is the basis of the author’s “Ottomanist” thesis. This version of “Ottoman revivalism” which he pioneered in literature, rejects everything alien and imposed on the Turkish culture and maintains that the secret of a regeneration is to be found in the “perfect” Ottoman system. In this novel, Kemal Tahir experimented, with unequal success, with a style which is mainly inspired by that of the 15th century chronicles and religious-epic folk stories. In other novels, important issues or episodes of contemporary Turkish history are discussed elaborately, with an approach which is usually different from the received or current versions. The village Institutes, an attempt to realize mass education of the peasantry (Bozkırda Cehirdeh, “The Seed in the Steppe”, 1969); the 1926 Unionist conspiracy against Mustafa Kemal (Kurt Kanunu, “Wolverine Law”, 1969); the short-lived Liberal Party (Serbest Fırka) experiment of 1930 (Yol Ayrımı, “Cross-Roads”, 1971); etc.

Kemal Tahir kept alive the interest and curiosity of his reading public by constantly dwelling on subjects and personalities which have always been a centre of heated controversy: East versus West, tradition versus innovation, the value of the Islamic and Ottoman heritage, for Modern Turkey; responsibility for military, political and economic setbacks and cultural stagnation since the Tanzimat; 'Abd al-Hamid II and his policies; the Unionist leaders and the real nature of their party; and lastly, Atatürk, his companions, his reforms and the Republican era which he inaugurated.

Kemal Tahir’s approach to all these matters is rather emotional and biased. His admiration for 'Abd al-Hamid II (already rehabilitated by some modern historians) and his reign, and his lack of enthusiasm for the 19th century reformers, for the Young Turks, and particularly for Atatürk, may perhaps be partly explained by his family background and his personal experiences. He never lived in Anatolia for any length of time, and his observations of peasantry are limited to his long years of association with the inmates of Central Anatolian prisons. His subjects of study were, by necessity, offenders of various types: bandits, murderers, thieves, forgers, sexual criminals, etc. This circumstance was bound to condition him when he judged and made generalisations on the way of life, problems and moral values of peasants and conditions in villages.

Kemal Tahir’s language and style differ considerably from his contemporaries. His peasants do not speak a local dialect, as is the case with most “village novelists”. Also, he almost ignores the language reform movement and avoids, most of the time, the
use of neologisms and prefers a "moderate" style close to that of the preceding generation. On the other hand, he has a repertory of colloquial or slang words and expressions, and his pet pseudo-archaic forms, which he likes to use indiscriminately on all occasions, and his many diverse characters have often disturbingly identical speech habits. In his novels the plot is often a pretext to put forward his ideas, and in every novel there are one or two characters who use every occasion to defend, at length, the author's familiar themes. Many of his novels consist consequently of loosely connected political arguments or didactic tales.

There can be no doubt, however, that Kemal Tahir ranks among the leading and most remarkable writers of modern Turkish, a writer who invited his readers to re-think on vital issues of Turkish political and cultural life, who experimented in the use of elements of classical and popular Turkish prose, thought to be dead wood by many, and who left two or three novels which will always be considered among the best of his time.

**Bibliography:** Tahir Alangui, Cumhuriyetten sonra hikaye ve roman iïi, Istanbul 1965; Bechet Necatiij, Edebiyatsmda isimler sozligi, Istanbul 1972; Idem, Edebiyatsmda eserler sozligi, Istanbul 1971 (critical summaries of some of Kemal Tahir's works, see index); Fahir Iz, in Cassell's *encyclopedia of world literature* ii, London 1973, s.v.; Memet Seydija (ed.), *Turk roman*, (an open forum on Tahir and Deslet ana), Istanbul 1969; Aytekin Yakar, *Turk romaninda mili mica-dede*, Istanbul 1973: *Turkije deijeri*, no. 6, April 1974 (a special issue on Tahir: important biographical and critical notes by a number of writers); Hulusi Dosdoğru, *Batu aldamacaligi ve pullara karsi Kemal Tahir*, Istanbul 1974 (with selections from his novels).

**KEMALÍYYE.** [see edin]

**KEMÁNESE,** ["Archer"], *Ali Pasha*, Ottoman Grand Vizier. Born in the district of Hamid-ili in Anatolia, he came to Istanbul and was trained in the palace service from which he emerged with an appointment as vezir beylerbeyi of Diyar Bakr with the rank of vizier, probably in 1029/1620. Difficulties arising over his executing a well-known provincial official without reference to Istanbul caused his transfer to the governorship of Bagdad, where he remained for about a year before being dismissed and retiring to the vicinity of Kaysariyya. Returning to Istanbul following the death of Othman II (Radjab 1031/May 1622), he was made a lesser (either fourth or third) vizier and subsequently replaced the Grand Vizier Mere Husayn Pasha, who was turned out of office in Dhu'l Ka'da 1032/August 1623.

Though there were serious problems in various parts of the empire during *Ali Pasha's* vizirate (the rebellion of Abaza Mehmmed Pasha [q.v.] continued in Anatolia, for example, and Bagdad fell to the Safawid ruler Shah 'Abbas II), he appears to have concerned himself mainly with affairs in Istanbul. He played a leading role in the second deposition of the incompetent sultan Mustafa I (Dhu'l Ka'da 1033/November 1623), but otherwise chiefly remained in the sources for his attempts to secure his position, building a sizeable fortune through such means as bribery and the sale of offices and attempting to undermine those whom he felt to threaten him. With the encouragement of his father-in-law, the high-ranking scholar Bostan-zade Mehmmed Efendi, he succeeded in bringing about the dismissal of the Şâykh al-Islâm Zekeriyya-zade Yabây Efendi, who had offended him by alluding in conversation to his susceptibility to bribery; he was unable, however, to obtain that post for his father-in-law, an aim which, had it been achieved, might have resulted in a dangerous concentration of power. He was less successful in his moves against two former Grand Viziers, Gurdjii Mehmmed Pasha and Khalil Pasha: having arrested them on the pretext of supposed subversive letters to Abaza Pasha, he refused to produce the letters for inspection when challenged and the two men were set free. The immediate cause for his dismissal and execution on 14 Dümâdâ II 1033/3 April 1624 is said to have been his attempt to conceal from Murad IV the news of the fall of Bagdad. His considerable possessions were confiscated and his body buried in the grounds of the 'Atik 'Ali Pasha Mosque in Istanbul.


**KENA.** [see KUNA]

**KENÁN PASHA,** also nicknamed Sarî ("pale-faced") and Topal ("Lame"), High Admiral (Kapudân Pasha, [q.v.]) under the Ottoman Sultan Mehemmed IV, d. 1669/1670. He originated from the northeastern shores of the Black Sea (Russian or Circassian?) and came as a slave into the service of Bâktrdi Ahmmed Pasha, Ottoman governor of Egypt. On the latter's execution he was taken by Sultan Murad IV into the Palace and educated there. He was promoted to be Agha of the stirrup-holders (Rikâb-dân aghasî) (Chronicle of Wadjhî, f. 97b of the Vienna MS.), became a favourite of Sultan İbrahim after his accession (1049/1640) and married his daughter 'Atike Sultan. He was at the same time appointed third vizier but banished soon after İbrahim's death 1058/1648) to Crete. In Shawwal 1062/Sep. 1652, he returned to Istanbul and was appointed to the charge of the defences of the Dardanelles. In Shawwal 1063/Sept. 1653, he was given the governorship of Ofen, but deprived of it in Dhu'l Ka'da 1065/Sept. 1655, and in Rabî' II 1066/Feb. 1656, appointed governor of Silistria. On 9 Radjab 1066/May 1656 he was appointed Grand Admiral. On 5 Ramadân 1066/26 June 1656, while in command of the Ottoman fleet sent out against the Venetians, he suffered a severe defeat in the Dardanelles, the greatest naval reverse inflicted on Turkey since the battle of Lepanto; the Venetians then occupied the islands commanding the Dardanelles and thus severed links with the Mediterranean for the Turks (cf. Kâtib Celebi, *Tuhfet al-bikâr fu asÂfâr al-bikâr*, Istanbul 1329, 133-4; Na'imâ, *Ta'rikh*, vi, 183-5; Von Hammer, *GOR*, v, 649 ff.). The whole weight of the Sultan's wrath fell upon Kenân Pasha who was immediately thrown into prison. He was finally released on the intercession of his Russian countrywoman, the Sultanâ-mother (Kösem Wâlide; [q.v.]) but was discharged from the office of Grand Admiral almost immediately on 26 Ramadân 1066/18 July 1656. Two years later he was appointed *Kâhid-malâm* of the imperial stirrup (rikâb-i kumâyân) but the very next month dismissed again and sent to Bursa as commander
of the garrison (muhdfi?) to protect the city against the rebel Abáza Hasan's possible attack (Nâ'îmâ, Ta’rîkhî, ii, 660; Von Hammer, GÖR, vi, 32). But he then left Bursa to join the rebel leader in Anatolia, possibly out of jealousy towards the Grand Vizier Köprüli Mehmed Pâsha. However, he shared the fate of Abáza Hasan and other rebel leaders, and was executed at Aleppo on 23rd Dhu‘dâd 1 i. 1659 (cf. Nâ’îmâ, ii, 685). His head was shortly afterwards brought to the Divânî in Istanbul and eventually buried at Qâshâdar. If this is the Kenân Pasha mentioned by Ewliyâ Çelebi, Siyâhat-nâma, iii, 366 (and he certainly never was governor of Oczakov any more than was Kudîa Kenân Pasha (d. 1602/1651) who is also often confused with the Grand Admiral, e.g. in the Sigîl-i ‘Othmânî, iv, 83), he was also an author and composed a Sâlih-nâma in honour of Shaîr Sâlih Baba (q.v.). His own warlike exploits, especially his military operations in the years 1636-8/1662-8 were celebrated in a rhymed Pasha-nâma by the poet and judge Tûlû‘î İbrahim Efendi (of Kalkandelen) of which there is a copy in the British Museum (Sloane MS. 3584); cf. Ch. Rieu, Catalogue of the Turkish MSS, 1911, with detailed summary of contents. The possibility that it celebrates the above-mentioned Kenân Pasha who had a very similar career to his namesake and contemporary (both were, for example, governors of Ofen), has always to be remembered. The biographical data regarding Shaîr Kenân Pasha are much confused, as the article in Râmîz Paşahâzâde Mehmed, Khaṣrî-i Kapudânîn-i Deryâ, Istanbul 1285, 63-6, and Şâmî Bey Fârsî, Kâmisâ-al-A‘lam, 3900, who follows it, show. According to this authority, Kenân Pasha was buried beside the school not far from Kirklê Çene. Bibliography: Siyâhadîr, Ta’rîkhî, Istanbul 1928, i, 123, 137, 155; Wedjîlî, Ta’rîkhî, Istanbul University Library, T.Y. no. 2543, ff. 317, 49b; ‘Abdî Paşha, Wehbâyi-nâma, Istanbul University Library, T.Y. no. 4140, ff. 30a-44b; Karâ Celebîzâde, Dhâyî-i raşdîl al-abîrîn, Istanbul University Library, T.Y. no. 1550, ff. 125a-183b; Mehmed Hâfiz Kâfifât-ı evvel, ed. I. Parmaksızoglu; Sigîl-i ‘Othmânî, iv, 83; Von Hammer, GÖR, x, 497; Münir Aktepe, in IA, s.v.

(F. Babinger - [N. Göyönc])

KENYA [see KUNA]

KENYA, a state of East Africa bounded on the east by the Indian Ocean, on the north by Ethiopia and the Sudan, and in the south by Tanzania. It was formerly a colony of the British Empire, but became independent in December 1963. The Muslim population in the country formed about 6% of a total figure of 8,636,263 in 1962. Assuming that the number increased annually by the present rate of 3.4%, the Muslim population would number some 800,000 out of a total population of 10,942,705 in 1974. The Muslims themselves generally feel that their numbers have been underestimated. A claim that they represent a quarter of the population has been advanced, although no special census has been made to determine the actual number of Muslims in the country. The Muslim communities in Kenya today comprise various races and tribes, together with all the major sects of Islam, with a definite predominance of the Shi‘î madhhab. A tribe like the Pokomo is 85% Muslim, whereas the Duruma is 25% only.

In the pre-Islamic period, the Kenya coastlands were visited by merchants from southwestern Arabia [see YAMAN, ZANDI], and some Arabs settled there. But it is difficult to fix a date for the earliest arrival and settlement of Muslims on the coast. Local traditions and chronicles of recent origin speak of Muslim settlement going back to the caliphate of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭâb, but no reliable evidence, archaeological or other, has been advanced to support such claims. During some four centuries, between Ptolemy's Geography and the first Arabic sources, there are no reliable data on the coast. The first Arabic source is al-Mas‘ûdî, who relates in the 4th/10th century that the island of Kanbalû (taken to be Pemba or Zanzibar) was ruled by a Muslim family and that its population consisted of Muslims and non-Muslims. Excavations recently carried out at a site on Manda island indicate that a thriving town existed there by that time. "Some of the buildings were of coral stone set in mortar, though many were of mud and wattle, masonry walls built against the sea are of very large coral blocks, many weighing over a ton—a massive form of construction found nowhere else in Sub-Saharan Africa" (Neville Chittick, Zamani). The excavation unearthed vast quantities of Islamic pottery and some shards of Chinese porcelain which indicate direct contact with other Islamic regions. The contacts with China were probably only through intermediaries. By the 4th/10th century, commercial relations were being pursued not only with South Arabia, but also with the Persian Gulf. Immigrants from Persia, known as the Banâdîr, also seem to have come to settle on the Somali coastal towns. They intermarried with autochthonous Bantu-speaking groups and thus contributed to the foundation of Mogadishu which, by the 7th/13th century, had developed into the most important Muslim town on the western coast. Many of these Shîrâzîs, as the Persian-African families became known, later moved south and settled at such places in Kenya as Shanga and Manda and became part of the ruling families in Malindi, Mombasa and Vumba Kuu. On Pate (Patta) island, an Arab family from ‘Umân, the Nabhânî, formed a ruling dynasty through a similar process of integration. The sultanate of Shanga Kuu, on the southern coast, was the result of Shîrâzî settlement and intermarriage between these Muslims and local Africans. In the 12th/18th century, an Arab family of Shâriîs from Hadramawt, the Bâ ‘Alawi, established a dynasty which adopted the title of Divânî for the ruler, but maintained the custom of giving him a Bantu nickname—a symbol of cultural exchange and synthesis, which was also reflected in the investiture ceremonies of the Divânî, which included Bantu and Muslim rites. The Nabhânî rulers of Pate also adopted a Bantu throne-name, Fumo (*spear*).

Such ethnic and culture integration renders inaccurate the description of these city-states as "Arab colonies". Their dominant feature was not their Arab nature but Islam, and they have been compared with some of the western Sudanese Muslim states.

Between the 7th/13th and 10th/16th centuries, up to the arrival of the Portuguese, the Muslim city-states enjoyed their greatest days of cultural and material efflorescence. They were largely independent of one another, the so-called Zanjî empire being a myth; they quarrelled and fought one another many times (Mombasa's and Malindi's enmity towards each other became proverbial), but there was a great deal of commercial and cultural interdependence among them. At this time towns produced an abundance of sorghum, millet, rice and bananas,
largely for their own use, but obtained their wealth from ivory, ambergris, gold and slaves. Gold came from the Sofala region in Mozambique, and was largely responsible for the comparative greatness reached by Kilwa [q.v.] and possibly for the Banadir emigration to the South. In return for their exports, the Muslims of the coast imported household utensils and wares. As their wealth increased, Islamic goods were augmented by greater quantities of Chinese wares indirectly acquired, probably from Cambay in India [see KHAMBARAYAT]. Also from India came glass beads that were used for barter locally. Silver was imported by the wealthy. Some towns had local industries: Pate was known for its production of fine gaily-coloured woven fabrics. In short, when the Portuguese arrived they were astonished by the urban material culture and civilisation of the “Moors” they encountered.

Their exploitation of the Muslim rulers of Mombasa, Kilwa and other city-states was part of their policy to out-flank Islam. Mombasa was burnt down at least twice. The two-centuries long episode of this Portuguese presence certainly contributed to the economic decline and cultural stagnation of the Muslim city-states, although it was by no means the only factor. Disruptive human movements on the mainland, such as that of the Galli, were also a noteworthy factor, as was the general decline of the centres of Islam during the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries.

Mombasa’s Muslims had appealed to the Imam of ‘Umân for help to overthrow their Portuguese oppressors. Their call was answered, although the liberation took some decades to be achieved. By the third decade of the 16th century, the Portuguese had been driven south of the Ruvuma. Their presence on the coast, Islam had remained triumphant, and although there are references in Portuguese sources to some local people becoming Christian, none survived the Portuguese expulsion. Christianity had to be sown anew on the coast from the middle of the 19th century onwards.

The Portuguese were succeeded by ‘Umân Arabs as nominal overlords of the coast, the local chiefs and sheikhs enjoying a great deal of local authority. These ‘Umân Arabs belonged to the Ibadîyya sect [q.v.]. However, by the time of their arrival the coast had evolved as a predominantly Shâfi‘i region. This may be ascribed to the influence of Haḍramî sayyids or sharîfs who had settled on the coast in large numbers during the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries. Through intermarriage with Africans, these sharîfs and their descendants came to determine not only the madhhab of East African Islam but also greatly influenced Swahili literature and culture generally. The legacy of this Haḍramî Arab settlement and scholarship is to be seen in the methods of teaching Islam, the religious manuscripts, the cult of saints, the veneration for sharifs, the poetic verse form and content of the Swahili epic or utenzi, etc. The Lamu archipelago, Zanzibar and the Comoro islands, became the main centres from which radiated the influence of the sharîfi families. A notable religious intelligentsia developed on the coast which became, and remained, the point of reference for the whole of East African Islam. By the 19th century, cultural traffic linked South Arabia to the Banâdir, to the coast southwards up to Mozambique, and to the offshore islands: the Lamu Archipelago, Zanzibar, Peînba, Mâfia and the Comoro islands. Haḍramî towns like ‘Inâšt and Tarîm, Mecca and Medina, sometimes Cairo and occasionally ıṣṭanbul, helped to mould the minds of East African Muslim scholars. Students from the East African towns travelled to Kilwa, Haḍramawt, and sometimes Egypt, to study under renowned scholars. The acquisition of an idqâda from one of these scholars established its recipient as a teacher in a mosque or in his own home, in the Arabic language, Kur’ânic exegesis, hadith, Sharî‘a, etc. From this educational system there developed a strong body of ‘ulamâ‘, from amongst whom the Bâ Sa‘îd rulers appointed their kâdîs. Some of the most outstanding names among these ‘ulamâ‘ for the latter part of the 19th and early part of the 20th centuries, are Sayyid Ahmad b. ‘Umây and his son ‘Umar; Shaykh ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Ma‘zûrî and his son al-Amîn; Shaykh ‘Abd Allâh b. Muhammad Bâ Kâchîr, Sayyid Abû Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Husayni, the great Lamu scholar, better known as Sayyid Manşâb, and Sayyid ‘Abd al-Rahmân bin Ahmad, the first Chief Kâdî or Shaykh al-Islâm to be appointed in Kenya in 1897.

In addition to them there were and still are the Kur’ân teachers (Wa‘îlimu, sing. Muwâlimu) and schools that abounded and still abound in every Muslim town and village. In the Kur’ânic school, the Muslim child learnt to recite the Kur’ân, and to write in Arabic characters, but rarely to write in that language. Overwhelming dependency on such a school led to the emergence of generations of coastal Muslims who were Ki-Swahili rather than Arabic-speaking. During his visit to the coast, Ibn Batţûtâ noted this trend, as the result of absorption and integration of Arabs within an African society. Ki-Swahili developed quite early as the lingua franca, though it relied heavily upon Arabic vocabulary. Arabic and Arabic culture enriched Ki-Swahili and enabled it to develop a significant literary tradition, sc. in the verse epic known as utenzi or utenzi [see SWAHILI]. The most famous of such didactic epics is al-Inkîshâfî, written ca. 1800 by Sayyid ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Ali b. Nâşîr, which uses the decline of Pate as a moral to emphasise the transitoriness of material wealth and enjoins its readers to lead a virtuous life rather than accumulative and real.

The ruins still standing in Pate, now a mere village, testify to a time of great prosperity. But this prosperity came much later than the local traditional source, the Chronicle of Pate, has indicated. N. Chittick’s re-appraisal of the Chronicle, in the light of archaeological work done by himself in the area, shows that the town was of a modest size before 700 to 1300, developing very gradually and not achieving its greatest period of efflorescence until the 12th/13th century. This is attested by the rich deposits of Chinese porcelain discovered from the 10th/16th century levels upwards. On the strength of these archaeological discoveries, Pate has been ranked with Kilwa in Tanzania as two of the three most prominent towns of Muslim civilization south of Somaliland, the third being Lamu. It achieved prosperity and strength during the reign of the Bâtîwâ dynasty, which had acquired power through intermarriage with the indigenous Wasania, a hunter-gatherer group from whom the Muslims had been purchasing ivory on the mainland, and during the reign of the subsequent dynasty, the Nabhânis, its days of prosperity lasted well into the 12th/13th century.

The dates of the birth and death of Sayyid ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Ali, the author of al-Inkîshâfî are deduced, rather than factually known, from the internal evidence of the poem and from the inscription on the
tomb of his uncle, Talib b. Nasir, who died in 1169/1755. Thus it is assumed that the poet was a youth by then and may have witnessed not only some of the glories of the mansions and life of Paté, but also evidence of the internecine fighting that contributed to its decline. It was subed first by the Mazrū’i rulers of Mombasa and later by the Bu Sa’idis sultans of Zanzibar. By the time the poem was written Paté had fallen into ruin (see W. Hichens, Sayyid Abd Allah al-‘Ali b. Nasir). The Ki-Swahili verses amply evoke a life of great luxury, when at least the ruling classes were familiar with porcelain wares and when furnishings were made from silk and brocade.

Another outstanding example of Ḥadrami contribution to Swahili religious culture is Sayyid ʿAbd Allāh. He was a descendant of the venerated Sayyid Abū Bakr b. Sālim, the 12th/17th century ġarif of Hadramawt, renowned for his erudition, piety and poetry. According to the Pate Chronicle, the people of the town appealed to him to pray for their deliverance from their enemies. It is not certain whether these enemies were the Portuguese or the Galla. In any event, descendants of his two sons ‘Ali and Husayn, settled on the coast and provided some of its most notable figures in the field of theology and literature. Sayyid ʿAbd Allāh was the son of ʿAli, a great-great-grandson; from Husayn’s line came Sayyid Manṣḥ (1828-1922), the renowned jurist of Lamu.

From the Lamu archipelago the poetic tradition spread south and ventured into new fields of comment. By the 19th century, a poet like Muyāka b. Ḥadīdī at-Ḥassānī of Mombasa was writing romantic poetry and patriotic verses in defence of Mombasa’s independence, then under the rule of the Mazrū’i dynasty, and against ʿUmānī attempts to impose their overlordship upon Mombasa and other towns on the coast. All those who appreciated this Ki-Swahili literary efflorescence became wenseyji “those who belonged” and waṣṣararabu (from Ar. isaʿaraḥa “the civilised ones”). These wenseyji differentiated themselves somewhat from the recent immigrants from Hadramawt or ʿUmān who, until they had integrated themselves, were considered alien to this local Muslim culture of the Swahili-speaking people of the coastal towns.

There is little evidence that this Swahili Muslim culture penetrated far beyond the littoral before the 19th century. However, there is evidence of some form of “diplomatic”, commercial, and religious interaction with some African tribes in the immediate neighbourhood, notably the Miji Kenda groups: the Digo to the South of Mombasa, the Rabai, Ribe and Duruma to the west, the Girama in the Malindi area, the Kambe, Chonyi, Kawna and Jibana, and the Segeju on the Kenyan-Tanzanian border. Before the 19th century expansion inland, a significant degree of intermarriage took place between the coastal Muslims and these groups. Duruma and Rabai acted as middlemen for goods exchanged between the Arab-Swahili people and interior peoples like the Kamba; diplomatic-cum-military “pacts” were made between groups of Miji Kenda people and coastal townspeople. The Segeju helped Malindi not only to ward off the danger from the mysterious cannibalistic Zimba, who literally ate their way northwards, but also to take Mombasa in 1552; African auxiliaries fought on Mombasa’s side against Malindi. The so-called Nyika “people of the bush”, or a section of them, helped in finally expelling the Portuguese from Mombasa in 1728 and in the restoration of Mazrū’i rule in 1746 during the struggle for supremacy between the Mazrū’i and the Bu Sa’idis; installation ceremonies of Mazrū’i governors (ṣāḥibin), were attended by neighbouring African notables. After the defeat of the Mazrū’i of Mombasa, their Bu Sa’idis successors not only recognised the autonomous political status of the longer-established Muslim groups known as the Ḥanafī-ṣaḥara ṣāḥibin, the so-called Twelve Tribes, but also acknowledged the long-established “pacts” that had been established between these various ṣāḥibin and neighbouring African groups, whereby the former acted as “agents” for the latter in relations with others. The vestiges of these bilateral relations lasted well into the early years of colonial rule.

To the south of Mombasa, in the area between Gasi and the northern areas of present-day Tanzania, a similar pattern of relationships developed between the Digo and the Segeju on the one hand and the leading Muslim families on the other, except that the politico-military relationships were reinforced by a significant religious impact. The Bā-ʿAlawi ġarift families in this area, centred upon the Diwānship of Vumba Kuu, were responsible for the Islamisation of the Digo and the Segeju. The Segeju had become wholly Islamised and the Digo on the coast had virtually all become Muslims by the time colonial rule arrived.

Islam expanded into the interior of Kenya or the rest of East Africa only in the 19th century, particularly after the Bu Sa’id’s ruler of ʿUmān, Sayyid Sa’id b. Sulṭān, decided to move his capital to Zanzibar. He attracted a large number of compatriots, Indians, Ḥadramis and Balūcīs, to serve in his garrisons, custom-houses, and civil administration. Others came to exploit the economic and commercial potentialities of these newly-acquired tropical dominions of ʿUmān. By this time, trade in ivory, rhinoceros horns and other inland products as well as slaves had already proved lucrative. Under Sa’id this trade was now promoted to unprecedented heights. Caravans, financed by Indian credit, which was shrewdly wooed by Sa’id, moved into the interior with goods such as cloth, beads, knives, axes, etc., to exchange for the inland products traditionally cited. The slaves were not only exported, but used in large numbers to found a plantation system in Zanzibar and on the mainland coast; Malindi in Kenya is a unique example which demonstrates the success of this agrarian industry. As late as 1846, it had been found “deserted and ruined” by the Christian missionary J. L. Krapf as a result of Galla raids. It was Arab settlement and agrarian development that revived it. By the 1870s, vast acres of land around the town had come under cultivation of maize, millet and fruit of various kinds, and it was described as the granary of the coast and to some extent of Arabia through a thriving export trade.

The indigenous ʿAlawi Arab-Swahili Muslims were now reinforced by Indian Muslims, among whom the Ḥodja or ʿAlawi Nizārī Ismāʿīllis, the Mustaʿlian Ismāʿīllis (Bohorās) and the Ḥanafī Memons predominated. An 1875 census of the Indian population reveals that there were more Indian Muslims than Indian non-Muslims on the coast, particularly Ismāʿīllis. In Kenya they were to be found in Mombasa, Malindi and Lamu, either as agents of firms having headquarters in Zanzibar, or as wholesale or retail merchants. Unlike the Hindus, the Indian Muslims generally arrived with their families and showed readiness to settle down on the island and coast ruled by a fellow-Muslim.

However, from the outset they maintained a cer-
tain degree of social and religious aloofness. They began to build exclusive quarters, sectarian mosques and independent religious organisations, in fact forms of internal government or autonomy which were acknowledged or tolerated by the Sultan of Zanzibar as well as by the colonial government thereafter. Thus the Ismailis looked and still look upon the person of the Aga Khan as their spiritual and administrative head. Locally they appointed mukhsis to care for socio-economic affairs. Later, at the turn of the century, a council was formed at Zanzibar to supervise the local mosque (djamati Khana) and the congregations (djamats) on the mainland, when a split arose within the Ismaili community (1880-1910); secessionists protested against the Aga Khan's claims to divinity and what was considered to be his excessive control over the local mosque. Later, Zanzibar lost this overall control as the community spread on the mainland and into the interior, and provincial councils were created to look after the spiritual affairs and general welfare of the community in various parts of East Africa.

The Bohorás [q.v.] formed and still form the second largest Asian Muslim community. The Bohorás who migrated to the East African coast belonged and still belong to the Dā'ī faction. By 1875 there were 54 Bohoras (as compared to 2725 Khodja Ismailis and 116 Memons) at different places in Zanzibar and on the coast. As the supreme spiritual and administrative head of the Bohorás, al-dā'ī al-mutlak appointed representatives to attend to the welfare of his followers. Officials bearing the rank of āmil, agent, were sent to Zanzibar and Mombasa towards the end of the 19th century. The āmil, also known as mīyān, looked after every Bohora congregation of 50 families. He dealt with religious, social and economic problems. His permission was and is essential for every religious ceremony. Among the most important duties, he performed the collection of dues for the Summoner, the administering of the covenant (mīthāk) to the followers; and the instruction in religion and religious history through sermons. It was not until the 1920s that congregational or djamati councils were formed by the Bohorás to look after their secular affairs.

The earliest Ithna-asharis, or Twelvers, arrived on the coast late in the 19th century during the split that occurred among the Ismaili Khodjas, late in the 19th century, over the claims of divinity by the Aga Khan. Many Nizāri Ismailis are said to have defected to the Twelvers. Like the other two Shi'ī sects, they organised themselves into djamati or congregations, each with its own council. In place of a dā'ī, the Ithna-asharis have muttahids, the most scholarly among whom was appointed usma, the interpreter of the faith to the community. No muttahid was appointed to East Africa. Instead, low-ranking mullas performed religious functions within the djamatis. Prayers were performed in the communal mosque whilst sermons, festivals and feasts were held in the Imamād-hā [q.v.].

The first Ithna-asharis were known to have moved to Zanzibar in 1806. By the last quarter of the 19th century, the Muslim population of Kenya had begun to be variegated in a sectarian and ethnic way.

By that time, too, nuclei of Muslims had been created in the interior. It has often been observed how important the caravan trade and trade routes have been in the spread of Islam from early times in different parts of Africa. In Kenya, and East Africa generally, this phenomenon took place particularly during the second half of the 19th century. Until the 1850s trade movements had mostly been from the interior to the Muslim coast. Ivory in particular was brought down to the coast and sold to the Arabs and the Swahili by the Kamba, at first through Duruma and Giriama middlemen, later directly. Gradually, this virtual monopoly of the Kamba was broken. Arabs and Swahili began to move inland significantly after 1860, in order to acquire trade goods directed from inland African peoples. This trade by now had come to include the slave trade, although Kenya was not as affected by it as other slave trading areas in Tanzania. In Kenya slaves were secondary to ivory, cattle, rhinoceros horns and other goods.

The Arabs and Swahili in Kenya were not able to establish bases as important and permanent as their counterparts did at Tabora and Ujiji in Tanzania. (The Maasai plains were never entirely free from danger to permit that.) The Kikuyu only grudgingly permitted some trade on the edges of their country; on the whole, they discouraged close ties with the coastal Muslims. Trade was more successful with western Kenyan peoples, among whom a network of caravan routes was gradually spun. Although not as substantive and lucrative as the trade in Tanzania and Congo, it was of some importance. The Arab-Swahili penetration was dependent upon a series of stop-overs that were chosen for the friendliness of their inhabitants and the security of their goods.

Through these trade connections, nuclei of Muslim traders and Muslim influence were implanted in the interior of Kenya within the body politic of small chieftaincies. Many of these traders passed also as men of medicine, of a novel kind with which the African of the interior was not familiar. The new magico-medical powers, the weapons they used and the goods they could deliver and the luxury goods they Barton, made them welcome and assured them great prestige. Trade relations led to at least some seasonal settlement and intermarriage and thus the nuclei of Muslims grew in size and importance. As the caravan traffic increased during the 1870s, 1880s and 1890s, especially with the decline of the Maasai, the Muslim traders began to make their influence felt upon the internal politics of inland African societies. Centres of such influence were established at such places as that of Kitoto, at Sapei and at that of Mumias, the last being the important capital of the Wanga kingdom in Western Kenya, ruled by Mumia, who allied himself closely with the Swahili traders.

Another factor, that led to the infiltration of Muslim influence into Kenya was tribal movement. The Somalis had been pressing south from the Horn of Africa since the 6th/12th century. It was their expansion that forced the Gaalla to their south to press hard upon the Muslim coastal people and cause a significant degree of depopulation and abandonment of many towns. Both Malindi and its appanage, Gedi, suffered decline as a result of Gaalla raids. Malindi had been eclipsed by 1667, and, as we have seen, it was Arab settlement in the 19th century that led to its revival. By the middle of the century, Muslim Somalis began to move decisively against the Gaalla to their south. They crossed the Juba river in force about 1850, thus making contact with the Gaalla who dominated the region of the Tana. An uneasy coexistence of some 15 years was broken when the Somalis turned upon the Gaalla, decimated them and occupied their territory. Thus began the invasion and settlement of another part of Kenya by Muslims and the slow religious interaction between Muslims and their neighbours. It is this process that has slowly led to a practical islamisation of such groups as the Rendille, Boran, and the Gaalla them-
selves. Today each of these groups is at least 90% Muslim.

By the last quarter of the 19th century, much of East Africa as a whole had come to form a huge Muslim sphere of influence, inspired by Zanzibar and based upon trade, leading to the saying that "when they pipe in Zanzibar, people dance on the shores of the great lakes". European travellers, explorers and missionaries observed these trends, and some were perturbed by them for political or religious reasons or for both. Livingstone and Stanley, whose reports did so much to mobilize Christian missionary efforts, were as much concerned about the slave trade as about Islamic influence. The Muslim traders generally welcomed the European missionaries and explorers, giving them all the necessary help in their ventures inland, even in the foundation of mission stations. No hostility was engendered towards Christianity as a religion. It was only when attempts were made to interfere with their trade, particularly the slave trade, that the Arab-Swahilis reacted with hostility, as did the African peoples who were their partners in this trade. Only in Buganda a religious conflict arose when the Christian missionaries, Catholic and Protestant, regarded the influence established by Muslims at the Kabaka's court as the basic enemy. This was the prelude to the religious wars that broke out late in the 19th century in that country, political pressure being the prime motive. The tide was fighting for: was Arab-Muslim power to be allowed to prevail over Christian-European power?

This was the most relevant and crucial question by the mid-1880s. The European scramble had begun. The extent of the suzerainty of the Muslim sultan of Zanzibar was being challenged by the Germans and the British. In 1884 the Germans declared protectorates over several areas in Tanzania. In 1885 they took advantage of local political and dynastic rivalries and declared a protectorate over the Witu Sultanate, founded ca. 1865 on the mainland of Lamu by a scion of the Nabhan family, after their original centre of power, Pate, had been taken by Zanzibar. Since then the founder of the Witu Sultanate, Ahmad Pumulo (nicknamed Simba "lion"), had been driven off all diplomatic and military attempts to make him acknowledge Zanzibari overlordship. He took advantage of the European scramble to seek German protection from further Zanzibari pressures. In 1886 an Anglo-German agreement signalled the beginning of the dismemberment of the Zanzibari Bu Sa'di sultanate. The sultanate was restricted to a ten-mile coastal strip between the Mozambique border and Kipini (in Kenya), some offshore islands and a 5 to 10 miles' radius round the Banadir ports. The rest of East Africa came under British and German influence, the former including most of present-day Kenya and southern Somalia, the latter comprising the present-day Tanzanian mainland.

The period between 1886 and 1895 witnessed widespread Arab-Swahili reaction and resistance against the advancing colonial designs of the two European powers. This resistance was provoked by several factors: fear of loss of political influence or trade in the interior, European interference with the traditional administration and the social, cultural and religious way of life. The Germans' determination to "Germanise" the Tanzanian coast and humiliate the sultan's representatives sparked off the Arab uprising in 1888, led by the Arabs but with widespread African backing. The blockade of the coast by European powers, whose aim was to strangle the revolt, was seen by the Muslims as a Christian alliance against them. In August 1890, after the revolt was over, the Germans and British sought to eradicate pin-pricks in each other's spheres by coming to another agreement, whereby Germany gave up her protectorate over Witu. This led to the first Witu uprising. Fumo Bakari, Simba's successor, feeling himself betrayed by Germany, ordered some German prospectors out of his Sultanate. When they resisted, a fight ensued in which nine of the Germans were killed. The British government, to whom Witu had been handed over, was forced to carry out a punitive expedition. Two other revolts broke out in Witu under the leadership of Fumo Bakari and Fumo 'Omari. In 1894 Fumo 'Omari was exiled to Zanzibar, by then another British protectorate, where he eventually died. The following year, the Mazrui revolt was sparked off at Takaungu, a stronghold of the family lying to the north of their former centre of power, Mombasa. It was caused by British interference with the traditional method of choosing a wali; Mbarrak, who was regarded as the logical successor, was bypassed by a pro-British wali. Mbarrak denounced British authority and spear-headed the revolt which engulfed virtually the whole Kenyan coast from Malindi to the Tanzanian border. Mbarrak was supported by his uncle, Mbarrak b. Raghid, son of the last independent Mazrui chief of Mombasa who was overthrown by the Bu Sa'di; in the past he had led several revolts against Zanzibari authority. Although this was basically a family revolt, it gained support from coast Africans long associated with the family as well as from Swahili chiefs, one of whom regarded it as a djihad and raised the flag of Islam. It was not until March 1896 that the revolt spent its force in the face of heavier odds. But rather than submit, the leaders sought refuge to neighbours who chose to seek refuge in German territory in the south.

The suppression of the Mazrui revolt meant the loss of any Arab or Muslim aspiration to maintain political independence not only in Kenya, but also the whole of East Africa.

However, in Kenya as in Zanzibar and the Tanzanian mainland under German rule, some semblance of Arab-Muslim administrative organisation was maintained. The first Commissioner of the East Africa Protectorate, which comprised most of Kenya (the western province being part of the Uganda Protectorate until 1902) was Arthur Hardinge, who had served in Muslim countries, such as Egypt and Turkey, an experience that had implanted in him some sympathy for Islam. Having vanquished Kenya's coastal Muslims, he granted them a special position in the administration of the Protectorate. Muslims were needed to establish a viable, new cadre in the administration, the judiciary, the military and the transport fields because they were the only literate indigenous people with some knowledge of administration and a working relationship with the peoples of the interior. Thus an Arab-Muslim administrative hierarchy was established, composed of livil'is (governors), mudir and kaddis, the first two being administrative officers in livil'ates and mudiriyeyets on the coast. Hardinge's plans to train more Arabs and "upper class" Swahili who could serve as officers beyond the coastal strip never materialised. In fact, as time passed, the number of livil'is and mudirs was reduced for reasons of economy or retrenchment.

In so far as Islam was concerned, the new European colonial era brought positive, if indirect results. If Muslim power had been shattered, the faith itself
spread inland with the extension of the *Pax Britannica*,
the hostility of Christian missionaries and
some officials who regarded Islam either as a rival
to Christianity or as a threat to European rule. The
spread of Islam during colonial rule was as haphazard
as in pre-colonial times. Diverse factors account
for this. The building of the Uganda Railway to join
the two British Protectorates brought fresh Indian immigrants,
many of whom were Muslims, some of whom stayed behind and encouraged others to come
out from India. Thus the Indian Muslim population
in Kenya increased in number and moved inland, em-
ployed either in the railway administration or private-
ly employed as merchants, shop-keepers, hunters,
etc. The medical officers, veterinary officers and
clerks of the railway administration had amongst them
the pioneer members of the Ahmadiyya
movement [q.v.] in Kenya. But the celebrated
militant missionary activity began only in the
1930s. The railway also facilitated travel of local
Muslims. Arabs and Swahili moved more easily
inland to settle and trade and thus founded such Mus-
ilim "locations" as Pangani and Pumwani in Nairobi.
Individual Muslim traders were soon to be found in
other townships where they married, settled and cre-
ated new nuclei of Muslims, e.g. at Kendu Bay,
Kisumu, Fort Hall (now Muranga), and the Machakos
district. Some local converts contributed to the
growth of these nuclei.

A second noteworthy factor that facilitated the
diffusion of Islam was the colonial administration's
employment of Swahili, Somali and Sudanese Muslim
troops in its punitive expeditions and in the manning
of garrisons. On retirement or discharge, many of
these soldiers settled in the interior and married local
Muslims. Indeed, the Swahili "colony" in Nairobi is one example of an ex-soldier settlement.
The early administration also employed craftsmen,
tax-collectors of Swahili Muslim
origin; domestic servants, in areas as far as Uganda,
were often Swahili, as were many of the foremen of
the first European settler farms. Thus the non-
Muslim and non-Christian Africans were made
conscious of the comparatively privileged position
of Islam as a soldier, foreman, craftsman,
and in 1900. In 1907 the ordinance
abolishing slavery was promulgated, which dealt a
final, heavy blow to agriculture, the mainstay of the
economy of the coast. Game regulations entailing
the purchase of licences and competition from Europeans
and Indians reduced Arab-Swahili participation in
the ivory trade. In 1908 the Land Titles Ordinance
was passed, and it led to vast acres of land being
either alienated or declared crown land; some of
these lands were leased or given freehold to European
planters.

Thus at the turn of the century, the indigenous
Muslims of Kenya found it essential to embark upon
a drastic reappraisal of their status under the new
colonial order, especially in regard to education.
When the British authorities began in 1920 to take
up responsibility for cultural development, there was at
first no provision for the teaching of Arabic and the
Kur'ān, and it was only in 1924 that the govern-
ment introduced Kur'ānic lessons in the schools of
Mombasa and Malindi.

Also, two very short-lived reform organizations
came into being amongst the Arab-Swahili of
Mombasa—the Mohamadan Reform League and the
Afro-Asian Association. The latter was basically a
political association, but established a Muslim school
in 1937. The most important Muslim Reformer
in Kenya was undoubtedly Shaykh al-Almih b. ‘Ali b.
Nafi‘i al-Mazrū‘ī [see al-Mazrū‘ī] who in his weekly
al-Islāh envisaged the creation of a body to defend
Muslim interests. Other non-coastal, non-Arab,
Muslims issued in 1931 a memorandum addressed
to a Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Close
Union of East Africa expressing their fears of the
threats to Islam in Kenya, whereas Christianity
was being encouraged by all means possible. In
February 1935, a delegation of three Indian Muslims
left Kenya for India to collect funds and personnel,
in order to initiate a Muslim missionary movement
in Kenya and thus counter-balance the Christian
missionary endeavour by turning more Africans
into Muslims; but its members returned without
achieving any immediate results. Only the Ahma-
diya movement showed interest in the initiation

Island by siding with the Germans. Copies of this
declaration in Arabic and Ki-Swahili were distributed
all along the coast. Equally widely distributed was
the Sharī‘ Husayn’s proclamation of June 1916,
renouncing his allegiance to the Turkish sultan and
denouncing the heretical measures of the Turkish
Committee of Union and Progress.

As it turned out, Britain need not have feared a
large-scale *djihād* in the East Africa Protectorate.
The Muslim population of the coast had never dis-
played active religious fanaticism on a significant
scale. Two decades earlier (1895-6), they had been
equally unenthusiastic in their response to Egyptian
religious exhortation to rise against the Sūfī of
Zanzibar and his British mentors, who had begun to
interfere with the lucrative slave trade. This was
part of an Egyptian design to occupy the East African
coast, from which they planned to forge a route to
the inter-lacustrine regions of central Africa to super-
sede the one down the Nile, which was causing undue
delay in obtaining men and equipment. The Egyptian
expedition along the coast got no further than Lamu,
and failed to exploit the religious sentiments and the
economic motives of the coastal Muslims.

Even so, by the outbreak of the First World War,
the indigenous Muslim population of the coast was
smarting under a series of blows. Punitive expeditions
had shattered all aspirations to political indepen-
dence between 1890 and 1900. In 1907 the ordinance
abolishing slavery was promulgated, which dealt a
final, heavy blow to agriculture, the mainstay of the
economy of the coast. Game regulations entailing
the purchase of licences and competition from Europeans
and Indians reduced Arab-Swahili participation in
the ivory trade. In 1908 the Land Titles Ordinance
was passed, and it led to vast acres of land being
either alienated or declared crown land; some of
these lands were leased or given freehold to European
planters.

Thus at the turn of the century, the indigenous
Muslims of Kenya found it essential to embark upon
a drastic reappraisal of their status under the new
colonial order, especially in regard to education.
When the British authorities began in 1920 to take
up responsibility for cultural development, there was at
first no provision for the teaching of Arabic and the
Kur’ān, and it was only in 1924 that the govern-
ment introduced Kur’ānic lessons in the schools of
Mombasa and Malindi.

Also, two very short-lived reform organizations
came into being amongst the Arab-Swahili of
Mombasa—the Mohamadan Reform League and the
Afro-Asian Association. The latter was basically a
political association, but established a Muslim school
in 1937. The most important Muslim Reformer
in Kenya was undoubtedly Shaykh al-Almihn b. ‘Ali b.
Nafi‘i al-Mazrū‘ī [see al-Mazrū‘ī] who in his weekly
al-Islāh envisaged the creation of a body to defend
Muslim interests. Other non-coastal, non-Arab,
Muslims issued in 1931 a memorandum addressed
to a Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Close
Union of East Africa expressing their fears of the
threats to Islam in Kenya, whereas Christianity
was being encouraged by all means possible. In
February 1935, a delegation of three Indian Muslims
left Kenya for India to collect funds and personnel,
in order to initiate a Muslim missionary movement
in Kenya and thus counter-balance the Christian
missionary endeavour by turning more Africans
into Muslims; but its members returned without
achieving any immediate results. Only the Ahma-
diya movement showed interest in the initiation
of a missionary movement, but its offer was refused. A year before, in 1934, the Tahrlk-i-Djadld of a missionary movement, but its offer was refused. The Ahmadiyya helped build or repair mosques and produced literature on Islam on a large scale, culminating in the production of a Ki-Swahili translation of the Qur’an in 1953. They had about 1,500 adherents in Kenya according to an authoritative estimate of 1974, compared with just over 1,000 in Uganda and some 2,700 in Tanzania.

Despite Shaykh al-Amin al-Mazrul’s efforts to provide practical guidance, none of his major proposals were implemented by the Muslims. They became more and more reconciled to the idea of living in separate groups, without organic links between African, Arab, Swahili and Indian Muslims. In Kenya the Indian Muslims were and still are the best-organised and the most prosperous. Hence they have been able to finance and build schools and, in the case of the Isma’ili, to build hospitals and contribute significantly to the educational and medical services in the country. The East African Muslim Welfare Society, founded in the 1930s, was a charitable Isma’ili organisation aimed at raising the status of the most depressed members of the Muslim community, particularly the African. A most noteworthy project of the Muslims in Kenya was launched after the Second World War. The colonial government, the Ağā Khān and the Sultan of Zanzibar jointly contributed towards the building of a Mombasa Institute of Muslim Education (MIOME), which encompassed a long-promised academic Secondary School for Arabs and Swahili. The Institute was to lay emphasis upon technical and vocational training, but Islamic studies were included to balance these secular studies. The Institute was seen as a precursor of a Muslim University, but within a few years of its opening in 1951, however, the Institute had to accept non-Muslims and changed its name first to “Mombasa Institute of Education”, then to “Mombasa Technical Institute”, and lately to the “East African Institute of Education”, University of Nairobi, 1974; R. Oliver, The missionary factor in East Africa; A. H. J. Prins, The Swahili-speaking peoples of Zanzibar and the East African coast, 1964; R. B. Serjeant, The Sayyids of Hadramaut.


KENZA (Nubia). [see AL-KANZ, BĀNū —]

AL-KERAK. [see KARKAK]

KERAKSU. [see GIRESON]

KERBELA. [see KARBELA’]

KERBĒNEH. Ottoman name for Karpenésion (Karpensis, Carpentitze), a small township in northern Aetolia. The district was probably occupied under Bāyezīd I [q.v.], when the adjacent regions of Salona, Domakia and [Neo-] Patras fell to the Turks (Hammer-Purgstall, i, 249-50, following Chalcoondyles); when it was first named in a published Ottoman source (the qịways of 894/1489, Beikeler, ii [1964], 100, n. 2), as Kār bāsh, it is grouped with “Badra” (Neopatras, Badarālik), Dūmēke, Čalatāj (Pharsala) and Mūnente (Bodenita). At this period it was presumably administered as part of the sandjak of Tirkhālā [q.v.]; it appears later as a kadā of the sandjak of Aynabāqlīh [q.v.].

The locality is famous in modern Greek history as the scene of the victory of the Suliot leader Marco Botarri (21 August 1204) over the gros de Teules, a French contingent that had come to the aid of the local Greeks.

Bibliography: Evijlī Čelebi, Seyahatname, viii, 611-2 (rough draft only); Greek tr. I. G. Giannopoulos, in ’Eπτεργις Ὕπτερινες Στρειφάλλακτικά Μελέτις, ii (1969), 172-3; F. C. H. L. Pouqueville, Voyage de la Grèce, Paris 1826-7, iv, 21-5; Mēγέλα Ἑλληνικὴ Ἑγκυκλοπαίδεια, s.v. Καρπενίτζο; I. G. Giannopoulos, Η δομική ιστορία του οικισμού της Στρειφάλλας Ελλάδος κατά την Τουρκοκρατίαν (1393-1821), Athens 1971, 100-2 (with full references).

KERC, a seaport at the eastern tip of the peninsula of that name at the eastern end of the Crimea [see KIRM] in the modern Crimean oblast of the Ukrainian SSR.

The district was clearly a well-populated one in pre-historic, Cimmerian and Scythian times, since it contains a large number of kurgans or burial mounds, many of which have been excavated since the last century. In classical times, it was from the 6th century B.C. onwards the site of the flourishing Ionian Greek colony of Pantikapaion, later called Bosporos and the capital of the principality of Bosporus Cimmerius (see Pauly-Wissowa, xviii/3, 780-825, s.v. Pantikapaion). After coming under the control of Mithridates VI of Pontus (end of the 2nd century B.C.) and then, from the time of Augustus, of Rome, it suffered badly during the barbarian invasions of such steppe peoples as the Sarmatians, Huns and Goths. From the late 7th century A.D. it was held by the Khazars [q.v.] as the capital of their foothold in the eastern Crimea, with the residence of the khan or governor there.

The name Kerc first appears in Islamic sources under various forms, such as Karz, Kargā, al-Karsh, etc., and may derive from a Greek form Korizos/ Korizos/Korizos.
confederation in the early years of the 11th century, Kerč fell to the Kiev Russians and for some decades the eastern Crimea formed part of the Russian principality of Tmutarakan in the Taman peninsula across the Straits of Kerč, under the patriarchate of Malegra in the Taman peninsula, whilst in 1332 it was to become a metropolitan sea itself (see Heyd, *Histoire de la commerce du Levant*, ii, 184-5). In the 12th century Kerč was in the hands of the Kipčak or Comans, and it may be the town of Rbšša mentioned in a treaty of 1159 between the Byzantine Emperor Manuel Comnenos and the Genoese. In the 13th century, Crimea and South Russia became part of the vast territories of the Golden Horde. Ihne Baţtâta, travelling from Karš/Kerč to Kafa, describes his meeting with Christian Comans (*Rbšša*, ii, 355-7, tr. Gibb, ii, 469-70, cf. Barthold,*Histoire des Turcs d’Asie Centrale*, Paris 1945, 157). From 1289 onwards there was a Venetian consul in Kerč (Heyd, loc. cit.), and by 1318 it was in the hands of the Genoese, who had established themselves on the southern littoral of the Crimea with their centre at Kafa/Kėfe [see KEFÉ] or Theodosia; it was a consulate subordinate to Kafa under the name of Cercro or Cerchio. In ca. 1400 there are mentioned Alan or Gothic princes in Kerč, remnants of the waves of barbarian invasions through South Russia in the Dark Ages, who are described by Signori de la Todor [B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde, die Mongolen in Russland 1223-1500*, Wiesbaden 1965, 314-15] and who presumably exercised theoretical jurisdiction over the town and its hinterland. In the 15th century there was pressure on the Genoese colonies in the Crimea from the Giray Khans, and then later in the century, after the attacks of the Ottoman commander Ahmed Paşa Gedik [q.v.], these settlements on the coastland fell into Ottoman hands. Henceforth, Ottoman trade with the Crimea and South Russia was channelled through Kafa rather than Kerč, and the latter’s commercial prosperity went into a decline.

After the conquest of Azov in 1696, Peter the Great in the peace negotiations of 1698 sought the session of Kerč to Russia, but this was refused, and after the Peace of Parnawa [see PARNAVA], Kerč remained in Ottoman hands. Sultan Muştafa III in 1114/1702 built the fortress of Yeşi Kale near Kerč to protect it (see Von Hammer, *GÖR*, iii, 909). Nevertheless, Kerč and Yeşi Kale were occupied by Catherine the Great’s troops in 1785/1777 without resistance, and theircession to Russia confirmed in the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarç [q.v.] in 1288/1774 (GÖR*, iv, 622, 638). It remained of small importance, although in 1821 Tsar Alexander I raised it to the status of a town, and its main function was as a trans-shipment point to shallow-bottomed vessels crossing the Sea of Azov to the Don-Donets basin ports. During the Crimean War, it was in 1855 occupied by the invading Allies, and in the Second World War it was held by the Germans from the winter of 1941-2 till 1944 and was the scene of fierce fighting. Its economic and industrial importance today derives from iron ore deposits, exploited since the end of the 19th century and now sent to the Donbas industrial area, and limestone quarries in the vicinity of the town; it is furthermore the base for an important fishing fleet, and in 1970 had a population of 128,000 (see *BSE*, xx, 565-6).

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

**KERIMBA.** a group of islands lying in lat. 12° S. off Musambik (Mozambique) between the mouths of the Ruvuma and Lurio rivers, with administrative headquarters at St João de Ibo on Quirimba Is. They were part of the sphere of influence of the mediaeval state of Kilwa, but with an independent ruler. They were Islamised at an unknown period, possibly in the 12th century. They were seized by the Portuguese in 1522 because of their important ivory trade: many mosques and large houses were destroyed. João dos Santos went to convert them to Christianity in 1539; the upper class was Muslim, but the majority pagan. In 1750, when the 'Umání Arabs were developing the slave trade from Zanzibar, the Portuguese commander accused the Arab and Swahili traders “of depriving the Portuguese of their ivory trade, God of the souls of Africans who were being enslaved by the Muslims, and the King of his taxes.” Regrettably, a recent account describes only the earlier Portuguese buildings: a systematic survey of the mosques and Muslim cemeteries has yet to be made.


**KERKHA.** [see KARKHA]

**KERKENNA.** [see KARKANA]

**KERKUK.** [see KIRKUK]

**KERMÁN.** [see kirmán]

**KERMÁN ŠÁH.** [see kirmán šáh]

**KERMIYÁN.** [see gerniyán]

**KERRI.** (conventional spelling, Gerri), a site on the east bank of the main Nile in the Sudan, lying at the southern end of the Sabalūkā gorge, about 44 miles north of the confluence of the Blue and White Niles. At the convergence of the route along the Nile and the Baydōa desert crossing the Nile at this point, Kerri was a settlement of political importance from the 10th/16th to the 12th/18th century as the seat of the ʿAbdallābī ḥājkhs, who levied tribute on the nomads during their annual migration-cycle, and, as the principal vassals of the Fundj [q.v.] of Sinnār, were regarded as the overlords of the Arab tribes. The first two ʿAbdallābī ḥājkhs derived prestige from their role as holy men and agents of islamisation in a fringe-region, rather than from purely tribal leadership. This is indicated by the ascription of a ʿSharīfī ancestry to the eponym, ʿAbd Allāh Dīmām al-Kuraynātī al-Kāsimī [fl. 10th/16th cent.], who is reputed to have overthrown Soba, the capital of the Nubian Christian kingdom of ʿAlwa [q.v.]. Tradition associates ʿAmārā Dānkas, the founder of the Fundj dynasty, with him in this explicit, while another tradition (reported by James Bruce) speaks of a victory of the Fundj over the ʿAbdallābī chief (anachronistically styled “Wed Ageeb”, i.e. Walad ʿAdji) near Arbajjī on the Blue Nile in 1504. The two traditions are not necessarily incompatible, and the second would explain the subordination of the ʿAbdallābī ḥājkhs to the Fundj rulers. A legend that Kerri was a Nubian stronghold captured by ʿAbd Allāh Dīmām so far lacks archaeological confirmation, while Bruce’s statement that the
Fundaj compelled the 'Abdallah to transfer their capital to Arbadji is unsupported in other sources. 'Abd jab al-Kafotha, the son of 'Abd Allah Djiamak, by the daughter of a holy man, Hamad Abi Dunana, is represented in 'Abdallah tradition as a pious Muslim, who enforced the Shari'a and made the Pilgrimage. He is distinguished by the title of mopsiflah, held by the great vassals of the Fundaj. He nevertheless fought against his suzerain, and temporarily extended his rule up the Blue Nile, but was subsequently defeated and killed by the Fundaj ruler, 'Adlan I b. 'Amr I, at the battle of Karkodi in 1016/1607-8. 'Adjab's tomb at Kerrl was surmounted by a dome (kubba), typical of the burial-place of a holy man but not of a tribal chief; it was a place of pilgrimage. Of the later skayyik of Kerrl, Dhiyab b. Badii established in 1149/1736 a waqf at Medina for the benefit of immigrants from the Fundaj territories. His harshness resulted in the depopulation of Kerrl, and it was perhaps for this reason that his uncle and successor, 'Abd Allah III b. 'Amr III (d. 1160/1747) transferred the capital to Halfayat al-Muluk, further to the south on the main Nile. Crawford's assertion that this transfer took place in 1798 under 'Abd Allah IV is unjustified. Halfayat al-Muluk remained the capital of the shaykhdom until the Turco-Egyptian invasion in 1821 ended the old regime.


KESRIYE, Ottoman name for Kastoria, a town in Macedonia, situated on the shores of a lake with the same name, at the northern most point of the upper reaches of the River Aliakmon.

An important centre of Christian art during the last centuries of the Byzantine era, it fell under the rule of Stephen Duhan (1337-53) and his successors, and in 1380 it came into Ottoman hands—by capitulation, according to tradition. It was the capital of the homonymous cadha2 of the pasa sandjakli in the eyalet of Rumei (Hadjidji Khalifa, Rumei und Bosna, J. von Hammer, Vienna 1812, 96; M. T. Gokbelgin, in Belleten xx (1956), and, after the administrative reorganisation of 1864, of a cadha3 of the sandjak of Koritsa in the vilayet of Manasti. According to Ewliya Celebi, it was a kadha4 of 150 akhes with 110 villages, and a kha'i of Fatma Sultan. Outside its fortress (in the varoq), there were 20 mahalles, 16 of which were Greek and one Jewish. The town had a djezdar, a mukhtesib, a badi-dar, a shiek kethuhudi and a kha'i aghasi.

The fur industry flourished in this small town, especially from the beginning of the 11th/12th century. Fur merchants from Kastoria distributed the products by caravan to important urban centres in regions north of Macedonia and set up commercial establishments in Istanbul, Vienna, Leipzig, Dresden and Moscow. Although the area was often quiet because of the activities of the Klepthis and the Albanians, the town's flourishing industry and economic prosperity contributed to the construction—especially in the 12th/13th and the 13th/14th centuries—of many Christian churches and its characteristic town houses, which are interesting examples of folk architecture. Greek schools were also established with funds supplied by wealthy emigrants. The Greeks were represented before the Turkish authorities by the kadija bagis. After 1797, the district was the scene of rivalry between Greeks and Slavs, with its metropolitan, Germanos Karavangetelis (1900-7), playing a leading role. With the Balkan War it became part of the Greek state (11/24 November 1912).


KETAMA. [see KUTAMA]

KETKHUDA. This Persian term "master of the house, head of the family", Pahlahi kahak-xwatai, acquired, in addition to the above meanings, those of husband, chief of a tribe, headman of a village and tithe-officer in a town (Chardin, Voyages, ed. 1811, iv, 77, "dixenier de quartier") responsible to the government, and under the Safawids they were playing a leading role. With the Balkan War it may have evolved during Ottoman times.

The term kethhudi is used in the Ottoman state administration from the 9th/15th century onwards (Kânâm-name-yi sulânî ber mühde-i 'orfi-i 'Othmani, ed. R. Anhegger-H. Inalcik, Ankara 1956, 17, 31-2), in the sense of someone who looks after the affairs of an important government official or influential person, i.e. the kethhudi was an authorised deputy official. Hence there were kethhudus below the âghâ or re'is in charge, e.g. of the treasury, the dockyards, the police guard, the Janissaries, the taxation registers, the Grand Vizierate, the imperial pantry, the bodyguard of dawids, of the artillery corps, etc. (see 'Abdurrahman Vefik, Tekâifî hâwidi, İstanbul 1786, i, 192-3). The office was conferred by a diploma (berd), in which the respect and loyalty of those to be under him was enjoined. (see Msbâhoktî Ahrar, Genc Müdürülüğü, Kâmiî Kepeci tasnifi, Rus ufûreti, no.

(i) In Ottoman Turkish administrative usage

Already in II Khânid Persia we find the kadhâhudi acting as the representative of the village vis-à-vis the government, and under the Saftsaws they were in charge of collecting taxes and responsible for the administration of a village or town (cf. A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant in Persia, London 1953, 122, 144, 168, 175, 430 and passim). We find the form kethhudi in Anatolian Sahjûk usage of the 7th/13th century (Osman Turan, Türkiye Selçuklu hakkinda resmi vesikal, Ankara 1958, 13), and the form kâhâyva may have evolved during Ottoman times.

The term kethhudi is used in the Ottoman state administration from the 9th/15th century onwards (Kânâm-name-yi sulânî ber mühde-i 'orfi-i 'Othmani, ed. R. Anhegger-H. Inalcik, Ankara 1956, 17, 31-2), in the sense of someone who looks after the affairs of an important government official or influential person, i.e. the kethhudi was an authorised deputy official. Hence there were kethhudus below the âghâ or re'is in charge, e.g. of the treasury, the dockyards, the police guard, the Janissaries, the taxation registers, the Grand Vizierate, the imperial pantry, the bodyguard of dawids, of the artillery corps, etc. (see 'Abdurrahman Vefik, Tekâifî hâwidi, İstanbul 1786, i, 192-3). The office was conferred by a diploma (berd), in which the respect and loyalty of those to be under him was enjoined. (see Msbâhoktî Ahrar, Genc Müdürülüğü, Kâmiî Kepeci tasnifi, Rus ufûreti, no.
217, pp. 14, 180, no. 2i6/a, p. 390). As in Persia, there were in Turkey kethkudas of villages charged with administrative duties there. The most important of those officials bearing this title was, however, the kethku$d of the Grand Vizier (S$adare kethku$d). In 1214/1799 it seems that this official was not only concerned with the affairs of the Grand Vizier in the Divan-ı Humâyûn, but of those of the other viziers also, hence it was decreed that he should concern himself with the affairs of the former only (Kha$t-ı humâyûn tasnifi, no. 13283). The official supervising the imâr-holders in the eyâlet$ and sandjâ$ was called the kethku$d yeri (see the Elâzî$ç judicial records, Divyaberkir Ziya Gökalp Mûse$i, no. 362, p. 137), and the same title was found in the corps of Janissaries (see I. H. Uzunçarşı$i, Osmanî devletinin teşkilî$ndan Kapı$ulu Ocaklari, Ankara 1943, i, 211-13).

Provincial governors had their own kethku$das stationed in the capital Istanbul to represent their interests; these were called kâpi kethku$das$ (similar representatives were allowed to trusted state servants, and in 1200/1785 there were seven kâpi kethku$das$ pertaining to the viziers (Nûrî, Ta$vârik$ Suleyman$i, Â$f$ Efendî, no. 239, f. 88b). Dependent and tribal princes, such as those of Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia, and even the Khâ$ns of the Crimean Tatars, had their representatives in Istanbul with this same title. We also find it used to denote the envoys or ambassadors of some foreign countries. Finally, it should be mentioned that the kethku$das$ of foreign and cities were decreed by a decree of 1204/1790 (Kha$t-ı humâyûn tasnifi, no. 9500), and that the term was also used within the nomadic tribes. A tribal chief would appoint a kethku$d for each of the subordinate clans in his tribe, and when hereditary chieftainship was abolished by the state, a person chosen by general consent of the tribesmen and from among themselves was appointed as kethku$d (see C. Oronhû, Osmanî imparatori$un$da a$$ileri is$kan te$shki$l).


(ii) IN THE OTTOMAN TURKISH GILDS

In Turkey the kethku$da$ was also the head of a gild who dealt with the material and administrative aspects of gild life (whereas in the earlier period of gild history, a skaykh fulfilled the ceremonial functions). He was usually chosen by the gild notables without formal election, and his appointment was then confirmed by the kâdi. Recently published documents do not seem to bear out the theory of Gibb and Bowen (i.e., 287) that "until much later [than the middle of the 11th/12th century?] kâdi$sk continued in all cases [even in gilds with Christian members] to be Moslem; but eventually this office... was granted in some instances to non-Moslems"; there were non-Muslim kethku$dâ$s in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries, as well as Muslim kethku$dâ$s of non-Muslim gilds in the 12th/18th century.

The gild kethku$dâs represented the gild vis-à-vis the authorities. They conveyed government orders and announcements to the gild members, and made certain that these instructions were carried out; for instance, it was their task to supervise the implementation of orders concerning the standards of production and of commodities sold. They provided the government with any services and labour which were required, and if necessary, they guaranteed the reliability and good character of the members of the gild.

The gild kethku$dâs were also responsible for the supply of certain goods to the authorities and for distributing raw material needed by artisans and craftsmen; and it was the task of the heads of practically all Turkish gilds to arbitrate in disputes among their members, and the task of some of them to supervise a fund for mutual help.

In later times, individuals who were not members of the gild were frequently appointed kethku$dâ$s, for instance, retired officials who thereupon agreed to renounce their pension. During the reign of 'Abd al-Hamîd II, favoured courtiers were appointed by the Sultan, often because the gild members hoped thereby to further their own concerns.

(iii) IN NORTH AFRICA

The term kethku$da$ was not used in North Africa in the period of Turkish domination, but the form kâ$â$ya was current in Tunisia until recent times to designate the subordinates of the calids or governors at the head of administrative divisions called kâ$hâa. In a more general way, kâ$hâa was in general use with the sense of "assistant to a high official, president or director" (e.g. kâ$hâ$ya râ$'s = vice-president); the deputy of the Public Prosecutor of the Republic was called kâ$hâ$yat al-muddâ$'i 'l-umâmi, and an under-secretary of state kâ$hâ$ya wa$â$ri. In Algeria, the kâ$hâa was a bey's lieutenant, but also a police superintendent and even a simple corporal in the army of the amir 'Abd al-Kâ$dî [q.v.]. The use of the term for a subordinate endowed it with the pejorative meaning of "inferior quality". (Ed.)

KHA$A; the seventh letter of the Arabic alphabet, here transcribed as kh. Its numerical value is 600, according to the eastern order (see Abjad).

Definition: voiceless post-velar fricative. According to the Arabic grammatical tradition: rik$wa, mahmî$s, mustâ$'iya. For the ma$h$ra$d: min â$nda 'l-hâlîk (from that part of the throat nearest to the mouth) (al-Zamâkshâ$ri, Mu$â$alâ$'i, ed. Broch, § 732); Ibn Ya$â$r (Sharb, ed. G. Jahn, 1460, 1. 6) defines it thus: "the khâ$" is nearer to the mouth than the gkay$. The Arabs accordingly placed the khâ$ in the throat and considered it as a laryngeal [ac-
cording to the terminology of H. Fleisch, Traité de philologie arabe, i, 59), as with the ghayn. However, G. Krokr, in WZKM, lix (1963-4), 245, tr. 4,5), puts forward "post-verbal" as corresponding to min adnā 'l-balh (cf. M. Bravmann, Materialen und Untersuchungen zu den phonetischen Lehren der Araber, 44, and H. Blanc, in Procs. of the Internat. Conference on Semitic Studies, Jerusalem 1965, 17). The text of the Mufassal is clear: adnā 'l-balh is the upper part of the throat, as opposed to awsal 'al-balh, the middle part, and asdah 'l-balh, the lower part. Then there comes, as the first sound pronounced within the mouth, al-khāf.

The articulation described is phonemic; for the phonological oppositions which define this phoneme kh, see J. Cantineau, Esquisse d’une phonologie de l’arabe classique = Mémorial J.C., Paris 1900, 175. According to him, its realisation is "fairly close to the German ch in Nach", and it is its localisation which is relevant. For the incompatibilities of ch, see ibid., 201. Kh (and gh) are by their nature mufakkhama and prevent the occurrence of imāla in most of the (eastern) Arabic dialects (Cantineau, Les parlers arabes du Horan, Paris 1946, 127). But this is not the case in Cairo (N. Leomich, Le parloir arabe du Caire, Paris-The Hague 1964, 32), nor in Maâsor Beid-Dine, Lebanon, where people say ākhūn "he betrayed" (Fleisch, in MUSJ, xxxi (1954), 298) and khdn "he betrayed" (ibid., 312).

In Classical Ar., kh is the continuation of a voiceless velar fricative ch of common Semitic. It "becomes h in Canaanitic Aramaic, in Tigrée and Tigrinya, and in Soqotri (Modern South Arabian); it becomes zero in most of the other (modern) Ethiopian languages" (W. Leslau in Manual of phonetics, Amsterdam 1927, 259).

In Classical Ar., kh undergoes few non-conditioned alterations; see Cantineau, Cours, 71. As a conditioned alteration, one only need mention the possibility of assimilation of unvoiced and voiceless, between kh and gh, when they are found in final or initial position of a word, thus: gh kh > khh and kh gh > ghkh (see Fleisch, Traité, i, § 12 p.).

The same type of assimilation is found in some modern Arabic dialects, as in Tlemcen (W. Marçais, Le dialecte arabe parlé à Tlemcen, Paris 1902, 26); note also the special case of Baghdad (Blanc, Communal dialects in Baghdad, Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs, x (1964), 3, 24 (c)).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(H. Fleisch)

KHABAR (A.), plural ADHABAR, ADHABIR, report, piece of information. The word is not used in any special context in the Kur'ān. In the hadith it occurs among other passages in the tradition which describes how the jinn by eavesdropping obtain information from heaven (khabar min al-samā') and how they are pelted with fiery meteors to prevent them from doing so (al-Bukhārī, A ḍhān, bāb 105; Muslim, Ṣāliḥ, tr. 149); al-Tirmidhī, Taṣfīr, Sūra lixxi, trad. 1).

In his collection al-Bukhārī has a chapter entitled Aḥhār al-ābād, which, as the tājidda indicates, deals with the validity of traditions regarding ṣaḥān, ṣalāṭ, fasting, the law of inheritance, and judicial procedure, and which are only given on the authority of one man [see hadāth].

Al-Ghazālī gives the name aḥhār to the traditions that go back to Muhammad. He distinguishes the sayings of the Companions by the term ādār (see his Ḥayā', passim). On such and similar technical distinctions see Lane's Lexicon s.v., and Dica. of

Techn. Terms, ed. Sprnger and Nassau Lees, s.v.

Aḥhār is further often found in the titles of historical works (see Brockelmann, Index ii); in the singular, khabar denotes a piece of information of a historical, biographical or even anecdotal nature, and comes to correspond to khā' ya [q.v.].

Ṣāhib al-Khabar was the title of one of a ruler's officers in provincial capitals whose duty it was to report to his master all new happenings, the arrivals of strangers etc. This post was often given to the director of the postal service [see bārd].

(A. J. Wensinck)

KHABAR, in Arabic grammar, refers to the constituent parts of the nominal phrase, e.g. Zayd ḥa'ir mānun "Zayd is noble"; here, Zayd, the first term, is mubāta, and karim, the second one, is khabar. For the verbal phrase, the corresponding terms are fā'il agent and fīl verb. The Arab grammarians, as can readily be seen, recognised two types of phrase, the nominal and the verbal, in their language. They also recognised clearly the necessity of the ʿābd, the nexus linking the two terms of these phrases, and they called it isnād "the act of leaning one thing against another", the linkage between al-musnad išāyi, the first term, and al-musnad, the second one. But musnād išāyi and musnād both remained terms of grammatical logic, used for the analysis of the nexus of the two types of phrase mubāta-khabar and fā'il fīl are the only terms recognised in the formation of the nominal phrase in the first pair, and in that of the verbal phrase in the second pair. Each type of phrase was studied for itself; the idea of subject remained alien to the Arab grammarians (see Fleisch, Études sur le verbe arabe, in Milanges Masségnon, ii, 153-5).

The khabar is marfū, i.e. in raf, the nominative, as also the mubāta. For an Arab grammarian, it was necessary to determine the ʿāmil, here called al-rāfi "that which puts it in rāf", the khabar and also the mubāta, for the question is connected.

This was the subject of great discussions between the Kūfān and Baṣrān grammarians, and even amongst the Basrans themselves; see the 3rd Question discussed in Ibn al-Anbārī, K. al-Insāfī, ed. G. Weil, ii, 7, 6, with a résumé in Ibn Ya ḍish's Mufassal of Zamakhshārī, ed. G. Jahn, 101, ii, 15-16.

In dislocated phrases, which were outside normal analysis, of the type Zayd khabāba abūhū "Zayd, his father left", the Arab grammarians considered the phrase taken up after Zayd as khabar (Zamakhshārī, Mufassal, ed. Broch, § 20).

After inna and its "sisters" (anna, lākinsa, layta, lā'alla and kaʾansa) the khabar is marjū. The Basrans and Kūfānians disputed over determination over the ʿāmil here, sc. about the rāfī which puts the khabar here into rāf (see the 22nd Question discussed in the K. al-Insāfī, 81-4, Mufassal, § 3, and Ibn Yaʾāfīsh, 124, l. 23-125, l. 17).

For the khabar of kāna and its "sisters", sc. verbs like isbabah "it took place in the morning" or ansāa "it took place in the evening", the Arab grammarians had the task of explaining the marf or accusative of the khabar, as in kāna khabīna "he was wise". They solved this by referring to an analogy with the fā'il and marf of a verb (Mufassal, § 97, and Ibn Yaʾāfīsh, 282). In fact, this accusative can be explained as a complement indicating state, a bāl; this explanation had already been given by the Kūfānians against the Basrans (K. al-Insāfī, Question under discussion, 282, 51; see also Fleisch, L'Arabe classique. Esquisse d'une structure linguistique, 181). The nāf is found after the negative nā (less usually after lā) when
this has the value of laysa (Mufassal, § 38, and Ibn Ya’qub, 132-4). This also involves the question of the ma’budiyyya (K. al-Insaf, 19). See Question under discussion, 76-9, and Ibn Ya’qub, 132, ll. 24-5.

For the khabar’s place, see the Questions under discussion: K. al-Insaf, No. 9, pp. 34-6, No. 17, pp. 70-2, and No. 18, pp. 73-6. For the separation between khabar and na’i, see Question No. 100.


KHABAR AL-WÂHID. Literally, tradition or report going back to one single authority. Synonyms are khabar al-‘âhâb, khabar al-infîrâd and khabar al-„âsîs. According to the generally-accepted definition, a khabar al-wâhid is a report which falls short of the predicate mutawâtir [q.v.] or, as certain scholars assert, mağhîr [q.v.] in that it has only one or a few (from two to five) transmitters in every jaba‘a of its isnad. The first classical scholar who writes about the khabar al-wâhid is, according to Nawawi (cf. Sharh sahih Muslim, Cairo 1349, i, 131), Shâfi‘i (d. 204/820). In his Risâla he devotes two chapters to it. He argues that a khabar al-wâhid constitutes an argument (hadîd) and should be able to grasp the meaning of what he transmits; (3) he should be able to warrant the exact wording; (5) he should transmit from memory, and (6) he should be free from taddîl [q.v.]. The khabar al-wâhid forms in itself an a‘f and can only in part be compared with juridical testimonies (ghahîdîd). It can only be invalidated by one or more other reports which present an opposing view and which, at the same time, meet the requirements of reliability more adequately.

Most Muslim scholars agree in that the khabar al-wâhid can be considered as conveying a probability (zânî, not definite knowledge (‘ilm), although various traditions hold the opinion that those contained in the compilations of Bukhârî and Muslim also convey ‘ilm to the exclusion of all others. The majority of orthodox Muslims, however, finally agreed on the fact that, inasmuch as a khabar al-wâhid conveys at least a probability, every Muslim is bound by it and is obliged to live by it.

Among those who reject the khabar al-wâhid as a valid criterion or an obligation are the Kâdiriyâ [q.v.], the Râfidî [q.v.], certain members of the Zâhiriyâ [q.v.] (although Ibn Hazm lends full credit to them), cf. al-‘îkâm fi usul al-‘âkâm, ed. Shâkir, Cairo 1345-7, i, 108) and the Mu’tazilâ [q.v.].


khabîr wa-mujâjahibhu, Damascus 1959, 152; J. Rosbon, Traditions from individuals, in JSS, ix (1964), 327-40; G. H. A. Juynboll, The authenticity of the tradition literature; discussions in modern Egypt. Leiden 1969, index, s.v. abâd.

Khabbab B. Al-ARATT, ABû ‘Abî AL-LâH OR ABû YAHyÀ OR ABû MUHAMMAD OR ABû ‘ABD RABBÎN, A Companion of the Prophet. Tradition is not unanimous about his origin. Some reports state that his father was captured in a raid launched by the Râbi‘a in the Sawâtíd, sent to Mecca and sold as a slave to Sîbî‘ b. ‘Abd al-‘Uzzâ al-Khuwâzî, a confederate (khâif) of the Banû Zuhrâ. Sîbî‘ (who was later killed by Hamza in the battle of ‘Ujd) gave him as a gift to his daughter Umm Anmâr who freed him. In a tradition attributed to ‘Ali he is said to have been the first of the Nabdî to embrace Islam. Other traditions claim that the mother of Khabbab, a professional circumciser, also gave birth to Sîbî‘; it is for this reason that Hamza when killing Sîbî‘ shouted to him “O son of the woman cutting the clitoris”. By virtue of this kinship, Khabbab claimed to be a confederate of the Zuhrâ in Mecca. Some reports say that this father was from Kastar or from the vicinity of Kûsâ. A quite different tradition states that al-‘Aratt was a Tamîmi, of the Banû Sa‘d, who was sent to Mecca in a raid in 612/c. to Umm Anmâr al-Khuwâzîyya, who freed him. This version, adopted by his descendants, gives his pedigree as follows: Khabbab b. Al-‘Aratt b. Sindâl b. Sa‘d b. Khuzayma b. Karb b. Sa‘d from Tamîm. Another account records that Khabbab was a freed slave (maswâd) of Thâbit b. Umm Anmâr; Thâbit, these sources claim, was a maswâd of al-Akhnas b. Sharîk al-Thâkafî, who in his turn was a confederate of the Zuhrâ. These contradictory traditions do not help to establish exactly his origin and his position in Mecca, but he must have been of a very low status, as he was doubly dependent, being a maswâd of a family which was in turn in a relation of dependence as confederates of the tribal group of Zuhrâ. Khabbab himself was a blacksmith, a profession regarded as base in Mecca and in the Arab peninsula in general. The tradition of his Sawâtíd origin seems preferable because of his father’s incorrect Arabic speech, which is indicated by his nickname al-‘Aratt; this would seem to point to Arabic not being his native language, and he probably spoke Nabataean, sc. neo-Aramaic. Although a maswâd, Khabbab apparently acquired some influence in the Khuwâzî family of his master. It was he who promoted the plan that the family of Sîbî‘ should join the Zuhrâ ‘Awî b. ‘Abd ‘Awî (the family of ‘Abd al-Rahmân b. ‘Awî) as confederates and he indeed succeeded in carrying out his plan. Khabbab was one of the earliest converts to Islam. He is usually mentioned as the sixth or the seventh man who embraced Islam. A unique tradition granting him an unusually high position in Islam says that he was the first man who embraced Islam.

Khabbab is recorded as one of “the weak ones” in Mecca. Lacking any protection (mana‘a), he was exposed to persecution and cruel torture. The noble Kurashîs and leaders of tribes used to mock the Prophet when they saw him in the company of Khabbab and other poor men, and some verses in the Qur‘an were revealed to the Prophet in this connection. It is said that Khabbab was attached to the Prophet and heard some chapters of the Qur‘an from his mouth, and that he witnessed the conversion of ‘Umar to Islam when present in the house of ‘Umar’s sister, reading chapters from the Qur‘an.
Having left Mecca as a muhddiir, Khabbab dwelt in Medina, together with al-Mikdad b. 'Amr, in the house of Kulfum b. Hidm; after the death of the latter they moved into the house of Sa'd b. 'Ubada. In some sources, Khabbab is included in the list of the descendants of the Prophet called the 'Abdab al-Suffa [see AH al-Suffa]. The Prophet set up the relation of brotherhood between Khabbab and Djab b. 'Atik. Khabbab participated in the battle of Badr and was entrusted with the division of the spoils al-Barr, al-Adal al-badawa, that he took part in and in all the other battles of the Prophet: he is, however, not mentioned in the list of warriors recorded in the stories of the battles.

No details are available about the vicissitudes of his life during the caliphate of 'Abd Bakr and 'Umar. 'Ummân granted him possession of Sa'nâb or Isti'niyâ in the vicinity of al-Kûfâ and he settled in al-Kûfâ. Shî'ites claim that he took part in the battle of Siffin in the company of Shâm'd* al-ashraf in Medina, together with al-Mikdad b. Amr, in the house of Sa'amâd*, after the death of the latter they moved into the house of Sa'amâd, in Medina, together with al-Mikdad b. Amr, in the house of Sa'amâd; after the death of the latter they moved into the house of Sa'amâd. Shâm'd* al-ashraf set up the relation of brotherhood between Khabbab and Djab b. 'Atik. Khabbab participated in the battle of Siffin and Nahrawan; some Shî'ites mention in the list of warriors recorded in the stories of the battles.

Khabbab died in 37 AH (or 39) at the age of 63 (or 73) as a rich man, leaving about 40,000 dirhams in cash. He regretted before his death that he had accumulated wealth; he was afraid lest he might have forfeited his reward in the next world, as he had reckoned on living long. In this respect Khabbab was aware that he should be buried outside al-Kûfâ, thus initiating a change in the custom of burying the dead in their own houses. 'Ali is said to have prayed over his grave when he returned from the battle of Siffin. He transmitted 32 utterances of the Prophet, some of which were recorded in the canonical collections of hadith, and some traditions of the Prophet were transmitted by his daughter. A son, 'Abd Allah, was cruelly killed by the Khawarîd.*

between Djabal Abd al-`Aziz and the Sindjar mountains, where it takes a southern direction, which it changes in the last part of its course into a south-western one.

Its springs, as well as those of its numerous tributaries, are chiefly connected with three important towns, Ra‘ al-`Ayn (Reşh’ayna of the Syrians) in the northwest, Mārdīn in the north and Naṣī bin in the northeast. The springs at Ra‘ al-`Ayn are said to be three hundred in number; they were shut off by iron girders in order to prevent people from being drowned in them.

Downstream from Ra‘ al-`Ayn the Khabūr is joined by the river of Nasibin; on Sachau’s map it bears the name of Nahr Zorgan. Just before passing between Djabal Abd al-`Aziz and the Sindjar mountains it is joined by the river of Naṣī bin. The Arab geographers apparently mean this river when speaking of the Hirrās; on Sachau’s map it is called Diaghdiagh. The course and the nomenclature of this and other tributaries are still uncertain.

The Arab geographers mention several more or less important places situated on the Khabūr between Djabal Abd al-`Aziz and Karṣīsīyā, such as Shāţā, Tunaynīr (upper and lower T.), Tābān (also on Sachau’s map), ‘Arbān or ‘Arbānī (also on Sachau’s map), a Shāyiṭayr, al-Shamiyyā (probably Sachau’s Shemīsān), Mākisin (“the customs-house”), al-Ghuddayr (“the pool”), and Şūwar (Sachau’s eṣ-Šawār). At Mākisin there was a bridge of boats. Much cotton was grown here, and by it lay the small lake of deep blue water called al-Munkharīk, which was said to be unfathomable.

The whole region through which the Khabūr flows, and particularly its lower course, was renowned for being fertile; its trees are mentioned in Arabic poetry, and its fruits were exported to the towns of al-‘Irāk. However, when Sachau travelled in the area (1899) the large fertile valley was devoid of towns, villages and human beings in general.


(II) The lesser Khabūr, one of the tributaries of the Tigris which flows past the mountains of southern Armenia, south of Lake Van and west of Lake Urmīya. It passes between the mountain ranges which are now called Djabal Harbāl (north) and Zākhā Dagh (south). The latter mountains derive their name from the town of Zākhā. The Khabūr joins the Tigris between Maghāra and Mazra. The Arab geographers often call it Khabūr al-Hasaniyya, after the town of this name. Here the river was spanned by a magnificent stone bridge which was looked upon as a miraculous piece of mason’s work. Al-Hasaniyya probably survives in the hamlet of Hasan Agha.
KHADIDJA — KHADIM AL-HARAMAYN

mad seems to have been trading in partnership with al-Sa'ib, as already mentioned. Khadidja is said to have died three days after Abu Talib in the year 619 (sc. three years before the Hijira).

Bibliography: Ibn Hisham, 119-22; 153-6; 232, 277, 1001; Ibn Sa'd, viii, 7-11; ii, 84 f., 130, 141; al-Tabarî, i, 1127-30, 1151, 1156 f., 1159, 1156, 1199, 1226; Isba, iii, 130; Usâd al-
Qâbah, v, 434-9; Ibn Hâbbû, Muṣhabhar, 9-11, 18, 77-9, 83, 99 f., 408, 452; al-Zuhayrî, Nasââ
Kurâysh, Cairo 1953, 21, 207, 230 f., 234; W. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early
Arabia, Cambridge 1885; F. Buhel, Das Leben Muhammeds, Leipzig 1930, 118-21; W. M. Watt,
Muhammad at Mecca, Muhammad at Medina, Oxford 1953, 196, indices.

KHADIM, from Arabic ḥudâma "to serve (a master)", means properly "servant, domestic", but it has acquired the euphemistic sense, first in Arabic and then in the other Islamic languages, of "eunuch"; hence the word is often ambiguous. In this article, only servants of free status are covered; for slaves, see *abâd and for eunuchs qašîf.

At the side of the slaves, there have always been free servants (coll. ḥammad, pl. ḥaddâm). Anas b. Mâlik [q.â.] entered Muhammad's service as a youth (al-Bukhârî, Dîhâdd, bâb 74 etc.) and he records it to his master's credit that the latter had never said a harsh word to him nor ever asked him for an explanation of his doings (al-Bukhârî, Wasâyû, bâb 25). Servants were used on journeys especially, and put up the tents, etc. These latter are called farsâk (lit. spreaders of the carpets), a name which is, however, given to servants who look after the beds and the house generally (Lane, The Thousand and One Nights, London 1859, ii, 202, no. 16).

In Egypt in Lane's time there was an organisation of servants. They were under special sha'yâkhhs to whom anyone who required a domestic had to apply; these sha'yâkhhs were responsible for any dishonesty or breach of trust by their people (Lane, Manners and Customs, London 1899, 139). There were also free female servants who performed the lowest house-hold duties (op. cit., 147, 197) for a very small wage (168). Some of the male servants used to shave their beards (573).

In Ottoman Turkish houses of the upper classes, these people, who were usually addressed by their name followed by Agha, worked as cooks, gardeners, janitors, etc., and they had to avoid the women's apartments in the house with which they communicated by the swivel-box (doldâb). If they were married they did not live in their master's house.

The women servants in the konaks lived in the women's apartments and had very little personal freedom. They sometimes belonged to impoverished Turkish families or were the children of former servants and slaves. They were called haifa (from khâifs) or hâlaâf (from khâlaâf) and the men ughâh, āfâyîr, hismetkhar (khidmetkâr). The servant girls (khidmetdij = ḥammadetdij) were usually Greeks or Armenians.

Uniformed officials in the imperial and official services were divided into various corporations (chamberlains, janitors, musicians) and were included under the general name hadama = ḥhadâma. On such corporations see also Von Hammer, Constantinopol und der Bosphorus, Post 1822, ii, 396 ff.

In North Africa, ḥâddim (dial. ḥâddâm) has acquired the specialised meaning of "negress", and ḥâddim is used for a domestic servant. However, classical ḥâddim retained an honourable usage in Morocco, where all letters sent out by the Sultan's chancery to his officials began with the formula ḥâddimanâ 'l-ardâ "to our well-pleasing servant". In contemporary Moroccan usage, šâhâb, pl. šâhîb, is more commonly found. Within the great families, there exists in effect a clientage of šâhîb who usually receive no regular salary but live on the bounty of their master. They accompany him on the road, look after his mount, and order illumination for trips at night, etc. If their master is a great kâfa or the head of a brotherhood, he appoints one of his aškhâb to accompany travellers who are passing through the areas over which his authority extends. This is a sign that they are under his protection. In Fez, there existed a corporation of female cooks who performed odd jobs within the household (Le Tourneau, Fès, 562) and were paid in kind.

In the sarayyas servants form a guild to which is entrusted the care of pilgrims and of the buildings; cf. Depont and Coppolani, Les confréries religieuses musulmanes, Algiers 1897; Douûtû, l'Islam algérien en l'an 1900.

The ḥadîth has handed down various sayings of Muhammad which endeavour to secure good treatment for servants; in these it is not always possible to distinguish whether the reference is to free men or slaves. The ḥâddim was responsible for any dishonesty or breach of trust by his people (al-Bukhârî, Wasâyû, bâb 25) on the other hand alms which he bestows out of his master's property bring him a heavenly reward (al-Bukhârî, Zâkâh, bâb 23). One should be ready to forgive one's servant (al-Tirmîdî, Bîrî, bâb 32); he should neither be beaten nor cursed (al-Tirmîdî, bâb 30, 31, 85); and the servant who has prepared a meal has a right to partake of it (al-Bukhârî, Aftîma, bâb 55; al-Tîr-
mîdî, Aftîma, bâb 44 etc.).

One may note finally that, amongst the titles of the Ottoman Sultans, was that of ḥâddim al-Haramayn "Servant of the two sacred areas", and also that at Mecca, one could purchase the title of ḥâddim al-masjid (Dozy, Supplement, s.v.). The collective khadâm is further used, often linked in paranomasia with ḥâddâm, to denote the partisans and entourage of a great man, above all, of a military leader or ruler.

(K. A. WENSINCK*)

KHÂDIM AL-HARÂMAYN (A.), "servant of the two holy places" (sc. Mecca and Medina), a title used by a number of Muslim monarchs. Adopted by the Ottoman Sultan Selim I after the conquest of Egypt in 922/1517 and used by some of his successors, it was regarded in late Ottoman times as a Caliphal title, and was said to have been taken over by Selim from the last 'Abbâsid caliph in Cairo. This does not correspond with the evidence, and appears to be part of the mythology of the Ottoman caliphate. As far as can be ascertained, the title was never used by the 'Abbâsid caliphs, whether in Irâk or in Egypt. It was however used by several Mamlûk sultans, and it was from the sultans, not the caliphs, of Egypt that the Ottomans adopted this title along with other possessions and perquisites of the Sultanate. Al-Kâkâshândi (Subh, vi, 46) is quite explicit, and lists it among the titles (alâbâb) of the Sultan. The first to use the title appears to have been Saladin, and the earliest known occurrence is in a restoration inscription in the Kubbat Yusuf in Jerusalem, dated 587/1191 (CIA, Jerusalem, ii, no. 30 = RCEA, ix, no. 3447). The introduction of this new title was probably a move in the rivalry between Saladin and the caliph al-Nâsir, over the leadership of the pilgrimage and related questions concerning the holy places in the Hijâz (on this rivalry see E.
Sivan, Salaadin et le calife al-Nasir, in Scripta Hierosolymitana, xxiii, 1972, 156 ff., especially 159 ff.

In the Jerusalem inscription of 589/1193 (CIA, Jerusalem, i, no. 36 = RCE, ix, no. 3466). In two inscriptions of Baybars, the title Khdim al-haramayn is followed or preceded by the words Sakh (or Malik) al-Kiblatayn", master (or king) of the two Kiblas", presumably Mecca and Jerusalem (Damasus, 659/1261, and Kara 664/1266; RCE, xii, no. 4476 and no. 4554). The same formula is attested for other Mamluk sultans, e.g. Kallwn (Cairo, 683/1284-5; CIA, Egypt, i, no. 82 = RCE, xii, no. 4852) and al-Asghar Khdli (Cairo, 687/1288; CIA, Egypt, i, no. 95 = RCE, xii, no. 4895).

Khdim al-haramayn is some variant of it (e.g. Khdim haramayn Allah wa-rasulihi (Khdli-bay, Cairo, 883/1480; CIA, Egypt, i, no. 325) was used only intermittently by the Mamluk sultans, and does not seem to have formed part of their standard titulary. An undated letter, purporting to have been sent by Timur to Bayazid I, complains of the use by the Mamluk sultan of the title "Sultdn (sic) al-haramayn". The writer regards this as presumptuous, and considers it a sufficient honour to be the servant (Khdmin) of the two holy places (Ferdin, Mznghd, i, 128, cf. T. W. Arnold, The Caliphate, Oxford 1924, repr. London 1965, 151). According to a Turkish chronicler, the Ottomans used to address the sultans of Egypt as Sultdn-1 haramayn babam, "my father the Sultan of the two holy places", but Mehemmed II replaced this by the less deferential Khdmin-i haramayn and even Khddim-i haramayn Misir Sultan, "my brother the Sultan of Egypt" (Aslkhpdaxzade, Tdwrikh-i Ali 0'tmn, Istanbul 1332 anno 863, p. 209; the passage occurs among the anonymous addenda to Aslkh pdaxzade's chronicle. Cf. Selhnttin Tansel, Osmanl1 kaynaklanrna gore Fatih Sultan Mehmed'in Siyas ve askeri faaliyeti, Ankara 1953, 337-8).

According to Arabic sources Selim I was hailed, during his conquest of Egypt, by the preachers in the mosques of Aleppo and later of Cairo (Arnold, Caliphathe, 140-1 and 145, citing Ibn Iyds, Ta'rkh Misir, iii, 98, and Khb al-Dtn, Chroniken der Staat Mekka, iii, 278-9; cf. Von Hammer, Histoire, iv, 280 and 448). Ottoman sources attach some importance to this recognition by the Sharif of Mecca, thus confirming his authority over the holy places, but significantly, without reference to the title (e.g. Sa'd al-Dtn, Tdgi t-tewavrlik, ii, 371-2; Solakzade, Tdtikh, 480; on some documents, see Selhnttin Tansel, Yavuz Sultan Selim, Ankara 1969, 215-7). In a letter to the ruler of Mecca, announcing his accession, Suleymnn refers to his father Selim as Khddim bayt Allah wa'l-haram fathi mamalik al-'Arab wa'l-Aqdam, "Servant of the house of God and the sanctuary, conqueror of the lands of the Arabs and Persians" (Ferdin, i, 448, cf. Arnold, 155). This appears, however, to be an honorific description rather than a title. In his own documents Suleymnn, while listing Mecca and Medina among his possessions, does not seem to have used the title Khddim. It appears, however, on coins of Suleymnn struck in Baghdad in 942/1535-6 (i.e., after its capture from the Persians), 988/1515, and 960/ 1553 (Khfi Edhem, Meskhd-4 'Othmniyne, Istanbul 1534, 250-2), and remained in occasional but not common use under later sultans. Thus in the treaty with Poland of 106/1607, it figures among the titles of the sultan in the preamble (Hammer, Histoire, viii, 407, citing the Destdr al-nisbah of 'Ali Abdullah), it occurs in the signature of 1528/1552 of a letter from the Ottoman court to the Mamluk sultan, for example (ibid., 161). A similar formula is used in documents of Selim III (M. Guboglu, Palaeographia et diplomatia turco-osmana, Bucarest 1958, 60). (B. LEWIS)

KHADIM HASAN PASHA ŞOKOLLI, Ottoman Grand-Vizier. We have no information about his origin, but he was brought as part of the de
gureme [q.v.] to the Imperial Palace and given a post in the Harem in the department of the white eunuchs; later, he became chief treasurer of the Inner Palace or Enderûn. In Djumadâ I 988/June 1585, he was appointed governor of Egypt in place of Mesih Pasha, but after complaints about him, dismissed in Rabî' II 991/May 1583, and on arrival in Istanbul imprisoned in Yedikule. However, he was pardoned and released after presenting valuable gifts to Nûrnân Sultan, the mother of Murâd III, and was appointed govern-
ernor-general of Anatolia.

In Djumadâ II/June 1585 he joined the Ottoman army at Sivas under Âzâd-Emîlû Pasha, en route for Persia. At the battle of Alîvar he commanded the right wing of the Ottoman army, and continued campaigning against the Persians in Ramadân 993/ September 1585 after the conquest of Tabriz. In the spring of 994/1587 he was appointed governor of Anatolia by Selim II, and in Dhu'l-Qa'da 996/ October 1588 governor of the province of Shirwan after the death of Dja'far Pasha. During the reign of Mehemmed III he was called to the Palace in Istanbul in Dhu'l-Qa'da 1003/July 1595 to be fourth vizier, and remained there as acting Grand Vizier when the young Sultan was absent campaigning at Egri. While in this office, and with the backing of the powerful court favourite, Efrd Efendi, he appointed the well-known Khôdja Sa'd al-Dtn Efendi and recently-appointed kadî of Istanbul by Mehemmed III, from entering Istanbul, retaining Âkhi-zâde 'Âbd al-Hallm Efendi in this office.

In Djumadâ I 1005/December 1595, as âdimmâbâm, he welcomed Mehemmed III back from the Egri campaign with a magnificent ceremony. In Rabî' I 1006/November 1595, he became Grand Vizier in place of the Bosnian Dâmdâ Ibrahim Pasha, the second vizier Djîrrâm Mehemmed Pasha being passed over for this office by the young Sultan. However, Khâmî Hasan Pasha's grand vizierate proved very short. When the Shâykh al-Islâm Bostân-zâde Mehemmed Efendi died, he refused to confer the office of Shâykh al-Islâm on the sultan's choice Khôdja Sa'd al-Dtn Efendi, but appointed either the poet Bâkî Efendi or Karâ Câlebiyân Hüsâm al-Dtn Efendi, which caused the already existing enmity between him and Sa'd al-Dtn Efendi to become worse. Consequently, Khâmî Hasan Pasha's old opponents, Ghâzanfer Agha Sa'd al-Dtn Efendi and the commander-in-chief of the Janissaries, Tînlâkî Hasan Agha, whose execution he had sought from the Sultan, banded together under the influence of the Wâlîe Sultan Şafiyê against him, and secured his downfall on charges of corruption. On 10 Ramadân 1006/8th April 1598, during the ceremony of laying the foundation of the Wâlîe Sultan (Yeâl)}
Mosque at Eminönü, Bostandji-Bashi Ferhâd Ağa arrested Khâdim Hasan Paşa and confined him in Yedikule; six days later he was executed. He was buried in his tomb beneath his medrese, after the incineration of all his property at Eyüp by the state. Near the Çagaloğlu palace and opposite to the present Emînîyet Sandîğî there were situated a mosque and a medrese which were built by him, and also a public fountain built after him in 1594/1602.

Another Sokollî Khâdim Hasan Paşa was the son of Sokollî Mehmed Paşa. He took part in the campaign of Egypt [q.v.] of 1004-5/1596, was beglerbegî of Rumeli, and died later than the Grand Vizier of the same name.

**Bibliography:** Istanbul, Başbaðanîk Arşivi, Mühammed deftleri, no. 43, p. 9; 'Abd al-Karîm b. 'Abd al-Rahbîm, Ta'rihî-i Miûrî, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. turc. no. 86, f. 74a; Hârîmî Bahîmî-zâde İbrâhîm Câwûgî, Gûnduz-uyu bûhî-i murad. Ist. Univ. Libr. Tskh. no. 2372, ft. 54a-57b; Şeref Khan, Şeref-nâmé, tr. M. E. Bozâlsan, İstanbul 1971, 290, 294; Mustafa Selânîkî, Selânîkî Ta'rihî, Ist. Univ. Libr. Tskh. no. 6027, ff. 283b-292b, ed. İstanbul 1281, 318-44 (important for the events of Khâdim Hasan’s grand vizierate);


(MOÎIR AKTEP)

KHÂDIM SÜLEYMÂN PASHA (7 - 954/1547). Ottoman governor of Egypt, commander of the campaign of 945/1534 against the Portuguese in India and Grand Vizier. When Selim I died in 926/1520, Suleyman Pasha was holding the office of beglerbegî, and in 931/1524-25 was appointed governor (beglerbegî) of Bâb al-Mandab, and thereafter became governor of Anatolia, acquiring the rank of vizier (Lutfî Paşa, Ta'rihî-i Âlî ‘Othmânî, İstanbul 1341, 358). On 11 Ra'dâb 943/25 October 1536 he was once more given the beglerbegî of Egypt. He stayed in the office until the year 945/1538, when he organised his famous campaign against the Portuguese in India.

Süleymân Paşa had planned a campaign to Yemen during his first governorship of Egypt, and had persuaded the Istanbul authorities to agree to this. He could not, however, put it into action as he had to join the Baghdad campaign of 945/1534-5 (Pevci, Ta’rihî, İstanbul 1282, i, 219). Now the situation was favourable to his plans; the Muslims of Gujûlîrât had been asking the Ottomans to help against the Portuguese, and the local ruler, Bâhâder Shâh, had sent a special envoy to Istanbul for this purpose. The Ottoman government determined on an expedition into the Indian Ocean (Lutfî Paşa, 358; Kübîl-dîn Makkî ‘Alî-Nahrwâlî, Al-Bâkî ‘Alî-î Yamnî fî fâlîth ‘Alî-î ‘Othmânî, Riyâd 1967, 70). Süleymân Paşa’s fleet consisting of 72 vessels with siege guns and about 6,500 soldiers, including 150 Janissaries, left Suez on 24 Muharram 945/24 June 1538 (R. S. Whiteway, The rise of Portuguese power in India, 1497-1550, London 1967, 256; anon., Rustem Paşa Ta’rihî, Istanbul Universîte kütopûnânesi, MS 2438, fol. 205b; cf. al-Nahrwâlî, 71; Kâtîb Cebelî, Tu’hatf al-bîhîr fi âsîrî al-bîhâr, İstanbul 1320, 57, 58). The Paşa sailed down the Red Sea, passing Djiedda and the island of Kamarân and arrived at the straits of Bâb al-Mandab. From there, he proceeded to the harbour of Aden, where he had Âmîr b. Dâwûd, the ruler of the town, hanged from the yard-arm of his flagship. Aden now passed under Ottoman control and became a sandjak dependent on Yemen (Topkapî Sarayı Müzeesi Arşivi, N.E. 6545).

After 19 days sailing Süleymân Paşa appeared before the coast of Gujûlîrât on 9 Ra’dâb 945/9 September 1538, having lost five ships of his fleet during this sail. Süleymân Paşa’s first attack and took the fortress of Gogala (called by the Portuguese Villa dos Rumos and by the Muslims Bandar-i Turkî) and then that of Kat, but failed to reduce the strong Portuguese fort of Diu. Mahmûd III, the successor of Bâhâder Shâh of Gujûlîrât, bearing in mind the fate of the amir of Aden, failed to help the Ottomans (Hâdîjî al-Darbî, Zafar al-udâlî bi-Musafar wa-alîhî, ed. as An Arabic History of Gujûlîrât, Baroda 1970, i, 226-7). On arrival of the news that the Portuguese fleet was approaching, and despite the fall of the outer fortress of Diu, Süleymân Paşa withdrew his siege artillery and on 12 Dîjêmîda 26 October, sailed back to the Red Sea (Particular relation of the expedition of Solyma Pacha from Suez to India against the Portuguese at Diu, in Robert Kerr and F. A. Eden, A General History and collection of Voyages and Travels, Edinburgh 1812, ii, 258-87). On the way, he stopped at Shîbr on the coast of Arabia, an important town for trade. There he aided Badr, the ruler of Shîbr to extend his power as far as Zufar (Dhofar) on condition that he paid an annual tribute (for the letter of this ruler, sent to Hariml e.on. Kabbakan Arşivi, İstanbul, 1852-53). On 8 Ra’dâb 938/30 November 1538 he proceeded towards Aden (Topkapî Sarayı Müzeesi Arşivi, N.E. 6704;
Whilst governor of Egypt, Süleyman Pasha made improvements in the citadel district of Cairo and constructed two mosques, one at Bulak and the other at the citadel of Cairo, and improvements in other districts of Egypt. (For critics of his activities see the various articles of L. Ribeiro in Studia orientalia, v, 59, 297-9, 302-3, and his Histoire de Suleyman Pacha.) In 1274, he died in a city between Egypt and the Ottoman empire.


AL-KHADIR (AL-KHIDIR), the name of a popular figure, who plays a prominent part in legend and story. Al-Khâdir is properly an epithet ("the green man"); this was in time forgotten and this explains the secondary form Khidir (approximately "the green"), which in many places has displaced the primary form.

(i) IN THE KUR'ân AND IN ORIENTAL LEGEND

Legends and stories regarding Khâdir are primarily associated with the Kur'ânic story in Sûra XVIII, 59-81, the outline of which is as follows. Mûsâ goes on a journey with his servant (fâdil), the goal of which is the magâma al-barayn. But when they reach this place, they find that as a result of the influence of Satan, they have forgotten the fish which they were taking with them. The fish had found its way into the water and had swum away. While looking for the fish the two travellers meet a servant of God. Mûsâ says that he will follow him if he will teach him the right path (rû instantly. They come to an arrangement but the servant of God tells Mûsâ at the beginning that he must not ask for explanations and as a result will not be able to bear with him. They set out on the journey, however, during which the servant of God does a number of apparently outrageous things, which causes Mûsâ to lose patience so that he cannot refrain from asking for an explanation, whereupon the servant of God replies: "Did I not tell you that you would be lacking in patience with me?" He finally leaves Mûsâ and on departing gives him the explanation of his actions, which had their good reasons.

This servant of God is called al-Khâdir by the majority of the commentators. Others, however, identify him with Mûsâ's servant (see below). Both interpretations have their roots in Oriental legends. The Kur'ânic story may be traced back to three main sources: the Gilgamesh epic, the Alexander romance, and the Jewish legend of Elijah and Rabbi Joshua ben Levi. The two first are, of course, again closely related to one another; at the same time it should be noted that the fish episode is lacking in the epic and is only found in the romance (cf. R. Hartmann in the ZA, xxiv, 307 ff.).

The main features which the three sources have in common with the story in the Kur'ân are the following:

The Gilgamesh epic. Overcome with melan-
made the fish live again and it swims away. Andreas jumped in after it and thus gained immortality. When he told Alexander his adventure, the latter at once realised that this was the well of life. All attempts to find it again failed: Alexander is denied the immortality which becomes the lot of the unfortunate cook, who does not know what to do with it.

The Jewish legend (printed in Jellinek, *Bel ha-Midrasch*, v. 133-5) tells how Rabbi Joshua ben Levi goes on a journey with Elijah under conditions laid down by Elijah, like those above of the servants of God in the Kur'ān. Like the latter, Elijah does a number of apparently outrageous things, which affects Joshua as it did Mūsā. Zunz, *Gesammelte Vorträge*, x, 130 first pointed out the similarity of this story to the Kur'ān legand. A comparison of the main features of these three sources with Sūra XVIII, 59 ff. suggests the following conclusions, questions and hypotheses.

The chief figure in the Kur'ānic story is called Mūsā. Some commentators doubt his identity with the great prophet (see below). There is not, however, the slightest hint of another Mūsā anywhere in the Kur'ān. On the other hand, we have no legends of Moses, which make him, like Gilgamesh and Alexander, go on the great journey. We might suggest the following explanation of the difficulty. The figure of Joshua ben Levi, with which Muhammad first became acquainted through the Jews and which does not again appear in Muslim legend, was identified, as we shall see, with Joshua b. Nūn. This identification may have resulted in a confusion of his master Elijah with Joshua b. Nūn’s master Moses. Mūsā thus represents Gilgamesh and Alexander in the first part of the Kur'ānic story and Elijah in the second.

The figure of the travelling companion is not connected with the Gilgamesh epic where it is not found, but with the Alexander romance and the Jewish legend. It probably comes in the first place from the romance. This is suggested by the fact that the companion is called *fātīḥa* (here meaning “servant”), a term that points to Alexander’s cook rather than to Rabbi Joshua; the first episode, which also is only found in the Alexander romance, points in the same direction.

The *madjima* al-bahrayn is given as the goal of the journey. The expression has no direct original either in the epic or the romance, although there are points of contact in both. Utnapīṣṭīm lives *ina pi narāt*, i.e. at the mouth of the river. It is not quite certain what the expression means, but it is probable that the place in the extreme west is meant where the sources of all running water are. This, however, still leaves the dual in the Kur'ānic expression unexplained. This is still the case, if we attempt to trace it to the Alexander romance, where (i.e. in the Syriac Alexander legend; see Budge, *op. cit.*, 259) Alexander with his army crosses a strip of land between the eleven bright seas and the ocean. It is also possible that the expression goes back to none of these but to another story unknown to us, which perhaps never found its way into literature, in which there was mention of the meeting place of two seas. According to western Semitic cosmology, this is the end of the world where the oceans of earth and heaven meet.

We can likewise only guess at the origin of the rock. It also belongs to cosmology (see A. J. Wensinck, *The ocean in the literature of the Western Semites*, in the *Verh. A. H. Amsterdam*, xix [26 ff.). It is found neither in the epic nor in the romance, again an indication that the Kur'ānic story borrowed from other sources.

The servant of God at the *madjima* recalls Utnapīṣṭīm-Khasisatra. He is called (v. 64) one to whom God’s mercy had been shown, to whom divine wisdom had been granted. This sounds almost like a translation of the name Khasisatra and the granting of divine favour is perhaps an echo of Utnapīṣṭīm’s immortality.

The test of patience to which he subjects the newcomer comes from the Jewish legend only; the servant of God in this respect thus represents Elijah.

(ii) DEVELOPMENT IN ISLAM

The commentators, *bāḥtiya*, and historians have collected a mass of statements around the Kur’ānic story, additions which, like the story itself, came for the most part from the three sources already mentioned.

The first question discussed is whether the principal character is Mūsā b. *Imrān* or Mūsā b. *Mishā* (= Manasseh) b. *Yūsuf* b. *Ya’qūb*, i.e. a descendant of the patriarch Jacob (al-Ībādī, *Maftūḥ al-ghayb*, iv, 333; al-Zamakhshārī, *Kashshāf*, on v. 59). Commentators are almost unanimous in favour of the former alternative and base their opinion on the following legend which is transmitted in several forms. When Mūsā, the famous prophet, was one day preaching to the children of Israel, he was asked if there was any man wiser than he. When he replied in the negative, Allāh revealed to him that his pious servant, al-Īdārī, was wiser than he. He thereupon decided to visit this wise man. The story comes from Jewish legend; it is found in a considerable number of Arabic sources (al-Bukhārī, *al-Kub*, bāb 16, 19, 44; *Anbiya*, bāb 27; *Tafsīr*, Sūra XVIII, bāb 2-4; Muslim, *Fadā‘il*, tr. 170-4; al-Tirmidhī, *Tafsīr*, Sūra XVIII, bāb 1; al-Ṭabarī, i, 417; *Tafsīr*, xv, 165 f.; Fakhr al-Dīn al-Ībādī, *op. cit.*, iv, 333).

The (salted) fish serves as a guide to the route; the place where it is lost or revived by contact with water is the spring of life where al-Īdārī lives (al-Ṭabarī, i, 417). A eunuch serves as cook, who does not know what to do with it. Vollers consider the reverse probable; he thinks that “river of the wolf” is a translation of the spring of life that is is marked by the rock, for it rises at its foot (al-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, xv, 167; al-Bukhārī, *Tafsīr*, Sūra XVIII, bāb 4). The rock is also located before the river of oil or the river of the wolf (al-Baydawī and al-Zamakhshārī on Sūra XVIII, 61; al-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, xv, 164). Some connection between a river of oil and the spring of life is in itself not impossible. According to many statements, oil is a feature of Paradise rivers. Then *النَّافَض* would be an error in writing *ثَمِّيْت*, which could easily arise. Vollers consider the reverse probable; he thinks that “river of the wolf” is a translation of the name Loukos, which is not uncommon in classical literature as a river-name. If this hypothesis is correct, one might think of the Lukkos in Morocco or the Lycus on the Syrian coast, two regions with which the idea of extreme west is associated, as we shall see directly.

The *madjima* al-bahrayn is explained in various ways. Some regard it as “the place where the Persian Ocean unites with the Roman Sea, to the east” (al-Baydawī on Sūra XVIII, 59; al-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, xv, 163). This points to the isthmus of Suez and is an echo of the idea that the coast of Syria was the extreme west (see A. J. Wensinck, *Bird and tree as cosmological symbols in Western Asia*, in the *Verh. A. H. Amsterdam*, 1921, 17 ff.). Others say that it is the junction of the Roman Sea with
the Ocean (Tandja, Ifriklya; al-Tabari, Tafsir, xv, 163, and al-Zamakhsharl on the passage). This view reflects a later cosmological standpoint which regarded the Straits of Gibraltar as the extreme west. A farfetched explanation is that the union of the two seas means the meeting of Mūsā and al-Khādir, the two seas of wisdom (e.g. al-Damārī, Ḥayāt al-bayyān 1, 315).

When Mūsā first sees Khādir he is wrapped up in his cloak, as the Kurān says, "because he was sleeping", says al-Ṭabarī (i, 418). When he sees a bird drinking out of the sea he says to Mūsā: "Your wisdom is insignificant as compared with that of God as the amount the bird drinks is compared with the sea" (al-Ṭabarī, i, 418; al-Bukhārī, Tafsir, Sūra XVIII, bāb 35; al-Rāzī, Maḏāḥ al-ghayb, iv, 333-4). Al-Khādir lives on an island (al-Ṭabarī, i, 422), or on a green carpet (ṭifāsa) in the heart of the sea (‘ālā ḫādir al-bāḥr; al-Bukhārī, Tafsir, Sūra, XVIII, bāb 3).

The test of patience is embellished by the commentators with a wealth of detail. It would take up too much space to go into them here; cf. the commentaries on Sūra XVIII, 59 ff., and the works on history and tradition mentioned in the Bibliography.

It may be expected from what we have said above, another branch of tradition lays particular emphasis on the connection between al-Khādir and Alexander's search for the spring of life. Friedländer, however, goes much too far when he says (Die Chadbirlegende, 108-9) "that originally Chadhir had nothing at all to do with the puzzling servant in verse 64—who belongs to quite a different cycle of stories—but with the servant of Moses (Alexander) who has charge of the fish in verse 59; in other words, he is identical with Alexander's cook whom we know so well from Pseudo-Callisthenes and the Ethiopic Alexander romance; cf. Friedlander's Paix des Babylone, 275. Clermont-Ganneau further pointed out the identity with St. George, with whom al-Khādir has certain similarities." The latter identification is probably due to a confusion with Alexander's cook whom we know so well from Pseudo-Callisthenes and the Ethiopic Alexander romance; cf. Friedlander, op. cit., 275. Clermont-Ganneau further pointed out the relationship between the consonants kh-d-r and the North Semitic group ḫ-r. The name has also been taken as a corruption of Khasisatra (Guyard in Reih RHR, I, 344-5) or connected with Ahasuerus, the wandering Jew (Lidzbarski in ZA, vii, 116).

Very varying dates are given for al-Khādir's period. Sometimes he is called a contemporary of Abraham, who left Babel with him (al-Ṭabarī, i, 415); sometimes he is put in the period of Afritīdīn; he is a contemporary of Alexander and lived down to the time of Mūsā (Ibn Ḥadjar, Ḥayāt, 886); according to others, he was born in the period of Nāṣihyāt b. Amūs (i.e. Isaiah b. Amos) (al-Ṭabarī, 415-6). The divergence in these statements is partly connected with his immortality (see below).

The descriptive character of the name al-Khādir is so obvious from its meaning that tradition could not but give the hero's real name, as well as his genealogy and date. We find him most frequently called Bālāya b. Malkān. In al-Masūdī (Murādī, i, 144) the latter is called a brother of Kābītān and thus given a place in the South Arabian genealogy. This makes it probable that Malkān is identical with Malkān (I Chronicles, viii, 9), who is also included among the South Arabian patriarchs. This genealogy is next traced back to Shem through Fālāq (Phaleg) and 'Abīr (Eber) (e.g. al-Ṭabarī, i, 415; al-Masūdī, Murādī, i, 92; al-Nawawī, on Muslim's Sahīh, v, 135). Is this Bālāya (Bālāya) perhaps not a corruption of Elīa (Elīa), which is identical with a Syriac form of the name Elījah? On the other hand, Elījah is also given in the Muslim form Iyās as al-Khādir's proper name and also Elīsha, Jeremiah (cf. God's words in Isāba, 889), Khadrūn (al-Ṭabarī, i, 415; al-Diyārbakrī, Taʾrīkh al-khāmis, i, 106, and Friedländer's Chadbirlegende, 333, under Chadbir).

Ibn Ḥadjar also gives the following genealogies (Isāba, 883-4): (1) He is a son of Adam (weak ḫnādā); with this is connected the story (Isāba, 887-8; Abū Ḥattīm al-Sidjastānī, Kiṣāb al-Muʿammardin, 1) that al-Khādir took care of Adam's body and finally buried it after the flood; (2) He is a son of Kābih called Khadrūn; (3) He is al-Muʿammarr ("the Long-lived") b. Mālik b. Abd Allāh b. Nasr b. al-Azd; (4) He is Ibn 'Amālī b. al-Nūr b. al-Qs b. Iṣhāk; (5) He is the son of Pharaoh's daughter; (6) He is a Persian, or his father was a Persian, or his mother a Greek or vice versa; (7) He is said to have been born in a cave, fed there on the milk of wild beasts and finally entered the service of a man called 'Abīd b. Malik, whom he afterwards visited. The latter identification is probably due to a confusion with a king (al-Damārī, i, 318; Ibn Ḥadjar, 891-2); cf. also his meeting "on the market-place of the Banū Isrāʾil" with the man who asks him for alms bi-wadjh Allāh (Isāba, 894-5).

This does not, however, exhaust the traditions about his names and genealogy. We shall only quote here the following from Maracci, Prodromi to Sūra xxvii, 57: Alcedrus, quem fabulantur Moslemi eundem fuisset, ac Phineas filium Eleazar, filii Aaron, cujus anima per metempsychosin emigravit primo in Eiliam, deinde ex Elia in S. Gregorium, quem propterea Mahumetani omnes summo honore prosequuntur. The latter identification is probably due to a confusion with St. George, with whom al-Khādir has certain points of resemblance; cf. thereon Clermont-Ganneau in Revue archéologique, xxxiii, and Friedländer op. cit., 275. Clermont-Ganneau further pointed out the relationship between the consonants ḥ-d-r and the North Semitic group h-r. The name has also been taken as a corruption of Khasisatra (Guyard in RHR, I, 344-5) or connected with Ahasuerus, the wandering Jew (Lidzbarski in ZA, vii, 116).

Very varying dates are given for al-Khādir's period. Sometimes he is called a contemporary of Abraham, who left Babel with him (al-Ṭabarī, i, 415); sometimes he is put in the period of Afritīdīn; he is a contemporary of Alexander and lived down to the time of Mūsā (Ibn Ḥadjar, Isāba, 886); according to others, he was born in the period of Nāṣihyāt b. Amūs (i.e. Isaiah b. Amos) (al-Ṭabarī, 415-6). The divergence in these statements is partly connected with his immortality (see below).

More important are the explanations of the name given in the oriental sources. Ibn Ḥadjar said to have been created through diving into the spring of life and thus got his name (Ethiopic Alexander romance; cf. Friedländer, op. cit., 235-6). As already
mentioned, he lives on an island (al-Damiri, op. cit., 317); he is also said to worship God on the islands (al-Sufi, see Friedländer, ii, 183; al-Tha'labi, 197). This may point to al-Khādir's having originally been a marine being. The following circumstances point in the same direction: he is frequently called the patron of seafaring people (e.g. Ta'ūriḥ al-khamīs, i, 107); he is said to be appealed to on the Syrian coast by sailors in stormy weather. In India he has become a regular river-god under the name Khādīja Khādir (q.v.), who is represented sitting on a fish. Clermont-Ganneau and Friedländer sought the origin of the figure mainly in this direction, the latter on the assumption that the Greek Glaukos legend reached the Muslims through a Syriac intermediary (op. cit., 107 ff.). But apart from the fact that we know nothing of any such intermediary, a connection between al-Khādir and Glaukos would only explain one aspect of the former; nor would it tell us anything about the origin of the figure. Indeed, one may doubt whether it is right to seek for the origin of a figure so complicated as al-Khādir, who has characteristics in common with Utnapishtim, with Alexander's cook and other figures.

There are other things to be considered. In a number of Arabic explanations of the name, al-Khādir is conceived not as belonging to the sea but to the vegetable kingdom (see al-Nawawi, who is represented sitting on a fish and it became green” (e.g. al-Nawawi on Muslin's Šābik, v, 135; cf. al-Tabari, Tafsir, xv, 168). “The skin”, adds al-Nawawi, “is the earth”. Al-Diyārakrī (i, 106) is still more definite. “The skin is the earth when it puts forth shoots and becomes green after having been bare”. According to Umāra, al-Khādir is told at the spring of life: “Thou art Chadhir and where thy feet touch the earth it will become green” (Friedländer, op. cit., 145). Wherever he stands or performs the saḥāṭ, it will become green (al-Nawawi, op. cit.; al-Rāzī, Mañīṭik al-ghayb, iv, 336). These are statements (especially the last) which remind us of a Messianic passage in the Old Testament: “Behold the man whose name is the branch and he shall grow up out of his place” (Zechariah, vi, 12). Al-Khādir is really connected with two Messianic figures—with Elijah (see ii, 115) and with Jesus; these three form with Idīr (q.v.) the quartette of those who have not tasted death (Ta'ūriḥ al-khamīs, i, 107).

The variations in the character of al-Khādir result in different views regarding his nature. If he is a prophet (see Ṣība, 882 ff.), it remains doubtful whether he is to be included among the Apostles (al-Nawawi, op. cit., 135). He is, however, also human, angelic, mundane and celestial (al-Tabari, i, 544, 798). Popular piety as well as Sāfi circles readily regard him as a saint (waṣā). According to one Sūfi view, every age has its Khādir, in so far (cf. Ṣība, 904 ff.). Every Friday he drinks from the Zam zam well, and Solomon's pond and meadows in the well of Siōmān (Ta'ūriḥ al-khamīs, i, 107; Friedländer, op. cit., 145). He flies through the air, meets Elijah on the dam of Alexander and makes the pilgrimage to Mecca with him every year (cf. Ṣība, 904 ff.). Every Friday he drinks from the Zam zam well, and Solomon's pond and meadows in the well of Siōmān (Ta'ūriḥ al-khamīs, i, 107; Friedländer, op. cit., 145); he can find water below the ground and talks the languages of all peoples (al-Ṣūri, in Friedländer, 184).

His immortality is particularly emphasised (cf. Rücker's poem “Chidher”; Umāra in Friedländer, op. cit., 145; Abū Hātim al-Sīgjāstānī, Kitāb al-Mu'amārīn, 1; Ṣība, 887 ff., 892, 895). According to the Ṣība, 882, he was given immortality after a conversation with his friend, the angel Raḥf, in order to establish the true worship of God on the earth and maintain it. Ibn Hāǧar describes a meeting between al-Khādir and a fisherman in various versions (Ṣība, 890 ff.). On meetings with individuals who lived at a later date see ibid., 908 ff.; on the table which was let down to him from heaven, see ibid., 919; on his presence at the battle of Kādisiyah, see Murādī al-dhahab, iv, 216.

He lives in Jerusalem and performs his saḥāṭ every Friday in the mosques of Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Kūbā and on the Mount of Olives; his food is kham'a and water-parsley (Ta'ūriḥ al-khamīs, i, 107; Ṣība, 889-90, 904).

On his marriages we have as early as classical khdith ( Ibn Mādjā, Zuhd, bāb 23) a legend also mentioned by al-Thā'labi, Kīṣās, 193 ff., which in its main features must have come from Christian sources. It is the motif of the pious youth who, married by his parents against his will, persuades his wife to become a mystic and to ascend to heaven (compare the Syriac Acts of Thomas, 2nd Praxis). The story links up with that of Pharaoh's daughter's handmaid.


KHADIR, BAN( sing. Khadir), a generic term in Najd [q.v.] for Arabs of dubious ancestry, e. not recognised as descendants of either 'Adnān or Kaḥṭān [see DIzIRAT AL-ARAB. vi. Ethnography]. The derivation of the term is uncertain.
In any case, it is not to be taken as the name of a tribe, though there are sections of Banū Khadr in various towns of al-Najd (see the tentative list in Lorimer, ii, 1904).

Many of Banū Khadr are tillers of the soil for Arabs of pure descent who own the land they work. Rarely is a Khadrī himself a landowner. Banū Khadr as cultivators are numerous in the oases of al-Aflāḥ, Hawwāt Banī Tamīm and its neighbours, al-Ṭārid, Sudayr, and al-Ḳāṣim [q.v.], as well as west of the Ṭuwayq escarpment in Dāmār and al-Kuwayṭ-iyya.

Men of Banū Khadr, however, often rise above the rank of common labourer. When the British official and explorer Philby first became acquainted with the court of ʿAbd al-ʿAzzīz b. ʿAbd al-ʿRahmān ʿAlī Suʿūd in 1336/1917-18, Khadrīs were serving the Wahhābī ruler as treasurer and as master of ceremonies, while others, along with slaves, made up the bulk of his bodyguard. At least three of ʿAbd al-ʿAzzīz’s early secretaries were Khadrīs, and the brother of one of these went on to become his powerful Minister of Finance.

In the old Arabia, Banū Khadr were subjected to a strong taboo: no matter how high a station in life a Khadrī held, any Arab of pure descent, humble though his circumstances might be, would flatly refuse to give him a daughter as his bride. In the new Arabia of the later 20th century, with great changes taking place in the economic and social structure, this taboo may be weakening.


**AL-KHADR, AL-KHAṬIR, KHAṬIR, ʿAṬIR, ʿAṬIRAT** is a name given by the Arabs to Abbadān [q.v.], because al-Khadir [q.v.] is supposed to have appeared there. According to a legend, a ragged man appeared on the bank of the Bahaddīn canal and asked the master of a passing sailing-boat to ferry him across. The master refused. The stranger ordered the boat to come to the spot where he was standing, pulled it out of the water by the anchor chain, and left it high and dry. Then he disappeared. Farmers of the neighbourhood built a mud wall around the boat. The wall was repaired by a builder, called Usta Dīʾāmī, in 908/1501. In 933/1526, a shrine with a cupola was built and the alleged anchor of the boat hung up inside. The shrine is now an object of pilgrimage.

(V. Melkonian)

**AL-KHADR, MUHAMMAD B. AL-HUSAYN (the name al-Khadir/al-Khidr being adopted during his stay in the east), scholar, poet and writer of Tunisian origin.** He was born at Nefta in 26 Radjab 1293/21 July 1876, and studied first at a Kurānic school before coming with his family to Tunis in 1888. In 1889 he entered the Great Mosque for his secondary studies and followed the courses of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Raʾūṣīḥ, Muhammad ʿAlī al-Dāʾīḍī and Sālim Bihādíjīb, who were known for their reformist ideas. He gained the iṣlāḥī atiṣṭ or diploma of completion of secondary studies in 1899, and began to teach at the Zaytūna, interrupted his career to make a trip to the east, but halted at Tripoli and ended up by retracing his steps in 1889. He subsequently began his activities by founding the first Tunisian journal in Arabic, al-Suʾūdī al-ʿumārī, in 1322/1904. He was appointed bāḥi of Bizerta in 1905 and continued to teach at the town’s Great Mosque, then left his post and took up his teaching post at the Zaytūna in 1906. His first lecture during this year, at the council of the Association of Former Sādīqīns, was on the subject “Freedom in Islam”. In 1907 he passed successfully a competitive examination for the teaching qualification, and in the next year began to lecture at the Sādīqī College. According to Mahdī ʿAllām, he refused a post as magistrate on the mixed tribunal, and entered the Khalīdīnīyya, completing three courses in the highest establishments of the capital. During this period, he gave lectures on “the evolution of the Arabic language”, ṣīḥāḥ and Ibn Khalīdūn, and encouraged his peoples at the Zaytūna to demand reforms in the teaching programmes. In 1902 he made a journey to Algiers and had made various contacts with his old pupils and with the local scholars.

In 1912 his uncle Muhammad al-Makki b. ʿAzzūz left for Istanbul, and this may have given him the notion of definitely leaving Tunisia for a new sphere of action, the east. Hence in this same year, he moved permanently to the Near East and toured through most of the Arab lands. At this time, he was appointed professor at the Madrasa sultānīyya in Damascus, but his political activities, envisaging a better Arab-Turkish understanding, irritated Djemal Pasha, who imprisoned him for endangering the state’s security. Six months later, on 18 January 1917, he was set free, probably on the intervention of the Sublime Porte, and summoned to Istanbul to work with the Arabic correspondence section of the Ministry of War. In the Ottoman capital he met various of his Tunisian compatriots, some of whom had been exiled for their “subversive” activities, e.g., Allā Bāḥī ʿHANDA, Muhammad Bāḥī ʿHANDA, ʿAlī ʿSHIRF and ʿIsāmīl ʿṢAYHĪ.

Still believing that it was possible to save the caliphate, he and others of his compatriots put themselves at the service of the Ottomans and was given charge of a special mission to Berlin concerned with arranging the escape of North African soldiers serving in the French army; the Porte had promised its supporters in the Maḥārīb to help them with these deserters for a war of liberation in the Maḥārīb. After the war, he returned to Damascus and taught at the military college, at the Ottoman school and at the Madrasa sultānīyya. In 1919 he was appointed as a member of a Damascus Academy, but soon left the Syrian capital in 1920 in order to escape from the French authorities, who would certainly have called him to account for his pro-Ottoman activities in Berlin. He only returned there in 1937, and then only for a two months’ stay.

In 1920 al-Khadir settled in Cairo, and had excellent relations with the Taymūr family; and in 1923 he founded the Association of North African Colonies. The work of ʿAllā ʿAbd ar-Raʾūṣīḥ, al-ʿIslām wa-ʾusūl al-buhm, which appeared in 1925 (tr. L. Bercher, in REI (1933), 353-90, and (1934), 163-222), and that of ʿAbd al-Raʾūṣīḥ on pre-Islamic poetry (1926) drove the ʿṣayḥī to reply in two nakāds which placed him in the public eye in Egypt when they appeared respectively in 1926 and 1927. The first work contains the same number of chapters (nine) as ʿAllā ʿAbd al-Raʾūṣīḥ’s, and is dedicated to King Fuʾād, who was considered by certain ʿulāmāʾ, including al-Khadir, as the best qualified person to assume the caliphate. In it, al-Khadir succinctly summarises each of the original author’s chapters and then refutes his arguments; in his opinion the caliphate is far from being a religious obligation, since Islam leaves to its adherents freedom to choose the form of government.
most suitable for them. But to argue from this that Islam separates the temporal from the spiritual, and has no political traditions, is to misunderstand the very message of the Prophet.

According to him, Thāḥa Husayn's work is at fault because it denigrates the Arab-Muslim heritage, and even that of Islam. Again following the same plan as the original author, al-Khādir tries to show that the former, the follower of Descartes and Margoliouth, expressly passes over in silence the methodical spirit of an al-Ghazāl or Ibn Khaldūn, with the manifest aim of discrediting the great figures of Islamic civilisation. Did not the old ruwäd themselves express doubts about some pre-Islamic poetry?

In 1926, al-Khādir founded the al-Ḥidāyā al-Islāmiyya society and became editor of its journal, bearing the same name. The editorship of the journal Nūr al-Islām, founded in 1926 and which in 1955 became the journal of the Azhar, Madjāīl al-Azhār, was also entrusted to him. In 1932 he became an Egyptian subject and was made a member of the Cairo Academy, of which he remained a permanent member until his death. He began to lecture at the Azhar, and his career reached its culmination in 1947 when he became rector of this celebrated institution. He left this post in 1954, after the ejection from power of General Nadjib (Neguib), and died in Cairo four years later, on 13 Ṭarādž 1377/2 February 1958.

The list of his works is very long. Several articles and lectures, published in Tunis or the east in the form of epistles, have been collected together into books as part of a general edition under his nephew, Allī Ṭawāf al-Dīn al-Ḥidāyā, 907

KHĀDIR — KHAWDJÀ-I DJAHAN, title of high dignitaries in various sultanates of India, notably the sultanate of Dihl, the Bahmanids, and the sultanate of Madura. It seems to have first been used during the time of Muhammad b. Tughlūku (724-52/1324-51), gradually replacing ṣadr-i ālī as the honorific title of the wāzir (I. H. Qureshi, The administration of the sultanate of Dihl, Karachi 1958, 85, with further references); the title was later accorded to other very high officials. Many such officials are known to history by this title (sometimes qualified by a nisha or łaḥab) rather than by their personal names, of whom the most important are the following:

1. Khwāja-i Dihān Ahmad Ayāz (7068-72/1720-31), who early in the 8th/14th century had held office as khasāıl of Sirf under ‘Alā’ al-Dīn and the later Khādījūs, received the title of Khwāja-i Dihān on Muḥammad b. Tughlūku’s accession in 724/1324. (Yabāyā Sirhindī, Ta’rīkh-i Muḥābrāh Shāhī, ed. Bib. Ind., 98) and became his wāzir, inferior in dignity only to the sultan’s nephew Fīruz b. Raḍjāb (see Fīruz Shāh Tughlūku); although effective power in the diwān-i ważarat was exercised (according to Śams-i Sirājī ‘Alī, Ta’rīkh-i Fīruz Shāhī, ed. Bib. Ind., 394-6) by the wāzīr of this celebrated institution. He left this post in 1932, after the ejection from power of General Nadjīb (Negiub), and died in Cairo four years later, on 13 Ṭarādž 1377/2 February 1958.

The list of his works is very long. Several articles and lectures, published in Tunis or the east in the form of epistles, have been collected together into books as part of a general edition under his nephew, Allī Ṭawāf al-Dīn al-Ḥidāyā, 907.
first of the Bahmanids, the title of Kh*adja-i Djahan was given to:

5. A zamindar Humayun, son of the waqif (and the sultan's father-in-law) Sayf al-Din Ghord [q.v.], who was appointed governor of the Bahmanids' Tilangana province.

6. Kh*adja-i Djahan Astarabd* figures as the waqif of the sultan's *Ala* al-Din Ahmad II in 839/1436, the first clear instance of the title going to one of the (Afakl) faction whom the sultan favoured at the expense of the Dakhnis.

7. On his accession in 862/1458 Humayun Shak* also favoured the Afakl faction, appointing Mummid Gawan [q.v.] waqif and waqfi sultanana, and Malik Sh*ab, said to be of Cingizid descent, *faraddar* of Tilangana with the title of Khadja-i Djahan; he is usually referred to as Kh*adja-i Djahan Turk. He was distinguished as a general in this reign and that of the minor Ahmad III (865-7/1461-3), in which he was a member of the council of regency. The animosity of the dowager queen caused him to be murdered in 870/1465-6.

8. A "local" noble, Kh*adja-i Djahan Dakhni, figures as the Bahmanids' governor of Parenda ca. 900/1495, supporting the Bahmanids and their Barid ministers against the breakaway factions in Biglapur and Ahmadnagar.

**Bibliography**: given in the article. For the Bahmani nobles see also H. K. Shervani and P. M. Joshi (eds.), History of medieval Deccan, i, Hyderabad 1973, index s.v. Khwaja-i Jahan. (J. Burton-Page)

**KHADJA KHOR** (or Khizr in India), is in many part of India identified with a river-god or spirit of wells and streams. He is mentioned in the Sikander-nama as the saint who presided over the well of immortality. The name was naturalised in India, and Hindus as well as Muslims reverence him; it is sometimes converted by Hindus into Raja Kidar. On the Indus the saint is often identified with the river, and he is sometimes seen to be an old man clothed in green. A man who escapes drowning is spoken of as evading Kh*adja Khizr (Temple, Legends of the Panjib, i, 221). In a poem by A zamindar regarding an Indus, a boat is unloosed "to float on the Kh*adja's waves", and it is asserted "the Kh*adja himself will remember that battle". (Popular poetry of the Baloches, i, 74), and by one poet his name is substituted for that of Mikar as one of the archangels. His principal shrine is on an island of the Indus near Bakhar, which is restored by devotes of both creeds (Sind Restored, ii, 226). Manucci, who was present at the siege of Bakhar in 1606/1658, alludes to this shrine under the name of Coia Quitan. Burnes also mentions it in his Travels into Bokhara.

The saint is believed to ride upon a fish, which was adopted as a crest by the Kings of Oudh, and by one poet his name is substituted for that of the name of Coia Quitan. Burnes also mentions it in his Travels into Bokhara, London 1834; J. Wise, Muhammadans of Eastern Bengal, in JASB, lxxii/3 (1894), 38 ff.; Ja'far Sharif-G. A. Herklots, Islam in India, or the Qawwals-I-Islam, London 1879, repr. 1892, 38-9, 67, 135-6. (M. Longworth Dames*)

**KHADJA MUIN AL-DIN HASAN SINGI**. [see Chishti]

**KHADJA-ZADE. [see Khoda-Zaede]**

**KHADJEGAN-I DIWAN-I HUMAYUN**, a title given to the heads of the imperial chancery of the Ottomans. Although the date of its origin is uncertain, the title was certainly known in the 10th/11th century (Huseyin Hazarfen, Teylik-i ul-hayvan fi hadin-nin-i il-i 'Othman, 1600, 1614, 1774, etc.); Tevki 'Abdurrahman Pasha, Kanaanname, in MTM, iii (Istanbul 1331), 520; von Hammer, Staatsverfassungen, repr. 1963, i, 93, ii, iii, ff. 127 ff.; A. H. Lybyer, The government of the Ottoman empire, Cambridge, Mass. 1913, 168 f.). Because the title of Khadjegean was bestowed annually, the term Khadjegeanlik became a synonym for mansab ("high office", "rank") and me'mariyyet ("official duty"). Those officials who were subordinate to the chief clerks (halem re'sleri), so the holders of Khadjegeanlik posts, were called "assistants" (khaliye) of the Khadjegean or "pupils" (agird) of the Khadjegean. From the mid-11th/17th century onwards, the application of the term widened, and it was also given to various officials additional to the chief clerks of the divan. The conferment of the Khadjegean rank and the retention of the Khadjegean in offices always took place in the first half of the month of Shawwal each year (Celebi-Zade Ismail Asim, Dheyli-i Râhid, Istanbul 1282, v, 123). For this ceremony, the Grand Vizier would prepare a conferment list and present it to the sultan for approval; if it was desired to dismiss an official holding the title of Khadjegean, he would write three names on the list, and because it was known that the last name was the name of the person preferred by the Grand Vizier, the sultan would appoint him. For the 6th Shawwal 1134/20th July 1722 list of Khadjegean conferment, see Ismail Hakan, Oduncu veli-in merkez ve bahriye te'kildii, Ankara 1948, 152, n. 1; for an undated conferment list of a later period, see Baybakank Arjivi, A-TSF.

In the 10th/16th century, there were 25 chief clerks forming the Khadjegean group. In a document belonging to the first half of the 11th/17th century, they numbered 15: the chief finance officer Defterdar, the Defterdar of Rumelia, the Defterdar of Anatolia, the Nizâhâ, the Defterdar of the Danube, Chief Secretary (Re'si ul-ku'tub), the Senior Rûsnâmelesi (Clerek in charge of financial transactions), the Junior Rûsnâmelesi, the Câsâhâb, the Chief Accountant (Baš munasebesi), the Accountant of Anatolia, the Accountant of the Awatch, the Chief tax farmer (Mukadda'âfg), and the Tax farmer of Istanbul (Kemânebâkar Mu'tasîf-va Fakha Lâyibârî), ed. Faik Rüstâm Unat, in TV, 1/6 (Istanbul 1942), 454.

By the mid-12th/18th century, because the Khadjegeanlik was also conferred on those who did not hold an official post, the numbers of people holding this rank grew to several times more than the holders of the actual office. Junior officials, besides the chief clerks, might now have the title, such as the clerk of a Pasha's treasury. Such a person thereby had the opportunity of being promoted to a higher post; when dismissed from this office his name would be
rubbed out from the register of Khwādēgdn (Khwādēgdn defteri) in order to give an opportunity for other officials (cf. the procedure applied to Yûsûf Efendi, the Junior Avcâf Accountant, described in Ahmed Wâsî, Maðsûn ul-âthâr we-hâbbâ'îk ul-âkhbâr, Istanbul Archaeology Museum Library, no. 355, f. 101). One notes the excessive number of those holding this rank. In 1180/1766 the officials included in the Khwādēgdn-i Diwân-i Humâyûn were as follows: the General Deputy to the Grand Vizier, the Defterdâr of the Shikkh-i ewvel (the finance accounts of the first division of the Ottoman Empire relating to Turkey in Europe), the Re'sî ul-kultûb, the Çâvûshbâsi, the first secretary to the Grand Vizier (Teâkkhâ-ì ewvel), the Master of court ceremonies, the Secretary to the Grand Vizier, the head of the government chancery office (Byeliklâhi), the Secretary to the Kethûhûd Bâg, the Defterdâr of the Shikkh-i şîhîn (the second financial division of the Ottoman Empire, comprising Anatolia), the Defterdâr of the Shikkh-i întini (the third division of the Ottoman Empire, including Hungary, Iraq, Syria, Egypt and Arabia), the Master of the Mint, the Prefect of the City (Şeher emini), the Emin of the Register, the Second Secretary to the Grand Vizier, the Senior Rûsznamelegî, the Chief Accountant, the Accountant of the Province, the Secretary to the Janissaries, the Overseer of the Kitchen, the Collector of Documents for the Cavalry (Atîl mulkâbâlegi), the Accountant of the Haramayn (Mecca and Medina), the Accountant of the dîzîya, the Arpa Emini, the Mâliyye tekhkiredîši, the Controller of the Office of Suspended Payments (Mezbûhîdî), the Overseer of Topghane (Topghâne nâszû), the Secretary of the Sîshkhs, the Secretary of the Sîlâmname, the Secretary of the Sildhâddrs, the Collector of Documents for the Infantry (Piyâde mulkâbâlegi), the Junior Accountant of the Avcâf, the Kalyonlar kâtibi (sc. the clerk who provided supplies for the galleons and kept the accounts), the Secretary for Expenditure, the Secretary of the Dîbedîsî, the Overseer of the Arsenal, the Chief Secretary of the Fortress (Bûysûk halî teâkkhiresi), the Chief tax Farmer (Boğh Mulkâbâ'î), the Junior Secretary of the Fortress (Kûşûk halî teäkkhiresi), the Tax Farmer of the Haramayn, the Tax Farmer of Istanbul, the Tax Farmer of the Khâdis revenues, the Emin of the Kâhid-i birân, the Emin of the Kâhid-i Enderûn, the Ta'tîrkhdîshik, the Tax Farmer of Bursa, the Tax Farmer of Avlonya and Erâbîz, the Overseer of payments from the treasury (Sergi nâzû), the Secretary of the gun-carriage drivers, the Secretary of the 'ülûfdejîyân-i yezmîn, the Secretary of the 'ülûfdejîyân-i yezmîn, the Secretary of the right wing of the Ghurebî cavalry, the Secretary of left wing of the Ghurebî cavalry, and the Emin of the Istanbul powder-factory, in total 53 officials (Cuştîmî- Zâde Muştafa Reğhdî, op. cit., 20-1, compare this list with those who were in the Khwâdēgdn-i Diwân-i Humâyûn in 1180/1766, in Ahmed Wâsî, Ta'tîrkî, Istanbul 1290, 33-4). For their places in the state ceremonies, see Nâzî'î 'Abdûllâh Pasha, Divân-i Humâyûn’â’ud tekhkîf, in TTEM, xcili (1926), 258 ff.

The Khwâdēgdn system continued in the same manner until 1240/1823. Thereafter the conferring of titles and appointments started to be made in Shâh bân, superfluous appointments were abolished, and civil servants were divided into four categories (Mehmed Thûreyûa, Nûkhbet ul-meṣâbût, Istanbul n.d. 21-2). In 1250/1834, when the Ministry of the Civil Service (Mâliyyeye nezârâtî) was established, a new scheme of rank and promotions was formed (Mehmed Thûreyûa, op. cit., 40-1; for the innovations in the field of administration after 1254/1838, see Luftî, Ta’tîrkî, Istanbul 1302, v, 114). The rank no longer had any importance, since every clerk who could write and express himself well was given the title of Khwâdēgdn; in 1254/1838 it was therefore decided that the rank of Khwâdēgdn should be conferred on those who could qualify by examination (Luftî, op. cit., v, 102, 126). But it had now lost almost all its prestige. It maintained its existence as a minor rank given to the office clerks (Kâlem âmirleri) among the new ranks invented after the Tanzimât reforms (Luftî, Ta’tîrkî, Istanbul 1328, viii, 155-6. For the status of the rank in 1270/1854, see Mehmed Thûreyûa, op. cit., 280, and see also M. Zeki Pâkânî, Osmanlı tarih devşîmeler ve terimleri tâlîfûsî, Istanbul 1946, i, 695).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(CENGIZ ORHONLU)
3. Kamal-nama, a mystical maqamawi in the metre of Haft Paykar, composed in 744/1343-4. It is divided into twelve bâhs and 1,840 bayts. In the prologue the poet praises Shaykh Abû Isâkh İbrahim of Kâzarûn (d. 426/1035), and in the epilogue addresses Shaykh Abû Isâkh, the ruler of Shîrzâ.

4. Rauwât al-Ensâr, also a mystical poem, in the metre of Maḥkan al-Asrâr, consisting of 20 maâshâs and 5,224 bayts. Composed in 743/1342-3, this volume is addressed to Shams al-Dîn Maḥmûd Sâînî, the vizier of Abû Isâkh İndî. This poem was printed at Tehran in 1907/1928.

5. Gauwar-nama, on ethics and mysticism, in the metre of Khusraw u Şîrin, composed in 746/1345-6, consisting of 1,032 bayts. The dedication is to Amîr Mubârîz al-Dîn Muhammad and his vizier Bahâ’ al-Dîn Maḥmûd.

(c) Other compositions: Sâm-nama, a romantic maqamawi in mulâqâb metre; Maîfâtî al-Kuškîa wa Masûdî al-Ghuyûb, a selection of Khâdîjî’s poems; and three risâlas in prose: Risâlah al-Bâdiyya, Sab’ al-Maḥkâmî, and Muntâzâra-i Şams wa Sab’hî.


Kh. AF, older orthography (e.g. in Ibn Rusta, 171) Kh.âb, a rûstak or rural district of Khûshtân in eastern Persia, lying between the district of Bahârâz (q.v.) to the north and that of Khân in the southwest, and adjacent to the modern Iran-Afghan border. The governors of the 4th/10th century mention the towns there of Salûmân (Huddâd al-Salûmî, tr. 803, Salûmîdâ), Farjîrûd and Kussîyâ, the latter being especially populous. Yakrut, Buldân, ed. Beirut 1374-6/1955-7, ii, 399, describes the district as having 200 villages and three significant towns, Sandjân, Sîrâwând and Khârjârd. Also reckoned by some authorities as belonging to the Kh.âf district was the important town of Zawzan; indeed, HamûlîTAB MUSTAWFÎ includes this with Sandjân and Salâm as the three chief towns there. Topographically bounded on the northeast by the Kûh-i Kh.âf, which rises to 8,260 feet (2,517 metres), the comparatively sheltered and fertile Kh.âf plain is described by the Islamic geographers as populous and prosperous agriculturally, producing excellent fruits, the dyestuff madder, and cotton and silk textiles; Mustawfî additionally mentions iron workings there (Nûhat al-kubûlî, tr. 152, 194).

In the early Islamic period, this rather isolated region was one where Zoroastrianism survived tenaciously; the Zoroastrian rebel Bih-‘âfrîd (q.v.) came from here, and a fire temple existed there well into the 5th/11th century, and this administrative subdivision also includes Zawzan; see Farhang-i dâwâdîyeyî-i Irân, ix, 153, 201.

Bibliography: given in the article, but for the information of classical Islamic geographers, see also Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire géographique, historique et littéraire de la Perse, 213-14, 190-1, and Le Strange, Lands of the eastern Caliphate, 357-8; and for the present century, Admiralty handbook, Persia, 385-7.

Men, etc. (C. E. BOSWORTH)

KHAFADJA, a subdivision of the Hawâzin tribe of ‘Ukail b. Ka‘b, which remained as powerful Bedouins longer than most of the other tribes which inhabited the Arabian Peninsula at the dawn of Islam. The genealogists give their affiliation to their kindred as Khâfâdja b. ‘Amr b. ‘Ukayl, and they were subdivided into eleven branches: Mu‘awiya Dhul-Karb, Ka‘b b. Dhul-Nuwayra, al-Akra’, Ka‘b al-Asghar, ‘Amir, Mâlik, Dhul-Harshâm, ‘Ali, Khazîn and Hanzîdî. According to Ibn al-Kalbî, Jamhara, fol. 132a, the name of Khâfâdja is Mu‘awiya b. ‘Amr. However, according to Ibn-Samînî, Anîb, fol. 204b, is 222-3. Another native of the area was Fâsih al-Dîn Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Kh.âfî, who was a protege of the Timurids of Harât in the first half of the 9th/15th century and who wrote a well-known historical and biographical compendium, the Mu‘allafrdt, see Browne, Literary history of Persia, iii, 428-8, and Storey, i, 90-1.

In the course of the 6th/12th century, Khûshtân, and Kh.âf and Zawzan in particular, became centres of Ismâ‘îlî activity, perhaps continuing the earlier traditions of heterodoxy there; hence in 654/1256 the Assassin stronghold of Kh.âfî was stormed by Hüleğü’s Mongol hordes, with a general massacre of the adult inhabitants (Djouyânil-Boyle, ii, 615-16; see also P. R. E. Willey, The Assassins in Uzbekistan, in Jnâl. of the Royal Central Asian Soc., iv (1968), 180-5). Not surprisingly, the succeeding period seems to have been one of economic and social regression for the district; whereas Yakût had recorded 200 villages there, Ḥâfî-î Abrû (early 9th/15th century), recorded only 30 (see I. P. Petrushevsky, in Camb. hist. of Iran, v, 496-7). It nevertheless retained some cultural vitality, and Mustawfî comments favourably on the devout Ḥâfî faith of the people of Kh.âfî, who were much given to works of charity and to going on pilgrimage. One of the five survivors of the Kh.âfî district dates from the Timurid period, sc. the madrasa of Khârjârd, begun by the architect Kiwâm al-Dîn Shîrzâl for two of Shîr Rûkî’s ministers, Ahmad b. Isâkh and Fâqîr al-Dîn Muhammad Kh.âfî (see Sir Percy Sykes, Historical notes on Khurâsan, in IRAS (1910), 114-51, and Survey of Persian art, iii, 1126-8).

In recent times, the name “Kh.âfî” has been used both for the district and for its chief town, also called Rûy-i Kh.âfî, near Khârjârd. Travellers such as C. E. Yate (1894) and Sykes (1705) visited it and described it during the late Kâddîr period. Yate found the centre Rûy-i Kh.âfî much decayed, with ca. 800 inhabited houses, all of whose denizens were Sunnis, but over half the houses in ruins; the silk industry had died out and had been replaced by the cultivation of opium and tabacco (Yate, Khurâsan and Sistan, Edinburgh-London 1900, 127-33, Sykes, A fifth journey in Persia, in Geogr. Jnâl., xxviii (1906), 580-2). At the present time, Kh.âf forms one of the five component bâhâkhs of the shahrastân of Turbat-i Haydarîyya in the ustân or province of Khurâsan, and this administrative subdivision also includes Zawzan; see Farhang-i dâwâdîyeyî-i Irân, ix, 153, 201.
probably wrong in saying that Khafadja is a name of a woman. Unfortunately, our early sources do not provide us with important information concerning their dwelling-places in pre-Islamic Arabia, presumably because of Khafadja's assimilation with Banū 'Ukayl. Out of whom they had emerged. However, from the scattered information found in the later sources, we know that they had their territory to the south-east of Medina and owned some villages, among which Sawr Lahūn, al-Sharkiya, Taḫhit, Tha'lab and Orāl are mentioned. Later, we find the frontier at the east war with the Banū Ḥanīfa in al-Yamāma. According to Asma, in Yākūt, Buldān, i., 785, they had their dwellings in the 2nd/8th century in the desert near the Rusafa settlement of the Umayyad Caliph Hīghām b. 'Abd al-Malik. It is probable that the Karmatī movement in al-Yamāma in the early part of the 4th/10th century caused them to move further northwards towards the borders of ʿIrāk. Here we find them towards the end of that century as masters of Kūfah under their amin Thumāl and his sons. About this time also, we find them around al-Šām, al-Rabba, Ḥalab and Hims, whilst al-Kalkaḥandī mentions that one of their branches had settled in Lower Egypt. They may have been at first allies of their cousins the Banū Yuzīl (not Bozīl as in Wustenfeld's Tabellen, or Yezīl as otherwise stated) who established themselves as rulers of Mawsīl and the surrounding country, but were rather in opposition to them. In the year 391/1000 the 'Ukaylīd Karwāsh attacked them in Kūfah and they were compelled to leave the lands and move along the Euphrates towards Syria, where they remained only till the following year, when the ʿAbbasīd general Abū Dāʾīf al-Hadidī was besieged in his aid when the ʿUkaylīds besieged al-Madāʾin. This brought them back again to their ancient dwelling-places and as the Baghdād government had probably supplied them with arms, they utilised these a few years later in 402/1011 in an attack upon the pilgrim caravan, emboldened by this attack, they demanded the lands to the east of the Euphrates which had in the hands of the ʿUkaylīds, and marched under the command of Sulfān, ʿUwān and Raḍāb, the three sons of Thumāl, to al-Anbār, laying the whole neighbourhood waste and besieging the town. An army sent against them from Baghdād and supported by the ʿUkaylīds drove them out and Sulfān was actually captured, but released upon the intercession of Abūl-Ḥasan b. Mazyad al-Asadī. No sooner had he been released than in the following year (403/1012), news was received at Baghdād that the Khafadja were plundering the country round Kūfah under Sulfān. An army was sent against them with support from Abūl-Ḥasan b. Mazyad, and they were surprised by the river al-Rummān. Sulfān escaped, but his brother Muḥammad was made a prisoner; as a result, many of the pilgrims, who had been captured in the year 403/1012, were liberated and reached Baghdād. Meanwhile, the ʿUkaylid amīr Karwāsh had been captured and released, and now tried to make common cause with the Khafadja and to join Sulfān b. Thumāl; but after their junction they were attacked by troops sent from Baghdād and routed, though subsequently pardoned. This gave a few years of comparative peace, but in 417/1026 Dubaybs b. Abīl Mazyad al-Asadī and Abūl-Fityān Manšūr b. Ḥassān, now chief of the Khafadja, ravaged the lands of Karwāsh in the Sawād (q.v.), assisted by troops from Baghdād, and encountered Karwāsh near Kūfah. Karwāsh fled northwards and was pursued by the combined tribes of Asad and Khafadja, who actually took possession of al-Anbār; but after this success the two tribes dispersed again to their pasture grounds. Manšūr b. Ḥassān then marched, with his followers to al-Dāmāfayn (see al-Hilla), which belonged to Dubaybs b. Saḍāka b. Mazyad, and plundered the lands round it; when pursued by Dubaybs, they turned northwards and attacked al-Anbār. The inhabitants defended themselves for a while, but as the town was not protected by walls, the Khafadja were able to plunder and burn it. On the approach of Karwāsh, they abandoned the town, but soon returned and looted it for a second time. When finally Karwāsh was able to drive them out, he spent the winter in the town and ordered protective walls to be built. Manšūr now swore allegiance to the Buwayhs ruler Abū Kālidjār and marched southwards to Kūfah, where he had the khudha pronounced in the name of Abū Kālidjār. This had the result that in 420/1029 Dubaybs severed his allegiance to Abū Kālidjār, being afraid of the depredations of the Khafadja. In the following years, the Khafadja sided sometimes with one party and at another time with the other, and when in 425/1033 Dubaybs had a quarrel with his brother Thābit, they sided with the former, but other quarrels also arose within the Khafadja chiefs, during which 'All b. Thumāl was killed and his nephew al-Ḥasan b. Abīl-ʿBarakāt became tribal chief. When in 428/1036 the Ḥādībīs Bārī Tūḏān rebelled in Baghdād, the Caliph's general al-Basāsīrī [q.v.] employed among others the Khafadja to quell the revolt, as a result of which Bārī Tūḏān was executed. We do not hear much about the Khafadja after that, but in 446/1054 they again made an inroad upon Dubaybs's town of al-Dāmāfayn, which they plundered; al-Basāsīrī came to his assistance, and the KhAFADJA retreated into the desert. They were pursued and their stronghold Khaffān was besieged and apart from its citadel, razed to the ground. When al-Basāsīrī rebelled against the caliph in the same year, he took al-Anbār after a prolonged siege, and we find that among the prisoners he took were 100 men of the Khafadja. There again followed a period of comparative peace, but when in 485/1092 the pilgrims from Baghdād had passed Kūfah they were attacked by Khafadja. When this news reached Baghdād, troops were sent who caused great slaughter among the KhAFADJA, reducing considerably their future power to do serious damage. In 490/1105 the KhAFADJA came into conflict with the Tayyī tribe 'Ubādah over some stolen camels, and while the latter could muster about 500 warriors, Khafadja were unable to place a similar number into the field. However, with assistance from the Asadī chief Saḍāka b. Mansūr they were victorious. This success was, however, of short duration, as in the following year the tribe of 'Ubādah, now assisted by Bādrān b. Saḍāka, utterly routed the Khafadja, who were compelled to forsake their pasture grounds and wander northwards towards Syria, while 'Ubādah in future was to occupy the lands adjoining the Sawād. Again in 536/1141 we hear of Khafadja making an inroad into 'Irāk, but the troops sent against them easily drove them off, killing large numbers. How weak Khafadja had become is evident from the fact that in 556/1160 they assembled in the neighbourhood of Hilla and Kūfah, asking for the food relief and dates which had apparently been granted them. The governors of the two towns refused to grant their request and Kayṣar, the governor of Hilla, sent 250 soldiers to
drive them off, a similar force being sent by the governor of Kufa. They pursued the fleeing Khafadja along the river Euphrates as far as Rabbat al-Sham, where the Khafadja made a stand, and in the fight which ensued Kayyar was slain while Arghash, the governor of Kufa, took refuge with the governor of al-Rabba. The Khafadja then pleaded for forgiveness, stating that they had been constrained to fight by their parol condition. Their excuse was accepted, as the Vizier Ibn Hubayrā, who had marched out against them, saw the futility of pursuing them into the desert. The last time we hear of the Khafadja is in 588/1192, when they came to the assistance of ʻAmir. In addition to the events narrated above in Trak, it is also mentioned that the Khafadja were among the Arab tribes who assisted in the siege of Tiberias in 507/1112 when the Crusader monarch Baldwin had taken refuge there after an unsuccessful raid upon Halab.

Among the poets of this tribe in ancient time was Tawba b. al-Humayyir, celebrated on account of his love for Layla al-Aghyaliyya and on account of the elegies which the latter composed upon his death in battle.


Al-Khaḍājī enumerates most of his works in his autobiography, many of them of considerable size, while he himself tells us that many of these treatises were never collected in book-form. His most extensive work is a commentary upon the Tafsīr of al-Baydawī which he entitled Ḥidāyat al-khādī, and which has been printed in Cairo in four large volumes. His follows the usual tedious method of explaining almost every word and of reproducing the statements of a large number of other authors who have treated upon the same subject. The same is the case with his second largest work, a commentary upon the Shifār of the Kādī ʻIlḥāḥ, entitled Nāsim al-riyāṣ (printed at Istanbul, 1267, in 4 vols.). His two biographical works, Khāḍājīa l-taṣawwuf, fi ma fi l-riyāṣ min al-bayda wa Raḥmat al-awālī wa-nushkat al-bayda al-dum, are hardly any better, and hardly any details, and it is only the arrangement by region which gives us any information on where the persons cited lived. We get, however, a fair amount of contemporary poetry, which enables us to judge to what miserable depth the art of rhyming had sunk. While the first named work exists only in manuscript, the Rayhānīa has been printed three times in Cairo (1273, 1294 and 1306), which shows us that the work was appreciated in Egypt. The most valuable portion of this work is an autobiography of the author (in which he has omitted to state when and where he was born) and the Makāmāt al-Raṣīmīya; the autobiography has furnished the material for the account of his life in the work of al-Muhābbī. Of more value are his Tārīkh al-mašjudīs and his Shifār al-qāhī. The former is a work of the class called amālī in 50 sessions (maḏāli), whose value consists in having preserved extracts of older works now apparently lost or undiscovered. It is interesting to find him quoting from the Kitāb al-Mašānī of al-Uṣnānī (printed in Damascus, 1340), the Fiṣāl of Ibn Hazm, the Fiṣāl of Ibn Nadim or the Anṣāb of al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, considering how rare manuscripts of these books are. The book is in fact a curious collection of odd information from all kinds of sources. Apparently there are two editions of this book, one Cairo, 1284 and a second without date printed in Tanta. The Shifār al-qāhī fi ma fi ḥalām
al-arab min al-da'khhil is, as indicated by the title, a work dealing with words of foreign origin in the Arabic language. The author has used for this purpose the Mu'arrab of al-Djawalik [q.v.] and similar works, but is not content with explaining words of foreign origin, as he also gives ample specimens of vulgar errors in correct Arabic speech. Closely resembling this book is a commentary on the Durrrat al-ghawdâd of al-Harîrî, which was printed together with the Durrra at Istanbul in 1999; this work, together with his Tîrâs, are probably the best of his compositions. His Duwân is mentioned by al-Mubîbî and is preserved in manuscript in Copenhagen.


(F. Krenkow)

KHAFàRA [A.]. "protection", is used, often together with hîmîya [q.v.], to designate certain social practices. Originally, it primarily denoted the protection which Arab tribes extended to merchants, travellers and pilgrims crossing their territories, often in return for payment or as part of an agreement [see IJAB]. Later, the word's usage became extended to the "protection" in return for an obligatory payment exacted by various social groups from other groups or from richer individuals (e.g., by the wyâyân and the 'ayyûs). Once the military class had assumed essential power, military commanders exacted various khafîrât from the rural estates, etc., but at the same time the state intervened to control them, to fix a tariff for them, or to revoke them for its own use. See further Hîmîya. (Cl. Cahen)

KHAFD or KHAFI (A.), female circumcision, corresponding to the circumcision of boys (khâtîn or khûtân [q.v.], terms which may be applied equally to both sexes). There is no mention of it in the Kur'ân, but more or less authentic kadîths attest to the practice in pre-Islamic Arabia and in a certain measure justify it. Tradition attributes to the Prophet the expression muqafâtât al-âl-bûsîr "cutter of clitorises" and the following words addressed to Umm 'Atiyya, iddî khafidî (khafîsi) fâ-unâmî wa-lâ iânîhâhî (i.e., do not excise everything), fa-‘annaku adnaâ‘îli-t-nâdî, wa-abhâ‘îmân sa-ânî, in which one can discern a somewhat curious aesthetic aspect, a display of masculine egoism and the authorisation to do the operation on condition of not going as far as total ablation of the external genital organs and even complete clitoridectomy. Although the texts and the dictionaries are not very explicit, the synonymy of khâtîn and khadîkh/hadîkh leads one to think that the minimal practice comprised excision of the prepuce of the clitoris.

In the Prophet's mouth, muqafâtât al-âl-bûsîr had a pejorative sense; but other items in the ancient vocabulary for designating the operator, khâtîna and muqâbâsîna, formed from basr "clitoris", do not seem to have a contemptuous connotation. However, a woman is called basrâ when she is affected by clitorism, or believed to be so, and lâkhanâ when she has not been circumcised; expressions meaning in effect "son of the uncircumcised woman", ibn al-bâsrâ, ibn al-lâkhanâ, are considered injurious and synonymous with "son of a whore", the violence of sexual appetite in a woman being considered the result of absence of circumcision. These pieces of information seem to prove clearly that the practice was current among the Arabs (who carry it back, like the circumcision of boys, to Abraham and Hagar [al-Dîabr, il-hayawân, vii, 27]), and remained so after the coming of Islam, excision becoming a characteristic trait amongst the Muslims. The Aghânî, ed. Beirut, xxii, 22, tells, for example, that Khâlid b. 'Abd Allâh al-Kasîr [q.v.], who was the son of a Greek Christian mother, was as a result of this called Ibn al-Bâsrâ; in the end, he decided to have his mother circumcised in order to escape satires, examples of which are to be found in the verses attributed to A'isha Hamdân (A ghânî, loc. cit.) or to Ziyâd al-Abî'âm [L. A. Y. my.; the word massân, "barber", "cupper", could well have here the sense of "one who sucks" and connected with such an insult as yâ mâyâsâh basri ummîki, which does not necessarily correspond to an actual practice).

Under Islam, the circumcision of girls has never been regarded as obligatory, but has been considered as recommended (e.g., see al-Kayrawâni, Risâla, 161, 305; Ibn Kudâmâ, Mughnî, 1947, i, 85); in fact, it is practiced very irregularly in the Muslim world, where whole populations are unaware of it or confine themselves to a symbolic prickling of the clitoris. In the same region, some tribes may perpetuate the custom, whilst their neighbours may have abandoned it, if they have ever known it anyway (see especially, H. Jaussen, Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab, Paris 1945, 36). In Java, girls are circumcised at the age of 9 and 15 (H. Masse, Croyances et coutumes persanes, Paris 1938, 51); on the other hand, it is unknown in Afghanistan (C. M. Kieffer, À propos de la circoncision, in Festschrift fur Wilhelm Eilers, Wiesbaden 1967, 201, n. 37). This is likewise the situation in North Africa (G. H. Bouquet, La morale de l'Islam, Paris 1955, 70), although the practice is attested for Mauretania, though this is a Maliki region (R. Arnaud, Précis de politique musulmane, i. Pays maures, Algiers 1906, 65-6), where the excision is done 7 or 8 days after birth. At all events, it would be extremely difficult to draw a map showing the extent of female circumcision, in view of the women's discretion and the men's ignorance, since the latter are not informed about the operation; this practice is unaccompanied by any celebration, and is even called sîr "secret" in Moab, according to Jaussen, op. cit., 35, 363, and also taḥr, by analogy with the circumcision of boys.

The only Islamic country, apart from some regions of black Africa (see Boris de Rachewiltz, Eros noir, moeurs sexuelles de l'Afrique de la pré-histoire à nos jours, Paris 1956, where any searching enquiries into this practice have been made is Egypt, where khaft (which according to 18th and 19th century travellers was general and often sought by girls) is still practiced, even amongst certain Copts. Anthropologists and physicians have revealed various degrees in female circumcision, ranging from removal of the labia minora and the prepuce of the clitoris to that of the whole external genitalia ("Sudanese circumcision"), or the labia minora and majora together, with the clitoris (see M. Karim and R. Amma, Female circumcision and sexual desire, Cairo 1965). The very title of this latter work, based on an examination of 331 women in Cairo, is an indication
of the spirit in which the enquiry was conducted, so within a broad movement towards feminine liberation and towards a certain demythologisation which has found a favourable echo in the press (e.g. al-Ahrām of 27 January 1959). The Sudanese Republic has decided to abolish the practice, considered nasty and even barbarous, and similar measures have been envisaged to end it in Egypt.

Female circumcision is far from being a surgical operation meant to prevent abnormal deviations of the genitalia (Wilken, Verspr. Geschichten, iv, 238 ff.), but is rather a rite de passage.

Sexual characteristics. Only in this way can the girl claim to be fully a woman capable of sexual life; Egyptian women still look down on an uncircumcised woman by saying “You are like a man”. In Egypt, the operation is carried out by the midwife either in complete secrecy or in the presence of a few invited women, and it is justified by the desire to maintain pre-marital chastity and virginity. It naturally presents serious dangers, of which the authorities are aware; apart from the complications which can sometimes be fatal, the cooling-down of the female temperament and desires, which the operation tends to bring about, causes on the men’s part an abuse of drugs, especially opium—another unexpected aspect of the consequences of mutilation, whose abolition would produce a three-fold effect.

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited, see above all the extremely well-documented article of O. F. A. Meinardus, Mythological, historical and sociological aspects of the practice of female circumcision among the Egyptians, in Acta ethnographica, Budapesti, xvi/3-4 (1967), 387-97, which has an extensive bibliography on the subject.

KHAFI KHAN, MUHAMMAD NASIM NASIM AL-MULK, historian; his title of Khafi Khan was given him by Muhammad Shah and is derived from a family connection with Khafi [i.e., a] district of eastern Persia, famous for its distinguished men. He was a son of Khafi Mir, a confidential servant of Murad Baksh, youngest son of Shah Djihan. The place and date of his birth are not known, but it seems probable that he was born in India, and a statement in his history (i, 739) implies that his birth took place about 1074/1664. The statement is that 74 years after the death of Shah Djihan’s minister, Sa’d Allah, he was 52 plus the age of discretion (14?). In other words he was 66 Muslim years old in 1140/1728. His father was Khafi Mir, a confidential servant of Shah Djihan’s youngest son, Murad Baksh, and was severely wounded at the battle of Samogad. Khafi Khan, possibly like Bernier’s friend Dandkhamand, began life as a merchant, or as an official’s clerk, and it was in one of these capacities that he visited Bombay in 1693-4 and had an interview with an English official (ii, 424, and Elliot-Dowson, vii, 350). He served under Awrangzeb, Bahirur Shah and Muhammad Shah in the Deccan and in Gujurat, and was long stationed at Surat. He also lived at Ahmadabābād, which he defends against the strikites of Djihnāfr, and at Rahuri; in

Sindjī’s country, and in the beginning of Bahādur Shah’s reign he was governor of Cāmpānār (i, 77). Probably he ended his days at Haydārābād in the service of Aṣaf Djihan Nişām al-Mulk (hence our author’s title of Nişām al-Mulk) about 1732-33. He was an intimate friend of Shāh Nawz, the author of Mādāhir al-umārā (who was also a Haydārābādābī officer) (see iii, 680 of the Bibl. Ind. edn. of that work, and Khafi Khan, ii, 670).

Khafi Khan wrote a history of the Indian branch of the Timurid dynasties, and called it Munākhāb al-lubāb (“The quintessential selection”). It is a standard work and is much admired, especially in the east, for its style, and its accuracy and impartiality, though it is often too grandiloquent for western taste. Still, it is by far the most human and interesting of native histories of India, with the doubtful exception of Badamī. After an introduction beginning with Turk b. Yafīt, and describing the origins, etc., of the Tatars and Mongols, it gives short biographies of Timur, his third son Mirān Shāh, and the descendants of the latter, who were the emperor Bābur’s ancestors. These are followed by a history of the emperors of Agra and Dihīl, beginning with Bābur, of whom there is a tolerably full account, and ending with the 14th year of Muhammad Shāh. Bābur conquered India in 932/1526, and the 14th year of Muhammad Shāh was 1140/1732, so that the history covers a period of over 200 years. The last ten years of the history are given in a very abridged form. The most valuable parts of the work are the accounts of Shāh Djihan and Awrangzeb, for both of whom the author had a high admiration. The history has been published in the Bibliotheca Indica (vols.), but the edition is not complete, for it wants the first part or volume. This last, however, is very rare, and perhaps does not exist in its entirety. There is only a portion of it in the British Museum. The author refers to it in vol. i, 49 of the printed edition. Khafi Khan also wrote a history of the minor Islamic dynasties of India, but this too has disappeared, though a small portion is preserved in manuscript in the India Office Library (Ethb., Cat., No. 407). It was apparently of little value, being mainly an abridgment of Firishta.

The charm of Khafi Khan’s history consists in his digressions and his frequent use of his own observations, and of information derived from his father and brother. He is a somewhat narrow Muslim, and he is too favourable to Shāh Djihan and Awrangzeb. Thus he slurs over Awrangzeb’s treacherous capture and subsequent execution of his younger brother, Murad Baksh. The capture he represents as a clever manœuvre (it was certainly to the public advantage), but he is evidently half-ashamed of it, for he declines to give the particulars. In his account of Murad Baksh’s attempt at escape, and his trial and execution, which he got from his father, he does not plainly set down Awrangzeb’s responsibility, and continues to pay him a compliment for his generosity in rewarding the man who declined to prosecute Murad for the murder of his father. He also deals lightly with Shāh Djihan’s conduct to Khusraw, and to his competitors for the throne, and says nothing about his debaucheries. Still, he is far more honest than Abu ʾl-Faqī āllām (i.e. the author’s title of Shēr Shāh and Dāhāngir are very fair, and in the latter of them he has a very interesting account; of Nur Djihan. He says he got it at Štrat in 1097/1685-6 from a very old man, who as a child had accompanied Nur Djihan’s father on his journey
from Persia to Afghanistan, and India. Khwāfī Khān, though the Tatars, may tell us too much about emperors and their wars, does not omit the more interesting subjects of plague, and famine, and internal administration.

_Bibliography:_ Elliot-Dowson, _History of India_, vii (which contains a very full abstract, by Dowson, of the 2nd volume of Khwāfī Khān); Colonel Lees, _Materials for the history of India_, ii, 1868, 37-8; there is a manuscript translation of vol. i by Major Gordon in the British Museum (Add. 26, 617). (H. Beveridge)*

KHĀFĪF. [see 'Ārōy]

KHĀFĪN AHMED PASHA. [see Ahmed Pasha]

KHĀKĀN, a title (originally ḵaḵān or ḵaḵānān) borrowed by the Turks from the Juan-juan and meaning “[supreme] ruler.” It was applied by the heathen Turks themselves and the mediaeval Muslim geographers and historians not only to the heads of the various Turkish confederations but also to other non-Muslim rulers such as the Emperor of China. In the form ḵaḵān it was borne by the successors of Čingiz-Khān [q.v.], the Mongol Great Khāns in Karakorum and Peking. Adopted by the Ottoman Sultan, the title, first brought to Europe by the Avars in the 6th century A.D. (the ḥanānas etc. of the later mediaeval chroniclers), survived into the present age.

_Bibliography:_ G. Doerfer, _Turkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen_, iii, Wiesbaden 1967, 141-179 (no. 1161); Sir Gerard Clauson, _An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish_, Oxford 1972, 611. (J. A. Boyle)

KHĀKĀN. [see Fath Allâh Shāh]

KHĀKĀN, AFDAL ALLĀH IBRĀHĪM (Radil). B. 'ALI B. 'UThMAH, outstanding Persian poet, born about 520/1126, d. 595/1199, who left a divān, the maṭnānawī called _TabīReferences_ al-‘Irākīyān and sixty letters.

Reliable material for Khākān’s biography is only to be found in his works. His poems and letters mirror both his external and internal life, and so they enable us not only to follow, yet formally as well, but to provide us also with historical information.

Khākān’s life can be divided in two main periods. The first period Khākān spent mainly in his home country of Sharwan as panegyrist at the local court. During the second period he led a retired life in Tabriz. Already at an early time his wish to leave Sharwan and to abandon panegyric poetry was connected with a tendency towards mysticism and escape from the world. Born into a humble family of artisans, the young poet attached himself to the Sharwānshāh Manūcīrh, from whose title Khākān-i akbar his own poetic name is derived. His relations with Manūcīrh were changing. More than once he tried to find another patron and his first _hādī jī_ (551/1156-9) should perhaps be regarded in this context. After Manūcīrh’s death (554/1159) he was imprisoned but was able to flee to Darband, his usual refuge when something went wrong in Sharwan. In the following years he seems to have established relations with several courts. In 559/1164 we find him in Persian Irāk. After he had asked for an annual salary of 30,000 dirhams from Manūcīrh’s son Aḵṣatān he returned to Sharwan. However, the good relations between the poet and his patron did not last very long. In 566/1171 he undertook a second _hādī jī_, but the atmosphere did not improve after his return. The deaths of his son and his wife in 571/1175 caused the decisive turn. He undertook a third _hādī jī_ with the intention to end his life as a _mugādir_ in Mecca. He had to return, however, and settled in Tabriz. Material need and the efforts of high personalities to gain his favour frustrated his hopes of achieving the calm he was longing for and obliged him once more to compose panegyrics now and then. In 578/1183 or 579/1184 he tried to reach Khorāsān, but in Ray the Atabeg prevented him from continuing his journey and he returned to Tabriz severely ill. In 580/1185 he tried to achieve his aim in another way. After that date we have no more relevant data about his life, which ended in Tabriz.

Khākān’s poetry is based on Persian _confrontismo_. The notions at his disposal reached farther than those of other _poetae docti_ of his time, especially his detailed knowledge of Christianity. Most of the elements of his poetical motifs are his own creation; this is all the more valid for complexes consisting of elements of motifs as well as of motifs (fantastic etiology, congruity of images, causal hyperboles etc.). Not without reason he felt himself in this respect superior to his predecessors and contemporaries and he was convinced that future poets also would draw on his muse. During the last decade of his stay in Sharwan his inventiveness in devising new elements of motifs declined. His accent was now on developing and combining motifs. In his Tabriz period he played with his enormous repertoire of elements of motifs and their combinations, while using his mastery of rhetorical representation in a more pointed manner than ever before.

In the field of formal devices, Khākān created a new type of _hādī jī_, characterised by a number of parts which are thematically mostly independent. In his later Sharwan period he preferred the _tarkīb-band_ form. About half of his many _ghazals_ belong to this genre only as far as form is concerned; they do not treat of erotic subjects. Besides _rubā’s_ and sometimes long _bīṣ’s_, the _divān_ contains also a series of shorter and longer Arabic poems, the fruit of Khākān’s attempt to write Persian poetry in Arabic.

In the panegyrics, that is in his professional art, Khākān celebrates rulers, generals, viziers, governors, teachers, scholars, but also friends and relatives. But what he loved most was ascetic _Ṣūfī_ poetry. This is indicated by his other pen-name Ḥaḵḵālī and thereon also his close relationship with Ṣanā’ī was based. A kind of combination of panegyric and _Ṣūfī_ poetry is to be found in the praise of the Prophet, to whom Khākān dedicates a series of _ḥāṣidas_, and he derives his honorary title of Ḫaḵḵān al-‘Irākīyām from this fact. His erotic verses usually celebrate profane love, but mystical elements are present in the _ghazal_ bā ḏīlam bā maḥbabbat niṭkān bā ḏīlam, where _Ibīl_ speaks about his _Hallādī_-like love of God. The pangs of love are often mentioned, as Khākān is generally eloquent and resourceful on lamentation. This subject is treated in a lot of his shorter poems and parts of poems, but as well as in those in whole _ḥāṣidas_ and not only in the _ḥabstīyāt_ (prison poems). Special attention is given to the description of nature (sky, stars, seasons and landscapes), and his poetic picture of morning and the morning-draught together with its drinking-utensils became very popular. His _hādī jī’s_ travels were less imitated. His first _hādī jī_ he describes in the _TabīReferences_ al-‘Irākīyān, where he addresses the sun in order to describe to her the way to Mecca. Around the sacred subject all kinds of profane praise are entwined. The often-posed question whether Khākān’s words represent real experience can probably be answered in the affirmative as far as the satires are
concerned, and perhaps also some elegies, laments, religious poems and ascetic verses. In general, however, the poetic transformation of reality seems to dominate.


**KHĀKĀNĪ, also KHĀQAN MEHMED BEY (?-1015/796); it was printed at Istanbul in 1264/1848.** The latter is considered as one of the most productive and influential of the poets of the period. His work is characterized by a strong sense of patriotism and a deep love for his homeland. His poetry is full of vivid descriptions of the natural landscape and the daily life of the people.

**KHĀKĀNIDS. [see SHIRWAN SHAH]**

**KHĀKSAR, a 20th century Indian movement for national regeneration, initiated in 1931 by a government servant called 'Inayat Allāh Khān (better known under his honorific of al-Mashrīkī). As a result of widespread frustration and despondency, this leader—originally a mathematician who had enjoyed a brilliant career—publicised simplicity of life (khāksar, i.e., “humble as dust”), discipline and self-sacrifice for the benefit of the country. Under the spell of the results achieved by Fascist regimes, al-Mashrīkī avowed that India was in need of benevolent dictators (see Asia, Aug: 1939), and in its outward manifestations his movement in its first stage bore a marked resemblance to the Nazi S. A. organisation; its members wore a khaki dress with a badge of ukhsuwa or “brotherhood” stuck on the right upper arm, and carried a belly or spade symbolising both the importance of labour and a readiness to fight. Every day they had to report to the local commander about some sort of social service performed after sunset prayers, and each district unit had their own aims at least fifteen years. Al-Mashrīkī’s followers were chiefly drawn from the petty bourgeoisie and better-off labourers. Explicitly non-communal, the movement was open to every man who believed in his Creator, Muslims as well as Brahmā Samadājists, and it claimed to be “the only party in the country above all parties”. In its heyday (i.e. ca. 1941), it is said to have secured a following of one-and-a-half million adherents; but in 1944 the all-India strength of the Khākṣārs had already dwindled to 20,000. Because of provocative actions, they clashed regularly with the provincial authorities of Northern India. Bows on the movement were imposed, and from time to time al-Mashrīkī was imprisoned. After independence, the leader officially announced the disbandment of the movement. Although the master died on August 27, 1963, a small group of faithful Khākṣārs are still to be found in the vicinity of the movement’s former headquarters at Ichra, a suburb of Lahore.


**KHĀL (א'), pl. KĒKHOWL, maternal uncle, whether a full, consanguineous or uterine one. In such a strongly patriarchal civilisation like that of Islam, the status of such an uncle necessarily entailed a certain degree of inferiority compared with that of the paternal uncle, a'mm (pl. a'mām).**

The latter is considered as one of the ʿasaba, and is high up in their hierarchy; he has a right to the whole of the succession if there are no heirs entitled to fixed shares or ʿasaba with a prior claim to himself. The maternal uncle on the other hand, never inherits in Mālikī law; even if there is no other heir, the Public Treasury is given preference. The position is similar in Shāfi'ī law, unless the Public Treasury is excessively mismanaged. According to the Hanafi and Hanbali schools, the maternal uncles can inherit, but in their capacity as a'mām.

Now it is well-known that this third class of heirs, the invention of these two law schools, can only...
succeed to an inheritance in the total absence of any representative of the fixed-shares heirs and the 'asabā; even the most favourably-placed are set aside in the presence of a single 'asib, however distant in relationship he may be from the deceased.

The same discrimination is found in regard to guardianship (waalāya) over a person. In the absence of the father, only an 'asib can be called upon—this rôle often falls upon a paternal uncle, but never to a maternal one. This inferiority in legal status of the maternal uncle dates from pre-Islamic times, and is moreover characteristic of Sunni Islami, mainly with regard to the various legal incapacities inherent in the maternal uncle. But even amongst the Shi'is, where there is no inequality on the legal plane between maternal and paternal uncle, reliable observers have noted that the populace generally displays more reference towards the paternal than the maternal uncle.


(Y. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS)

**KHAL, KHALAJ, KHALĀ.', [see FIRĀSA].

**KHALADJ**. a people or tribe ostensibly of Turkish origin and living in western Turkistan and then in eastern Afghanistan during the pre-Mongol Islamic period.

1. **History.**

The Islamic geographers of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries place the Khalaj amongst the tribes of the Turks. Thus Ibn Khurradadhîbîh, 48, 31, includes them in a list of Turkish tribes in the Central Asian steppes; he states that their winter quarters were beyond the Sûr Daryâ in the Talas region, adjacent to the lands of the Kârlûk, but also that they lived “on this side of the Oxus”, i.e., to its south and west. The contradiction illustrates the hazy of uncertainty which envelopes the history of the Khaladj in the pre-Ghaznavid period. A frequent cause of ambiguity is the similarity of the consonant dacty of Khaladj, Ñâ, to that of the name Khalûkh, Ñâ (= Kârlûk), especially as the Kârlûk also lived in the Talas region but at an early date infiltrated south of the upper Oxus into Tughârâstan [see Kârlûk]. Kâshârî, ed. Kîshâlî Rîfî’at Bey, ii, 307 = tr. Atalay, iii, 415, in his long article on the Türkmen, says that the Khaladj originally comprised two of the 24 tribes of the Türkmen, but separated from them and were therefore no longer accounted part of them; and he gives a fanciful etymology for the name, that the two ancestors of the two Khaladj tribes were told by the rest of the Türkmen, bal adî “stay, remain behind!” (another explanation in the Oghâ-nâmâ, ed. W. Bang and G. R. Rachmati, SBPr. Ak., W., Phil.-Hist. Kl. xcv (Berlin 1932), bal ad “stay and open!”).

Hence there is some uncertainty about the original Turkishness of the Khaladj. Marquart, Érânlah, 252-4, connected the Khaladj with the Khu’l-i-s. (? Kholas) of a 6th century Syriac source discussing the Turkish tribes, and with the Kholatâ mentioned in the report of Zemarchos, Byzantine envoy to the Karluk of the Turks in 687, and he opined that the Khaladj were remnants of the Hephthalite confederation, in which case there is the possibility that the Khaladj may have been originally an Indo-Iranian tribe, perhaps remnants of the Sakas subsequently Turkised. In support of this view is the information of the Samanid official Khârâzmî in his Maʃā’lîth al-’ulâm (composed shortly after 366/977), ed. Van Vloten, 119-20, that the Khaladj and the Kandûna Turks (the latter located in the mountains to the north of the upper Oxus, see kumkâta) were remnants of the Hephthalites (see C. E. Bosworth and Sir Gerard Clauson, Al-Khârâzmî on the peoples of Central Asia, in JRAS (1965), 8-9).

We only possess what seems to be unequivocal information on the location of the Khaladj from the second half of the 3rd/9th century onwards. Ibn al-’Athîr, vii, 226, records in his notice of Ya’kûb b. Layh’s death (263/879) that the Saffârîd Amir, in the course of his conquests in eastern Afghanistan, had attacked the Zunbîl or local ruler in Zamin-Dawar and had subjugated the Khaladj (al-Khalâdjîyya) and the people of Zâbulistân, and this is confirmed by the Târikhî Sîstân, 215, which mentions Ya’kûb’s campaigns there against “the Khaladj and the Turks”. In the next century, Işâkîîrî, 245, also locates the Khaladj in Zamin-Dawar, and states that they were ancient immigrants to the region, that they were pastoralists, and that they had retained their Turkish customs, external appearance (and in language?) (see Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran, 36, 271: later sources dependent on Işâkîîrî have ilbâsîkî “their clothing” for lâsînîkî, but Marquart thought that the reading “their language” was the original one). The Hudûd al-alâm, tr. Minorsky, 111, describes the Khaladj as sheep-herding pastoralists in the Ghazna-Zamin-Dawar region, but with outlying groups in Balkh and Tughârâstan, Gûzgân and Dâvar, and distant district of Buzurg Daud.

Some form of suzerainty over these nomads of eastern Afghanistan was exercised by the Sâmanîds, and this passed towards the end of the 4th/10th century to Sebûkîtîn, founder of the Ghaznavid amirate. Nîsâm al-Mulk in his Siyyasat-nâmâ, ch. xxvii, ed. Darke, 135, tr. idem, 108, says that Sebûkîtîn had already once been sent by his master Alpîqîn to “the Khaladj and Türkmen” in order to collect taxation due to the Sâmanîd central government. The Ghaznavid historians Utbî and Bâyhaqi mention the Khaladj at times, and describe how Mahmûd recruited them on occasion for his armies; but his son Mas’ûd had in 432/1040 to send out from Ghazna a punitive expedition against them. It is interesting that Utbî tends now to link the Khaladj with the Afghans, which is not surprising, since the Khaladj must have lived in close proximity to the Afghân tribal heartland of eastern Afghanistan.

It appears that there now begins a process of assimilation of the Khaladj to their Afghân environment, leading to what seems very probable, if not wholly proven, sc. the evolution of the Khaladj Turks (whatever their pre-Islamic ethnic origins may have been) into the Pashto-speaking Ghâlay or Ghilzay tribe of Afghans (see Ghilzay). Minorsky cited a passage from the early 7th/13th century geographer Muhammad b. Nadîj Bârân’s Dîkhn-nâmâ, that the Khaladj Turks had migrated from the Kârlûk region (sc. Turkistân) to Zâbulistân, but had now become adapted to their new milieu in appearance and speech, their original language having changed (Hudûd al-alâm, 347-8, and The Turkish dialect of the Khalaj, in BSOS, x (1940-2), 432). Khaladj tribesmen from Zâbulistân were utilised by the Ghîrîds in their campaigns, and Sultan Ghiyâth al-Dîn Maḥmûd succeeded to power in Pirızkûh.
The Mongol invasions created a melting-pot of peoples in Inner Asia and the Iranian world, and the tide of conquest seems to have swept Khaladi elements westwards. Already Muhammad b. Nadji (see above) speaks of Khaladi settlements near Kabul, etc. Ablward near Bawurd, sc. Ablward on the northern fringes of Khurasan, doubtless brought thither during the long struggles of the Ghurids and the Aramz-Shahs for control of that province. An Özbeg tribe whose name in Russian transcription, Galači, may ensnare a memory of the Khaladi in this region, was registered for Russian Central Asia in the mid-19th century, see G. Jarring, On the distribution of Turkic tribes in Afghanistan, Lund-Leipzig 1939, 53. Khaladi are mentioned in Kirman and Pars in the Crimea, which enshrine the name "Khaladi". The Turkish dialect of the Khaldils speaks of Khaladi settlements in the SE) is as considerable, or even more considerable, of these differences (sc. from the most remote points, Ta'kh-āb in the NW of the Khaladi area, and Vinarîc, in the SE) is as considerable, or even more considerable, than the differences between Kazan Tatar and Bashkir, or between Ottoman Turkish and Azerbaijani.

The Khaladji groups is characterised by its very outstanding archaisms. Thus it has preserved -d (ancient Turk adak "foot" = Ottoman Turkish ayak = Khaladi hadad); the ancient Turkish h- (see bibliography, Eine seltsame ... ); the proto-Turkish threefold vowel quantity (short, long, diphthongal), etc. Even in morphology, it has preserved many archaic features, such as the ablative in -da, the participle in -gil ( = ancient Tükic -gil). Khaladji is especially important in the field of lexicography; there are many Turkish hapax legomena, such as qadâhu "fly", which survive only in Khaladji and in no other Turkish language.


KHALAF B. 'ABD AL-MALIK. [See Ibn Bash-Kuwal].

C. E. Bosworth

2. Language.

The Khaladi language ought to be called, more precisely, the Khaladji group of languages, because it is as independent a branch of the Turkish family of languages as, e.g. the south-western (or Oghuz) group or Chuvash, etc. It is spoken (by about 20,000 persons in 47 villages, situated about 150 miles SW of Tehran. Whereas the linguistic differences from each village to each other village are small, the sum of these differences (sc. from the most remote points, Ta'kh-āb in the NW of the Khaladji area, and Vinarîc, in the SE) is as considerable, or even more considerable, than the differences between Kazan Tatar and Bashkir, or between Ottoman Turkish and Azerbaijani.

The first scholar to have studied the Khaladji language was Minorsky, in 1940 (see bibliography). Only a short time after him, the Iranian scholar Mughaddam, when investigating the Iranian local dialects around Āshīyān, also gave a short survey of Khaladji. In 1968, the present writer described the peculiar features of Khaladji in an article based on the two older works. In 1968 and 1969 two expeditions to the territory of the Khaladji were undertaken, which produced a considerable amount of material (50 tapes, a vocabulary consisting of 60,000 words, numerous texts, etc.).
KHALAF b. HAYYĀN AL-AHMAR, ABŪ MUHRIZ — AL-KHALAFIYYA

KHALAF b. HAYYĀN AL-AHMAR, ABŪ MUHRIZ

(ca. 155–80/ca. 755–96), famous rāwīya of Basra. He parents came originally from Farṣandā and had been brought as captives to Šrāk, and then freed by Bīlāl b. Abī Burda [see AL-ASH], whose mawla Khalaf remained. He had a prodigious memory, and knew perfectly Bedouin life, their language, traditions and legends, and he gathered together all the poetic works set before him in order to transmit them to his successors. He is said to have been the pupil of Ṣād b. ʿUmar and Abū ʿAmr b. ʿAṣāʾ [q.v.], but did not pride himself on his knowledge of philology and was content with his perspicacity, which allowed him to distinguish easily between authentic and apocryphal verses. However, he became the transmitter of the poetic corpus gathered together by Ḥammād al-Rāwīya [q.v.], fully aware of his bad reputation, and brought about a change of tastes among the ruṣūd of Basra by instructing them about the nasib of the Bedouins (al-Dāhibī, Bayān, iv, 234). His teaching was followed particularly by al-ʿAsmaʿī and ʿAbd Zayd al-Anṣārī [q.v.], who had great faith in his judgment. Even so, his deep knowledge of archaic poetry, linked with a tendency which was quite frequent in his time, led him to compose poetry of Bedouin type which he attributed then to ancient poets, if at least his contemporaries are to be believed. He is especially accused of having fraudulently placed a number of verses under the name of Abū Duʿād al-Yādī [q.v.], and above all, of being the author of the Lāmīyyat al-ʿArab, which al-Ṣafarā [q.v.] did not in fact write; discussions about the authenticity of this poem have still not ended (see e.g. ʿAbd al-Muʾmin: al-Mallūḥ, al-Lāmīyyat al-ʿArab, Damascus 1966, who attempts in his introduction to show that Khalaf was not the author). At the end of his life, he is said to have condemned his own forgeries, but nothing is known of this. According to al-Dāhibī, Hayāwān, iv, 181, numerous radjāʾ verses were attributed to him without permission.

He is said to have composed a K. Ḍāhib al-ʿArab [q.v.], in which mountains are mentioned, and his works, of which a few verses are extant, have been gathered into a Ḍiwān transmitted by Abū Nuwās, who is himself said to have written within Khalaf's own lifetime his funeral oration, an elegy in fāʾ (Ḍiwān, ed. A. Ḍalāl, Cairo 1953, 574-7).

**Bibliography:** The suspicion which rests on Ḥammād and Khalaf throws doubt on the recension of archaic poetic texts, so that these two transmitters are frequently cited in the controversies over the authenticity of pre-Islamic poetry. ʿAlawārd devoted a monograph to Khalaf, Chalaf al-ʿAhrmar’s Qasida, Greifswald 1859. See also ʿAlawār, Bayān and Hayawān, indices; Ibn Sallām, index; Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, index; ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, index; Marzūnak, Muwākad, index; Ḥāfīẓ, ʿInbāb al-ruqūd, Cairo 1950–5, i, 348–51; Zabīdī, Ṭabākāt, Cairo 1956, 177–81; Ṣuyūṭī, Buḥyā, 242; Abū Ṭayyib al-Luḡawlī, Maṭāb al-naḥawīyīn, Cairo 1955, 46–7; Yākūt, Irāq, iv, 179 ff. = ʿUdābāʾ, xi, 66 ff.; G. Jacob, Ṣafarānī’s Studien, in SB Bayr. Akad. (1914–15); F. Gabrieli, in RSO, xv (1935), 538 ff.; idem, in Atti . . . Lined (1946); Blachere, HLA, index. (C. W. Pellat)

KHALAF b. MULĀʾĪH AL-ʿASHHĀBĪ, with the ʿābāb sayf al-dawla, ruler of Ḥimṣ and Afāmiyya in the 5th/11th century. He was accused of various misdeeds, including brigandage, and is said, during a siege of Salamiyya, to have thrown the Shārtī Ḥanīf al-Ḥāflī against the tower from a mangonel. In 483/1095, complaints were sent to the Sultan Malikshāh, who ordered his brother Tutūsh, the ruler of Damascus, and other rulers of Syrian cities to proceed against him. A joint expedition captured Ḥimṣ, and Khalaf was sent in an iron cage to the Sultan in Ṣafāhān. He remained in captivity until the Sultan’s death in 485/1092, when he was released by the Sultan’s widow and sought refuge with the ʿAzmī al-Juyyāsh al-ʿAfdāl in Cairo. In 485/1095–6 a delegation from Afāmiyya went to Egypt to request a new ruler, and accepted (or perhaps proposed) Khalaf, who returned to Syria, presumably in the Fāṭimīd interest. He resumed his activities, and remained in control of Afāmiyya until he was murdered by Ismāʿīlī Assassins in 499/1105.

**Bibliography:** A biography of Khalaf is included in the Buḥyāyat al-ṣalāb of Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿĀdīm (ed. from the Istanbul manuscript by B. Lewis in Mélanges Fuad Köprüülü, Istanbul 1953, 332–6); other sources in Ibn al-Kalānīsī, Ḍhalīl Tarīkh Dimashq, 120–1; ʿAzmī, 368, 371, 376; Ibn Muyassar, 466; Ibn al-ʿĀdīm, Zubāl, ii, index. The account in the Buḥyā is based on the (lost) fuller version of the chronicles of the Banū Munkīdī, and the North Syrian chronicle of Ibn Zarayrī, as quoted by al-Ulaymī, known as Ḥawāḥiḏī ʿAṣīrī. (B. Lewis)
al-Aflab b. 'Abd al-Wahhab, after which Khalaf's principality began to disintegrate. Thus the eastern part of this principality, comprising the northeastern part of Tripolitania, to the east of the meridian of Tripoli, became independent, and according to Ibn Khuradadhbih [q.v., in ca. 232/846-7 formed a Berber kingdom under Ibn Sa'ghir al-Barbar al-Maṣmūdī. Likewise, the Tripolitanian Dījāfārā, which had also been part of Khalaf's principality, fell at about the same time under the influence of the Nafūsa of the Dijblo. Certainly, when the ruler of Egypt Ahmad b. Tulun in 266/879-80 besieged the Aghlabid town of Tripoli, the people there received help from Abū Mansūr Iyās, governor of the Dījbal Nafūsa and from the imāms of Tāhtī; he must therefore have been, at this time, in control of all the region between the Dījbal and the Mediterranean.

It was apparently shortly after this that Ibn Khalaf, Khalaf b. al-Samb's son and successor, who had been expelled from his seat of Timiya, took refuge with the Berber tribe of Zawāgha, partisans of the Khalafīyya, in the Risū or Rīsū peninsula (Rīmū in al-Shammākhī, Ris in Muntaner, the 14th century Catalan chronicler, Rāzī in al-Bakrī, the modern district of al-Akkāra opposite Dījbera). Pursued by Abū Mansūr Iyās's army, Ibn Khalaf crossed over to Djerba, where he put himself under the protection of a section of the Zawāgha tribe, which had been assigned to Arkāli Khan. Another sent him along with other captives to Multān, tried to escape, but he was soon surrendered by a Hindu mukaddam and was deported to Bengal. Ibn Khalaf became Abū Mansūr's prisoner, and was deported to the Djabal Nafusa, where he died at some unknown date, by then probably a convert to Wahbism.

Thus there were Khalafi splinter groups at Ghadames and in the Fezzan in the 3rd/9th century, in the district of Risu and on the island of Tahert; he must therefore have been, at this time, in control of all the region between the Dījbal and the Mediterranean.

Certainly, when the ruler of Egypt Ahmad b. Tulun in 266/879-80 besieged the Aghlabid town of Tripoli, the people there received help from Abū Mansūr Iyās, governor of the Dījbal Nafūsa and from the imāms of Tāhtī; he must therefore have been, at this time, in control of all the region between the Dījbal and the Mediterranean.

It was apparently shortly after this that Ibn Khalaf, Khalaf b. al-Samb's son and successor, who had been expelled from his seat of Timiya, took refuge with the Berber tribe of Zawāgha, partisans of the Khalafīyya, in the Risū or Rīsū peninsula (Rīmū in al-Shammākhī, Ris in Muntaner, the 14th century Catalan chronicler, Rāzī in al-Bakrī, the modern district of al-Akkāra opposite Dījbera). Pursued by Abū Mansūr Iyās's army, Ibn Khalaf crossed over to Djerba, where he put himself under the protection of a section of the Zawāgha tribe, which had been assigned to Arkāli Khan. Another sent him along with other captives to Multān, tried to escape, but he was soon surrendered by a Hindu mukaddam and was deported to Bengal. Ibn Khalaf became Abū Mansūr's prisoner, and was deported to the Dijbal Nafusa, where he died at some unknown date, by then probably a convert to Wahbism.

Certain Khalafi groups persisted after the fall of their imāmate. Thus there were Khalafi splinter groups in Ghadamès and the partisans of the Khulfa at al-Risū in the 3rd/9th century, in the district of Risū and in the region of Dījbera in the 4th/10th century, in the town of Zawāgha on the Tripolitanian coast in the 5th/11th century, and in the districts of Yefrem, Bābil, Kikla and Tābkāl in the east of the Dījbal Nafūsa, until the middle of the 7th/13th century. According to L. Massignon, there were still remnants of them amongst the inhabitants of the Dījbal Nafūsa and the Ghāria in ca. 1295.


T. Lewicki

KHALDJIS, an Indo-Muslim dynasty who ruled briefly in Dhihi 629/1230-1320.

The Khaljis were probably of Turkish origin [see KHALDI, History] and the old view that they were Afghāns or Pathans probably arose from Baranī's statement (Taʾrīkh-i Firuzshāhī, Calcula 1862, 171) that the relations of Djalāl al-Dīn Firuz Shāh, founder of the dynasty, with the Turks were strained because he belonged to another racial stock (aslı). He was the son of Yughrā (Yabhā b. Ahmad, Taʾrīkh-i-Mubarakshāhī, Calcula 1931, 61), and seems to have entered the service of Sultan Bālūhn, who is stated to have left him with his son Bughrā Khan when the latter was appointed to the government of Bengal after the suppression of Tughrīl Beg's rebellion in 678/1280 (Iṣāmī gives 670/1271, see Fustakh al-saltānīn, Madras 1948, 168). Eight years later Bughrā Khan passed him on to his own son Kayūkābād, who had succeeded Bālūhn as Sultan of Dhihi, and he subsequently became governor of Sāmāna and then Baran, before being summoned to Dhihi to take charge of the important office of Arūd-i Mamālīk, receiving the title of Shāhīstān. The health of the Sultan was deteriorating fast due to an attack of paralysis, the Turkish nobles, led by Itimār Kačān and Itimār Surkāh, deposed him and enthroned his three-year-old son under the title of Shams al-Dīn Kayumārth. Firūz managed to dispose of his rivals Kačān and Itimār Surkāh, and had them killed, so that most of the Turkish maliks and māḥās now came over to Firūz, and he ascended the throne on 3 Jumādā al-Akhīr 689/13 June 1290, according to Amir Khusraw, Misāḥ al-futūḥ, English tr. in Elliot and Dowson, iii, 536, but Rabiʿ al-Ākhirī/April-May, according to Taʾrīkh-i-Mubarakshāhī, 61, as Sultan Djalāl al-Dīn, Kayūkābād having already been killed by a person whose father had been put to death under his orders. As the people of Dhihi believed that the Khaljis were not Turks, there was opposition to the transfer of power to them; hence in the beginning, Djalāl al-Dīn stayed in Kayūkābād's palace at Kūkikērī, which was rebuilt and embellished and came to be known as Shahr-i-naw or New City.

Before formally crowning himself, the Sultan had made some promotions and transfers, the most important of which, besides the awards conferred on his sons and relations, was the appointment of Balban's nephew, Malik Čaḍjīdū Kīshī Khan to the ıskat of Karā-Manīkpur. However, he raised the standard of revolt in the second year of the reign and marched towards Dhihi. Djalāl al-Dīn, leaving the capital in the charge of his eldest son, Kīshī Khanān, also moved out of the capital and reached Badāyūn. His advance guard, led by his second son, Arkālī Kīshī, crossed the Ganges, attacked the rebels and completely worsted them. Kīshī Khan tried to escape, but he was soon surrendered by a Hindu mukaddam or headman with whom he had taken refuge. The Sultan treated him mildly and sent him along with other captives to Multān, which had been assigned to Arkālī Kīshī. Another instance of his mild treatment of offenders was his decision about the murderous thugs who had been captured and brought to Dhihi, and who were simply deported to Bengal.

However, it is rather surprising that in the case
of a dārāṣūr, Śīfī Muwallīḥ, Sūlṭān Djalāl al-Dīn de-parted from his policy of leniency and allowed him to be killed barbarously under the orders of his son. Muwallīḥ originally came from the northern territories (wflayyāt-i-mulk-i-bālā, Barani, 208), and is stated to have stayed for some days with Shaykh Fardī al-Dīn Gandīshākār who had advised him not to allow rich people to become associated with him. It appears that he paid no heed to this advice and threw open the doors of his hospice (khānābād) to men in all walks of life, regardless of their status. His growing popularity roused jealousy, and some of his enemies created a suspicion in the mind of the Sūlṭān that Śīdī Muwallīḥ was planning to capture the throne. Djalāl al-Dīn accordingly ordered his arrest, but unable to establish his guilt, the Sūlṭān is said to have appealed to a party of Kalandar dervishes who were present to do him justice; one of them immediately attacked the Śīdī with a sharp razor, and at the order of Arkāl Khān he was trampled to death under the feet of an elephant. Most of the historians consider it as the murder of an innocent person; Barānī goes to the extent of remarking that after his murder the city was enveloped in the evening by total darkness due to a wind storm (kālī anbāḥ), and adds that in fact the death of the Sultan's political position was attributed by contemporary historians to some authorities, an off-shoot of the previous Shaykh Package and Kalandar Khāns who were present to do him justice. 

After his arrival in Kara, 'Ālā' al-Dīn adopted an attitude of apprehensive penitence and ultimately succeeded in persuading the Sūlṭān to visit him and forgive his misdemeanor. Despite the warning of his counsellors, Djalāl al-Dīn left Dīhlī and reached the bank of the Ganges, where his nephew was encamping. Just at the moment when the aged Sūlṭān was about to embrace him in affection, 'Ālā' al-Dīn had him murdered, proclaimed himself king (Rama-dān 695/July 1296), and seized Dīhlī.

During his reign of twenty years (695-715/1296-1316), the new Sūlṭān not only made extensive conquests resulting in the annexation of the entire region of central and south India, but also established peace in the north by stopping the raids of the Mongols and introducing a number of administrative and economic reforms; here only a brief reference can be made to his multifarious achievements. 'Ālā' al-Dīn had not been on the throne even for a year when the first raid of the Mongols came. They were, however, defeated and pushed back by the Sūlṭān's forces. This was soon followed by another raid under a Mongol chief, named Sālīd (Barānī 253; Sagālī and Sālīd in Futūḥ al-salātīn, 251); as before 'Ālā' al-Dīn's brave commander, Zafar Khān defeated them capturing 2,000 prisoners. In 699/1299 came one of their greatest raids under the leadership of Kutlug Khwādji, when they reached the gates of Dīhlī. Rejecting the advice of his counsellors to buy off the raiders, 'Ālā' al-Dīn assembled a large army, marched out of the city and encamped in the plain of Sirī. After the death of the Sultan's brave commander, the Mongols nevertheless broke camp and retreated. The next Mongol invasion was led by Tārgāl, who, knowing that the Sūlṭān was busy in the siege of Chitor (702-3/1302-3), marched with an army of 120,000 horsemen right up to the Jamūna. 'Ālā' al-Dīn, who had in the meantime returned from Chitor, having suffered considerable losses in matériel, shut himself up in the fortress of Sirī which was besieged by the Mongols. The Sūlṭān is stated to have requested Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā', a pious Sūfī shaykh, living near Dīhlī, to pray for his victory, and the sudden and unexpected retirement of the Mongols when they were in a clearly advantageous position was attributed by contemporary historians to his prayers. Nevertheless, 'Ālā' al-Dīn was shaken by this raid and decided to take effective measures to increase the strength of his army and repair and regarrison the old forts in the north-western region. It is not surprising, therefore, that when the next horde of the Mongols came in 705/1305 they found the Sūlṭān's army fully prepared to meet them. They avoided the newly-repaired forts, and marching along the line of the Himalayas, reached Arōmā, about 80 miles to the east of Dīhlī. The Sūlṭān's army commanded by the maliks Tughlūk and Kāfūr intercepted them on their return march and defeating them in battle captured their leaders, 'Ālī Beg and Tārgāl, with 8,000 men besides a large number of horses (Barānī, 320; Tārgāl in Amīr Khur-rāw, Khwādīn al-futūḥ, 37). 'Ālā' al-Dīn ordered the prisoners to be killed and their skulls to be built into the walls of the fortress of Sirī. In the following year, the Mongols again entered the subcontinent under Kabāk and crossed the Indus near Multān, but Tughlūk again defeated them on their return march. The last raid of the Mongols in this time (according to some authorities, an off-shoot of the previous one) was led by Ikbālmand; he was also defeated and slain, and the Sūlṭān ordered the captives to be crushed to death. Their successive defeats, the harsh treatment meted out to the captives and Tughlūk's incursions into their own regions deterred them from raiding the territories of the Dīhlī Sultanate as long as 'Ālā' al-Dīn occupied the throne. It appears that besides the major invasions mentioned
by the historians the Mongols frequently raided the frontier regions, for according to an inscription, which Ibn Battūta saw in the mosque of Multān, Tughluq had encountered the Mongols on 29 occasions and it is for this reason that he had come to be known as Ghāzi Malik.

Far more enduring than his victories over the Mongols were 'Alāʾ al-Dīn's conquests in central and southern India. In 698/1299 the Sultan sent Ulugh Khān and Nuṣrat Khān to conquer Gudjārāt. They captured its ancient capital Anhilwara (Pafan), but its ruler Rādājā Karan managed to escape towards Deogir. Besides the booty, they also brought to Dihlī the idol that had been set up in place of the one destroyed by Sūltān Māḥmūd. 'Alāʾ al-Dīn's successes during the first two or three years of the reign led him to entertain wild schemes of conquering the world and founding a new religion. Luckily one of his wise counsellors, 'Alāʾ al-Mulk, cautiously advised him to abandon the idea of founding a new faith, and to undertake the conquest of Raiputana and other parts of the subcontinent. Accordingly in 699/1299 he sent an army to conquer Ranthambhor and subsequently left the capital to supervise the operations in person. In the course of a hunting trip on his way to Ranthambhor he was separated from the main party. One of his nephews, Akat Khān, finding him unprotected, attacked and shot him dead with an arrow. Then he rushed to the camp and proclaimed himself Sūltān, but before he was able to fully control the situation 'Alāʾ al-Dīn, who had only become unconscious for some time, returned with a party of his followers. Akat was overpowered and put to death, and 'Alāʾ al-Dīn proceeded towards Ranthambhor. During his absence from the capital, two other nephews of the Sūltān unsuccessfully rose against the central government in their fiefs in Mādhyān and Awadh. More serious than these risings was the rebellion of Ḥādījī Mawlā who seized the Red Palace at Dihlī and placed on the throne a Sayyīdī who was, through his mother, a descendant of Sūltān Shams al-Dīn Iltutmīsh. Within a week however, the rebellion was suppressed by Malik Hamd al-Dīn, called Amīr-i-Kāk. In the winter of Džumādī II 702/January 1303, 'Alāʾ al-Dīn's army reached Dwārā Samudra, capital of the Hoysāla ruler, Vīra Ballālā III. After its fall, Malik Nāʾīb moved towards the Pāṇḍya Kingdom in the extreme south. Prince Sundar Pāṇḍya, who had murdered his father but had failed to seize the throne and had been expelled by his brother, Vīrā, had come to the court of 'Alāʾ al-Dīn with an appeal for help. However, the hearing that Malik Nāʾīb was marching on his capital Vīrā fled from there and the Sūltān's army captured Madurā without any fighting. Malik Nāʾīb's last expedition to the south was directed against Deogir, as its new Rādājā had tried to defy the authority of the Sūltān. The Malik put the rebellious Rādājā to death and assumed its government. To make firm the authority of the central government, he had to recapture some fortresses in the south and annex the Jaungabād region between the Krishna and Tungabhadra rivers. Malik Nāʾīb is stated to have built a small mosque, known as Masjīd, at Rāṃghvāram, near the sea coast, which was in existence when Fīrūštā wrote his book (Bombay ed., i, 210). Thus in the course of less than eight years, 'Alāʾ al-Dīn's generals brought the entire region of the south under the sway of their master. The Sūltān, however, being a realist in politics, did not assume direct administration there; except for Deogir, which was annexed and directly governed from Dihlī, the Hindu rulers remained as vassals of the Sūltān.

Besides his extensive conquests and positive measures to establish peace by stopping the raids of the Mongols, 'Alāʾ al-Dīn's reign is marked by a series of administrative, agrarian and economic reforms. The successive rebellions which had occurred during his absence from the capital at the time of the siege of Ranthambhor convinced the Sūltān of the need of inquiring into their causes and taking necessary steps to eradicate the possibility of their recurrence. It seemed to him and his advisers ultimately that they were due to neglect of the internal espionage system, a general use of wine, matrimonial alliances among the families of the nobles of the court and the concentrated excessive wealth by individuals. In pursuance of curbing this last, he enacted laws according to which
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all rent-free lands, including religious endowments, were confiscated to the state, and tax collectors were instructed to collect gold on all possible pretexts, with the result that only small holdings of a few thousand tankas' rental were left with the landowners, thus reducing their military power and their ability to rebel, as is clear from the history of the remaining years of 'Ala' al-Din's reign. The internal espionage system was improved, and it was stated that courtiers became so afraid of their conversations being reported to the Sultan that when near the palace they dared not speak, and expressed their ideas by signs rather than words. Another ordinance prohibited the use of alcohol and intoxicating drugs; the Sultan himself did not speak, and expressed their ideas by signs rather than words.

Lastly, he issued an ordinance which made it obligatory on the nobles to obtain permission of the Sultan for matrimonial alliances among their families. This enactment naturally affected the nobles and wealthy families living in the capital or its suburbs, but 'Ala' al-Din knew that the rich and influential persons in the villages could also become a source of danger. The regulations issued by him with regard to the leading men in the villages (mukaddams, badshars and khufs) have been misunderstood by some writers; Baranî used the general term 'Hindu' for these persons, and possible most of them did belong to that community. According to another ordinance, some new taxes were levied as, for instance, a grazing cess on milch cows and goats.

'Ala' al-Din's economic policy, mainly based on a system of price control, was the result of his efforts to maintain a large standing army against threats from the Mongols. Apparently realising that taxes could not be raised indefinitely, and that it was dangerous to decrease the pay of the soldiers, he decided to reduce the prices of commodities and make the necessaries of life so cheap that a horseman could be recruited for a pay of 234 tankas per annum with 71 tankas for keeping an additional horse. 'Ala' al-Din started with issuing several regulations according to which prices of corn were fixed, government stores were opened, the caravans of newcomers were registered and state revenue in the neighbouring areas was collected in kind. Malik Kabûl, an honest and strict officer, was appointed Shaâna-i-Mandî (market superintendent). He suppressed hoarding, and the Sultan ordered that those who gave short measure should have flesh equal in weight to the deficiency cut from their own bodies. The state also fixed the prices of other necessaries of life, such as cloth, for which a separate market was opened in an open plot of land near Badayûn gate, known as the tankas, or drâdû or bârdû in the Persian histories, grew day by day until the latter secured an ascendancy over his master, and he decided to kill the Sultan and seize the throne. Mubarak was warned of the danger of a conspiracy, but he paid no heed to it and Khursaw's partisans succeeded in murdering him (720/1320). His head was severed from his body and thrown into the courtyard where the courtiers who were urgently summoned to the Palace could see it. On the following morning, Khursaw ascended the vacant throne, assuming the title of Sultan Nâṣîr al-Dîn; his reign, however, proved brief.

According to Baranî, 411, Khusraw and his followers embraced Islam but were not genuine in the change of faith; they started worshipping idols within the palace, used copies of the Qur'an as stools and wantonly outraged the Muslim women. Some of the Muslim leaders, unable to bear his excesses, decided on his overthrow. Djîla Kâhî (the later Sultan Muhammad b. Tughluk (725-52/1325-51) left the capital for Sâmânâ where his father, Giblî Malik, was then posted. The latter organised a campaign and marched in the time of 'Ala' al-Din, whilst his son Mubârak Shâh Khâlîdî was unable to enforce them. 

'Ala' al-Din was a severe but vigorous ruler, yet owing to rivalries and a quarrel for power between his eldest son, Khidr Kâhî, and Malik Nâ'îb, his last days were unhappy. The former was transferred to Amôra and thus sent away from the capital, but returned to Dhihî on the pretext of visiting the tombs of some of the leading shaykhs there. In the midst of these worries, the Sultan died in Shâwâl 716/January 1316. Before his death Malik Nâ'îb, who had great influence over the Sultan, had persuaded him to disinherit Khidr Kâhî, to imprison him in the fort of Gwalior, and to nominate his young son, Shâhîb al-Dîn 'Umar, as heir to the throne. On the latter's accession Malik Nâ'îb assumed the powers of regent and ordered Khidr Kâhî and his brother, Shâdî Kâhî, who had been imprisoned in Sirî, to be blinded. 'Ala' al-Din's third son, Mubârak Kâhî, who had also been imprisoned, was also blinded. The prince, however, succeeded in bribing some of the palace guard, and they agreed to murder Malik Nâ'îb and his companions. Thus this cruel and ambitious slave of 'Ala' al-Din was killed only 35 days after his master's death. Mubarak now became the regent of his infant brother, but only two months later he blinded him and ascended the throne under the title of Kuþîb al-Dîn Mubârak. The new Sultan, aged of 18, began his reign by setting free a number of prisoners, recalling those who had been banished by his father and rescinding his enactments in regard to heavy taxation and control over prices of commodities, thus gaining considerable popularity.

Soon after his accession Mubarak left for the south where Harpâl Deo, a son-in-law of Râma Candra, had seized power and defied the authority of Dhihî. On the approach of the Sultan's army, however, he fled from the capital, but he was captured and put to death and the administration of Deoغرî was entrusted to Malik Yaklakhi; after sending his favourite slave, Khursaw, on an expedition to Mâdûra, and having spent the rainy season of 718/1318 in Deoغرî, the Sultan set out for the north. On his return journey a plot was made to kill Mubarak, but the news leaked out and the conspirators were executed. He also ordered his three brothers, Khidr Kâhî, Shâdî Kâhî and Shâhîb al-Dîn 'Umar, to be murdered.

Mubarak now gave himself up completely to a life of debauchery. His infatuation for Khursaw Kâhî, a slave belonging to a low caste (variously spelt as purnârî or brâdû in the Persian histories), grew day by day until the latter secured an ascendancy over his master, and he decided to kill the Sultan and seize the throne. Mubarak was warned of the danger of a conspiracy, but he paid no heed to it and Khursaw's partisans succeeded in murdering him (720/1320). His head was severed from his body and thrown into the courtyard where the courtiers who were urgently summoned to the Palace could see it. On the following morning, Khursaw ascended the vacant throne, assuming the title of Sultan Nâṣîr al-Dîn; his reign, however, proved brief.
on Dihli and defeated an army that was sent against him under the command of Khursaw’s brother. The final battle was fought near the old fort of Indrapat in which Khursaw was defeated, in spite of his profuse distribution of wealth to win the support of the army and the sympathy of the people. He escaped, but was later found, and Ghazi Malik ordered him to be beheaded. On the following morning the nobles urged him to accept the crown as there was no one left in the family of ‘Ala’ al-Din who could lawfully wear it. Hence Ghazi Malik ascended the throne of Dihli in Shab’an 720/September 1320 under the title of Sultan Ghiyath al-Din Tughluq Shah and began the line of Tughluqid Sultans.


(S. Moinul Haq)

KHALLIS OF MALWA. [see MALWA].

AL-KHALDUNIYYA (AL-DJAMCIYYA), a cultural association established in Tunis under the spiritual aegis of Ibn Khaldun. It was sanctioned on 22 December 1866/18 Radjab 1314 and its premises officially opened on Saturday, 14 Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 1314/15 May 1897 in the presence of the Tunisian authorities.

Its creation was in part due to the united efforts of Tunisians educated at the Siddik College, who were anxious to effect a reconciliation with former students of the Zaytuna. In this aim they were supported by shaykhs who were the Zaytuna’s instructors. Their action was in line with the political and cultural trends advocated and put into practice by the minister Khayr al-Din [q.v.], which put a determinedly modern slant on traditional studies and provided the Zaytuna’s students with a scientific course of study that gave them an opening into the modern world, which the French socio-cultural presence in Tunisia made essential.

The activities of the Near Eastern reformists, and Shaykh Muhammad ‘Abduh’s two visits to Tunis (in December 1884 and 1903), also had an influence on the teaching of Arabic studies. During his second visit to the city, ‘Abduh even put forward the notion of introducing instruction in science and mathematics into the Zaytuna itself.

In 1884 the modern studies courses followed at the Khalduniywa were set as obligatory tests in the Zaytuna’s examinations and recognised in the official diploma of applied studies which was created by a decree of 28 Jumada II 1316/12 November 1898 and which conferred job advantages on its holders.

In order to achieve these ends, the association had to smooth over difficulties, combat numerous instances of prejudice and counter the many objections raised by the traditionalists, who considered that the study of modern science was a profane action which might strike a blow at the unity of Islam. The association also had to struggle to balance a very shaky budget and raise the necessary cash to cover the cost of organising courses and lectures, acquiring books for the library and materials which would enable students to begin scientific experiments.

The Khalduniywa course of studies, taught in modern Arabic, imparted, up to World War I, the rudiments of knowledge which played a valuable part in the diffusion of scientific ideas among students and the adults who attended lectures aimed at popularising ideas on physics, chemistry, zoology, botany, modern literature, history, law, economic and commercial geography and political economy.

The last president, Shaykh Fadil Ibn ‘Ashur, had a Zaytun university education but was a wholehearted advocate of the modern ideas that, from 1945, took over from the former directors, who were of essentially Sdikian education. Ibn ‘Ashur inaugurated the final phase, which culminated with the educational reforms of 1958. Several projects were dear to his heart. He renewed the objectives of the association by setting up many “Khaldunian” organisations which coincided with a new spirit of nationalism stemming from the Arab League. He created an Arabic general certificate of education based on a general and scientific curriculum in the Arabic language which fitted students for enrolment in the universities of the Arab countries. He also opened an Institute of Islamic Studies which was intended to revitalise Islamic culture, and from 1945 onwards drew attention to the new realities governing the modern world by organising a series of conferences on specific themes. In addition, he set up an Arabic Institute of Law in 1946 with the aim of modernising law studies and improving the education of barristers and magistrates; that Tunisian justice might be better served. Finally, in the same year he founded the Institute of Philosophy, to educate students who wished to prepare for advanced level philosophy, and also to give wider currency to the major trends of Islamic philosophy.

It is clear, therefore, that from its inception the Khalduniywa had the dual aim of preparing students for official examinations through a proper course of study and of giving adults the opportunity to round off their general education and diversify their knowledge.

With its combination of instruction and culture, the Khalduniywa was gradually raised from the status of a private association to that of a national cultural institution which organised courses and conferences and put in train various other activities. To fulfil these tasks, it employed a linguistic tool which served to transmit traditional teaching but was sufficiently flexible to convey and give mastery of modern and scientific knowledge.

BANU KHÄLID, an Arab tribe occupying the central part of the eastern provinces of modern Saudi Arabia along the Gulf coast known since earlier times as al-Ahsā\(^2\) or al-Hasā\([q.v.]\). The tribe at present occupies the territory lying between al-Mikrā\(1\) in the north and al-Bayḍā\(2\) in the south, with its centre at the town of al-Hasā. For the last two centuries, the chieftainship has been in the hands of the 'Urây'ir family.

The tribe begins to figure in historical sources from the tenth-sixth century onwards, indicating its growing importance. In 989/1581 they fought off Sharifian forces trying to occupy al-Hasā from the sea, but could not prevent the Ottomans, who had the support of the Muntafiq tribe\([q.v.]\) of Lower Irāk, from occupying the region soon afterwards. The Ottomans held it till 1082/1670, when Barrak b. 'Urây'ir Āl Ḥamīd, member of an important family of the Banū Khalīd, killed Rashīd b. Muhāmīs Āl Shābīb of the Muntafiq and drove the Turks from the town of al-Hūfāf or al-Hufuf\([q.v.]\) and thus ended the first Turkish occupation of the province. It was Barrak who established a summer residence in Kuwayt, in a fortress called, like that of al-Hūfāf, a kārīr or kāfīr (whence the diminutive kūfayt from this Indian word). He also sacked the town of al-Dīrīyya\([q.v.]\) in ca. 1091/1680, but died soon afterwards, and his brother Muhammad succeeded as tribal chief.

Until his death in 1102/1691, Muhammad made various incursions into the regions of al-Yamāmā, al-Kharḍj and Sudayr in Najd. He was followed by Sa'dūn b. Muhammad b. Husayn b. Uṯmān, who had been Barrak's ally in the expulsion of the Turks, and under him the area controlled by the Banū Khalīd reached its greatest extent, from Kuwayt in the north to Kātar in the south. Muhammad envisaged also a policy of conquest in Najd, where in 1095/1684 the Idrīsid Sharīf Idrīs b. Watbān, who at that time controlled al-Dīrīyya, had been killed by one Sūlṭān b. Ḥamīd al-Kaysī, who was probably a member of the Banū Khalīd, and who then made himself lord of that town; it was held by Sūlṭān and his brother ʿAbd Allāh for some two decades.

However, incursions from al-Hasā continued, and we find Sa'dūn again attacking and sacking ʿĀkrābā and ʿAmmārīyya in 1133/1721 just before his death in battle in 1135/1723.

A series of internecine conflicts within the family followed, ending in the triumph of Sa'dūn's cousin 'Ālī b. Muhammad, who was in turn followed by his brother Sulaymān. It was during his reign that Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb\([q.v.]\) began his preaching in Najd, and Khalīd opposition to this teaching was one of the main causes of the ensuing warfare between the Banū Khalīd and the Āl Su‘ūd, beginning with the expulsion of Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb from ʿUyayna by Uṯmān b. Ahmad Āl Muʿammar at the behest of Sulaymān b. Muḥammad, after he settled at al-Dīrīyya (1157/1744). Further internal conflict followed amongst the Banū Khalīd, with Sulaymān driven out of al-Hasā in 1165/1752; he found refuge in al-Khārdj, but died there in the same year. The Āl Su‘ūd now intervened in al-Hasā, at the invitation of discontented members of the ruling family, but when Sa'dūn of the Banū Khalīd was defeated at Djāda\(3\) by the rebels, who were aided by the Muntafiq chief Thuwaymi, Sa'dūn actually found refuge in al-Dīrīyya, with his enemy ʿAbd al-'Azīz b. Muhāmīs b. Sa'dūn and Sa'dūn died there shortly afterwards. The rebel leaders Duwayhiy and Muhammad b. 'Urây'ir, together with their uncle ʿAbd al-Muḥsin, now became leaders of the Banū Khalīd in al-Hasā until 1203/1789, when they were briefly succeeded by Zayd b. 'Uray'ir and Barrak b. ʿAbd al-Muḥsin. In 1207/1793 ʿAbd al-'Azīz felt strong enough to invade al-Hasā, and two years later totally defeated Barrak. One Nāḍīm, of obscure family and not a member of the Banū Khalīd, came to power now in al-Hasā as a vassal, nominally wāli or governor, of the Āl Su‘ūd.

The expansionist policies of Su‘ūd b. ʿAbd al-'Azīz, who by 1223/1808 controlled the Hijāz, ʿAṣrī, al-Hasā and Bahrayn, as well as Najd, alarmed the Ottoman Porte, leading to the invasion of Egypt by an army under İbrahim Pasha\([q.v.]\) which defeated Su‘ūd and razed al-Dīrīyya to the ground in 1233/1818-19. This provided an opportunity for the Banū Khalīd to regain control in al-Hasā, and two brothers from the 'Urây'ir family, Māḍīj and Muhammad, briefly managed to seize al-Hufūf and Katīf before İbrahim's commander Muḥammad Kāshīf appeared there. Māḍīj, however, remained ruler of al-Hasā until 1245/1820, when he was killed in battle at ʿAklā with the resurgent Āl Su‘ūd. Al-Hasā again passed under Su‘ūd control, despite the temporary re-imposition of Turko-Egyptian control over Najd in 1838, until internal conflict within the Āl Su‘ūd in 1857 allowed the Ottomans to re-establish their power in al-Hasā, with their headquarters in al-Hufūf. In the following year, the Turkish troops withdrew, and the Porte appointed as local governor or mutaṣāṣirī a member of their old supporters, the Banū Khalīd, sc. Bāzī̇ b. 'Urây'ir. His position nevertheless proved unstable, and when the Su‘ūd ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Faysal attacked him, and besieged him in the citadel of al-Hufūf, al-Kūt, Turkish forces had to return and drive off the Su‘ūdīs.


(ʿAbd Allāh al-Kasarī)
account of his Christian mother. Some scandalous details about Khamd's ancestry seem to reflect anti-
Arab Shu'ubî sentiment (Goldzweber, Muh. Stud., i, 205 = Eng. tr. i, 188). In a tradition which Goldzweber
(ibid., ii, 45-6 = Eng. tr. ii, 53-4) classified as a pro-Umayyad fabrication, and which may refer to the rivalry between Khamd and his successor as governor of 'Irâk, Yûsûf b. 'Umar al-Thalâsf (q.v.), the Prophet gave Khamd's grandfather Asad precedence over a man of Thakîf and asked for special blessings on Asad's descendants. The report that Khamd was not a descendant of Asad (Ibn 'Asâkir, Damascus 1332/1914, v, 68) may be a response to this hadith. For these and other details of Khamd's ancestry, see especially Aghani, xix, 52 ff.

The dates of Khamd's governorship at Mecca are uncertain. Tabari's two reports, one sub anno 89/709-8, the other sub anno 91/710-10, both attribute Khamd's appointment to the caliph al-Walid. Some sources, however, refer to Khamd as governor at Mecca under 'Abd al-Malik (d. 86/705), among them a detailed report in pseudo-Ibn Kûtabya of the arrest by Khamd, after his arrival as governor in Mecca, of the pious Sa'id b. al-Dubayr [q.v.], a refugee from 'Irâk after the suppression of al-Hâdîdîdî of the revolt of Ibn al-'Ashî'î (K. al-Ismâ'a wa l-tiyasa), Cairo, ii, 51 ff.). The information about Khamd's activities by Khalid, after his arrival as governor in Mecca, in the hope that, since B. Badjila was not powerful and belonged neither to Mudjar nor Yemen, he would be able to remain aloof from the inter-tribal feuds which had become more intense as a result of the rebellion of the Yemeni Ibn al-Muhallab and the pro-Mudjar policy of Khamd's predecessor, 'Umar b. Hubayra. Nevertheless, his appointment seems to have aroused the hostility of the Mudjar, and this may have been a factor in causing his removal from office and downfall, an event which the sources attribute to the jealousy of the caliph at the increase of Khamd's wealth as a result of his agricultural works. In relation to the length of his governorship in 'Irâk, information about him is provided by F. Gabrieli (Ii califato di Hishâm, Alexandria, 1935, 8, n. 2) that the story of the arrest of Sa'id b. al-Dubayr that has been moved forward by pseudo-Ibn Kûtabya in order to make follow the report of Ibn al-'Ashî'î's defeat in 84/703 or 85/704, and that other reports which have Khamd as governor of Mecca under 'Abd al-Malik all derive from the account of pseudo-Ibn Kûtabya, seems to be contradicted by the reports of al-Azrâkî, an earlier source, which refer to Khamd as governor Mecca for 'Abd al-Malik in circumstances which have nothing to do with Sa'id (F. Wüstenfeld, Die Chroniken . . . Meha, Leipzig 1857-61, i, 265, 304-5). Wüstenfeld considered it possible that Khamd governed Mecca on two separate occasions, once for 'Abd al-Malik and once for al-Walid (ibid., iv, 148). While the end of Khamd's governorship of Mecca is usually associated with the accession of the caliph Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Malik (96/715) and his removal of those officials whom he considered had been too close to al-Hâdîdîdî (J. Wellhausen, Das arabischc Reich, Berlin 1902, 165 ff., Eng. tr. 265 ff.), al-Azrâkî has two traditions which refer to Khamd governing Mecca for Sulaymân and which seem inconsistent with the view that the removal of Khamd from office was one of Sulaymân's first acts as caliph (Chron. Meha, i, 339-40).

Apart from his involvement in the arrest of Sa'id b. Dubayar, the information about Khamd's activities in Mecca concentrates on aspects of the cult. He is said to have decorated the Ka'ba with gold sent by al-Walid (Azrâkî, Chron. Meha, i, 146; Ya'kûbî, ii, 340), to have been the first to enforce the segregation of the men from the women in the masjid (Azrâkî, 265-6), and the first to arrange the lines of worshippers around the Ka'ba (ibid., 304-5). But, on the other hand, he is said to have proclaimed his willingness to violate the hadâm (Tabari, ii, 1231) or to tear down the Ka'ba and remove it to Jerusalem (Aghânî, xii, 90; pseudo-Ibn Kûtabya, ii, 51-2), should the caliph desire it, and it is Khamd who is charged with the construction, on the orders of al-Walid (Tabari, ii, 1199-1200; Aghânî, xix, 60) or Sulaymân (Azrâkî, 339-40), of a fountain which was intended to supplant Zamzam.

Between his removal from the governorship of Mecca and his appointment to that of 'Irâk, Khamd is mentioned only as one of the two men sent by the caliph Yazid b. 'Abd al-Malik to take amân to Yazid b. al-Muhallab [q.v.] in a futile attempt to forestall his revolt (Tabari, ii, 1382, 1387-8). His appointment as governor of 'Irâk is dated to the beginning of the caliphate of Hishâm b. 'Abd al-Malik, but there is some doubt whether it was in 105/723-4 or 106/724-5 (Tabari, ii, 1474; but see Dhinawrî, A khâlier al-funûl, Leiden 1888, 336, where it is said that it was Yazid ii who appointed Khamd).

It seems likely that Khamd was appointed to 'Irâk in the hope that, since B. Badjila was not powerful and belonged neither to Mudjar nor Yemen, he would be able to remain aloof from the inter-tribal feuds which had become more intense as a result of the rebellion of the Yemeni Ibn al-Muhallab and the pro-Mudjar policy of Khamd's predecessor, 'Umar b. Hubayra. Nevertheless, his appointment seems to have aroused the hostility of the Mudjar, and this may have been a factor in causing his removal from office and downfall, an event which the sources attribute to the jealousy of the caliph at the increase of Khamd's wealth as a result of his agricultural works. In relation to the length of his governorship in 'Irâk, information about him is provided by F. Gabrieli (Ii califato di Hishâm, Alexandria, 1935, 8, n. 2) that the story of the arrest of Sa'id b. al-Dubayr that has been moved forward by pseudo-Ibn Kûtabya in order to make follow the report of Ibn al-'Ashî'î's defeat in 84/703 or 85/704, and that other reports which have Khamd as governor of Mecca under 'Abd al-Malik all derive from the account of pseudo-Ibn Kûtabya, seems to be contradicted by the reports of al-Azrâkî, an earlier source, which refer to Khamd as governor Mecca for 'Abd al-Malik in circumstances which have nothing to do with Sa'id (F. Wüstenfeld, Die Chroniken . . . Meha, Leipzig 1857-61, i, 265, 304-5). Wüstenfeld considered it possible that Khamd governed Mecca on two separate occasions, once for 'Abd al-Malik and once for al-Walid (ibid., iv, 148). While the end of Khamd's governorship of Mecca is usually associated with the accession of the caliph Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Malik (96/715) and his removal of those officials whom he considered had been too close to al-Hâdîdîdî (J. Wellhausen, Das arabischc Reich, Berlin 1902, 165 ff., Eng. tr. 265 ff.), al-Azrâkî has two traditions which refer to Khamd governing Mecca for Sulaymân and which seem inconsistent with the view that the removal of Khamd from office was one of Sulaymân's first acts as caliph (Chron. Meha, i, 339-40).

Apart from his involvement in the arrest of Sa'id b. Dubayar, the information about Khamd's activities in Mecca concentrates on aspects of the cult. He is said to have decorated the Ka'ba with gold sent by al-Walid (Azrâkî, Chron. Meha, i, 146; Ya'kûbî, ii, 340), to have been the first to enforce the segregation of the men from the women in the masjid (Azrâkî, 265-6), and the first to arrange the lines of worshippers around the Ka'ba (ibid., 304-5). But, on the other hand, he is said to have proclaimed his willingness to violate the hadâm (Tabari, ii, 1231) or to tear down the Ka'ba and remove it to Jerusalem (Aghânî, xii, 90; pseudo-Ibn Kûtabya, ii, 51-2), should the caliph desire it, and it is Khamd who is charged with the construction, on the orders of al-Walid (Tabari, ii, 1199-1200; Aghânî, xix, 60) or Sulaymân (Azrâkî, 339-40), of a fountain which was intended to supplant Zamzam.
after the death of Higham and the succession to the caliphate of al-Walid b. Yazid, by his deliverance on the orders of the new caliph once again into the hands of his successor as governor of Yurak, Yassuf b. 'Umarr the Thakafi, under whose torture he died (126/743-4; Tabari, ii, 1641-59, 1778-83, 1812-25).

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(G. R. Hawting)

KHALID b. BARMAK. [See al-Barmakia].

KHALID b. SAFWAN b. 'ABBAD ALLAH b. 'AMR b. AL-AHTAM (whence the htbh of Ibn al-Ahtam; sometimes given to him) AL-TAMIMI AL-MINQARK, ABU SAFWAN, of Banu Thakufl (d. 155/772), the companion of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, Higham, 'Abd al-Malik, Khalid b. 'Abd Allarih al-Kasri and probably Abu Safwan, of Basra (d. 135/752), the companion (sometimes given to him) AL-TAMIMI AL-MARK!.

B. AL-AHTAM

of historical traditions, poetry and memorable indices; Ibn Kutayba, ftayawdn, 'Uyun al-akhbar, i, 351-2; Brockelmann, S I, 105 (not to be confused with al-Kassih, Bukhald*, index). Towards the end of his life he lost his sight (al-Safadi, 'Umydn, i, 148-9).

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Kalbi, Dammara-Caskel, Tab. 76, ii, 343; Dallgbit, Baydun and ftayawdn, indices; Ibn Kutayba, 'Uyun al-akhir, index; idam, Mawarih, index; Ibn 'Asikir, Ta'igit Dammara-v, 35-63; Harawi, Zaydadr, 82; Ibn 'Abd Rabblah, Tld, index; Mubarrad, Kamil, index; Yakkit, Udbat, xi, 24-35; Darrat al-mawarih, ii, 351-2; Brockelmann, S I, 105 (not to be confused with al-Kassih, Bukhald*, index). (Ch. Pellat)

KHALID b. SA'ID b. AL-'AS b. UMAYYA b. 'ABBAD AL-SAMS b. 'ABBAD MANAF b. KUSAYY b. KILAB b. MURRA b. KA'B b. LU'AYY, d. 13/635, was, according to several traditions, if not the fourth Companion of the Prophet, at least one of the second group of three. Ibn Ishaq, however, places his conversion to Islam at a much later date and thus excludes him from the privileged group of the eight Predecessors (sdbikun, mutakaddimun).

As a rich member of the Umayyad clan, he is said to have presented to Muhammad the slaves inherited from his father; he had some education, and was possibly Muhammad's third secretary, after 'Uthman and 'AII. He fulfilled this latter rôle, and was also responsible for protocol at the time of the reception of the important tribe of Thakafi and their allies in the year 9.

Previous to this when one of the emigrants in Ethiopia, he had just come to profess his adhesion to Islam, he appointed Khalid to accompany him and to collect the sadaka. At the beginning of the year 11, and just before his death, Muhammad appointed seven governors for Yemen and 'Umar, including Khalid for the territory in Baydun, between the streams of Shadr and Zabid. At the time of al-Aswad's revolt, the governors came together around al-Tahir b. Abi Haila, who was in charge of the Tihama of Yemen, but Khalid b. Sa'id had the responsibility of arranging the match (as wali or asail), placed upon him by his companions, although one tradition gives this task to 'Uthman.

His political career began in the year 10. When Muhammad sent back to his tribe in Yemen Farwa b. Musayk, who had just come to profess his adhesion to Islam, he appointed Khalid to accompany him and to collect the sadaka. At the beginning of the year 11, and just before his death, Muhammad appointed seven governors for Yemen and 'Umar, including Khalid for the territory in Baydun, between the streams of Shadr and Zabid. At the time of al-Aswad's revolt, the governors came together around al-Tahir b. Abi Haila, who was in charge of the Tihama of Yemen, but Khalid b. Sa'id had the responsibility of arranging the match (as wali or asail), placed upon him by his companions, although one tradition gives this task to 'Uthman.

His political career began in the year 10. When Muhammad sent back to his tribe in Yemen Farwa b. Musayk, who had just come to profess his adhesion to Islam, he appointed Khalid to accompany him and to collect the sadaka. At the beginning of the year 11, and just before his death, Muhammad appointed seven governors for Yemen and 'Umar, including Khalid for the territory in Baydun, between the streams of Shadr and Zabid. At the time of al-Aswad's revolt, the governors came together around al-Tahir b. Abi Haila, who was in charge of the Tihama of Yemen, but Khalid b. Sa'id had the responsibility of arranging the match (as wali or asail), placed upon him by his companions, although one tradition gives this task to 'Uthman.

His political career began in the year 10. When Muhammad sent back to his tribe in Yemen Farwa b. Musayk, who had just come to profess his adhesion to Islam, he appointed Khalid to accompany him and to collect the sadaka. At the beginning of the year 11, and just before his death, Muhammad appointed seven governors for Yemen and 'Umar, including Khalid for the territory in Baydun, between the streams of Shadr and Zabid. At the time of al-Aswad's revolt, the governors came together around al-Tahir b. Abi Haila, who was in charge of the Tihama of Yemen, but Khalid b. Sa'id had the responsibility of arranging the match (as wali or asail), placed upon him by his companions, although one tradition gives this task to 'Uthman.
once again accorded to him by al-Tabari, who cites four hadiths mentioning his death, shows the interest which Khalid b. Sa'id seems to have raised; it is probable that his attitude, together with reminiscences of his friendship with Muhammad, posed a problem of conscience for Abu Bakr.  


KHALID B. SINN. R. *AYTH AL-ABRIS* (see his genealogy in Ibn al-Kalbi, Dāmūkara, Tab. 133). One of the personages of the interval [see Fāṭra] between Christ and Muhammad who, in Islamic tradition, was considered as a prophet; he was even regarded as the first prophet to arise amongst the descendants of Ismā'īl. He is said to have foretold the coming of Muhammad, and the latter is said to have greeted Khalīd’s daughter, who had come to him, with these words “Here is the daughter of a prophet whom his people has lost!” popular belief even went as far as to attribute to him knowledge of Sūrat al-Ikhlas (Thiμār al-ḵulūb, 456). He is mentioned in connection with the fire called nār al-Harratayn (al-Dājibī, Hayyūvān, iv, 476; cf. al-Kalākhashandī, 82b, i 409-10), into which he threw himself and which he extinguished (Thiμār, 456), and in connection with the ʿankā (q.v.), whose race God destroyed as the result of a prayer of his (R. Basset, Mille et un contes, iii, 203-4). There is already found in al-Dājibī (Hayyūvān, iv, 477) a tradition according to which Khalīd is said to have instructed his people to disinter him after death so that he could reveal the secrets of the hereafter; this is often repeated (Ibn Kutayba, Maṣāfī, 62, al-Māṣūdi, Murūdī, iv, 22-2 = §§ 1349-50; al-Harawi, Zīvārāl, 61337; etc.).  

These legends, together with the prophethood of Khalīd, are rejected by al-Dājibī (Hayyūvān, iv, 478) in the name of the muḥakkalimān who say that Khalīd was a Bedouin, but God never raised up a prophet from amongst the Bedouin, hence Khalīd could not have been a prophet (a syllogism taken up, in particular in Thiμār, 456).  

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the text, see Dājibī, Tarīb, index; Ḍamīrī, Hayyāt al-hayawān, s.vv. ʿankā and sīlād; Maṣʿūdi, Murūdī, index; Ibn Ḥadhārj, Isbā, No. 2335; Makānī, Čeṣṭa, iii, 17, 130, 176-9.  

KHALID B. AL-WALID B. AL-MUGHIRA AL-MĀHMUDĪ, Arab commander at the time of the early conquests. Muslim tradition gives his career as follows. He fought against Muhammad at Ubūq, but was converted in 6/627 or 6/629 and participated in the expedition to Muṣta and the conquest of Mecca, both in 8 A.H. The Prophet charged him with the destruction of the idol of al-ʿUzār at Nakhrā and later sent him to the B. Dāḥalīmā, whom he wrongfully attacked. In 9/630 the Prophet sent him from Tabūk to Dūmat al-Dāhbal (q.v.) where he captured the ruler al-Ukaydir and sent him to Medina. In 10/631 he was sent to invite the B. al-Ḥārith of Yemen to Islam. On the outbreak of the ridda or “apostasy” after the Prophet’s death in 11/632, Abū Bakr sent him against the rebels, on which occasion he committed another two misdemeanours, first by killing Muslims (through a misunderstanding) and later by marrying a Muslim woman. Abū Bakr, however, forgave him and he commanded the Muslims against Musaylima in the Yamāmā. In 12/633 he was sent either directly from the Yamāmā or via Medina to ʿIrāq where he conquered al-Ḥira (q.v.), Dūmat al-Dāḥbal and other places before crossing the desert to Syria to assist the armies there. He stayed in Syria, though his troops returned to ʿIrāq (Tabarī, i, 2145). On Abū Bakr’s death in 13/634, ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb immediately dismissed him from the high command, but he fought in Northern Syria under Abū Ubayda and conducted a number of campaigns on the Byzantine border before his death in Ḥims (or Medina) in 21/642. His son ʿAbd al-Rahmān was governor of Ḥims and the Dāżāra for Muṣṭwīya, who is said to have had him killed because he feared his prestige. Khalīd b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Khalīd, who avenged his father, is found as a commander in 48/689-9, but otherwise nothing significant is heard of the family.  

There are two points of major interest in Khalīd’s career. Firstly, Muslim tradition is extraordinarily eager to discredit him. He is known as Sayf Allāh, an epithet he earned in battle against the Romans at Muṣta (Tabarī, i, 1017, differently in 1531), but he is condemned rather than celebrated as such, doubtless because the title belongs in the same context as that which designated the armies of Syria as ḡund Allāk, sent to take revenge from the Romans for their oppression of the Arabs (Thiμār, 456), and which knew ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb as the redeemer (fāsrāk, see ibid.). Later tradition might have reduced Khalīd to Sayf Rāsūl Allāh (cf. Khalīfāt Allāh), but instead reduced his contribution, partly by depicting him as self-willed, as exemplified in his misdeeds, and partly by having ʿUmar dismiss him, though, as De Goeje has pointed out, ʿUmar must on the contrary have appointed him to the high command in the first place.  

Secondly, Muslim tradition has Khalīd initiate the conquests in ʿIrāq, a point contradicted by non-Muslim sources. Sebeos (ca. 661 A.D.) has the Arabs divide their armies after their first successes in Syria and send one division to ʿIrāq (the returning armies of Muslim tradition), and the Kūzātānī chronicle (ca. 680 A.D.) only knows Khalīd as the conqueror of Syria. In fact, Tabarī, i, 2082, has Abū Bakr instruct Khalīd to go to Syria. The doctrinal significance of this shift is that it suppresses Syria’s status as the promised land for Jews and Arabs alike (for a similar shift, compare Syria in Sebeos, 95-6, with ʿIrāk in Tabarī, i, 2254, 2285, 2289). The manner in which the shift was effected is clear when we consider the appearance of the Prophet at the head of the first invasions of Syria in non-Muslim sources (Doctrina Iacobi, ca. 634 A.D., 86-7; Cont. Byz. Arab, in MGH, xi, 337), which Muslim tradition has reduced to the pointless expedition to Tabūk. It was from Tabūk that the Prophet sent Khalīd to Dūmat al-Dāḥbal, the city which he is supposed to have conquered again on his later campaign in ʿIrāq, though this was an unlikely détour from al-Ḥira. On initiating the conquest of Syria, the Prophet must therefore have sent Khalīd to Dūmat al-Dāḥbal, which was vital for the control of Syria, and it was from here that Khalīd crossed to join the armies in Syria, a more plausible, if less romantic, desert crossing than that preserved in Muslim tradition.  

Bibliography: Ibn Hishām, passim; Tabarī, index; Baladhurī, Futūḥ, index; Wāqīdī, ʿAbd al-maghāṣī, ed. M. Jones, Oxford 1966, index; Doctrina Iacobi super quinque libros, ed. N. Roeser, in Abh. G. W. Göt, n.s. xii (1920); Sebeos, Histories d’Heraclei, tr. F. Macler, Paris 1904, 98;
KHĀLĪD B. AL-WALĪD — KHĀLĪD B. YAZĪD B. MUʿAWIYĀ

Khalid was the boon-companion of 'Ali b. Ḥishām and then of al-Ḍawār b. Marwān. He had the entree to al-Muṭaṣīm's company, was close to the poet 'All b. al-Ḍāḥim [q.v.], and collaborated with the famous player on the ḥurnār, Aḥmad b. Ṣadak (Aḥdānī, xxi, 320-7; Dīyārādī, 16-17; Tāʾirīkh Baḡdād, viii, 313). In practice, he was the author of short pieces of up to four verses only. When he went so far as to compose long poems in honour of al-Muṭaṣīm's victories (the ms. of his Dīwān contains five eulogies), Dīyārādī [q.v.] criticized him for tackling something beyond his capabilities. Khalid's real talent lay in the elegy, in which he describes the lover's torments and the cruelness of his solitude; the memory of the beloved haunts him, and the fatalness of passion tortures him. His verses are addressed to women and also to ephebes, to whom he devoted numerous poems. He also wrote some moving elegies during the period when his reason was tottering. He complained at that time of the loss of his poems: "He said despairingly to his companions when his mind gave way, in circumstances which remain obscure (Yaqūt, xi, 48)."

He then wandered, almost naked, through the streets of Baḡdād, pursued and stoned by a mob ofurchins (Aḥdānī, xx, 244; al-Sāḥibī, Wuzurād∗, 162-3). He died ca. 269/685.
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KHALID B. YAZID B. MUWA'WIYA — KHALID DIYA'...

Also at this time, he sent his first original writings to the same periodical. He experimented with a poem 'Ağlıkımın mezari' ("The Grave of my Love") which he sent to the Istanbul daily Terziumâni-i hâkimat. It was published, with ironical remarks of Mu'âlim Nâdiri [q.v.], who was later to become the main opponent of the new school. Leaving school at seventeen, he began to work as a clerk in his father's business, took lessons in English and dancing and enjoyed the cosmopolitan life of Izmir society. In 1894 he founded, with his poet friend (later a Young Turk) Tewfîk Newzâd (1865-1906), the short-lived review Nevarûs where he serialised the translations of Georges Ohnet's Le Maître de forges as Demir-hâne müdürüs. He made a short abortive attempt to Istanbul to try his chance at entering a diplomatic career, but he did, however, meet there important personalities of the literary and publishing world and secured the publication of his Gharbdan şarha seyddâ-i edebîyye ("Literary current from the West to the East")'. Back in Izmir, he was appointed teacher of French at the Rûkıdiyye and an accountant at the Ottoman Bank, where he was the only Turkish employee. Later, he also taught at the local lycée (s'dâddi). In 1886 he founded, again with Tewfîk Newzâd, the newspaper Kâhidmi where he published his Menküf girîve ("The wretched woman") (published in book form in 1889) and began to serialise his first novel Sefile ("The wretched woman"), which was stopped by the censor. Some of his short stories and his second novel Nâmêde were also serialised in Kâhidmi. The loss of his mother in 1886 inspired his poems in prose Mezarîndan sesler ("Voices from the grave"), followed by his third novel Bir sûrunun defleri ("The diary of a dead man"), also serialised in Kâhidmi. In the meantime, Khalîl Diya' married Memnuhâ Kâhidmî, the daughter of a tax director (and a niece of Köse Râ'îf Paşa, 1836-1912).

He accompanied an uncle on his European trip, as far as the Paris exhibition of 1889; he was particularly impressed by Paris, which he knew so well from Balzac's novels. The years 1889-93 were full of bitter experiences for Khalîl Diya'; several losses in the family sent his father, his old daughter and his grandfather, and the arrest and banishment of one of his uncles for being involved in a secret society. In the middle of this turmoil, he finished his fourth novel Ferdi ve şeurâkâsi ("Ferdî and co.") serialised in Kâhidmi (published in book form in 1312/1896). At the same time, he translated specimens from world literature (including Sanskrit and Hebrew) which were later published in four volumes (Nâbilî, 1308/1892).

About this time, he met Redjâlî-Zâde Ekrem, who was passing through Izmir, and who invited him to come to Istanbul to join the group of young writers there. After resigning from the Ottoman Bank, and a brief period as acting director of the Foreign Affairs (Meşhîbî-i eğnînîyye) Department at the Vilâyet, he received an offer to become First Secretary to the Director of the Rejî (Réjîe, administration of the tobacco monopoly) in Istanbul, which he eagerly accepted. This was a turning point in his literary career. He arrived in Istanbul on 31 August 1893 (amid the anniversary celebrations of 'Abd al-Hamîd II's enthronement) and immediately began to visit the celebrities of the literary and publishing world like Redjâlî-Zâde Ekrem, Ahmed Midhat, Mu'âlim Nâdiri, Abu 'l-Diya' Ebulhâsim [q.v.], Tewfîk, 'A'll Efendi and Ahmed Ihsân. Within a very short time, he had met all the leading writers of the new group: Mêmmed Râ'îf, Huseyên Dâhid...
KHALID DIYÄ

(g.o.), Djenab Shihab üd-Din, and free-lance writers like Riza Tewflk (Boliikbashi), Ahmed Rasim (g.o.) and Huseyn Rahmi (g.o.). Some time later, he met the poet who was to be his great partner in the new movement, Tewflk Fikret (g.o.). His office, comparatively safe from Hamidian control, became gradually a kind of a literary club where long and excited discussions were held at a period when a meeting of more than three people was forbidden. Khalid Diya² began to write short stories for Ahmed Ihsän’s Therwet-i funun (g.o.) (originally a popular science magazine founded in 1891 as the weekly supplement of Therwet) and for the dailies Ikdam and Sabäh. In 1894, he also began to contribute to the literary fortnightly Mekteb (originally a children’s magazine, founded in 1891), where several members of the new group published their works. An article he published in Mekteb on Sanskrit literature, where he discussed Indian philosophy and pantheism, was denounced to the Palace by an informer’s jurnal which claimed that the article was trying “to spread the doctrine of the materialists (Maddîyyûn) in the country”. Although the article had passed the censorship, Khalid Diya³ was summoned to the residence of the Minister of Public Security (Dâbîyye nâzîrî). Mekteb ceased to appear and most of the new writers moved over to Therwet-i funun which seemed safer, thanks to a friend and a protector of Ahmed Ihsän’s in the Palace. On Reji³-ı-Zade’s invitation, Khalid Diya³ joined it under Tewflk Fikret’s editorship (1896). For five years Therwet-i funun became the most representative organ of the new, western-oriented literary school of Edebîyyat-i dâlîlede or Therwet-i funun edebîyyâtî. It was in the Therwet-i funun that Khalid Diya³ serialised his famous novel Mâfi ve siyây (Nos. 273-317) and his masterpiece ‘Aghh-i memnî (Nos. 413-79), and many of his short stories and articles appeared there. But all this suddenly came to an end: a jurnal sent to the Palace (probably by Baba Tâhir, editor of the rival conservative periodical, Ma’tâmâ) informed the Hamidian censors that in issue No. 553 of Therwet-i funun, published in October 1896, the forbidden words “Revolution” appeared, and in an article translated from the French by Huseyn Dâhid (for details and the text of the article, see Huseyin Cahit Yaçın, Edebi hatıralar, Istanbul 1935, 161-9). The journal was immediately suspended, and when it was allowed to reappear again, all literary writings were banned and it could only publish articles on popular science. Khalid Diya³ interrupted the serialisation of his novel Kîrh hayâtlar (“Broken Lives”), which had already been mutilated by the censorship, and wrote nothing for more than six years until the Revolution of 1908, meanwhile living in his villa in Ayastafanos (present Yeşilköy). During the nine months³ period between the restoration of the constitution in 23 July 1908 and the deposition of ʿAbd al-Hamîd II, following the mutiny of 13 April 1909, Khalid Diya³ wrote extensively in many of the dailies and periodicals which quickly mushroomed after the abolition of the censorship. He also serialised in the daily Sabäh his period novel Nesî-l-i ahlîr (“The last generation”) which he never published in book form; cf. Cevdet Kudret, Türk edebîyâtında hikaye ve roman (1976, 176-80). Also, during this period, he was appointed government representative at the Rûûs (virtually a sinecure) for five years. One of the personalities of the Istanbul literary world (with his earlier association with the Palace and the Unionists.

When Muṣṭafâ Kemâl ( Atatûrık) started his language reform movement in 1932, with the inauguration of the First Turkish Linguistic Congress in Istanbul, Khalid Diya³ joined the host of writers and scholars who declared their enthusiastic approval of the movement (Birinci türk dili kurultayı, tezler ve müzakere tabbaları, Istanbul 1933, 330-42; the single exception being Huseyin Dâhid (Yaçın), ibid., 270-9). Khalid Diya³’s last years were troubled with family misfortunes, culminating in the suicide in 1937 of his young diplomat son Khalîl Wejdâd. His last two public appearances were his participation in 1942 in the 50th anniversary jubilee of his career as a writer and his chairmanship in Ankara of the committee for the “Best novel” prize (awarded to Khalîl Edîb’s Sinîkî bakkâl). He died on 27 March 1945 in his country house at Yeşilköy near Istanbul. An extremely prolific author, Khalid Diya³ contributed to all branches of prose literature as journalist, essayist, publicist, popular science writer, playwright and translator. But his name is particularly associated with the short story and novel, of which he is the real founder in modern Turkish literature.

Novels and short stories in modern sense did exist before him. After ʿAll ʿAzîz’s (g.o.) Mûlhaṣâyalet (1796), which is a transition between the old and the new type of story-writing, and several translations (mainly from the French) in the 1850’s and 1860’s, the tendency to modernise the narrative technique is apparent in Turkish literature. If we leave out the pioneer work of the scholar-writer Şems üd-Dîn Sâmi’s Taʿâshûk-i tâlkat we filât (1872) and experiments by Namık Kemâl (Ibnâbî, 1876) and some of his associates (particularly Sâmi Paşa-Zade Şevâat’s Serçûdeğe, 1880), the prototype of the novel among the generation of Tàngîmî modernists is Ahmed Midhât, whom Khalid Diya³ greatly admired; see his note at the end of his un-
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finished translation of George Ohnet's Maître de forges, Demirkhdne müdürü, 1889). Hiuseyn Rahmi, an independent contemporary of Khalid Diya', was a follower of the Ahmed Midhat school and soon became an equally popular novelist. Although Khalid Diya', as a boy-writer, was an admirer of Ahmed Midhat and had a high opinion of Hiuseyn Rahmi's talent (Kirk yil, 421), there is hardly any trace of the old Turkish popular narrative technique or the influence of the French novels of adventure and entertainment, even in his early novel Izmir period (1888-93). These romantic and, at times, over-sentimental, stories with some elements of realism (particularly in Ferdî ve şürekâslar, 1893), already reveal a complete break with traditional methods of story-telling and develop a well-disciplined narrative technique where there is no room for irrelevant digressions or "small talk" with the reader (for synopses and analyses of Khalid Diya's individual novels, see Bibli.). Khalid Diya' perfected this technique in his later novels of the Istanbul period, inspired mainly by the method and style of French realists and naturalists, and until the middle of 1930's, his works remained the best examples of realism in the Turkish novel. Two titles stand out: Mâ'âr ve şüyâh ("Blue and black", 1897) which describes the dreams, struggles and eventual disillusionment of a young poet and his love ("Forbidden love", 2000), generally considered his best novel, which tells the story of the desperate love of a young woman who could not find happiness in her marriage to an elderly rich man. In both these novels and in his later works, the environment and the setting are described in minute detail and the characters are submitted to exhaustive psychological analysis. The setting and the characters are often chosen from upper or upper-middle class of Istanbul, for which Khalid Diya' has been severely criticised. A stereotype judgement on him is that his characters are not typically Turkish and never leave Istanbul. This is obviously an unfair criticism. Under the Hamidian régime, travel, even within the country, was restricted and supervised, and writers had to confine their observations by necessity to Istanbul. Also as a member of a well-to-do upper-middle class family, and very reserved in temperament, Khalid Diya' described only the type of people with whom he came into direct contact. We know now, from various sources, particularly from many Turkish and foreign memoirs, that an exclusive upper-class Turkish society flourished in Istanbul following the Tanzimat, particularly after the 1880s. It led an alla francâs (alafranga) way of life which is faithfully described by Khalid Diya' and his colleagues of the Thüret-i fânün (1901, reminiscences of the court of Mefremmed V; Bir act hikaye, Istanbul 1942, mainly about his son Khalîl Wedâd and his death. These memoirs are selective and of limited interest, as the reserved and over-cautious character of the author did not always allow him to treat freely and discuss impartially the people he had known and events he witnessed. Finally, Khalid Diya' s research work, including his courses in the University, were mostly based on translation or compilation.

In October 1909, she wrote her first important novel Seniyye Sâlîb (published in 1910), and while continuing her articles on educational problems, joined the staff of the Women Teachers' Training College (Dâr al-mu'llâmiyât), and with the help of the noted educationist Nakiyye Khanîm (Nakîyi Elgûn, 1882-1965) reformed its syllabus and administration. In the meantime, she was married from Sâlîb Dîkî Bey, having left home immediately after he had told her that he had married a second wife (1910). Soon she was attracted by the new movement of Turkism (Tûrkülûk [q.v.]). She wrote her novel Yeni Türkân (1911) and joined the activities of the Turkish Hearût (Tûrk Odâiçî [q.v.]), where she worked with Dîyâ’ Gökalp [q.v.] and his associates. When she resigned her teaching position over a conflict of principle with the Minister of Public Instruction Şûklîr Bey (see Gövä, op. cit., s.v.), she became Inspector-General of Ewâdî Schools which the minister, (the later Şêkîh-ê Islâm Muştafa Khîryî Efendî [q.v.]) decided to modernise. This gave her an opportunity to visit and study the outlying and poorest districts of Istanbul and their people, which incidentally became valuable for her novels. At the same time, she joined with Nakiyye Elgûn in the activities of the Women's Club (Tûlâ-ye Nisvan Diîmî-yi-yeti) in social relief work and nursing.

In the autumn of 1916, at the invitation of Dîmâl Pasha [q.v.], Army Commander in Syria, she toured all the important educational institutions there, and then returned to Istanbul after submitting her report. She subsequently continued her educational activity there by organising schools and by reforming the large ‘Ayûntûr Orphanage. Meanwhile, she was married to Dr. ‘Adnân (Âdvâr [q.v.]), a leading member of the CUP, by proxy (23 April 1917). Her educational work completed, she returned to Istanbul in early March 1918. In the autumn of the same year the war was over. After the Armistice of Mudros (30 October), the CUP triumvirate and many leading members of the Committee fled the country, and the Allied fleets entered Istanbul.

Parliament was dissolved, Italian troops occupied Antalya, and the Greeks, supported by the Allies, landed in Izmir (15 May 1919) and were advancing towards the interior. Sporadic resistance and guerilla warfare started in Anatolia. Khâlide Edîb joined in protest rallies, and her name is particularly associated with the historic mammoth meeting of 23 May in Sultan Ahmed Square, where she made a famous moving and dramatic address; her bust stands there today in memory of that unique occasion (Halîde Edîb, The Turkish ordeal, New York 1928, 32-3). In the following week, 55 intellectuals were deported to Malta by the British. In the meantime, Muştafa Kemâl Pasha (Atatürk) had assumed the leadership of the resistance movement in Anatolia. On 10 August of the same year, Khâlide Edîb wrote a famous controversial letter to Muştafa Kemâl Pasha in support of an American mandate over Turkey (Ghazi Muştafa Kemâl, Nutuk, Ankara 1927, 56-9; Speech, Istanbul 1963, 76-80). She represented a group of opinion which thought that in the summer of 1919 there could be an alternative to armed resistance and to the partition of the country, e.g. by asking for a great power's mandate (H. N. Howard, The King-Crane Commission, Beirut 1963, index; SabahattînSelek, Anadolu ihtilalî, Istanbul 1968, 276-8; Niyaży Berkes, Türkîyedî de çâçdaştî, Ankara 1973, 419-20). At Khâlide's suggestion, an American representative was sent to the Congress of Sivas
(4-11 September) by Charles R. Crane, the co-chairman of the American King-Crane Commission, in order to interview Mustafà Kemâl and to investigate the question of the American mandate (Nutûf, 63, Speech, 85-6, Kinross, Atatûrk, 188, Howard, op. cit. 289-90). The idea was discussed and definitely rejected by the Congress (Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Millî mücadele hatıraları, İstanbul 1935, 175-6). During the winter months of 1919-20 Khalîde kept in close contact with the Nationalists and their supporters in Istanbul and talked frequently to a number of American and British officials, but there came a reinforced occupation of Istanbul by the British (16 March 1920), followed by a raid on the Parliament and more arrests and deportations, so that the recently-elected pro-Nationalist Parliament which had adopted the National Pact (see Miḥâkı-i Millî) had to prorogue itself on March 18 (see B. Lewis, Emergence, 251). To avoid certain arrest and deportation (see Ordûl, 65-8, and A. E. Yalman, Gûrdû -lerim ve geseârûdûlerim, ii, İstanbul 1970, 55) Khalîde and her husband Dr. ʿAdnân went into hiding in a dervîsh convent (Osbekler tekseyi) in Üskûdar and left secretly for Ankara. They arrived in Ankara on 1 April 1920 (followed shortly by Colonel ʾIṣmÊt (Inöönü) and Fevzî (Çâmûk) Pâsha (G. Jaeschke, Türk kuruluşusuna sanayi kronolojisi, Ankara 1970, 96) and she immediately began to work in the “Agricultural School”, the headquarters of the Nationalists, where she surveyed the foreign press, collected news for the “Anatolian Agency”, translated or drafted English and French correspondence and occasionally contributed to the daily Hâkî- miyyat-i millîyya, the organ of the Nationalists. She soon became a member of their “inner circle”, and with Muṣṭafà Kemâl Pâsha, and five other Nationalist leaders, was condemned to death on 11 May by the sultan’s government in Istanbul. In the fighting in central Anatolia, the first victory of the nationalist regular army was won by ʾIṣmÊt at Inöönü (10 January 1921), a few days after the guerilla leader Çerkes Edhem (q.v.) had gone over to the Greeks. Khalîde Edib was busy in Ankara, mobilising the women of the city and reorganising the Red Crescent. Before the Greek offensive of July, she went to Eskişehir and worked as a nurse in the Red Crescent hospital until the fall of the city. On August 5, 1921, Muṣṭafà Kemâl was elected generalissimo (Baṣîh kumandân), and soon afterwards, Khalîde Edib volunteered for work on the Western front under ʾIṣmÊt Pâsha. During the critical weeks before and during the battle of Sakarya (q.v.), 22 August-11 September, she served in the general headquarters (Ordûl, 284-310); she was promoted to corporal (onbaşî), and the name Khalîde Onbaşî became the symbol of Turkish women who took part in the national struggle. Towards the end of December 1921, she moved to Akşehir (between Afiyân and Konya), the new headquarters, and she spent the best part of the eight first months of 1922 with the army, which was preparing for the great offensive. On 24 August she was summoned to the front just before the offensive started. After the decisive battle of Dumlupînar on 30 August the Greek army began to retreat, burning cities and villages and massacring the civilian population in their wake (Lord Kinross, Atatûrk, London 1971, 318). After spending a week in recaptured İzmir with the leaders, Khalîde, now a sergeant-major, left with a group of journalists to inspect and report on the devastated area between İzmir and dervîshlar Bursâya, in collaboration with Yaṣûb Kâdir and Fâlîth Rîfî, İstanbul 1922). After the armistice of Mudanya (17 October) which confirmed the triumph of the Nationalists, as the sultâne was abolished by the Grand National Assembly, presided over by Dr. ʿAdnân (1 November) and Khalîde settled in İstanbul, as her husband was appointed representative of the Ankara Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Kâhidîsiyye müsarûbûhâshî) in İstanbul. Ideological differences between Muṣṭafà Kemâl, an uncompromising radical, and most of his close associates (including Khalîde and ʿAdnân), who were conservatives or liberals, soon developed into a rift culminating with the foundation (17 November 1924) of the Progressive Republican Party (Terakkipërver Diümûrûiyet Fırkast [q.v.]). This party was soon suppressed (3 June 1925) following the counter-revolutionary rebellion, led mainly by Kurdish şerûkân, in the east. Khalîde Edib and Dr. ʿAdnân had left for Europe before the discovery on 15 June 1926 of the conspiracy against Muṣṭafà Kemâl’s life, planned mainly by a group of former Unionists. All leading members of the former Progressive Party, suspected of the complicity with the plotters, were arrested. Dr. ʿAdnân was tried in his absence, and although completely acquitted, he and Khalîde Edib lived in self-imposed exile in Europe for fourteen years. During the four years when she lived in England (1924-8) she wrote her memoirs and continued to write novels which were serialised in the Turkish dailies (see N. A. Banoglu’s interview with Khalîde Edib in the Yedîgün of 28 May 1939). During 1929-30 she lived mainly in Paris, where her husband was lecturer in Turkish at the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes. In 1929 she was in the United States, and went on a lecture tour of various American Universities. She was a visiting professor at Columbia University during the 1932-3 academic year. In 1935 she went to India to lecture on the political and cultural background and contemporary problems of Modern Turkey, at the Dîvânî’s Mi-liyya-i İslâmîyya of Delhi, then left for a lecture tour of the principal universities of the sub-continent. Back in Paris, she wrote more novels, particularly her only novel in English, The Clôun and his daughter, which she later re-wrote in Turkish as Aymîlî bâkhal (see below). She paid a brief visit to Istanbul in August 1935 and returned to Turkey on 5 March 1939 for good, four months after Atatürk’s death (10 November 1938). In December 1939 Khalîde Edib was appointed the chairman of the newly-founded department of English at the University of Istanbul where she trained, in ten years, a team of young scholars with whom she worked on new translations of Shakespeare. Elected as an independent member of Parliament for İzmir at the general elections of May 1950, she retired from political life in January 1954. Dr. ʿAdnân died in July 1955 and her health began to decline; she herself died in her modest home in Bayezîd on 9 January 1964 at the age of eighty. Khalîde Edib was a woman of small stature but with extraordinary energy and vitality. Although considered primarily a novelist, Khalîde Edib was an extremely prolific and versatile writer and her enormous output extending over nearly 60 years covers a wide area: novels, short stories and essays, criticism, articles on social, educational and political topics, plays, memoirs, translations and research. Many of her essays, etc. appeared in various dailies and periodicals, where most of her novels were also serialised. Khalîde Edib (who signed her name Khalîde Sâlib until her divorce from Sâlib Dheki in 1920) started her career in the daily Tanin and since
then she contributed mainly to the dailies Akşam, Waβit, İkdam, Atımkıhâr-ı Yüce (Cumhuriyet), Yeni İstanbul and periodicals Turkish Yardıç, Büyük Vele Meşîmâ, Dergişt, Yedigün, Hayat, etc. (for a detailed list with dates, see the introduction of Inci Enginün’s anthology Halide Edib Aðavur, Istanbul 1975).

Her twenty novels can be divided into three categories: (1) Novels where love and passion are the central themes, and the heroines, who predominate, are submitted to elaborate psychological analysis, e.g. some of her early novels like Seyiye fâlîb (1910), Khandâm (1912), Son etleri (serialised in 1913, published 1919), Mesârîd hûkim (1919) and the two novels of the twenties: Kâbl aγhîrî (1924) and its continuation Zeynâne nûn ıggü (1926). All these novels have considerable autobiographical elements and the passionate, independent, strong-willed heroines synthesise the author’s ideal of the emancipated Turkish woman; until she joined the Nationalists in 1921, the settings are mainly those of the Anatolian countryside. (2) Novels on the episodes of the War of Liberation: Atesbâm gömîk (serialised in İkdam from 6 June to 11 August 1922, published 1923; Eng. tr. by Y. Khan, The Daughter of Smyrna, Lahore 1938) and Vurun hahbeyle! (“Hit the whore!”) serialised in Akşâm, 1923, published 1926; these are based on personal experience and first-hand information, like most of her short stories of the same period (see Dağka iîham kurt, Istanbul 1922, enlarged 4th ed. 1963). These novels were pioneering works on this period; they became immensely popular and were filmed several times (see Aytekin Yakar, Türk romanında millî mücadele, Ankara 1973). (3) Period Novels. After the age of fifty, Khalide Edib produced a series of novels in which she proposed to describe the various aspects of Turkish society, beginning with her most famous novel Siwash kétéh (serialised in English as The clown and his daughter, London 1935) serialised in the Istanbul daily Haber in 1935 and published in 1936, which won the Republican People’s Party’s prize for the Best Novel in 1942, became an all-time best seller in Turkish literature (33rd edition in 1976) and was filmed in 1968. This is mainly a description of the Istanbul society in its various aspects at the turn of the century during 4Abd al-Ḥamîd II’s autocratic rule. A Karâgâs (g.v.) performer and his talented daughter with a beautiful voice who live in a back street of Istanbul (“in the quarter of fly-ridden grocers”) are the central characters of the novel, assisted by a great number of secondary heroes, including the inevitable Hamîdîncâm and Young Turks (synopsis in Litteratur-Lexicon, see Bibliogr.). This popular novel was presumably conceived to cater for a foreign audience in search of exotic details which explains its somewhat artificial “mystic” atmosphere and its unconvinving dénouement. It was followed by Tatarch (”The Little Tatař”) in 1939, an equally unrealistic description of the generation of the young people grown up during the author’s years of exile (for a synopsis, see op. cti., and Muzaffer Uyguner, Halide Edib Aðavur, Istanbul 1968, 63). After 14 years of absence, Khalide Edib settled down again in an old district of Istanbul where she soon built up a large circle of friends, but also discovered the new world of the Anatolian peasants and small town-dwellers who had moved to Istanbul. Most of her novels written after the last two mentioned above, particularly Sonsuza ânay (”The eternal fair”, 1946), Dönem ayına (“The revolving mirror”, 1954), Akle Hamın sokağ (“Akle Hamın Street”, 1958) contain a realistic rendering of her personal experiences and of her observations of Turkish society in the late 40’s and the 50’s, and describe powerfully the panorama of the various types and problems of a society in the process of rapid political and social change in the years following the World War II.

Her novel Yeşil Türan (serialised in Tanın in 1912 and published the same year, German tr. by F. Schrader, Das neue Turan, 1916) stands by itself as a fruit of her brief courtship with Pan-Turkанизm or Pan-Turkism, supported at the time by the CUP (synopsis in Litteratur-Lexicon, see Bibliogr.); although she later rejected Pan-Turkism as a political creed (Halide Edib, Türkiye’de şarîh, çarşî ve Amerikan tesirleri, Istanbul 1956, 99-101), this novel is nevertheless imbued with the strong nationalistic spirit that characterises most of her writing. The obvious failures in the post-1908 period of Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism, served further to strengthen her national consciousness (Memoirs, 312, 329-34), and during the traumatic years 1911-22, her exuberant nationalism mellowed and was further enriched with her experiences in exile.

Some of her short stories have been collected into three books: Dağka iîham kurt mentioned above; Kharâb ma’dîlî (1911, 4th ed. 1973) which contains her earliest work; and the posthumous miscellaneous collection Kübbede kalan hoş sada (Istanbul 1974).

Khalide Edib wrote her memoirs in two volumes in English during her years of exile in England (Memoirs of Halide Edib, New York 1926 and The Turkish ordeal, New York 1928). Apart from their intrinsic literary value, these volumes are of invaluable documentary importance for her biography up to 1922 and for the background of many events in Turkish history between 1900-22. In these, she is extremely honest and candid in recording everything about her own life and, on the whole, fair and balanced in her description and judgement of other people. Thus she is generous in praising many leading men like Talât, Djemîl and ɬîmât Fâshas; but she loses her sense of balance and fairness frequently when she discusses Muştâfa Kemâl Fâshâ, recognising his unquestionable superiority, his almost superhuman energy and his powers of command, but recognising also his obstinacy. This makes her vacillate between praise and blame; she is unfair to the point of conspicuously leaving out the name of the hero of Gallipoli while referring to that campaign (Memoirs, 384), and elsewhere complains that “Turkish people are always the victims of hero worship, especially in military affairs” (Memoirs, 341). All this is of course the result of the fundamental conflict between her own liberal views and the radical nationalism of Muştâfa Kemâl. Khalide Edib published substantially shortened and altered Turkish versions of her memoirs: Mor saltımsî ev (serialised intermittently in Yeni İstanbul, 1951-55 and published 1963) and Türkün ateşle imtihan (serialised in the weekly magazine Hayat as Millî mücadele hatatlar, 1959-60, published 1962) in which much of the controversial material has been either left out or toned down. Khalide Edib is not always careful with dates; her chronological data should be used critically.

Apart from her English novel already mentioned, Khalide Edib published three books in English while
Abroad. The first two are based on her lectures in America and in India: Turkey faces west, New Haven 1930 and Conflict of east and west, Turkey, later
1935. The third book, Inside India, London 1937, contains her impressions and thoughts on a country which she "felt to be nearer to my soul-climate than any other country not my own" and where she met Mah- 
ma Gandhi and all the outstanding nationalist leaders of the sub-continent. The Turkish version Hindistan’ a 
davranışı was serialised in Yeni Sabah in 1940, but not published in book form. Khalide Edib was always 
keenly interested in the theatre, but wrote only two plays, which had no success: the experimental 
Kenan cobanlanar (produced in Syria 1916, published in 1918) and Maske ve rüh (serialised in Yedigün in 1937-8, published in 1945, 
English version Masks and souls, 1953). She directed the translation of four plays of Shakespeare in the Department of 
English of Istanbul University: Hamlet (1941), As you like it (1943), Anthony and Cleopatra (1943) 
and Coriolanus (1945), and she translated herself George Orwell’s Animal Farm (Hayvan çiftliği, 
serialised in Cumhuriyet in 1952, published in 1954). Her research work mainly consists of a history of 
English literature from the origins to the end of the 17th century in three volumes, İngiliz edebiyati 
tarihi, Istanbul 1949-50.

Khalide Edib’s language and style have always been severely criticised both by fellow writers and critics (Rüşün Eşref, op. cit., passim; Cevdet Kudret, Türk edebiyatında hikaye ve roman, ii, Ankara 1970, 66-7). It is true that her language is often awkward and ungrammatical, her style undistilled and unpolished, but it is equally true that this warm and extremely 
personal style has a strange charm and an immediate impact upon the reader. As a great 
admire of folk literature, she had always disliked 
and the role of Victor Hugo in introducing such in-
fluences between Arabic and European (mainly French) 
literature, their respective developments, the in-
fluence of Arabic literature on European literature, 
and the name of the author given. His other works were 
mainly political and scientific, such as Al-İnkibâb 
al-‘Uthmânî wa-Turkiyê ‘l-Fatât was lithographed 
and dated Bordeaux, 7 October 1908, probably in 
the author’s own writing, and further published 
in al-Hilal, xvii (1908), xix (1909), xxi (1910) 
with the title Al-İnkibâb al-siyâsî al-‘Uthmânî. 
Al-İnkibâb also wrote Al-Mukaddima fi l-mas’ala 
al-shariyya mûndûra nașîtîkah ‘l-alâ al-ırbû 
al-thâni min al-karn al-‘lâmîn ‘sâgar (Jerusalem 1925?); Al-Kimyâ’în al-‘Arab (Cairo 1953) 
Risâla fi surat ihtîyâr al-dîn al-Muhammadi fi 
asâm al-‘lâm al-İslâmî (Tripoli 1341/1826); and an 
edition of a booklet by Sa’d al-Dîn al-İnkibâb, 
known as Ibn al-Dîrî, entitled al-İbâb fi ‘l-lukm wa 
‘l-imthân al-‘âlah al-ıbrâ al-ıshûr al-mâl (1321/ 
1903). There are other works still in manuscript. 

Bibliography: J. A. Dagher, Mașâdir al-
dirâsâ al-adabiyya, ii/ii: al-Râbi‘lân (1800-1955), 
Beirut 1956, 333-35; al-Zirîkhî, Al-‘lâmîn, iii, 
64; Sarkis, Mu‘âmmâl al-mubâhîl, cols. 813-14; 
Cheikho, Ta’rikh al-‘ââdâb al-arabiyya (Beirut 1920), 
50; al-Mukaddima fi l-mas’ala 
al-shariyya, pp. a-h. 

(S. Moreh)

AL-KHALIDIVAN, the name generally given 
to two poets of Sayyf al-Dawlawa’s [q.v.] entourage, 
the two inseparable brothers Abû ‘Uthmân Sa’d/ 
Sa’dî (d. 350/961) and Abû Bâvr Mûhâmmad (d. 380/990), sons of Hâshim b. Sa’dî b. Wa’îla. 
Theisson had originally from a village of the region of al-
Mawsil called Al-Khâlidiyah (Yûkût, ii, 390), 
and possibly lived for some time in Başra (Yâkût, Udayâb, 
xi, 208 affirms this and attributes to Abû ‘Uthmân 
the ethnic designation of al-Baṣrî), but became 
celebrated above all as the librarians of Sayf al-Dawlawa, 
to whom they dedicated their occasional verse. 
They attracted notice through their rivalry with al-Bâvâfâ’ 
[q.v.], who accused them of plagiarism through the 
use of their prodigious memory; Ibn al-Nâdim 
describes the gap at this, and gives a reply via Abû 
Bakr that he knew by heart a thousand books (sîf) 
each of a hundred leaves. Their poetic works, of 
which specimens can be read in al-Tha‘labî’s Yâsîma, 
i, 507-70, were gathered together by Abû ‘Uthmân 
into a diwan which has not, it seems, been preserved. 
However, two anthologies compiled by the brothers, 
Hamâsât shîr al-mubâhîl (or al-‘ââdâb wa l-
naṣî‘îr) and al-Hâdîyâ wa l-‘lûtâb, are extant (Ibn 
Brockelmann, i, 147, S 1, 41, 226); also attributed 
to them is a Mubâhî min shîr Bâbrîhî, known 
through a selection made by Abû Tâhir Ismâ‘îl-
A study of the caliphate, its institution and subsequent developments, has never been attempted in its entirety until the present. The principal reason for this is that it has not seemed possible to conduct such a survey independently of historical studies relating to different reigns, which are still in most cases insufficient, or even non-existent, whereas studies of doctrine, while more advanced, have not been developed to the same extent with regard to the various periods. The tentative attempts that have been made have therefore been superficial, or lacking sufficient historical perspective. Here we must confine ourselves to making a brief statement of the question and stressing the problems, rather than attempting a complete exposition, which, to do justice to the subject, would require treatment at too great length.

A. The first period

In a sense, the institution of the caliphate was born on the day after the death of the Prophet when the new head of the community, in the event the trusted Companion Abū Bakr, became in 11/632 khalfat rasūl Allāh. The date and the circumstances of the appearance of this institution would seem therefore to be well-established, but two questions arise at once. First, how did the designation of the first caliph take place, and was the procedure adopted observed in subsequent cases? Second, what powers were attributed to this “successor” of the Prophet?

As regards the first point, the tradition adopted by the majority of historians tells of the acclamation of the new caliph by the leading Companions, who gave him an oath of allegiance; this was the first bay'a. Whatever were the circumstances under which this proclamation was made, whatever pressures were applied by 'Umar to the congregation to have Abū Bakr recognized, whatever may have been the protests of 'Ali and his supporters, it seems to have been accepted from this time onwards that the oath of the Believers, to which corresponded the promise of the new chief to lead the community on the right path, alone conferred upon him the succession.

For the two caliphs who followed, variations in procedure should be noted. Abū Bakr, before his death in 13/634, had, according to the chroniclers, personally designated his successor in the presence of 'Umar. The community of Believers was not there-fore in a position to state its own wishes, but got the chance to ratify this oath. The fact in fact, was taken only by the Companions present at Medina, which explains how the authority of 'Umar could be disputed by certain groups dispersed elsewhere in Arabia, who refused to pay the legally-assessed poor tax [see RIDDA].

'Umar, before dying in his turn in 23/644, had decided that a group of six persons, including among others 'Uthmān and 'Abd, should choose his successor from among themselves. After discussion the choice fell on 'Uthmān, who then received the oath of allegiance. So even with the designation of the first three caliphs, three different methods were explored; all, however, were only to be put into effect if ratified by the community, or by its most influential and closest members.

The second question, that of the powers exercised by the new leaders of the community, is more problematical, since these powers were not at the time defined in a precise fashion. One cannot base conclusions on the sense of the title khālīfa (see above) which, suggesting at once the ideas of succession, appointment and authority, remained somewhat vague. These powers seem, essentially, to have authorized the first three successors of Muhammad to pursue the actions previously set in motion by the Prophet himself for the expansion of Islam and to put into practice the regulations set out in the Kur'ānic message, which was to be supplemented by the Sunna instituted among the community of Believers in the lifetime of the Prophet.

The continuation of the work begun by the Prophet was seen during the time of Abū Bakr in the fight against the dissidents of Arabia, soon followed by raiding operations to the north which became a vast movement of conquest. From this time onwards the caliph assumed the role of army commander, and military operations, conducted against infidels or against rebellious Muslims who, for one reason or another refused to accept his authority, became one of his most important responsibilities.

Meanwhile, questions of law, relating to the spheres both of the cult and of social relations, were posed to those caliphs called by the tradition rājdān, that is to say "those who walk in the right way", as opposed to those who came later and were accused of making the caliphate a family possession. Thus 'Umar was obliged to take decisions concerning the penal law, certain types of inheritance and the practice of the law of retaliation (Shahrastānī, Mi'llāh, Cairo, i, 38). To him also are attributed some initiatives in matters of ritual, culminating in the attempt, carried on by 'Uthmān, to set in motion the establishment of the text of the Kur'ānic “vulgate”.

It was also in the time of 'Umar that for the first time the question was raised of the financial organisation of the Islamic state. Since members of the Arab tribes were entitled to endowments, 'Umar instituted the diwan, a register in which the names of beneficiaries were inscribed. In addition, the troops were entitled to a share of the booty, which was gradually replaced by a pension, registered in the same way. The organisation of the diwan [q.v.], first established at Medina, later in all the principal cities of the empire, was thus linked to that of the fiscal system, on which it is not possible to dwell here. Let it be said only that it was at the initiative of the two caliphs 'Umar and 'Uthmān that a treasury was established, which collected and from which were distributed the revenues supplied first by booty, later by property taxes. As this treasury
also met some expenses of communal interest, it should have been seen as the beginning of a financial system which was not strictly in accord with Qur'an principles for the distribution of booty, but which was made necessary by the development of the new State [see BAYT AL-MāL]. This innovation was one of the causes of the troubles which culminated in the assassination of Uthman in 65/656.

Another cause was the choice by Uthman of members of his own family to undertake the government of the principal provinces; in acting thus he was in effect supplanting the earliest converts to Islam, who by virtue of this title had in general more right than the descendants of Abu Sufyān to participate in the organisation of the community. Two concepts of power came into conflict here, of which one consisted in observing strictly the principles of the Qur'ān and giving pride of place to the "first converts", while the other paid greater attention to the efficiency of the apparatus of government. After the confrontation which took place between 'Ali and Mu'awiyah, following the judgement of 'Ādhrūb [q.v.], the second concept held definitive sway.

The murder of Uthman and the events which followed posed to the Islamic community the problem of knowing whether a caliph could be deposed for neglecting his duties. It seems that it was at this time that there appeared the sect later to be known as the Khawārij which declared the principle that the caliph must not under any circumstances deviate from the ordinances of divine origin (see the interpretation by W. Montgomery Watt, The formative period of Islamic thought, Edinburgh 1973, 14-15). The judgement of 'Ādhrūb itself, the principle of which was denied by the Khawārij on the grounds that the cause of good could not be set under discussion, implied a conception of the caliphate according to which the holder of power must answer for his actions, and the justification chosen by Mu'awiyah to explain his action against 'Ali was the defence of the rights of his kinsman, "unjustly" assassinated at the instigation of his political enemies.

The Umayyads, however, on becoming installed in power, made efforts to eradicate this notion of moral responsibility. At the same time as they had the principle of dynastic succession recognised, they maintained the idea that unconditional obedience was owed to the reigning caliph. Thus Yazīd and his successors paid no heed to the proclamation as caliph of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] at Medina in 61/681 nor to the declaration of dethronement pronounced by the leading citizens against the son of Mu'awiyah. It was their opponents, of the movement called Kadarī, (see Kadrīyya), who vindicated the right to judge the actions of the sovereign, establishing a doctrine which was invoked by Yazīd III, pretender to the caliphate, to justify his revolt against al-Walid II, accusing him of misconduct. As for the revolutionary movements which appeared at this time, some of them were of a Kharidjī tendency, demanding of the caliph particular moral qualities (they succeeded in proclaiming Kātari b. al-Fudājā [q.v.] caliph in Fārs and Kirmān; he bore the title amīr al-muwāminin and coined money in his own name for ten years, 69-79/688-99), while the others followed more or less strictly the Shi'ī tendency, that is to say, demanding the accession to the caliphate of either a descendant of 'Ali, or in the case of the 'Abbāsid party, of an unspecified member of the Family of the Prophet. It was therefore the legitimacy of the Umayyads that they contested, while at the same time they strove to discredit them, denying their adherence to Islamic principles and accusing them of having usurped their legitimate rights; the origins and the actions of the ruling caliphs thus being called into question.

On their side, the Umayyads were not content with imposing the notion of unconditional obedience to the caliph; they established at the same time, in effect, the dynastic caliphate. Without abandoning the principle of election followed by oath of fealty (bay'a), Mu'awiyah accomplished his object by means of an election guaranteeing in advance that his son Yazīd would be recognised as his successor. The same procedure was used for the designation of Mu'awiyah II. But on the death of the latter, the problem of succession arose once more, and the Arab "nobility", meeting at Dābiyya, made free use of their right to proceed to the choice of a new caliph, without however denying the fact that he should belong to the family of the Banū Umayya. A cousin of Mu'awiyah, Marwān, was duly appointed caliph; to the branch called Sufyānid, there succeeded the Marwānid branch to which belonged all the subsequent Umayyad rulers, all of them nominated by their predecessors, with the exception of the rebel Yazīd III. In fact, from the time of 'Abd al-Malik onwards, the caliph was in the habit of leaving a written designation, called 'ādād (whence the granting to the new caliph the title wali 'l-'abd, in the sense of beneficiary of a contract concluded between him and the community). The testamentary nomination, bearing the signature of witnesses of repute, thus became the essential mandate which had executive force and relegated the ceremony of the bay'a to a position of secondary importance. It was also the practice for the caliph to nominate two heirs; but such nominations were not acted upon unless an order of precedence had been set.

The heir was most often a son of the ruling caliph, or in the case of the 'Abbāsid branch, his successor paid no heed to the proclamation as caliph of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.]. At Medina in 61/681, nor to the declaration of dethronement pronounced by the leading citizens against the son of Mu'awiyah. It was their opponents, of the movement called Kadarī, (see Kadrīyya), who vindicated the right to judge the actions of the sovereign, establishing a doctrine which was invoked by Yazīd III, pretender to the caliphate, to justify his revolt against al-Walid II, accusing him of misconduct. As for the revolutionary movements which appeared at this time, some of them were of a Kharidjī tendency, demanding of the caliph particular moral qualities (they succeeded in proclaiming Kātari b. al-Fudājā [q.v.] caliph in Fārs and Kirmān; he bore the title amīr al-muwāminin and coined money in his own name for ten years, 69-79/688-99), while the others followed more or less strictly the Shi'ī tendency, that is to say, demanding the accession to the caliphate of either a descendant of 'Ali, or in the case of the 'Abbāsid party, of an unspecified member of the Family of the Prophet. It was therefore the legitimacy of the Umayyads that they contested, while at the same time they strove to discredit them, denying their adherence to Islamic principles and accusing them of having usurped their legitimate rights; the origins and the actions of the ruling caliphs thus being called into question.

On their side, the Umayyads were not content with imposing the notion of unconditional obedience to the caliph; they established at the same time, in effect, the dynastic caliphate. Without abandoning the principle of election followed by oath of fealty (bay'a), Mu'awiyah accomplished his object by means of an election guaranteeing in advance that his son Yazīd would be recognised as his successor. The same procedure was used for the designation of Mu'awiyah II. But on the death of the latter, the problem of succession arose once more, and the Arab "nobility", meeting at Dābiyya, made free use of their right to proceed to the choice of a new caliph, without however denying the fact that he should belong to the family of the Banū Umayya. A cousin of Mu'awiyah, Marwān, was duly appointed caliph; to the branch called Sufyānid, there succeeded the Marwānid branch to which belonged all the subsequent Umayyad rulers, all of them nominated by their predecessors, with the exception of the rebel Yazīd III. In fact, from the time of 'Abd al-Malik onwards, the caliph was in the habit of leaving a written designation, called 'ādād (whence the granting to the new caliph the title wali 'l-'abd, in the sense of beneficiary of a contract concluded between him and the community). The testamentary nomination, bearing the signature of witnesses of repute, thus became the essential mandate which had executive force and relegated the ceremony of the bay'a to a position of secondary importance. It was also the practice for the caliph to nominate two heirs; but such nominations were not acted upon unless an order of precedence had been set.

The heir was most often a son of the ruling caliph, or in the case of the 'Abbāsid branch, his successor paid no heed to the proclamation as caliph of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.]. At Medina in 61/681, nor to the declaration of dethronement pronounced by the leading citizens against the son of Mu'awiyah. It was their opponents, of the movement called Kadarī, (see Kadrīyya), who vindicated the right to judge the actions of the sovereign, establishing a doctrine which was invoked by Yazīd III, pretender to the caliphate, to justify his revolt against al-Walid II, accusing him of misconduct. As for the revolutionary movements which appeared at this time, some of them were of a Kharidjī tendency, demanding of the caliph particular moral qualities (they succeeded in proclaiming Kātari b. al-Fudājā [q.v.] caliph in Fārs and Kirmān; he bore the title amīr al-muwāminin and coined money in his own name for ten years, 69-79/688-99), while the others followed more or less strictly the Shi'ī tendency, that is to say, demanding the accession to the caliphate of either a descendant of 'Ali, or in the case of the 'Abbāsid party, of an unspecified member of the Family of the Prophet. It was therefore the legitimacy of the Umayyads that they contested, while at
policy, sometimes directly concerning the sphere of Qur'anic precepts. They were obliged for example to define the place that non-Arabic converts, non-Arabic becoming mawdli, might take in the organisation of a state where the reins of power were held by Arab Muslims. Also, the exigencies of the conquests in the west led them to employ the services of Berber contingents, who played an active role in the conquest of Spain and whose status raised difficulties from that time onwards. More delicate was the fiscal problem, which the caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz was obliged to settle by means of an edict. His decision to establish fiscal equality between the original Muslims and the converts having proved impossible to put into effect, it was decided to retain the former land-taxes, irrespective of the religion of the occupant of the land. Thus was established the form of the levy called dhizya, whereas new converts were required to pay a higher tax than that levied on the original Muslims for the lands that they possessed subsequent to the conquest. Hence to this period belongs the definition of the bharadji and dhizya taxes, an important stage in the development of Islamic law, the process of which can only be grasped with difficulty, but which is to be attributed to the activity of the Umayyad caliphs.

B. The 'Abbāsid caliphate until 658/1260

New modifications to the concept of the caliphate were brought about by the 'Abbāsid dynasty, which assumed power in 132/750 and retained it in 'Irāk until 658/1260, then in Egypt until 923/1517. Its members presented themselves as belonging to the family of the Prophet, and it was with this title that the first among them to accede to power justified their action. They thus maintained the thesis according to which the caliphate must revert to the kinsmen of the Prophet, and more particularly to the descendants of al-'Abbās, who were considered to be the best qualified. Nevertheless, this 'Abbāsid legitimism raised difficulties in establishing principles usable against 'Abd claims. The principal argument, employed very frequently by the caliph al-Mansur in his controversy with the Hasanid Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah, and subsequently developed on several occasions by the sovereigns themselves or by their panegyrist, followed the principle of right of succession: the descendants of al-'Abbās, son of the Prophet's uncle, must take precedence over the "sons of the daughter", that is to say, over those who were descended from the Prophet through his daughter Fātimah and who were related to his two grandsons al-Husayn and al-Hasan. As this argument did not always appear sufficient, the caliph al-Mahdi sought to adduce in addition the thesis according to which al-'Abbās had been nominated by the Prophet himself as his successor. Quite independently of this attempt, which did not last long, the panegyrist for their part strove to prove the eminent qualities of al-'Abbās, protector and nephew of the Prophet. The legitimacy of the 'Abbāsids thus depended on various arguments, whose vague changed with the times, arguments which were sometimes radically opposed to those upon which the Umayyad legitimism had been based and which sometimes approximated to them, as when the panegyrist inevitably proclaimed that the sons of al-'Abbās were "the best of Kuraysh". This legitimism never ceased in defining themselves as the uniquely recognised, even when the "great amirs" of Shi'i persuasion held power, and it was in a sense consolidated by the arrival of the Saljūqs who, taking control of the empire, nevertheless upheld the Sunnī caliphate as it was then established.

Previously, the most dangerous challenge had taken place during the reign of al-Ma'mūn, when this caliph attempted to nominate as his heir the 'Alid ʿAli al-Riḍā, considered by him "the best of the descendants of ʿAli and of al-ʿAbbās". This attempt did not amount to an adoption of the Shi'i point of view; rather, it aimed at restoring vigour to a broader Hāshimi legitimism, which would have permitted the choice of the imām from one or the other of the branches of the Hāshimi family. To this new legitimist concept was linked a doctrine of Zaydi inspiration, according to which the office of imām must revert, in the context of a defined line of succession, to the most deserving. If the attempt failed, it was through the opposition of circles in 'Irāk who showed their attachment to the 'Abbāsid family and their hostility to the new religious policy of al-Ma'mūn, which the latter was forced to abandon.

Whatever may have been the basis of 'Abbāsid legitimism, it was the priority of the ruling caliphs to reinforce the theocratic nature of their power. The same expressions were employed in their case as in that of the Umayyad caliphs. Al-Mansūr declared himself, it is said, "the power of God on earth" (sulṭān Allāh fi ardi-hi) and the caliphs exacted, like all their predecessors, a duty of unconditional obedience which was founded, from the 3rd/9th century onwards, on the concepts of traditionists of the Hanball persuasion. In addition, the royal titles adopted by the sovereigns stressed the charismatic quality of their power: the second caliph had himself named al-Mansūr, "he who receives the victory from God", the third, al-Mahdī, "he whom God leads in the right way", a title which tended at the same time to assimilate the caliphs to the 'Alīd imāms. Subsequently, the honorifics al-Āmin, al-Ma'mūn and al-Wāthik bi-llah, stressed rather the piety of those who bore them; but the personal link between the caliph, and the divinity guaranteeing his power remained strongly marked. One may add that from the reign of al-Ma'mūn onwards, the caliphs did not disdain the title of imām, previously considered to be of too Shi'i a flavour.

Also, the dynastic principle was applied in the same fashion as under the Umayyads, the heir being most often nominated by the ruling caliph after consultation with the most influential supporters of the régime. The procedure adopted bore a solemn character on some occasions; thus the testament of Hārūn al-Rashīd, which named two heirs, establishing a kind of division of the empire between them and specifying the rights and obligations of each towards the other, was displayed in the Ka'ba at Mecca in 285/898; the same procedure was used for the testament of al-Mu'tamid in 261/874.

But as in the preceding period, no rule determined this choice, and the caliph could just as well nominate a distant cousin as one of his sons. It was nevertheless to a son that the sovereign most often sought to bequeath his office, on condition that the son was of the required age or close to it, that is to say, to the age of majority. This need was admitted by all, as it had been already in the Umayyad period, but not the procedure for its application. On the one hand, a minor could be designated heir, since normally he was not required to assume immediately the function of caliph; on the other hand, the age of majority was not fixed in a precise fashion. It was only in 296/908 that the nomination of a caliph, 13 years of age, al-Muṣṭafīdīr, set a kind of precedent.
The practice of testamentary nominations posed another problem when these contained two names. It often happened that a new caliph sought to cancel the act established by his predecessor, so as to replace the person chosen as second heir and now becoming first heir—his brother most often—and to substitute for him his son, for example. It was necessary in such cases to obtain the abdication of the heir, since there was no procedure allowing for the dismissal of an heir, just as there was none for a caliph, and it was considered that the oath of allegiance already given was binding upon the heir as it was upon the community. In consequence, it was almost always by means of more or less violent persuasion that heirs considered to be undesirable were forced to renounce their rights.

As in the preceding period, it happened sometimes that a caliph died without having designated an heir. The choice then reverted to the community or at least to its most prominent representatives. On the death of al-Wâhiq in 232/847, it was a select committee composed of the chief-kâdî, of the vizier and some of the officers of the Turkish guard, who proceeded to the nomination of the future al-Mutawakkil. However, at the times of the sickness of al-Muktafi in 269/980, it was the vizier and the leading officials of the court who chose a caliph, who had not chosen an heir. So the composition of the electoral council varied according to the circumstances.

Under the 4 Abbâsids, no more than under the Umayyads, was there a procedure for deposing a ruler for moral faults. Where attempts were made to do this, it was a case of local councils, convoked in an arbitrary fashion, proclaiming the dethronement of the ruling sovereign or of the heir presumptive, and these had no more than a limited influence on the course of events. Examples of this were seen when al-Ammân and al-Mâ'mün declared another one deposed, or when the population of Baghdâd refused to obey al-Mâ'mün and proclaimed as caliph Ibrâhîm b. al-Mahdî [q.v.]. In fact, these situations always culminated in a trial of strength, and the judicial death sentence, dismissal or abdication of one of the rivals produced each time a judicial solution.

On the other hand, each abdication registered officially by the kâdîs led to an interregnum, and abdications were frequent in the history of the 4 Abbâsî caliphate. There were almost always forced abdications. One caliph, al-Kâhir [q.v.], who refused to bow to pressure, had his eyes put out, by which means he was legally incapacitated from fulfilling his duties. But instances of forced abdication were particularly flagrant in the period of the Buwayhid amîrs, who brutally deposed two caliphs to replace them with princes of their own choosing. The grand-amîr then convoked each time an electoral college comprising the principal dignitaries of the State as well as jurists and members of the 4 Abbâsî and 4 Aflîd families; but his own opinion was the only decisive one in the final choice.

It is only in the 4 Abbâsî period that one sees in the texts the office of caliph as clearly accompanied by insignia worn by the caliph when giving audience; there is mention of the cloak attributed to the Prophet (bûrda [q.v.]), his sceptre (kâdîf [q.v.]), and of a high bonnet (kalânsûwa), which first appeared no doubt in the Umayyad period (although the information concerning ceremonial in this period remains of dubious interpretation); in addition, in the 4 th/10 th century, a copy of the Kurân of Uthmân was carried ostentatiously by the caliph. Insignia of this kind, recalling to a greater or lesser extent contemporary or previous courtly practice, had the object of stressing the eminent qualities of the “successor of the Messenger of God”, and a full etiquette governed the conduct of audiences, requiring from visitors and officials precisely defined marks of respect: the principal one being the kissing of the carpet (tâbâhî) on coming face-to-face with the sovereign, if not kissing his hand. A similar symbolism marked the manners of solemn processions, and when the caliph appeared in public outside the palace he was preceded by the chief of police bearing the lance (harba), at once the symbol of authority and a reminder of the customs of the Prophet.

Between the 2 nd/8 th and the 4 th/10 th centuries, the functions of the caliph are easy enough to determine, using the information supplied by the ancient chronicles. The caliph was then seen as the guardian of dogma, and in this capacity opposed innovations (bîda*) and all that was considered to be such. He was thus permitted to play a full part in the formulation of doctrine, and numerous examples of this may be cited: al-Mahdî ordered for example the persecution of the zîndîlîs [q.v.]; al-Mâ'mûn and his two successors sought to impose Mu'tazilism as an official doctrine, al-Mutawakkil sought to impose in particular the notion of the “created” nature of the Kurân; later, al-Mu'tadîd sought to curb the activities of popular preachers of traditionalist tendencies; al-Râdîl [q.v.] condemned Hanbali theodicy; al-Kâdir [q.v.], in the full swing of the Buwayhid period, proclaimed his adherence to a profession of faith of Hanbali inspiration in an attempt to prevent the dissemination of other doctrines. On the other hand, the caliphs did not participate in the formulation of law; al-Mansûr did not take up the suggestion of Ibn al-Mukaffâ [q.v.], to establish a uniform code of law to which judges would be obliged to refer, and from this time onwards, the judicial schools were established, independent of all interference from the caliph. The measures which the caliph could take in the judicial sphere were thus heavily limited to decrees applying to fiscal matters, although he was obliged, in his capacity as leader of the community, to ensure that the law was observed in all its various aspects.

The caliph was the imâm [q.v.] par excellence, and conducted the Friday Prayers in the great mosque. At the end of the 3 rd/9 th century, however, he was exercising this function only in the great mosque of the caliph's residence, leaving to delegated officials the task of conducting the prayers and performing the khutba [q.v.] in the other great mosque of the capital. Similarly, he performed the Pilgrimage in his official capacity or sent a delegate on his behalf. Many of the earlier caliphs performed this religious duty in person, sometimes more than once, as in the case of Harûn al-Râshîd.

In the same way, the caliph was expected to preside over the periodic expeditions against the lands of the infidel. This was done in person by Harûn al-Râghîd, then by al-Mâ'mûn, while subsequent caliphs delegated this duty to appointed officers. He also conducted campaigns against rebels, whoever these might be; but when operating against particularly ferocious enemies such as the Zandî [q.v.], he would delegate his powers to an effective regent, in this event, al-Muwaffâkî, brother of the sovereign al-Mutâmîd. The maintenance of order was in fact one of the normal obligations of the caliph, who was
obliged to defend the community against all types of subversion. It was also the caliph who was obliged to deal with those governors who demanded financial autonomy and the hereditary status of their office. On the other hand, it was his duty to ensure the normal exercises of the judiciary in nominating directly—as the practice had been established since the start of the Abbasid caliphate—the kādīs, who were themselves subject, from the reign of Harūn al-Rashīd onwards, to the intermediate authority of the kādī l-khudādī. So the caliph delegated his powers to magistrates, but he reserved the right to arbitrate as a last resort in cases of litigation and to settle differences arising between administrators and administered. It was the practice of “redressing of wrong” that every caliph conscious of his reputation conducted in person, while other entrusted it to persons specially appointed for this purpose.

Finally, the caliph ensured the well-being of the state, though this concept was to some extent ignored in the middle period of Islam—that is to say, he ensured the material life of the community. In particular, he managed the levying of taxes of which the revenues were subsequently distributed between soldiers and officials, and these taxes were levied according to rules established at the end of the Umayyad caliphate [see DZIYAH, KHZRĀJ, 'USHR, ZAKĀT]. The collection of these taxes was entrusted to agents of the caliph, the 'ummālī, who collected sums in cash or contributions in kind from the administered peoples, or to “tax-farmers”, who sent to the treasury a lump sum and then recouped the equivalent by means of the sums collected in the territories entrusted to them; the method used remained at the discretion of the caliph. The system varied according to different regions and periods at the will of sovereigns constrained to a greater or lesser extent to cover continually rising expenses; but financial difficulties led the caliph to make a general practice of the farming-out of the taxes, advantageous in the short term but later to prove dangerous, and in the long term making the caliphs dependent on these tax-farmers.

Nevertheless, the details of the powers thus exercised by the caliph and related in precise fashion in the historical texts do not suffice to clarify completely the technicalities of a situation in respect of which two kinds of questions are posed. The first kind arises from the impossibility of deciding with certainty in what measure the authority of the caliph was, or could be, arbitrary or despotic. Certainly, the arbitrary exercise of power was in principle limited by the existence of the law, which the caliph was bound to respect, while enforcing it upon others, and which forbade him in particular to put a Muslim to death, except in precisely defined circumstances. But on the other hand, the duty incumbent on the caliph to suppress all rebellion gave him in this capacity a free hand in treating as a rebel against Islam every rebel against the dynasty, and thus in eliminating, sometimes in summary fashion, the enemies of his own policy.

The second set of problems arises from another difficulty, that of deciding to what extent the caliph himself exercised the powers with which he was invested. It is certain for example that the representatives of judicial authority enjoyed a certain degree of independence, in that they possessed knowledge and technical ability to which the caliph could only with difficulty lay claim; cases of resistance to the caliph on the part of provincial kādīs, or even of the chief kādī of Baghdad, were not uncommon. It is certain also that the arbitrary exercise of the powers of the caliph was restricted, after the end of the 3rd/9th century, by the establishment of High Courts, before which individuals accused of treason or heresy were most often tried; in this period, only rebels caught bearing arms were executed or subjected to torture in a manner not authorised by the law; others were tried before courts where the final decision was taken by one or the other of the kādīs of Baghdad, playing the role of chief magistrate, although the caliph was not bound to ratify this decision.

In addition, it should be noted that in numerous other fields, between the 3rd/9th and the mid-4th/10th century, the caliph no longer reserved for himself the conduct of affairs. We cannot speak in this context of a steady progression, since we observe on the part of some sovereigns reactions in the opposite direction, which were generally of short duration. The evolution was, however, none the less irreversible and the main beneficiary was the vizier [see wazīr], a man of trust and reliability whose title appeared at the start of the Abbasid regime, without from that time onwards being necessarily attributed in a regular fashion. It was to him that the caliph most often delegated the conduct of administrative affairs, and subsequently matters of general policy, including dealings with the governors of provinces and military affairs. The vizier was, however, entrusted with nothing more than the execution of political decisions which he had previously formulated and which had received the approval of his master; he was regularly accountable to him and could be dismissed at any moment, as could any agent of the sovereign, and was only the “minister” par excellence of the caliph, employed by him for as long as his activities gave satisfaction and liable to be replaced as soon as he ceased to please. The arbitrary will of a caliph who apparently disassociated himself from the conduct of affairs but wished nevertheless to retain the exercise of power, was much in evidence in these appointments and dismissals, of which we see examples in the reigns of Harūn al-Rashīd and al-Muktadir. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that the caliph would have difficulty in holding cheap the services of a supporter who could assure him of such-and-such a group of partisans and faithful servants, without whom it would be impossible to govern, and from among whom originated the viziers. Even if there existed among the administrators themselves rival cliques which encouraged the exercise by the caliph of arbitrary power, the presence of these persons, linked to the régime which supplied them, according to the circumstances, with more or less high offices, remained an element of stability likely to discourage abuse of personal power in the golden age of the caliphate.

After the middle of the 4th/10th century, the caliphs ceased to exercise their authority in person, and even ceased to control those to whom they had delegated this authority, in whole or in part. It was then that there began the period of the “grand-amīrāt”, to be replaced a century later by the sultānate. The chief characteristic of this period is that the delegate of the caliph appeared first as a military commander and that after 356/965, that is to say ten years after the appointment of the first “grand-amīr”, a dynasty of grand-amirs was established and the caliph was not permitted to interfere in the succession of these new officers. The authority that the latter exercised in all matters relating to
the administrative, financial and military spheres was nevertheless officially delegated from him, and the caliph retained, in theory at least, the right to appoint agents. It was thus that he succeeded, in certain exceptional cases, in exercising real power, and in one known instance, the Buwayhid amir was unable in spite of all his efforts to obtain for a Husaynī sharif nomination to the post of chief kādī. For, besides doctrine, the area in which the caliph continued to exercise some influence was the judiciary. There was, however, no clear-cut separation of functions between the caliph and the amirs, and it would be inaccurate to say that the latter exercised "temporal power", while the caliph retained a limited authority in "spiritual" matters. Not only did the caliph consider himself entitled to intervene in all areas of policy, but the amirs did not hesitate to use their authority for settling religious affairs, e.g. in promoting the celebration of specifically Shi'i feasts.

Moreover, the relations established between the caliphs and their amirs varied constantly. There was during the second half of the 4th/10th century a period when caliphs were frequently dethroned or forced to abdicate to be replaced by persons chosen by the amirs, although the latter did not always obtain this means the result envisaged. On the contrary, in the first half of the 5th/11th century the caliphs al-Kādīr and al-Kā'im were able to nominate their own heirs and enjoyed a resurgence of power, feeling themselves supported by the Ghaznavid amirs who appeared in Khorāsān and actively upheld Sunni policies there. However, at this time there appeared the first examples of titles compounded with din and attributed to certain local amirs, to Buwayhids as well as Ghaznavids. This practice, the origin of which cannot be definitely identified, doubtless did not correspond so much to a new set-back in the authority of the caliph, as to a devaluation of the titles compounded with dāwla, which were born at first only by the grand-amirs, later by the Ḥamdānī amirs of al-Djazīra, and were eventually attributed to other amirs of secondary rank. In the eastern provinces which did not appreciate: it was with the greatest of difficulty that the sultans had imposed themselves on the sovereigns. They did not abandon the attempt to recover their power, undermining as it was the capacity of the caliphs and their successors, receiving a large measure of power which was entirely a matter of secondary rank. On the other hand, the caliphs and the sultans did not follow the same political-religious orientation. Faced with sovereigns remaining loyal to the traditionalist Hanball doctrine, the sultans adopted the Shāfi'i-Ash'arī line, which was somewhat different, and it was of design that one of the most remarkable viziers, Niẓām al-Mulk, founded in Bagdād as in the eastern provinces madrasas intended for the training of future lawyers. It was nevertheless admitted, in this period of domination by Suldūk sultans, that the latter alone should nominate the candidate for the caliphate: this attitude was justified, as we know, in various of the writings of the celebrated al-Ghazālī who, among other things, castigated the "bad doctors", too eager to submit to the authority of the sultans. The doctors for their part, considered themselves at this time to be the true depositaries of the Law, and demanded in consequence no longer the capacity of idṭṣḥād for the caliph which in principle was claimed for him in the past, but above all qualities of morality and piety.

In these difficult circumstances, the caliphs did not abandon the attempt to recover their power, undermined as it was by various quarrels, about 60/1067-8, al-Kā'im dismissed a vizier judged to be too amenable to the sultan Alp Arslān. Then his successor al-Muktafi, after the death of Malik Shāh, succeeding in profiting from the rivalries between the various claimants to the sultanate to make his own authority better respected. Subsequently, in 495/1092, al-Mustarshīd managed to raise an army which permitted him to oppose the Arab chief Dābār, but which did not prevent him from being made a prisoner by sultan Mas'ūd. Finally, it fell to al-Muktafi, after the death of Mas'ūd in 547/1152, to assert definitive sway over ʿIrāk. Whatever the circumstances, the disintegration of the Suldūk empire was accompanied by a multiplication in the number of sultans, and this fact alone further enfeebled the position of the Suldūks; it was in 544/1151 that for the first time more than one candidate for the khūṭba was nominated, although the Suldūks themselves had no more influence in ʿIrāk the ʿAbbāsid which he represented the caliphate, al-Kā'im dismissed a vizier judged to be too amenable to the sultan Alp Arslān. Then his successor al-Muktafi, after the death of Malik Shāh, succeeding in profiting from the rivalries between the various claimants to the sultanate to make his own authority better respected. Subsequently, in 495/1092, al-Mustarshīd managed to raise an army which permitted him to oppose the Arab chief Dābār, but which did not prevent him from being made a prisoner by sultan Mas'ūd. Finally, it fell to al-Muktafi, after the death of Mas'ūd in 547/1152, to assert definitive sway over ʿIrāk. Whatever the circumstances, the disintegration of the Suldūk empire was accompanied by a multiplication in the number of sultans, and this fact alone further enfeebled the position of the Suldūks; it was in 544/1151 that for the first time more than one candidate for the khūṭba was nominated, although the Suldūks themselves had no more influence. The arrival of the Saldūk Turks brought, in principle, no changes of an institutional order to the situation. The new amirs behaved like their predecessors, receiving a large measure of power which extended legally to the west, occupied by the Fatimids, as to the east; this is indicated notably by the succession of Malik Shāh in 543/1150, to the aid of the sovereign, with the particular object of the caliph. Another difference, with particular reference to the functioning of the régime, was that the Suldūk sultans claimed to be defenders of the Sunna and the Sunni caliphate, claiming to have come to the aid of the sovereign, with the particular object of re-opening the Pilgrimage route. But the tension was hardly less between the caliphs and the sultans than it had been previously between the caliphs and the amirs.

Thus the sultans had imposed themselves on the caliphs in a manner which the latter could not and did not appreciate: it was with the greatest of dis-
One of his propagandists, Abū Hafs al-Suhrawardi, thus formulated a theory of the caliphate which, while retaining the traditional bases, linked to these Shi‘ism and the futuwwa, making the caliph the intermediary between God and the believers and giving him the attributes of a kind of šaykh. Al-Nāṣir, who had no vizier as such, was better able by virtue of this to assert his political prerogatives: he succeeded in having his authority recognized by the powerful Abu ‘Abd al-Salāh al-Dīn (576/1181), who for his part declared himself a defender of the caliphate and of Islam. It was nevertheless with difficulty that he obtained the bay‘a of certain local amirs of Persia and Upper Mesopotamia. Moreover, the efforts of al-Nāṣir, in which he continued until his death in 622/1225, did not prevent the caliphate from remaining fragile as an institution, and the great reconciliation between Sunni and Shi‘is which was one of the most cherished objectives of his policy was never achieved. After only a few more years, the Mongols put an end to the ‘Abbāsid caliphate of Baghdad, executing the caliph al-Musta‘ṣim in Șafar 656/February 1258.

Even so, one should not forget the importance of the rôle played throughout the Sāldjūq and post-Sāldjūq period by an ‘Abbāsid caliph, whom a number of local rulers recognized as the bearer of their power. Alongside the sultans, who were not so numerous, even when the sultanate was conferred upon several dynasties (Sāldjūqs of Rūm and of Iran, and Ghaznavids), there were princes of Syria, of Anatolia or of Iran who to some extent put themselves under the authority of the caliph, bearing among their titles a title with the component of amir al-mu‘minin bestowed by the chancellery of Baghdad and stressing their personal link with the caliph. This was the case with Zankīds and Ayūbidids in Syria, Rasūlids in the Yemen, Ghaznavids, Ghūrids and princes of Delhi in eastern Iran and in India, to mention only the most important of this group. Different relationships were established too between the caliph and a prince of the Islamic west such as the Umayyads of Cordova, the ‘Abd al-Rabbīs of Ifrikiya, prince of the Ghurids and princes of Delhi in eastern Iran, and where since the 4th/ioth century rival caliphates appeared with the title of amir al-mu‘minin, which they adopted with the consent of the chancellor of Baghdad, the Almoravids contented themselves, as has been seen, with the title of amir al-mu‘minin, thus setting himself up as a rival to the ‘Abbāsid sovereign and claiming that he was restoring a caliphate now in decline, in the same way that the Mādī Ibn Tūnart, the Almohad caliph al-Mustāriz, who for his part declared that the sons of ‘Abd al-Mu‘min had transformed the caliphate into a mulk (al-Maṣkari, viii, 23), the Almohad protocol retained in its formulae (al-hadra al-ṣunniya al-tadhira al-kudsiyya), a reminder of the initial doctrine. The title of caliph was subsequently taken over by the Hafṣids, successors to the Almohads, and likewise by the Marinids.

C. The caliphates of the west.

It was at the beginning of the 4th/oioth century that an Umayyad amir of Spain put an end to the situation which had previously arisen in the region: the appearance of a local prince who, while not recognizing the authority of the caliph of Baghdad, nevertheless allowed the bay‘a to be made in his name. Then, in 316/928, ʿAbd al-Rabbī II declared himself amir al-mu‘minin. According to Ibn Khaldūn, this decision was explained by the fact that at that time “the authority of the caliphate of the east was reduced to nothing”. To this should be added the fact that the Fāšīmīd caliphate had appeared in Ifrikiya, and the new caliph of al-Andalus hoped to make himself the champion of Sunnism against this new form of sovereignty.

The new caliphs essentially based their legitimacy on the idea of inheritance. “Sons of the caliphs” they considered the caliphate a “portion” set aside by God for the Banū ʿUmayya, who had inherited it from Marwān, if not from ʿUthmān himself, as was stated by Ibn Bassām who went so far as to call the Umayyad caliph “kinsman of the Prophet” by virtue of his status as a member of Kuraysh. Furthermore, in imitation of the Umayyads, the caliphs of Spain adopted the colour of white. They applied the hereditary principle in a stricter manner than did the ʿAbbāsids, not considering the minority of an heir presumptive as an obstacle to his proclamation. But the succession was put into effect by the same process, bay‘a, whether preceded by an ʿabd or not. Also, the bay‘a held a more important place than in the Orient and sometimes the rite lasted several days.

The caliph frequently declared himself the “caliph of God”. He governed in a direct fashion, surrounded by a council of viziers, but in the course of the 4th/oioth century, he rapidly ceased to take an active interest in the conduct of affairs, relying on a prime minister who bore, in Spain, the title of hāджī, not that of wazir: whence the appearance, in 317/929, of a dynasty of “major-donors”, of which the founder was the famous al-Manṣūr (Almanzor). A kind of sultanate was thus established in Spain also, but it lasted only a short time, since the caliphate came to an end, in a period of disturbances, in 422/1031.

In the West, other Sunni caliphs appeared subsequently in rivalry to the caliph of Baghdad. If the Almoravids contented themselves, as has been seen, with the title of amir al-mu‘minin, which they adopted with the consent of the chancellor of Baghdad, the Almohad ʿAbd al-Mu‘min, successor to the Mādī Ibn Tūnart, ca. 525/1132 took the title of amir al-mu‘minin, thus setting himself up as a rival to the ‘Abbāsid sovereign and claiming that he was restoring a caliphate now in decline, in the same way that the Mādī Ibn Tūnart had revived Islam; in addition, the Almohad caliph, just as was previously the Shī‘ī imām, was the bearer of the ʿisma. Although the original character of the Almohad movement was gradually eroded, to the point where one chronicler declared that the sons of ‘Abd al-Mu‘min had transformed the caliphate into a mulk (al-Maṣkari, viii, 23), the Almohad protocol retained in its formulae (al-hadra al-ṣunniya al-tadhira al-kudsiyya), a reminder of the initial doctrine. The title of caliph was subsequently taken over by the Hafṣids, successors to the Almohads, and likewise by the Marinids.

D. The Fāšīmīd caliphate and the Shī‘ī imāmates.

Founded in 297/910 in Ifrikiya by the Mahdi ʿUbayd Allāh, the Fāšīmīd caliphate [q.v.], the appearance of which had, as stated above, led to the constitution of an Umayyad caliphate in Spain, had only a temporary historical rôle to play—it lasted in fact only until 567/1171—but dominated a vast expanse of territory, including Egypt and Syria, and for a brief period came close to endangering the institution of the ‘Abbāsid caliphate. It was a Shī‘ī caliphate derived from the Ismāʿīlī movement. As such, it presented a different aspect from that of the Sunni caliphate; the caliph was the imām maṣjīm, impeccable and infallible, supreme interpreter of the Law. This charismatic leader derived his powers from his predecessor by virtue of an explicit nomination (nasṣ), kept secret throughout the preceding reign and revealed only after the death of the caliph, by the man of trust to whom it had been confided. Opinion held that the descent should be by a direct line, from father to son, and by virtue of the Shī‘ī doctrine, the community could not remain even for a moment without an imām, whom it had no right to nominate.
This principle of accession was applied in a general way throughout the duration of the Fāṭimid caliphate. After the demise of each sovereign the waṣīyya of the late caliph, revealed by the senior minister, was put into effect. Nevertheless, after the end of the 5th/11th century the system ceased to function regularly, as the ministers had begun to exert too much influence and to involve themselves in affairs of succession. As early as 411/1021, on the death of al-Ḥākim, who had nominated one of his cousins, his sister Sīt al-Mulk decided that the rule and intervened to have the son of the late caliph proclaimed. Later, in 487/1094, the minister al-ʿAfdal proclaimed the succession of one of the caliph’s sons, al-Mustaʿṣir, whereas another son, Nizār, had, in the opinion of some, been named by the waṣīyya. This was the origin of the schism of the Nizaris or neo-Ismaʿilis. Another crisis occurred in 525/1130, when the caliph al-ʿĀmir died without male issue and without having named an heir: this caused some public disorder, if we are to believe the historians; the caliphate passed to a collateral branch of the family. More serious was the initiative taken by the minister Tālāʾī in 555/1160 when, upon the death of al-Fāʾiz, he sought out a candidate for the caliphate without troubling to discover whether the late caliph had designated an heir. The new caliph could not be under age, as was the case with al-Fāʾiz; in such an instance a de facto regency exercised power, and sometimes the trustees were women. This was what happened for example in the case of the aunt of al-Fāʾiz, and previously in the case of the sister of al-Ḥākim, who for a time made her authority supersede that of a nephew, then seventeen years of age. Let it be added, that throughout the closing years of the regime, the candidate for the caliphate, whose position was the same as that of the waṣīʿ ʿl-ḥād for the ʿAbbāsid, was appointed by the minister.

The new caliph received a bayʿa which apparently did not differ from the bayʿa made for the ʿAbbāsid caliphs. This bayʿa was, however, in principle simply an expression of homage, and could not in any sense be considered a designation of the sovereign. The caliph, as imām, was in this respect the chief of propaganda, the interpreter of the law, the source of all knowledge. The panegyrists did not cease to develop these themes, stressing that the caliph was the friend (wālī) of God, intercessor for all; the doctrine of the waṣīyya was in fact regarded by the jurists as one of the pillars of the faith. Only the caliph al-Ḥākim went so far as to consider himself an incarnation of the deity, or at least, he allowed himself to be proclaimed as such (in 408/1017).

The theocratic nature of power was thrown into especial relief under the Fāṭimid caliphate. Nevertheless, the conditions for the exercise of power did not differ noticeably from what they were under a Sunni caliphate. Here also the authority of the caliph fell into decline and, in the 5th/10th and the 6th/12th centuries, power was in the hands of all-powerful ministers who, to the normal title of waṣīʿ, succeeded in adding that of malik (530/1135), and some of whom passed on their power in what was temporarily a hereditary manner. The last of these ministers was Šalāḥ al-Dīn, who put an end to the régime, restoring the ḥudūs to the name of the ʿAbbāsid caliph and depriving the last Fāṭimid caliph al-ʿĀṣid of his rights and powers, without however proclaiming his dethronement.

Although the Ismaʿil movement thus succeeded in maintaining an effective caliphate for more than two centuries, there never was such a possibility for the Imāmī movement, whose devotees continue to this day to await the return of the Mahdi.

On the other hand, the Zaydi movements led to the creation of Zaydi states ruled by imāms descended from al-Ḥasan. One of these states, that of Ṭabaristān, constituted in the mid-3rd/9th century, was short-lived, but the other, the Yemen, constituted in 288/901, lasted into the very recent past, covering it is true, only a very limited area. The Zaydi imāms, though not considered impeccable, were doctors schooled in the religious sciences as well as warriors. The most famous of these was the founder of the state of the Yemen, Yabhā b. al-Ḥusayn, who took the surname al-Hādī ʿl-dī ʿl-hādh, as well as the title amīr al-muʿminīn, which appeared in the state documents and on the coinage. Al-Hādī, considered by the Zaydis to be a model sovereign, possessed, in addition to his qualities of courage, a great knowledge of law and great piety. It is said that he strove to apply strictly the prescriptions of Islam, especially in fiscal matters, and to him are attributed a number of scholarly writings. Under the terms of the Zaydi doctrine, the imām did not command unconditional obedience, because the subjects ceased if the caliph deviated from the prescriptions of the Book and the Sunna. On the other hand the imāmāte did not necessarily pass from father to son, since it was personal qualities which, in addition to ʿAlid origin, gave entitlement to the imāmate. This explains how it was that the Zaydi imāmāte succeeded in surviving into the 20th century, in spite of interruptions, especially in the Ayyūbīd and Ottoman periods, and in spite of various vicissitudes.

E. The institution of the caliphate after 658/1258.

If the murder of al-Mustaʿṣim and the Mongol invasions did not bring about the effective disappearance of the ʿAbbāsid caliphate, the new era which began at this date was nevertheless of a quite different character. The Mamluks, having gained power in Egypt and Syria, took to Cairo a member of the ʿAbbāsid family, the uncle of the last caliph of Baghdad, and Baybars had this man declared caliph through the good offices of the chief ḥādi who had verified his genealogy (Radjīb 659/June 1261). This individual, who took the surname al-Mustansir, claimed in his first ḥudūs all the privileges of the caliph and claimed to extend his authority over the whole Islamic world, to which end Baybars entrusted an army to him. He failed in his attempt to reconquer Baghdad, and the new caliph, al-Ḥākim, who was then proclaimed in Cairo (Muḥarram 661/November 1262) and installed in the citadel, no longer had the right to interfere in political life; his presence seems to have had no other purpose than to render legitimate the power effectively exercised by the Mamluks, according to a regulation which remained in force for two-and-a-half centuries.

From a juridical viewpoint, the caliph remained, it is true, titular holder of a sovereignty which continued to be transmitted in the line of the caliph al-Ḥākim. But the ensemble of powers, including the right of nominating various agents, had been delegated to the sultan, who was henceforward chosen by the Mamluks and invested with the sultanate by the caliph. The author al-Kalkashandi compares the sultanate to a delegated vizierate, and declares besides that it consisted of a combination
of the ʿimārat al-ʿiṣlād with the wizārat al-taʿfīd (Ṣūbḥ, xi, 72), which shows the importance that he still attached to the investiture by the caliph. The sultanate had none the less acquired a kind of juridical autonomy; when the Mamluks could not agree on the appointment of a sultan, as happened for example in 615/1219, they entrusted to the caliph the powers of the sultan, which were thus, according to the chroniclers, "added" temporarily to the caliphate.

In addition, the caliphs lost in Cairo certain of their privileges, the right of sīkha, which was no longer observed from the time of the third caliph onwards, the right of ḥuḫba which seems to have fallen into disuse, while the traditional insignia of the caliphate were henceforward carried by the sultans themselves. The name of the caliph was no longer mentioned in the ḥuḫba at Mecca, but retained the prestige of holding a power of divine origin and of being, as in the past, the "lieutenant of God on earth" (nāʾīb Allāh fi ardi-hi). So obedience to the caliph seems to have been, especially for rulers of distant provinces, a kind of religious duty. Investiture at his hands was always sought by various sovereigns, notably the Muḥaffāzīn of Iran, the sultans of Delhi and the Ottomans of Anatolia. Khāliḍ al-Zahrīʾ (d. 863/1459) wrote: "The amīr of the believers is the lieutenant of God on earth and no prince of east or west can justly call himself sultan if he has not received investiture at his hands." Without this investiture, he could not for example nominate a ḥāḍī whose decisions were to be valid.

Various princes of this period refused, however, to recognise the ʿAbbāsid caliphs of Cairo. This happened notably in the case of the ʿIl-Khwānī Shāhān Khan who occupied Damascus and had himself named in the ḥuḫba "the august sultan, sultan of Islam and the Muslims". As for the Timūrid Shāh Rūkh, he considered himself sovereign by divine right and it was his ambition to be recognized as ḥalfīṣa by the other princes which was refused by the Mamlūk sultan Barsbāy and the Ottoman sultan Murād II.

Moreover, it seems that from the end of the 7th/13th century onwards, certain princes introduced the word ḥalfīṣa into their titles, without however appropriating the title amīr al-muʾminīn; this was done by the Saldūjī sultans of Rūm, protected by the Mongols, and also by the sultans of Dīhil. The Türkmen Uzun Ḥassān (857-82/1453-78) wrote ca. 875/1467 to the Ottoman sultan concerning his new capital Shīrāz, calling it the "throne of the caliphate". At the beginning of the 9th/16th century the prince of Transoxania, Muhammad Shāybahī, put on his coinage the title ḥalfīṣat al-Rahmān. While it is admitted that these titles did not always correspond to a precise aspiration, it appears that from the time of the Mongol invasions onwards, the title of ḥalfīṣa was no longer reserved for the ʿAbbāsid amīr of the Believers and that a number of rulers did not hesitate to take it up, as though it were a normal title of Muslim sovereigns.

This title appeared notably in letters of congratulation addressed by allies to Ottoman sultans after certain of their successes. Thus Murād I at the end of the 8th/14th century saw fit to call himself "chosen ḥalfīṣa of the Creator", and "shadow of God on the earth". A little later, the sultan Bāyāzīd did not hesitate to apply to himself verse VI, 165 of the Kurʾān: "The amīr of the believers is a representative of the (ḥalfīṣa) on the earth." In the same way, Muḥammad I after the restoration of the Ottoman empire at the start of the 9th/15th century, spoke of his "caliphate", a term which the other Ottoman sovereigns did not hesitate to use on occasion in dealings with their allies. At all events, and in spite of the fact that Muḥammad II the Conqueror did not take to himself the title of ḥalfīṣa, official correspondence addressed to the Ottomans by their neighbours did not cease to consider them repositories of the caliphate and Selīm himself, after 1512, was called by his brother "shadow of God on earth".

It is noteworthy that at the same period too, various eulogists applied on occasion to Ottoman sultans the title of ḥalfīṣa or ḥalfīṣat Allāh, although these expressions were nothing more than laudatory epithets, appearing generally in texts of rhymed prose and not to be regarded as official titles. More often, indirect expressions such as "the throne of the caliphate" were employed.

In fact, the Ottoman sultans early wished to be considered, without however claiming the title amīr al-muʾminīn, as bearers of the sultanate and the caliphate combined, a caliphate conceived by the Muslim thinkers of the time in terms completely different from those of early Islam. Thus two thinkers as different one from the other as Ibn Taʾmīyya and Ibn Khālīd agree in declaring that the caliphate ceased after the ʿalāʾīd caliphs and that the sovereignty exercised by the latter was the "lieutenant of God on earth and no prince of east or west can justly call himself sultan if he has not received investiture at his hands." Without this investiture, he could not for example nominate a ḥāḍī whose decisions were to be valid.

At the same time, they recognised no authority on the part of the caliph of Cairo. This is seen in the episode when the sultan Selīm conquered Syria, then Egypt, making a prisoner of the caliph al-Muṭawakkil, treating him with a complete lack of deference and exiling him to Constantinople. Al-Muṭawakkil was unable to leave this involuntary exile until the reign of the sultan Sulaymaṇ, returning to Egypt where he died in 950/1543; he made no further exercise of his functions as caliph, except in conferring the investiture on the governor Aḥmad Paṣā, a governor who had rebelled against the Ottoman sultan. The fact emerges clearly from the account of these events that the last ʿAbbāsid caliph was considered of negligible importance by the victorious Ottoman sultan.

On the other hand, not one of the historical accounts states in precise fashion that Selīm sought to take to himself the legacy of the caliphate to the extent that it might be inferred from the late, popular versions which began to circulate at the end of the 19th century and were collected by Mouradgea d'Ossborn. There is no justification for the view that there was an official transfer of the caliphate to Constantinople. It is true that certain relics of the Prophet and of the Companions were transferred...
to the capital of the Ottoman empire; as for sultan Selim and his successors, they never bore officially in documents of state, inscriptions and coinage, titles other than sultan and hâdiş; they did not use those of amir al-mu'minîn or of imâm. The only new title adopted by Selim after the conquest of Egypt was that of hâdidî al-şarâmayn [q.v.], which was in fact a title belonging to the Mamlûk sultans and not to the caliph.

These ill-defined pretensions of the Ottoman sultans towards sovereignty over the entire Islamic world, came into conflict in certain respects, in the east, with the ambitions of the Mughal rulers of India during the 16th and 17th centuries. After the reign of Akbar (963-1014/1556-1605) [q.v.], the capital of these faraway but powerful princes, Dihlî, was called dâr al-şârifî ("seat of the caliphate") and the coinage of Akbar bore the inscription: "the great sultan, the exalted al-şârifî."

The Mughals, who dealt on equal terms with the Ottomans, continued until the reign of Shâh Âlîm II (1172/1760) to qualify themselves with the title of al-şârifî, although it is unclear to what extent they were thereby disowning the traditional concept of the Kurâshî caliphate.

Nevertheless, it was the masters of the Ottoman empire who finally enjoyed the distinction, in the 18th century, of being presented by their diplomats to foreigners, including European monarchs, as the holders of the "caliphate". An example of this appeared in 1774 in the treaty concluded between 'Âbd al-Ḥamîd I and the empress Catherine of Russia; the sultan was called "the imâm of the Believers and the caliph of those who profess the divine unity"; an expression which at the time was rendered in French by "le Souverain calife de la religion musulmane". The intention was to retain the sultan's religious authority over Muslim populations which had passed under foreign domination; this the Russians did not accept (the treaty was revised in 1783).

In any case, from this time onward, and throughout the 19th century, in the various confrontations which occurred between the Ottomans and the European states, the Ottomans never present themselves officially as caliphs, that is to say, as the spiritual leaders of the Muslims and defenders of Islam. The distinction, of European origin, between the spiritual and the temporal thus found, through the exigencies of the situation, echoes in Ottoman circles. Hence the constitution formulated in December 1876 by the sultan 'Âbd al-Ḥamîd II declared explicitly in its art. 3: "The august Ottoman sultanate, the office of the supreme Islamic caliphate, must devolve upon the eldest of the members of the family"; and in art. 4: "the sultan, in his capacity as caliph, is the protector of the Muslim religion".

Even though the process of giving executive force to the constitution of 1876 was postponed until 1908, the sultan continued to hold to this conception which enabled him to assert his authority over the Arab countries and furthermore to embrace the ideal of pan-Islamic unity, inspired in him by Djamîl al-Dîn al-Afghânî [q.v.]. The principle was in any case recognised in the countries of the West, and in Bosnia-Herzegovina, after the annexation of the province to the Austro-Hungarian empire in 1908, the name of the Ottoman sultan continued to be mentioned in the public prayers. In Libya, even after the establishment of the Italian protectorate, the chief ba'dî of that country was still appointed by the Ottoman shâhîkh al-Islâm. In Bulgaria, under the terms of the treaty of Constantinople of 1913, the prerogatives of the Ottoman sultan, though more strictly limited, were nevertheless upheld, as was also the case in Greece at that time.

It should be added that the Ottoman sultans had, in fact, for a number of centuries, exercised functions similar to those of the ancient caliphs, with the difference that they sought to establish a more regular system. In addition to the law, they formulated a code of rules, the purpose of which was in principle to supplement the law, but which sometimes tended to supplant it; called hâmîn, it was employed by Sulaymân the Great as by the other sultans, and was applied not only to financial questions, but also to questions such as the problem of succession. Later, in the 19th century, the sultans sought, under the pressure of various circumstances, to modernise the structures of the Ottoman state. This is not the place to examine the reforming measures known as the Tanzimât [q.v.], but it should be recalled that it was in their capacity as leaders of an important Muslim community that the sultans introduced modifications in the traditional fîkh, as in the organisation of public powers. The movement culminated in the formulation of the constitution of 1876 which envisaged a parliamentary régime and which did not come into force until 1908.

The installation of a parliamentary régime, then the appearance of the officers of the Committee of Union and Progress, had the effect of calling into question, even before the First World War, the sultanate and the caliphate. The Young Turks had at first been cautious, and if they sought to circumscribe the powers of the sultan, they tended also to use the expedient of the caliphate to maintain Turkish influence over the Arab lands. The issue of the war modified the assumptions of the problem, since the new Turkish nationalism, whose champion was Mustafa Kemâl, had nothing to do with the caliphate. The suppression of the ancient institutions was nevertheless gradual. Mustafa Kemâl began by attacking the sultanate, while recognising the caliphate as "a moral link, sacred and respected by the entire Muslim world." On 29 October 1922, the sultanate was abolished by the Grand National Assembly of Ankara, which reserved for itself the right to choose the holder of the caliphate under the terms of the Constitution adopted in January 1921 and which declared the sovereignty of the people. The sultan Meşûmmed VI, deposed by means of a fatawâ, went into exile and was replaced by 'Abd al-Magîd, who had been chosen by the Assembly and was asked to consider himself only as the caliph of the Muslims. In fact, the new caliphate was ill-defined, and fruitless discussions were held regarding the functions to be attributed to a figure in whom Mustafa Kemâl, in April 1923, recognised above all "supreme inter-Islamic authority" and the "symbol of Islamic solidarity", and yet who held no real spiritual power; for he did not have the right to appoint ba'dîs, muftis or preachers. In January 1924 Mustafa Kemâl declared: "The idea of a single caliph, exercising supreme religious authority over all the peoples of Islam, is an idea taken from fiction, not from reality." In February, the caliphate was abolished by the National Assembly which was then enwowed with all powers of legislation (législatif). The prayer was delivered in the name of al-şukûma al-żujumîhîyya wa l-ḥâkîmah wa l-hâkimîyya. Meanwhile, a group of "ulama" had drafted a document which was circulated not only in Turkey but also in the Arab countries and which tried to show that the problem
of the caliphate was a question not of theology but of practical politics, that the caliphate had not been instituted by the Prophet and that it did not constitute a fundamental element of Islam.

The abolition of the caliphate, of which the concept had changed somewhat since the 7th/8th century, was none the less powerfully resented in the Middle East, where various projects were attempted for the restitution of this institution, considered to be fundamental to the very life of the community of Islam. The khalif of Mecca, Husayn, made an attempt to have himself recognised as caliph, but succeeded only with a few neighbouring princes. In 1026, two congresses were held, which had the object of debating the issue of the caliphate; one took place in March, in Cairo, the other in July at Mecca, without any result. The western powers, for their part, sought to encourage the restoration of the caliphate, on the condition that the holder be their ally. In 1930 there was denunciation from certain Muslim quarters of the policies of the British, who continued to give financial support to the former Ottoman sultan while backing King Husayn, and those of the French, who favoured the Bey of Tunis. Then in 1931, a congress of ulama and political figures was held in Jerusalem. It had no result other than to affirm the spirit of solidarity which still existed among Arab and Muslim countries and which, in 1941, led to the “Congress of Arab Unity” held in Cairo and from which arose the League of Arab States, founded in 1944. Meanwhile, the attempt of King Fārūk of Egypt, in 1939, to revive the caliphate to his own advantage, met with vigorous opposition from the Turkish government. The rise of nationalism thus brought about the transformation of a pan-Islamic movement into a simply pan-Arab movement.

In fact, Muslim opinion was in general resigned to the new situation, entrusting interpretation of the Law to the doctors, and political affairs to the de facto authorities. Even in 1922, the reformist Rashīd Rīdā had proposed a plan for the reform of the caliphate in his work al-Khilāfa aw al-Imāma al-'Uṣūma; he asserted that no Arab sovereign was worthy to accede to this office and he proposed the holding of a seminar with the purpose of drawing up a list of doctors from among whom the caliph would be chosen; the rôle of the caliph would essentially have been to adapt Islamic law to the conditions of modern life. But such a project was never realised.

More radical was the theory advanced by a bā'nah of al-Azhār, ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Rāzīq, who, in 1925, wrote an essay entitled al-ʿIslām wa-usūl al-bāghā “Islam and the bases of power”, which caused a sensation in traditionalist Muslim circles because it laid down a doctrinal basis for the separation of the temporal and the spiritual, and suggested that the government of the Prophet at Medina was not dependent on the prophetic mission. This work was condemned by the bā'nahs of al-Azhār, but the notion of temporal sovereignty continued nevertheless to take root in Muslim circles during the decades that followed.


H. Inalcik, The Ottoman empire, the classical age 1300-1600, London 1973; H. A. R. Gibb and Bowen, Islamic society and the West, ii/1, Oxford 1950; E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., iii, passim; M. van Berchem, Suites califés d’Occident, in JA (1907/1), 245-335; R. Brunschvig, La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafides, i, Paris 1940, esp. 40. (D. Sourdell)

(ii) In political theory

There are two references to khālīfa in the Qurʾān (Sūra II, 30 and Sūra XXXVIII, 20). The first, “We have made thee a khālīfa in the land; then judge between the men with the truth, and follow not thy desires, lest they cause thee to err from the path of God”, refers to Adam. The second, “We have made thee a khālīfa in the earth; so judge between the people with truth” is addressed to David. The plural (khālīfīn) and khulūfīn) is more frequent, means successors (i.e. progeny) (see further R. Paret, Signification coranique de halīfa, in Studia Islamica, xxxvi (pars prior), 211-17, and W. Montgomery Watt, Islamic political thought, Edinburgh 1968, 32 ff.). For the commentators such as Zamakhshāri, the concept of Adam included or typified all mankind and the prophets, while David had the dual rôle of king and prophet. Although there is no indication that the word khālīfa was intended to serve as the title of the successor of Muhammad, both the passages quoted above are important for the development of the theory of the khālīfa as the successor of the prophet, and his office, the khilīfa.

It is asserted by Muslim historians that the term khālīfa was first used as the title of the successor of Muhammad by Abū Bakr, but it is doubtful whether he ever assumed it as a title (Caetani, Annali dell’ Islam, i 1 A.H., para. 63 n. 1). From the reign of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, however, khālīfa rasūl Allāh, successor of the messenger of God, became the common designation of the community, the amīr al-muʾminīn [q.v.], the Commander of the Faithful, the title which ʿUmar had adopted on his
The title *khilafat rasûl Allâh* implied the assumption by Muhammad's successor of Muhammad's functions as judge and temporal leader of the community. Muhammad's prophetic functions, on the other hand, was held to have ceased with him and it was believed that the spiritual guidance of the community had been inherited by the community as a whole. The *khilâfâ*, thus, had no authority to give new interpretations to religious matters: his function was merely to maintain old doctrines. His office was simply a delegation of authority for the purpose of applying and defending the *sâri'a*. The title *khilafât rasûl Allâh* was commonly applied to the orthodox or rightly guided caliphs (the Râshîdûn), who were regarded as the representatives or successors of Muhammad. Muâwiya's claim to the caliphate, if it was based on the text of the Kur'ân (XVII, 35), was to be sultan: as such he was not Muhammad's deputy but God's, and the title *khilafât Allâh*, vicegerent of God, appears to have been approved by the Umayyads (Diwan Ibn Thabit; *Rdhat al-sudur*, in *A volume of oriental studies presented to E. G. Browne*, ed. T. W. Arnold and R. A. Nicholson, Cambridge 1922, 327). The phrase *khalifat Allâh* had earlier excited the indignation of Abû Bakr, because of the boldness of its implication. It was, nevertheless, used by 'Âッシn b. Thâbit in A.D. 35 in an elegy he wrote on the caliph *'Uthmân* (*Divan* of हस्सân Ibn Thâbit ed. W. N. Arafat, GMS, N. S. ii, London, 1971, 110). The 'Abbâsid later employed the title *khalifat Allâh*, but its use was resisted by many of the 'ulamâ', who rejected the idea that the *khalifat* was the representative of God and the implication of autocratic power contained in the title (I. Goldziher, *Muhammadianische Studien*, ii, 61; H. A. R. Gibb, *al-Mawardi's theory of the caliphate*, in *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*, ed. S. Margoliouth, London 1922, 135). An attempt to limit the true caliphate to the Râshîdûn, on the basis of a tradition attributed to the Prophet which states "the caliphate after me will be thirty years: then it will become kingship" (quoted by Margoliouth, op. cit., 328), did not become accepted doctrine. Later Sunnî jurists, however, drew a distinction between the caliphs of the Râshîdûn, the *khilafât al-nubuwa* (the vicariate of prophecy) and the later caliphs which they held to have had the character of worldly kingship (*mulk*). As used in the sources, the terms *khilafat* and *imâm* (and *khilafat* and *imâm* [q.v.], which refers to his office) are broadly interchangeable. The former is primarily applied to the supreme leader of the Muslim community as the ruler of the community exercising the "temporal" functions of Muhammad, while the latter is applied to him as the religious leader of the community and derives from his function of leading the prayers of the community, which, in the view of the Sunnis, was his most important function. The propriety of the election of Abû Bakr was, in fact, defended by many jurists on the ground that he had led the prayers. In the literature the terms *imâm* and *imâm* are used in preference to *khilafat* and *khilafât*. Among later writers traces are occasionally to be found of a distinction between the functions of the leader of the community as *khilafat* and as *imâm*. For example Râwandî alleges that Tughrîl b. Arslân's atabeg, Muhammad Pahlavân-djâhân, used openly to say, "The *imâm* should occupy himself with delivering the *sâri'a* and leading the prayers, which are the best of actions and the greatest of deeds and which uphold (or protect) profane rulers; and he should entrust kingship to sultans and leave rule to this sultan (i.e., Tughrîl)" (*Rkât al-shâri'a*, ed. M. A. Shahâbî, GMS, N. S. ii, London, 1921, 334).

Politics and religion in Islam were inextricably mixed and the political doctrines of the *khilafat* as the leader of the community cannot be easily separated from the theological and juridical doctrines concerning his office (see *imâm*). The early doctrinal disputes and religious polemics—the controversies over the imamate raised by the first civil war, the development of the *Shî'î* and the Khawârîdî schisms, the succession of the Umayyads and their overthrow by the 'Abbâsids, the Mu'tazîli movement and its refutation by the Ash'ârîs, and the polemics against the Rawâfîd and Khawârîdî—profoundly influenced the development of the political theory as well as the religious doctrine of the *khilafat*, and also did Hellenistic and Sassanî theories of government.

As the temporal head of the community, whose internal organisation was secured by a common acceptance of and submission to the *sâri'a*, the caliph was the symbol of the supremacy of the *shâri'a*. He, like other believers, was subordinate to it and they owed him obedience only as its representative. So far as there was an element of contract in the relations between him and his followers this was to be found in the *bay'a* [q.v.]. Termination of the contract was only permitted if a change took place in the status and condition of the caliph such as might cause prejudice to the rights of the community. The weakness of the position was that no tribunal was specified to decide upon his deposition.

Gradually the political doctrines of the imamate were worked out in the political development of Islam (cf. H. A. R. Gibb, *al-Mawardi's theory of the caliphate*, 154-5). Significantly, most of the important expositions of the theory of the caliphate were written, if not at a period of crisis, at least at a time when some fairly major problem faced the Muslim community and was exercising the minds of the faithful.

In the turbulent years following the transfer of power from the Umayyads to the 'Abbâsids, Ibn al-Mukaffa' [q.v.], who died probably in 1309/756, concerned at the internal dissensions within the community, felt the need for a definition of the powers and authority of the caliph. Recognising the change in the basis of the caliphate which had taken place with the 'Abbâsid revolution, and believing that the only bond between the caliph and his army was religious conviction, he made right belief the cornerstone of his political programme. Convinced of the need for stability, he proposed a rigid control by the state. He suggested that the caliph should supersede and regulate *ra'y* [q.v.] as used in the ancient schools of law and recommended that he should create a code based on (i) precedents and usage (*siyâr*), (ii) tradition and analogy, and (iii) his own decisions which would in turn be emended by succeeding caliphs. Ibn al-Mukaffa's pleas, however, went unheeded: orthodox Islam rejected the view that *ra'y* was the domain of the ruler and referred the final decision
to idāmā (q.v.) (see further S. D. Goitein, A turning-point in the history of the Muslim state, in Studies in Islamic history and institutions, 149-67).

Abū Yusuf (d. 182/298) (q.v.) represents a somewhat different point of view. Disturbed by contemporary practices, many of which seemed contrary to the spirit of the early caliphate as reflected in the works of the Traditionists, he cites a number of traditions in his Kitāb al-Kharāj showing the duty of the subjects to their imām. The bay'a by this time was no longer of practical significance and Abū Yusuf does not attempt to maintain even the principle of election. He is aware of only one source of authority: God's choice by which the caliph became a vicegerent of God on earth (see further S. D. Goitein, Attitudes towards government in Islam and Judaism, in Studies in Islamic history and institutions, 203 ff.). By implication he holds that the actual possession of power is the necessary basis for authority and a sufficient justification for its exercise, irrespective of the ruler's personal qualifications. Although Abū Yusuf, who looks upon the caliph as the shepherd of his people, bases the principles of true Islamic government upon the sunna of the Rāshīdūn and of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, and implicitly protests against the prevailing cult of the Sasanian tradition (cf. other later works of Ibn al-Farraʿ in al-iHikmat, and discusses the functions of his office, having in mind the limitations imposed upon the caliph by political circumstances. Like various writers before him, al-Māwardi speaks of the forfeiture of the imamate, without, however, laying down any legal means by which this might be brought about. In his discussion of the formal institutions of government he concentrates mainly upon what constitutes a valid investiture by the caliph of his functionaries, in particular the ważir and the amir. Some two centuries earlier al-Dījahiz had defined political obligation with regard to the overthrow of an impious imām in terms of possibility. Al-Māwardi went further. Constrained by necessity and expediency, he limited even the political obligations of the caliph as the executor of the sharīʿa by the possibility of fulfiment. (See further H. A. R. Gibb, al-Mawardi's theory of the caliphate.)

In the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries the jurists continued to wrestle with the problem of how to assert the supremacy of the caliph. They were all concerned to a greater or lesser degree with the caliph's mission as the vicegerent of the prophet, and with his duty to defend Islam and to administer the affairs of the community. Among them were Abū Yaʿūs (380-458/990-1066) Ibn al-Farraʿ (q.v.), Ibn ʿAqlī (435/1040-1119) (q.v.), al-Dījahiz, Ibn al-Hayamayn (410-498/1020-1105) (q.v.), and al-Ġazālī (450-505/1058-1111) (q.v.). The last named breaks new ground on the subject of the relationship of caliph and amir in his Ḥūṣād al-ʾtibād. The caliph remains the symbol of the supremacy of the sharīʿa but the amir is associated with him and recognised as the holder of coercive power (see further L. Blinder, al-Ġazālī and Islamic government in Muslim Iraq, July 1955, and H. Laoust, La politique de Ġazālī, Paris 1970).

Ibn Dījamā (639/1241-733/1333) (q.v.), writing after the extinction of the caliphate by the Mongols, broadly speaking transfers to the de facto rulers the constitutional theories worked out by earlier jurists, holding that the seizure of power itself gave authority, while Ibn Ṭaymīyya (672-755/1273-1328) (q.v.), seeking a more radical solution, denied the obligatory nature of the caliphate (see further H. Laoust, Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Ibn Taimīyya, Cairo 1939, idem, Le traité du droit publique d'Ibn Taimīyya, Beirut 1948).


the works of the Muslim theorists mentioned above see under the relevant articles.

(A. K. S. LAMPTON)

(iii) IN ISLAMIC MYSTICISM

This term may have any of the following meanings, all carrying the idea of vicarship, when used in writings dealing with or pertaining to some aspects of Islamic mysticism:

1. He may be the kuth or perfect man, al-insân al-khâlîfâ [q.v.], around whose spheres of being evolve, upon whom the Muhammedian tradition (al-âhâlî al-muhammadiyya), which is the hidden side (bâtînî) of his own reality in the world, irradiates. This makes the kuth the khâlîfa of the Prophet on the plane of manifestation (gâtîrîn). In this sense the founders of the farîkâs [q.v.] and their successors, when identified with the kuth, are referred to as khâlîfât of the Prophet (see e.g. Muhammad Abu 'l-Mâhâsîn al-Kâmî, al-Badr al-munîr 'âlaihi al-khâlîfah al-khâlîfah, Alexandria 1312, 9; Muhammad Mâdî Abu 'l-'Azîzîn, al-Tafrîr al-madârî 'âlaihi al-âbrâr, Cairo 1340, 32; Muhammad 'Abd al-Rahîm al-Nasîrî, Asrâr al-hâddîsî li-man yahâmîkhu al-khâlîfah, Cairo 1921, 66 f.).


2. He may be the successor of the (alleged) follower of a jârî or to the deceased leader of a group of mystics, without the connotations attached to the term as mentioned under (1). The term may refer to his immediate successor (see e.g. Tafrîr al-Dîn 'Abd al-Râyîshîn al-Wâsîshî, Tirajîr al-muhbabîn fi farrâkât khâlîfât al-mudhkiyya al-ardîsîn, Cairo 1305, 20; Karîm al-Mâhâsîn al-Azn坚持不懈înî, Tanwîr al-ihdîsî li-man yahâmîkhu al-sâhirîn al-âbrâr, Tunis 1325, 345; al-Nasîrî, Asrâr, 64 f.) or to the successor to al-khâlîfah, i.e. to the position of supreme leadership over the jârî or group as shaped by its founder or first leader and/or their successors (see e.g. Dâlîl al-Dîn al-Karâkî, Lisân al-jârî al-loyd al-âsli al-jârî Sîdî 'Abd al-Karîm al-Dašâshî, ed. 'Abd al-'Azîz al-Dîn Khâlîfâ Allât, Tanâtî 1960, 5 f., for al-khâlîfah al-Bîrâmîyya, and al-Dâbârî, 96d-dîn al-dâbârî, 70, for al-khâlîfah al-Wâfîsîyya).

Equivalent to al-khâlîfah in this sense is the term sadîqâtâda [q.v.]. According to 'Abd al-Wâhhab al-Shârâni, al-Âmsâr al-khâdîsîyya fi mârifat bâdîz alâ-sâhirîn, Cairo-Beirut 1962, 6, 1, 185, preference for succession of a deceased dâya [q.v.] should be given to the eldest of his disciples. The successor may already have been designated by the jârî's leader during his lifetime (on this see e.g. Muhammad 'Abd al-Bâdi al-Lânkâwî, al-Minâh al-mudhkiyya fi muhkâtârat al-sâhirîn, Medina 1330, 88 ff.). In addition, the sûfî manuals maintain the existence of consensus among the disciples about the successor as a legitimate basis for the assumption of leadership (cf. al-Lânkâwî, al-Minâh, 93). Hereditary patrilineal succession to the leadership position became the rule adopted by many of the Sufi orders. This practice is frowned upon by those belonging to the shâbîhah, who has the obligation to grant the ijdâsî al-khâlîfah to a disciple who has attained perfection.

'Abd Allât al-Khânlî, al-Bâghâlja al-sâhirîyya fi âdâb al-jârî al-sâhirîyya al-Khâlîfîsîyya al-Nâgâkhândîsîyya, Cairo 1339, 33, and it is discarded as a practice which was used by authors belonging to al-Shâdîhîlîsîyya [q.v.], such as 'Allî Sâlim 'Ammâr, Abu 'l-Hassan al-Shâdîhî, Cairo 1951, 62, 1, 31.

3. He may be a murîd [q.v.] who, after having reached a certain stage of mystical perfection as defined by the teachings of the jârî to which he belongs, is granted permission by his spiritual master to initiate novices and to guide them on the mystical path. This includes permission to transmit the jîrîka's prayers, to lead hadras [q.v.] and to grant the status of khâlîfah to his own disciples in turn. To this effect a so-called ijdâsî (Pers./T. igâzâtâtâmâmâ/casetename [q.v.]) is granted to him by his spiritual master, possibly during a festive gathering of the jîrîka's members, when the ijdâsî is read (cf. P. Kahle, Zur Organisation der Derwischorden in Ägypten, in Isl., vi (1926), 157). The actual investiture may consist in the pronouncement of a special oath-formula, the muhâba'at al-khâlîfah (cf. al-Lânkâwî, al-Minâhîsî, 89) which differs from the common 'ahd formula [q.v.]. An ijdâsî of this type may be defined as the deed of spiritual succession granted to a murîd. It is generally referred to as ijdâsî al-khâlîfah (Pers./T. khâdîsîtaç etçin, khajîfêtdenê, or just khâlîfah. This document generally contains a more or less elaborate exposition of rights and obligations of its recipient and mentions the silsila [q.v.], i.e. the chain of initiation and transmission of mystical knowledge also known as sanâd [q.v.] al-khâlîfah (cf. 'Abd al-Muhammad al-Shâdîhî, al-Simq al-madîdî fi 'aşrân al-bay'â wa 'l-âdîn wa 'l-âs'în wa-sâsîlîsî al-jârîh, Haydarâbâd 1327, 67 f.). Provided with the seal of its purveyor, who must have been similarly authorised by his own spiritual master, and sometimes endorsed by a number of witnesses, who may also be khâlîfahs (cf. Muhammad b. Mubârak 'Alâwî Kirmânî, Amîr Khûrûc, Siyar al-awliyâsî=), Dîfîl 1302, 179) it constitutes the khâlîfah's primary source of legitimacy as a teacher of the jîrîkh. The ijdâsî al-khâlîfah need not necessarily be restricted to the permission to transmit mystical knowledge, but may also contain permission to teach and transmit texts of a different nature. It can also contain permission to initiate into and to teach the methods of more than one jattâ (cf. Muhammad b. Sulaymân al-Hânâfî al-Bâghâdî, al-Hâdîsî al-mudhkiyya fi âdâb al-jattâ al-Nâgâkhândîsîyya wa-l-bâghâdîsî al-Khâlîfîsîyya, Cairo n.d., 45). The fact that somebody has been granted the ijdâsî al-khâlîfah means only that he possesses the prerequisites for initiating and guiding disciples of his own, independent of his spiritual master. He is not under the obligation to do so, and he may very well refrain from setting himself up independently until after his master's death (cf. e.g. Amîr Khûrûc, Siyar al-awliyê, 169, and for present-day practice, Siyed Nagûb al-Attas, Some aspects of Sufism as understood and practiced among the Malays, Singapore, Malaysian Sociological Research Institute, 1963, 37). He may also choose not to set himself up independently but to accept the spiritual leadership of another khâlîfah as his master's legitimate successor. In this case a "renewal of the 'ahd" may take place with the latter (see e.g. Mâmûbî b. 'Affî al-Dîn al-Wâfîhâ, Maš'hâd al-tâhîsî fi sâmî al-munirîn 'âlîn al-jârîh, Cairo 1960 (various editions), 245). According to the Sufi orders, of some of which the shâbîhah has the obligation to grant the ijdâsî al-khâlîfah to a disciple who has attained perfection.
4. He may be the deputy of the head of an order in a particular area. The pre-condition for assignment to such a position is formal investiture as khalifa and hence possession of an idjazat khalifa, which is crucial for the legitimation of any claims for the office or position of local deputy. Appointment as khalifa by this sense may be to an already existing group of murids, in succession to a deceased or suspended predecessor (cf. Muhammad al-Bakhshi al-Halabi, Shams al-mafdir, Delhi-i Kitab Khaliid al-djawshir, Cairo 1908, 27; Amir Khurd, Siyar al-awliyd, Cairo 1908, 27; Muhammad Hasan Shams al-mafdir, Dhayl li-Kitab KadiHd, Cairo 1306, 110; Muhammad Haghim Bada khalifat al-khulafa*, Zubdat al-makamay, Lucknow 1859, 70-1, 347, 352; al-Baghdiri, al-Hadika al-nadiyya, 85). The degree to which these khalifas could and did act independently of the incumbent(s) of a position of superior authority within the fariba differs considerably among the various farikas over time and in diverse areas. The position of the office of khalifa may differ within the organisational hierarchies of the orders. Thus within the Central African Kadiiriyya branch, having its centre at Ujiji (Tanzania), khalifas are inferior to and nominated by a category of officials known as maakhir (sing. akhda), (cf. J. M. Cuqo, Les Musulmans en Afrique, Paris 1975, 325).

Within a fariba such as the Ahmadiyya al-Maraziq, the khulafa* of its semi-autonomous sub-sections (buyut) rank under the Shaykh of the buyut, who is a khulifa himself in the sense mentioned in section 3 above (cf. Muhammad Hasan Shams al-Din, al-Risla al-Ahmadiyya al-Thaynaya, Cairo 1976, 59). In the Maghrib and West Africa, the local deputy of the head of an order is generally referred to as muhaddam [q.v.]. This is also the case within a number of Shairiyya orders in the Middle East and Egypt, e.g. al-Yashrutiyya (cf. J. van Ess, Libanesische Missstellen 6, Die Yashrutiya, in WI xvi (1975), 1-103, passim), and a now defunct Egyptian branch of al-Nasiriyya. Within the latter fariba, the muhaddams (khulifas) ranked under the so-called nayhibi, who as provincial leader held jurisdiction over them (cf. Ibrahim Khalil, al-Majarid, Cairo 1934, 40 f.). Frequently, the khulifs in a particular area was inherited within the family and developed into a virtually autonomous power position which allowed its incumbents to pay only nominal allegiance to the head of their fariba. In many cases, this constituted the prelude to the formation of an independent branch or an entirely new fariba. The position of the khulifa as murshid [q.v.] is to all intents and purposes the same as the position of the head of a fariba. Therefore, the rules for spiritual leadership, i.e. the pre-conditions which allow one to assume the position of khulifa, found in Sufi manuals, also apply to the position of khulifa. It is only in relatively late 19th and 20th century manuals of the Egyptian orders, which became integrated parts of a highly developed bureaucratic organisation, that some of rules pertaining to the office of khalifa may be found. Within this organisation a limited number of khulifas in various areas received additional confirmation as local deputies of the heads of their orders from the head of al-Bakriyya [q.v.], and formed a special category of dignitaries within the administration. They held jurisdiction over those khulifas who could only claim this status by virtue of the idjazat al-khulifa in their possession. Within some of the Egyptian orders, a khalifa may continue to hold some degrees of authority over either the khulifa* ordained by him or over those within a particular fariba. In this case, he is referred to by the term khulifa al-khulifa*. In Persia under the Safawids [q.v.], a similarly-named office existed, which was defined by V. Minorsky as 'a special secretariat for Sufi affairs'. The incumbent to this office was regarded as the vicar of the king, on whose behalf he acted and appointed khulifas in the provinces (cf. Minorsky, Tadhkirat al-muluk. A Manual of Safawid Administration (London 1943, 95-125 f.). A possibly identical office of this name was also mentioned in another Shii fariba, the Ni'matullahiyya [q.v.] (cf. R. M. Savory, The Office of khalifa al-khulifa* under the Safawids, in JASOS, ixxxv (1965), 497).

5. He may be the pre-eminent representative and principal propagator of a fariba in a particular area acting independently of any authority as mentioned in section 3 above but not paying allegiance to any of the fariba's leaders elsewhere. It is this meaning which can be most safely adduced whenever the term khalifa is mentioned in conjunction with the name of a fariba or of a fariba founder, when the latter is not a contemporary of the khalifa mentioned and when there is no evidence of the existence of this fariba as an organisation. It should be interpreted as such in passages in a variety of texts in Arabic, Persian and Turkish as diverse as the following ones in which the relevant passage is found on the pages indicated: Muhammad Da'if Allah al-Dja'ali, Kitab al-Taba'at fi khushâs al-awliya* wa 'l-sâhlîn wa 'l-`ulamâ* wa 'l-qâdirâ* fi 'l-Sudn, Cairo 1930, 40; al-Djabarti, 'Idjazat al-Sudn, i, 220; Mahmet Shukri al-Alusi, al-Mizk al-adhfar, Baghdad 1930, 14; Tâsuk-i Dâshângiri, ed. Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Ghazipur 1864, 211; Ewliya Celebi, Seyhâname, Istanbul 1938, 8, 237.

6. Within al-Bektashiyya [q.v.] it refers to a rank of spiritual achievement which could be attained only by those who had been ordained as bâbâ. It is marked by the donation of the idjazat al-khulifa* as mentioned in section 3 above and was the pre-condition for investiture as dede. The latter degree entailed, among other rights, the right to participate in the elections of a dede bâbah. Investiture as dede entailed the right to appoint heads (bâbâs) of tekkes.
In addition, the term khalifa may denote the representative of the head of the Sanusiyya order who has been sent on a mission to a zawiya (cf. H. Duveyrier, *La conférence musulmane de Sidi Mohammed Ben Ali es-Senoussi et son domaine géographique*, Rome 1918, with notes by C. A. Nallino, ii, 1), the head of a holy lineage among the Mourners in Senegal (cf. D. B. Cruise O'Brien, *The Mourides of Senegal. The political and economic organization of an Islamic brotherhood*, Oxford 1971, 111), and in Turkish periods. In 1295, the vicar of the head of a teke, as reported by J. P. Brown, *The dervishes or oriental spiritualism*, London repr. 1968, 114. It may take a similar meaning in the Maghrib, where the term spiritualism may denote the vicar of the head of a zawiya (cf. V. Crapanzano, *The Hamadsha*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1973, 81 f.). In Mamluk Egypt, the offices of the custodians of the shrines of Ahmad al-Badawi and Ibrahim al-Dasuki respectively of the custodians of the shrines of Ahmad al-Badawi and Ibrahim al-Dasuki are referred to as khalifat-`amr al-badawi and `amr al-badawi. On the appointment of khalifas and on the khulaf* Ahmad al-Badawi respectively of the custodians of the shrines of Ahmad al-Badawi and Ibrahim al-Dasuki, n.p. [Cairo], n.d. (approx. 1898), and al-Karaki, *Lisan al-tarif*, 51 f.).


In the Sudanese Mahdiyya

(1) The originator of the Mahdist movement, Muhammad `Abd Allah, as a leading member of the Sammaniyya faridya, was commissioned in 1917/185-6 to appoint `Abd Allah ben Sharif Nour al-Din-the head of this order of the Egyptian Sudan: one letter of appointment is extant (see Muhammad Ibrahim Abu Sallim, *al-Murhid tla wathdik al-Mahdi*, [Khartum] 1969, no. 1). (2) After his public manifestation as Mahdi (1 Shabban 1302/29 June 1881), Muhammad Ahmad appears to have conferred the title of khalifa on at least some of those to whom he delegated authority to administer the bay'as: two examples have been calendared by Abd al-Salim al-Murhid, no. 113 (see Muhammad Ibrahim Abu Sallim, *al-Murhid tla wathdik al-Mahdi*, [Khartum] 1969, no. 1). This use of the term khalifa for local Mahdist leaders fell into disuse, and the title became restricted to three of the Mahdi's principal companions, `Abd Allah b. Muhammad al-Ta`ahikh (q.v.), `Abd Allah b. Muhammad Hili (a pious man of the tribe of Dighayn from the White Nile), and Muhammad Sharif b. Hamid (the Mahdi's son-in-law). The Mahdiyya was represented as an eschatological drama, reproducing the primitivistic umma in the end-time. In his drama, the Mahdi was the Successor of the Apostle of God (Khalifat Rasul Allâh), and his three companions the Successors respectively of Abû Bakr (Khalifat al-Siddîq), `Umar (Khalifat al-Fârûq), and `Ali (Khalifat al-Karrâr). The date of this development is uncertain; perhaps before the Mahdi left Abû (Ramadan 1298/August 1881) or during the following months, while he was at Kadrî (cf. R. C. [von] Slatin, *Fire and sword in the Sudan*, London 1896, 338; F. R. Wingate, *Ten years captivity in the Mahdi's camp 1882-1892*, London 1892, 14). In a letter dated 5 Rajab 1300/12 May 1883, the Mahdi informed Muhammad al-Mahdi al-Sanusi that he had been designated by the Prophet as the Successor of `Uthman, but al-Sanusi ignored this approach. The letter is calendared in Abû Salîm, *al-Murhid*, no. 113: there is a good text in Manghûrât... Muhammad al-Mahdi b. `Abd Allâh, ii, 70-3 (Khartum 1963, photographic reproduction of corpus lithographed during the Mahdiyya).

The pre-eminence of `Abd Allâh b. Muhammad was stressed in a proclamation of the Mahdi (17 Rabî' I 1300/20 January 1883), where he is styled Khalifat al-halifat (calendared in Abû Salîm, *al-Murhid*, no. 78: text in Manghûrât, i, 30-2). The restriction of the title khalifa, and the special status of `Abd Allâh b. Muhammad, aroused resent-
ment. One of the Mahdi's most influential sup-
porters, al-Manna Ismacll, a holy man of ... ThanI ever
since.
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Mahdl's death, 'Abd Allah b. Mu-
hammad succeeded him as head of the Mahdist state,
the analogy to Abû Bakr's succession to the Prophet
was emphasized in a proclamation by the two junior
khalifas and the Mahdi's kin (text in Abu Salim (ed.),
Manghârât al-Mahdiyya, 84-9, dated 8 Ramadanâ
1302/22 June 1885). From this time, 'Abd Allah
assumed the new style of khalifat al-Mahdi, "the
Successor of the Mahdi", which was not used as a
formal title by his two colleagues. His reign saw the
appearance in Dâr Fûr (q.v. of another pretend
the holy man called Abû Djummayya, who claimed
the vacant khalifa of 'Ughman, but who died about the
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AL-KHALIFA, the ruling dynasty of Bahrain since
1197/1783. One of the three clans of the Utb tribe
the others were Al Saâbâh and Al Djalâhima)
which established itself in Kuwait ca. 1128/1716, the
Al Khalifa migrated to Zubâra in Katar under the
leadership of Khalifa b. Muhammad in 1179-80/1766.
Khalifa b. Muhammad died in 1197/1783 while on
pilgrimage to Mecca, and in the same year his son
Abd Allah was made ruler of the Bahrain Islands from
the Persians. Abd Allah's predecessor was his kinsman,
Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah, son of 'Abd Allah b. Abd Allah. Supported by other disaffected
members of the Al Khalifa and several hundred
tribesmen, they descended upon Bahrain in Djuumâdâ
II 1286/September 1869, overcame 'Alî b. Khalifa,
and slew him. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah then
turned on his allies, imprisoned Muhammad b. Khalifa,
and declared himself ruler. Two months later he and Muhammad b. Khalifa both surren-
dered to a naval force sent by the British Indian
government and were taken as prisoners to India.
There they remained in custody until Muhammad
b. 'Abd Allah's death in 1294/1877, when Muham-
dad b. Khalifa was transferred to Aden. He lived
there for ten years and was then released on con-
dition that he never returned to Bahrain. He died
at Mecca in 1307/1890.
The new ruler of Bahrain was Sâd b. 'Ali, the
21-year-old son of the slain 'Ali b. Khalifa. Consider-
able pressure was exerted upon him by the Ottoman
Turks, after their occupation of al-Hâsâ in 1288/
1872-2, to acknowledge Ottoman suzerainty, and it
was because of this pressure that a convention was
concluded by him with the British government in Mu-
barram 1298/December 1880 by which he undertook
not to enter into relations with any other state or
to allow other governments to establish diplomatic
or consular agencies in Bahrain. He confirmed this
undertaking in a further agreement signed in Shâbân
1309/March 1892 in which he also engaged not to
alienate any of his territory to another power. By
this time, most of the Al Khalifa possessions in Katar
had been lost to Djasîm b. Muhammad Al Thânî of
Dawhâ, who had acknowledged Ottoman suzerainty
in 1288/1871. Zubâra, the principal Al Khalifa pos-
session in Katar, was sacked and destroyed by
Djasîm, in alliance with renegade members of the
Al Khalifa branch of the Al Khalifa, in Dhu
l-'Ka'da 1295/November 1878. Although the town
was not rebuilt, ownership of its site has been disputed by the Al Khalifa and the Al Thânî ever
since.
Sâd b. 'Ali reigned longer than any other Al
Khalifa ruler; for although he formally abdicated in
his great-uncle's. He was constantly embroiled at
home in quarrels with his kinsmen and with his sub-
jects in Katar, who several times rebelled against
his oppressive conduct and repeated fiscal exactions;
whilst abroad he was at feud with the Al Saâd, the
Persians, and the Ottoman Turks, all of whom
claimed sovereignty over Bahrain although only the
Al Saâd attempted to pursue the claim by force
of arms. Muhammad b. Khalifa's struggles with his
kinsmen disrupted the peace of the Gulf, which the British Indian government was at pains to
preserve. His conduct led that government in
Dhu l-'Ka'da 1277/May 1861 to force him to con-
clude a convention by which he forswore piracy,
maritime warfare, and the seaborne slave trade, in
return for British recognition of his independence
and a guarantee of the security of his territorial
possessions against aggression. Six years later,
in Djuumâdâ II 1284/October 1867, he attacked
and sacked Dawhâ and other ports in Katar to
punish some rebellious tribesmen. When called upon
by the British authorities in the Gulf to afford
redress for this breach of the convention, he refused
do so, and as a consequence he was deposed by the
British as ruler of Bahrain in Djuumâdâ I 1285/
September 1868 in favour of his brother 'Ali.
Muhammad b. Khalifa found refuge after his de-
position at Katîf, where he formed an alliance with his
kinsman, Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah, son of 'Abd Allah b. Ahmad. Supported by other disaffected
members of the Al Khalifa and several hundred
tribesmen, they descended upon Bahrain in Djuumâdâ
II 1286/September 1869, overcame 'Alî b. Khalifa,
and slew him. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah then
turned on his allies, imprisoned Muhammad b. Khalifa,
and declared himself ruler. Two months later he and Muhammad b. Khalifa both surren-
dered to a naval force sent by the British Indian
government and were taken as prisoners to India.
There they remained in custody until Muhammad
b. 'Abd Allah's death in 1294/1877, when Muham-
dad b. Khalifa was transferred to Aden. He lived
there for ten years and was then released on con-
dition that he never returned to Bahrain. He died
at Mecca in 1307/1890.
The new ruler of Bahrain was Sâd b. 'Ali, the
21-year-old son of the slain 'Ali b. Khalifa. Consider-
able pressure was exerted upon him by the Ottoman
Turks, after their occupation of al-Hâsâ in 1288/
1872-2, to acknowledge Ottoman suzerainty, and it
was because of this pressure that a convention was
concluded by him with the British government in Mu-
barram 1298/December 1880 by which he undertook
not to enter into relations with any other state or
to allow other governments to establish diplomatic
or consular agencies in Bahrain. He confirmed this
undertaking in a further agreement signed in Shâbân
1309/March 1892 in which he also engaged not to
alienate any of his territory to another power. By
this time, most of the Al Khalifa possessions in Katar
had been lost to Djasîm b. Muhammad Al Thânî of
Dawhâ, who had acknowledged Ottoman suzerainty
in 1288/1871. Zubâra, the principal Al Khalifa pos-
session in Katar, was sacked and destroyed by
Djasîm, in alliance with renegade members of the
Al Khalifa branch of the Al Khalifa, in Dhu
l-'Ka'da 1295/November 1878. Although the town
was not rebuilt, ownership of its site has been disputed by the Al Khalifa and the Al Thânî ever
since.
Sâd b. 'Ali reigned longer than any other Al
Khalifa ruler; for although he formally abdicated in
favour of his son Hamad in 1342/1923, he continued to hold the reins of government almost until his death in Sha'ban 1351/December 1932 at the age of 85. Hamad b. Isa, who had been named heir-apparent by his father with the consent of the principal members of the Al Khalifa as early as 1311/1893, in turn designated his son Salmán heir-apparent in Muharram 1359/Febuary 1940, again with the consent of the leading Al Khalifa members. Two years later, in Safar 1361/February 1942, Hamad died at the age of 76, and Salmán b. Hamad succeeded. He ruled until his death in Dhu 'l-Qa'da 1371/November 1961, aged 67, being succeeded by his eldest son Isa, who had been named heir-apparent some years earlier.

A slight but significant devolution of power, under the pressure of domestic and external events, took place in the latter years of Shaykh Salman’s reign, and the process was accelerated by his successor. An advisory council to assist the ruler was established, individual members having responsibility for different departments of government. The councilors were at first predominantly members of the Al Khalifa, but after the accession of Isa b. Salmán they have become more representative through the addition of members from Bahrayn’s mercantile and professional communities. Isa b. Salmán promulgated a constitution in 1393/1973 which declared Bahrayn to be an Islamic state with the Sha'ifs as the principal source of legislation. It also provided for the setting-up of a national assembly composed of appointed and elected members. The first elections for the 30 elected seats took place in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1393/December 1973.

In external affairs, the principal changes that have occurred have been the renunciation by the Persian government in 1390/1970 of its claim to sovereignty over Bahrayn, and the termination of the Al Khalifa’s treaties with the British government, following Britain’s withdrawal from its special position in the Gulf in 1391/1971.


**Al-Khalifa b. Abi ‘l-Mahasin Al-Halabi,** Arab physician who came originally from Aleppo, and was possibly related to the family of Ibn Abi Usayiba [g.v.]. The biographical details concerning him are fairly sparse, but it is known that he wrote, probably between 654 and 674/1256-75, a work on ophthalmology called al-Kifa fi l-khul (or fi l-fibb). In this he gives a concise sketch of the history of ophthalmology among the Arabs and deals with the anatomy, physiology and hygiene of the eyes, citing the medicaments used for treating eye disorders, and describing also the surgical operations, e.g. for cataract, which can be performed on them. All in all, the work is on a high scientific level, and the text is often accompanied by synoptic pictures and illustrations which throw light on the text itself. Various manuscripts exist, and a German translation has been made by J. Hirschberg and his collaborators.

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, II, 366, S I, 895; Sejrig, GAS, III, index; J. Hirschberg et alii, Die arabischen Augenärzte, Leipzig 1905; ii; G. Sarton, Introduction, ii, 1101. (ed.) **Khalifa b. ‘Askar, Libyan nationalistic leader, who after having sought refuge in Tunisia, hastened from November 1914 onwards to assume leadership of the revolt fomented by the Sanussis [q.v.] against Italian domination. The rebels soon achieved some spectacular successes against the Italians [see Libyia], and Khalifa speedily attempted to raise the Tunisians against France. On 16 August 1915, in a letter to the head of the postal service in Dehibat (southern Tunisia), he called upon the latter to send back to him his family, which had remained in Tunisia, and declared war on the French government. Benefiting from a certain amount of complicity in his plans by the notables of southern Tunisia, he went on to the attack in September of the same year with Tripolitanian troops aided by some tribal elements of Tunisia. These fellaga [see Fallak] at the outset constituted a grave threat for the small outposts strung all along the frontier, and these had to be evacuated, and then they inflicted severe losses on the Franco-Tunisian garrisons of the Dehibat, Tatahouine and Remta outposts, without however managing to occupy them. On 2 October, at the head of 3,000 rebels, Khalifa suffered a severe defeat before Umm Swjih, which led to a period of calm for some months along the Tunisian frontier, but the situation became threatening again in the following spring. Armed now with some field artillery, Khalifa returned to the attack, bombarded Dehibat on 19 June 1916 and then inflicted heavy losses on the Remda garrison; but he was again defeated on 28 June and did not engage in activity with such ardour during the last two years of the Great War. After the Armistice, the Tunisian rebels benefited by munificence of clemency, and Khalifa b. ‘Askar was even able to be reunited with his family, who had been kept as hostages.

**Bibliography:** See that to Libyia and to Tunisia. (ed.) **Khalifa b. Khayyat [see Ibn Khayyat al-Turjumani].**

**Khalifa Shāh Muhammad, Indian Muslim scholar who flourished during the latter part of the 11th/17th and early part of the 12th/18th century. He was the author of an epistolary work in Persian entitled Diāmi‘ al-kawdnin, also known as Inšā‘ al-Khulafa. According to Ghulam ‘Ali Kathārī and Sayyid Khayyār Allāh (d. 1115/1703). The Diāmi‘ al-kawdnin is divided into four sections: the first two contain long and short letters respectively, the third (divided into two parts) comprises letters of greetings and condolence, and the last gives forms of civilities and styles of addressing in correspondence. The book, as mentioned in the preface, was composed at the incentive of some friends while the author was residing in Kanawjī as a student. The original printed edition of the work (Lucknow 1846) carries a chronogram which gives 1085/1674 as the date of composition.

**Bibliography:** Diāmi‘ al-kawdnin, B. M. Add. 19,434; Ghulām ‘Allāh Khān Azād Bilgrāmī, Mā‘ādir al-kirām, B. M. Or. 1804; cf. Rieu, Catalogue of Persian manuscripts in the British Museum, i, 414. (Munibur Rahman) **Al-Khalīl.** [see Shām.]

**Al-Khalīl.** The Arabic name for Hebron, a town in southern Palestine, 32 km. south of Jerusalem.
lem (31° N 34° E), the only urban centre in the southern Judaean hills and their virtual capital and commercial centre. It has given its name to the entire mountainous region surrounding it, which is known as Diabal al-Khalil, while the whole plateau is known by the name of Diabal Kays, due to the local tradition which regards the fellahin of the area as of Kaysi origin (cf. Volney, *Voyage, Paris* 1787, ii. 104-5, 197). Hence in the Bedouin dialects of southern Palestine this means a peasant, particularly of the Hebron hills.

In mediaeval times Mukaddasî, 172, mentions Diabal Naḍra (or Naṣra, Naṣra) as the nearest hills to the town. Since the reading is uncertain (*EI* art. al-KHALLIL), it is possible that Naṣra represents a copyist's mistake for nimra (Mamre (?); cf. Arculfus, *Early travels*, 6), the north-westernmost spur of Diabal al-Dja'ābira, which dominates the city from the north-east. The town is the highest in Palestine, and one of the highest in the Middle East, ascending on the surrounding hills to altitudes between 925 m. (the old city) and 1,000 m. (the modern parts built in the present century) above sea level. It is situated in the northern reaches of Wâdi al-Khalil which is a tributary of the Wâdi Beersheba. Its extremely fertile soil and the fair amounts of rainfall, especially in the northern parts of the area (average of 700-850 mm. a year), along with the skill the inhabitants have acquired in preserving water and utilising the soil, have made this area into one of the most flourishing in the country.

Because of the mountainous nature of the area and its climate, it developed the cultivation of certain fruit trees, particularly apples and grapes, which, according to Mukaddasî loc. cit., used to be exported mainly to Egypt. The Hebronites developed, in particular, the cultivation of vines, and throughout the ages they were regarded as the best viticulturists in the Middle East (Karmôn, in *Studies on Palestine*, etc., 71-3). They learnt how to prolong the grape season for about six months a year, between July and December, a fact which proved to be of great economic importance. After the Islamic conquest, many vineyards in the lowlands of Palestine had to be abandoned in the wake of the prohibition and decline of wine production and consumption. Hebron then turned its supply of fresh grapes into its main cash-crop.

In addition to this agricultural advantage, Hebron had yet another advantage arising from its topographical setting. It lies astride natural crossroads which lead to the Negev and the coast in the south and south-west to the southern end of the Dead Sea and the main ancient Syrian-Arabian caravan route. Hebron thus offers an alternative to the Via Maris, sc. the mountain route which cuts from Baysan through Nablûs and Jerusalem. In the later Middle Ages and until modern times, travellers from Egypt often preferred the Hebron route to the Via Maris which could be more easily attacked by Bedouins.

**Topography.** The ancient town of Hebron (Kiryât Arbaʿ (?) see below) was built to the west of Wâdi al-Khalil or the Valley of Hebron, which runs along the modern town in the north-east direction, on Diabal Romanûa, on which a tomb called Kaibrâbun is shown today next to Mashtaghe Arbaʿ 'in (called today by the name of Dajbat al-Kayfûn), a Muslim sanctuary which in Jewish tradition has been identified with the tomb of Jesse. The Arab town developed on the eastern side of the Vale around the sanctuary of the Tomb of the Patriarchs; until the Crusading period, to the north of it Nâṣir-i Khursaw, 55-4, *Le Serant Palestine*, 312, and during the Mamlûk period in other directions also, mainly in the south and south-east. Until the beginning of the 19th century, therefore, the town consisted of three sections. The oldest, on the easternmost spur of Diabal al-Dja'âbira (called al-Ra's), adjacent to the Haram; a smaller section around the Mosque of 'All al-Bâkka (the north-west of it on another spur called Djibal Bayûn; and a third section, larger than the previous two, called Hârat al-Kayfûn, to the south of the valley. This division of the town into three sections was possibly the factor which prevented the construction of an encompassing wall (cf. Arculfus, *op. cit.*). Each section was partially protected by means of building the houses along the periphery in a continuous line with no doors facing outwards.

Water supply was the main problem of the town. In the pre-Ottoman period, the Muslim sources mention a few springs from which water used to be brought to the town by means of aqueducts. Nâṣir-i Khursaw, *loc. cit.*, cf. Le Strange, *loc. cit.*, mentions a channel conducting water "in no great abundance" from a spring in a nearby village to the town. This must have been the same channel which is later mentioned by Mudjîr al-Dîn loc. cit., conducting water from the village of Maṣjîd Fâsîl to a water tank near the northern entrance to the Haram, which was rebuilt by the Mamlûk amir Bakhtâmûr al-Djûkandâr. In the *szâriya* of Shaykh 'All al-Bâkka, a water tank and a sâbil for a well that was found in the place, were built by Sâyî al-Dîn b. Sâlâr, the Mamlûk Nâbîb al-Sûlûnî in Syria, in 702/1300. Mudjîr al-Dîn mentions a number of six springs that supplied water to the town (al-Uns al-djâjîlî, 428). However, the quantity of water supplied by all these springs was meagre and could hardly have supported the population of the city. Since during the later Middle Ages and the Ottoman period, large numbers of pilgrims came to the city and passed through it on the Hadîjî route to Mecca, the need for greater reserves of water necessitated the construction of two large reservoirs in the Hebron valley. The date of their construction is unknown, but in the Ottoman period and most probably during the time of Sûleymân Kanûnî they were rebuilt and enlarged. One was called Birkaṭ al-Kâzâzân (today filled up, and a mosque built in its place), and the other Birkaṭ al-Sûlûnî, a name given to several cisterns built by the Ottomans along the Hadîjî route, including Solomon's Pools, the large reservoirs in Kurmul (Biblical Carmel) and 'Ein Gêdî. This further attests to the prominence of Hebron as an important station on the Ottoman (and possibly Mamlûk) Hadîjî route from Jerusalem to the main Syrian route in Trans-Jordan through southern Judaea and the Dead Sea region (Karmôn, 74-6).

**The name.** The ancient Biblical name of Hebron, Kîryût Arbaʿ, is not mentioned in the Arab sources, which are very well-informed about the original name of the town and which they repeat in many versions: Habrûn, Hafîrûn, Hibra (or Habra), Bayt Habrûn, (Mukaddasî, 172; Yâkût, s.v. al-Khalil, Dimashkî, 201; Kâl���sînî, Subh, i, 335; iv, 102; Arûd Habrûn (Ibn 'Iyâs, Nağî al-Ashârî ed. Arnold, *Chrest Arab.*, 60), Mazraʿ at Habrûn (Muţahhar b. Tâhir al-Mâkdîsî, *al- Bad' wa l- tabîkî* ed. Huart), iii, 53). However, the number of four settlements hinted by the ancient Hebrew name (Arbaʿ, cf. B. Mazar, *Kîryût Arbaʿ* in *Sefer Hevron* [in Hebrew], 20 f.) could have some reference to four localities in the
city and its environments mentioned in the Islamic literature: Ḥabrūn, Martym, Bayt ʿAyūn (= Khirbet Beit Einūn; its identification with Aenon of St. John, iii, 23 is very doubtful, cf. EI, art. al-KHALIL), and Bayt Ibrāhīm. According to a famous legend which appears as early as the 2nd/ 8th century, the Prophet bestowed the different quarters of Hebron on his companion, the oil merchant Tamīm b. Aws al-Dārī (Muṣṭir al-Dīn, 428-9). In the early literature, however, there is mention of only two or three localities. Ibn Saʿd mentions Hibra and Bayt ʿAyūn (Ṭabakat, ed. Sachau, i/2, 75; vi/2, 129-30; cf. Bākrit, Muṣṭir, ii, 420; Ibn Durayd, Iyīkhāb, ed. Hārūn, Cairo 1958, 377), and Balādḥurī adds to them Masǧīd Ibrāhīm (Futūk, 129; cf. Kalkashandi, i, 335). The name Martum, which has always existed as well in this or similar form appears in later literature, and it was mistaken by Naṣīr-i Khusrāw as the name of the whole town (though in the corrupted spelling Maṭlūn, Sāfar-nāma, 53, cf. Le Strange 310 and note; Kalkashandi, xii, 120 has al-Ruṭūm).

The Muslims extended the name which they gave to the sanctuary, Masǧīd Ibrāhīm al-Khalīl, to the whole town, in the same way that Bayt al-Makdis was extended to the whole of Jerusalem. In both cases, the new name is connected with the sacredness of the respective shrines in Islamic tradition (see al-Kuds). The prominence of Abraham in Islamic literature, and the strong mention of the bestowal of the name of Abraham, who was also called “Haver” (Mīrāzkh Rabbā, on Genesis, section 84; Babylonian Talmud, Menākhōth, 33b). The deep Islamic significance of the attribute al-Khalīl was, however, further stressed in the Islamic tradition which says that Muḥammad was also named Khallī Allāh (Muṣṭir, Saḥīh, masāqīd, no. 23, cf. LA, kh-1-i).

Islamic Significance. The Islamic sanctification of Hebron came in two phases, parallel to and following that of Jerusalem. Whereas at least the name of Jerusalem was known to the Muslims from the time of Muḥammad, they did not know anything about Hebron. In the earliest reports about the conquest of Syria, unlike the case of Jerusalem, its conquest is passed over with no special remark. The sources only mention the legend of the bestowal of the place on Tamīm al-Dārī and his descendants by the Prophet, a fact which was of importance to the beneficiaries alone. They later tried to confirm their claims by presenting a letter from the Prophet to Nuʿaym b. Aws al-Dārī attesting it. Although the Arabic sources mention such a document (kiyāb), there is no doubt that it is a forgery (EI, art. al-KHALIL; Balādḥurī, loc. cit.; Muṣṭir al-Dīn, 428-9; Kalkashandi, i, 335; cf. Caetani, Annali dell’ Islam, iii/1, 298, 9 Al., § 69). However, the tradition about this kiyyāb is very early, and the rights of the Dāris have been recognised down the ages. At least one abortive attempt was made on the part of the government to abolish them on the ground that the Prophet could not have granted land which he had not possessed (Muṣṭir al-Dīn, loc. cit.).

For lack of any detailed early Islamic traditions, we must assume from the mention in Balādḥurī of the name of Masǧīd Ibrāhīm that the first phase of the Islamic sanctification of the city was connected solely with the memory of this Patriarch. Similarly, the early traditions about Jerusalem made it holy because of the Biblical episodes and figures which were related to it, (Abraham’s sacrifice, the Ark of Moses, Solomon’s Temple, etc.). The fact that active worship of the tomb of Abraham was conducted by Jews in Hebron during the Byzantine period, as attested by the 5th century Greek author Sozomenus, puts this assumption on firmer ground. The close and friendly relations, immediately after the conquest of Syria, between the local Jews in Palestine, who were quite numerous in the Hebron area, and the Muslims, may explain this. It also elucidates the Frankish account, according to which the Jews showed the Arabs the entrance to the sanctuary which had been walled up by the Byzantines, and in return they were allowed to live in peace in the town and build a Synagogue next to the Sanctuary (RHC, Hist. occ. v, 309 f.).

The report of Muṣṭir al-Dīn, that the Dāwulīyya mosque, adjacent to the mosque from the north-east, was built over an ancient Jewish cemetery, attests the historical element in this account.

The second phase of the Islamisation of al-Khalīl came about when the city was connected directly by the person of Muḥammad once again according to the same method applied to Jerusalem. The older Biblical traditions were no longer sufficient for an Islam to that had to confront both Christianity and Judaism; the Islamised holy places had to be connected to the founder of the faith. The isrāʾ and the miʿrāj were therefore connected at the beginning of the 2nd/8th centuries with Jerusalem and later with many other places in Syria which had to have a proper Islamic sanctity. Early traditions speak about the isrāʾ only from Mecca to Jerusalem (cf. Buḫārī, Sahīh, al-Muṣṭir, and al-Miʿrāj). Later on, probably towards the second half of the century, traditions appeared saying that the Prophet was ordered, during the isrāʾ, to descend and pray on Mount Sinai, in Hebron and in Bethlehem before finally reaching Jerusalem (Tadmuri, Muṣṭir al-gharām, 132). Local traditions developed very rapidly connecting the sanctity of Jerusalem with that of al-Khalīl, enhanced no doubt by the interest in establishing the Islamic holiness of Palestine vis-à-vis Christianity and in attracting pilgrims and settlers to it. The Cave of the Patriarchs was made the Tomb of Adam as well, his head lying in Jerusalem and his feet in Hebron (Tadmuri, 178 f.; cf. Muṣkaddasī, 46; Arculfus, loc. cit.). When Abraham died, Allāh said to Hebron, antī ʿabdī wa-baytī makdiṣ, and promised that it would be the scene of the resurrection (Amos, BM, MS. or. 1510, fol. 54b-55a). Local, popular Islam found a real object of veneration in the tombs of the Saints. Jerusalem had none, but Hebron had plenty of them. In addition to Adam, the Patriarchs and their wives, the tomb of Joseph was also discovered just outside the southwestern wall of the sanctuary and a dome was built over it (in the time of the Abūṣāid al-Muṣṭarīd, Tadmuri, 186-91), and some forty obscure martyrs were also found to be buried on the Dāwulīyya, the tomb of which also became a pilgrimage site (Muṣṭir al-Dīn, 427). In the post-Crusader period, Jerusalem and Hebron were called al-Haramayn al-Sharifayn, a
term which, until then, was reserved for Mecca and Medina. During the Mamluk period, control of the Haram was transferred to the Mamluks and their extensive endowments, was entrusted to one functionary, either a Mamluk amir of a local dignitary, who bore the title Nâṣir al-Haramayn al-Sharafsayn (Saḥalwī, al-Dawūd al-lāmī, iii, 208, 218, IV, 13, 134, VII, 32, and passim; Mūḍir al-Dīn, passim, all through the description of the Mamluk period e.g. 440-5, 623, 632, etc.; on an inscription: M. Van Berchem, C. A. ii, No. 201), which grew up around the visiting of the Tombs of the Patriarchs which were similar to those practices at the visit of the Prophet’s Tomb in Medina, and traditions appeared to legalise them. “He who cannot visit me”, the Prophet was made to say, “let him visit the Tomb of Abraham... The prayer next to it is the Ḥadīth of the poor...”, “He who visits the tomb of Abraham, Allāh abolishes his sins”, etc. On the attachment of the sanctity of Hebron to that of Mecca and Medina see Khiṣârīzmī, MS. BM Or. 4584, fol. 22b (Kister) (Tadmuri, 193-6; Sibt b. al-Djawzī, Mirrât al-samānī, ed. Jewett, 305; Kister in Le Muséon lxxxii (1969), 193). Al-Khālīl thus developed in popular Islam as a real substitute for Medina in the same way that Jerusalem was supposed to be a minor sacred city.

For the visitors to al-Khālīl, the tombs also had a practical meaning. An atmosphere of miracles and mysticism grew up around those tombs. This found expression in popular legends concerning the cave, in which the Patriarchs were supposed to rest, and in which the requests of the believers were promptly fulfilled (e.g. Tadmuri, 139). This atmosphere, the status of the city and the pilgrimage to it, were all supported and stimulated by the practice peculiar to this popular veneration of both sanctuaries and their localities. The whole atmosphere, the ceremonies and practices centred around it, all gave rise to a most unobjectionable reaction amongst the strict Islamic orthodoxy. Most of the popular ceremonies which developed around the Tomb, including the Simā‘, were regarded as bid‘āt. Early traditions denounced the use of tombs as mosques, (“May Allah curse the Jews and Christians, they turned the tombs of their prophets into mosques”, Muslim, Ṣāḥīh, masâ‘īdī, nos. 16-22). However, the fact that there is a hadīth which says that Muḥammad is Allāh’s friend (Khālīl) exactly like Abraham and continues to forbid the usage of tombs as mosques (ibid., no. 23), which is a simple amalgamation of two traditions, shows that the debate around the status of the al-Khālīl shrine was an early one. The only tomb that Islam has sanctified for the purpose of prayer and pilgrimage is the Prophet’s tomb. The above combination of traditions puts Abraham and Muḥammad on the same level in an attempt to give the former’s tomb the same status as the latter’s. Orthodoxy has never accepted the solution hinted at here. While Mūkaddasī, loc. cit., only raised objections to partaking in the free meals of the Simā‘, in the post-Crusader period, with the wave of Islamic veneration of Jerusalem and Hebron, scholars representing strict orthodoxy like Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Kayyim al-Dawawiyya (Ibn Ḥādījār, al-Durar al-kāmina, ii, 40) raised objections to this popular veneration of both sanctuaries and cast doubt even on the authenticity of the locality of al-Khālīl’s tomb. The Maghrībī theologian Ibn al-Hādījī al-‘Abdārī (died 737/1336) ruled against entering the sanctuary on the grounds that the exact location of the graves is unknown, and that the present tombs were built by the Franks, who also opened a door in the sanctuary wall. The pious Muslim should heed therefore the previous generations and visit the place only from outside (al-Madkhal, Beirut 1972, iv, 258). He was particularly angry about the musicians of al-Khālīl who used to play trumpets; drums and other instruments after the afternoon prayer (naubah al-‘ālī), and brought people to dance and be amused, all of which he regarded as a grave sin (shāhī ‘wa-munkhār) (Kister, op. cit., 195). He also objected to the use of bread and lentils called diyāfāt al-Khālīl which he regarded as a desecration of Abraham’s memory, for he used to offer his guests meat and not lentils (ibid., 259).
On the other hand, there were ‘ulamā’ who argued in favour of the place. Tadmuri and Muḏjir al-Dīn devote long discussions to proving the authenticity of the tombs by reporting stories about people who went into the cave and actually saw the bones or even the intact bodies of the Patriarchs (Tadmuri, 183-4, 188-9). Prominent authorities are quoted calling the place haram and musjid to prove that it is not a cemetery and that the prayers and the other ceremonies in it are legal (Muḏjir al-Dīn, 55).

In the long run, the advocates of al-Khaylī were those who triumphed. Both the Mamlūk and Ottoman governments showed considerable interest in the town, in which popular Sūfī activity came to be combined with learning. Muḏjir al-Dīn, 425-7, lists 32 sūfīyyas, mosques and musqāfīyyas, in addition to the Mas̱jīd al-Ṭārifīn (mentioned above) and the mosque of Shaykh ʿAll al-Bakkāʾ (died 670/1272, Makrīzī, op. cit., 1, 604) and two masjūdās, al-Madrasa al-Fakhriyya and al-Madrasa al-Kaymaṣīyya. This was confirmed by the Maghribī traveller al-Balawī, fols. 62b-63a, who regards al-Khaylī as a place of Islamic scholarship.

History. Historical information about al-Khaylī in the Arabic literature is very sparse, since the city, like the rest of Palestine, was never the centre of any important political events during the Crusader period. Sporadic traditions concerning its sanctuary already appear in the 2nd/8th century, but it was only at the end of the 9th/15th that, probably for the first time, a more comprehensive work appeared, compiled by the kāfī Muḏjir al-Dīn. It seems that he was the first to collect and classify the material then available about it. With the exception of the legend about Tamlīm al-Dīn (see above), the sources are silent about the town. Nothing is said even about its conquest. A Frankish source, which could by no means be considered as reliable, reports that the Byzantines walled the entrance to the sepulchral cave before leaving the town and that the Arab invaders were shown the place by the Jews (for the implications of this, see above).

The history of al-Khaylī revolves around two main poles, its sanctuary and its topographical situation, and also its proximity to the desert and its important traffic route.

Until the time of Muḏjir al-Dīn, the sources concentrate on the sanctuary with a few references to the agricultural products of the locality. The first information is, however, no earlier than the 4th/10th century (Iṣṭāqīrī and Ibn Hawkal, loc. cit.). From the more detailed information of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh Mukhlīs it appears that the Muslims changed nothing inside the sanctuary nor in the traditionally-accepted arrangement of the tombs: Isaac and Rebecca inside the covered (Byzantine Basilican) mosque in the south-east, Abraham and Sara at the entrance and Jacob and Leah on the other (north-western) side of the open court. This arrangement was established at least at the end of the 3rd century A.D., if not earlier (Brašlāvī, in Senfr Hebron, 288). According to Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh Mukhlīs, the tombs were built in the Islamic period (but Muḏjir al-Dīn ascribes the work to the Umayyads). According to Nāṣir-i Khursaw (438/1047), who gives a minute description of the Haram, one of the Fāṭimid caliphams ordered that a gate be opened in the north-eastern wall of the Sanctuary enclosure. He also relates, and this was most probably repeated later by ʿAbd Allāh, that until then the interior of the building was inaccessible for visitors (op. cit., 238; cf. Le Strange, 315). The place was highly venerated by the Fāṭimid and other rulers who sent many expensive gifts, and Muslims from many other countries sent their dead to be buried there (ibid., cf. Muḥammad, 173, note d).

In 425/1033, the Haram suffered from the heavy earthquake which destroyed large parts of Ramla and Nābulus (Muḏjir al-Dīn, 269-70). It underwent extensive alterations under the Crusaders, who occupied Hebron in 1099 and converted the mosque into a church, supplying it with a sloping roof (the present building, cf. Le Strang, 311, notes). They called Hebron Saint Abraham, and Godfrey of Bouillon bestowed it in 1100 as a seigneurie on Gerard d’Avesnes (d. 1102). He was followed by Hugo de Rebèque, Rohardus (Rorgius), Galtérie Mahomet and Baldwin. In Baldwin’s time (1119-20), the sepulchral cave was discovered by Christian monks, a detailed account of which was preserved in a Frankish chronicle (see EI art.) and mentioned by ʿAll al-Harawi and later Arabic chroniclers (cf. Le Strange, 318). It seems that Baldwin and his successors were the governors of Hebron, first under the king of Jerusalem and later, from about 1155, under the lord of Karak. In 1168 Hebron was made a bishopric, and the Crusader convent of ʿElī Gédi was subordinate to it (EI art.; E. Rey, Les colonies franques de Syrie aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles, 1883, 384; cf. G. A. Smith, Historical Geography, 185).

ʿAll al-Harawi, who visited Hebron in 567/1171-2, relates how he met a knight who had entered the cave, and gives details about the restoration of the place at the order of King Baldwin II (Le Strange, 316-18). It was then that the ancient flat roof of the covered mosque was replaced by a system of arches and a sloping roof (Vincent, Hebron, 166).

Hebron was captured by Ṣālāb al-Dīn, according to most sources, after the conquest of Ascalon (Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, Beirut 1966, 360-1; Makrīzī (op. cit., i/1, 95) puts it in the same year but before the conquest of Ascalon (583/1187). According to Muḏjir al-Dīn (56), the wooden minbar which had been built by Badr al-Dīn al-Dīrī (cf. supra) by order of the caliph al-Mustansir in 484/1092 (for the inscription on the minbar see, M. Van Berchem, in Festschrift Edvard Sachau, Berlin 1915, 500-1; Vincent, Hebron, 222, fig. 85, cf. ʿAbd Allāh Mukhlīs, in BIFAG, xxv, 57; Jaussen, KB (1953), 579; RCEA vii, n° 2790).

After the death of Ṣālāb al-Dīn, Hebron passed into the domains of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Dāwūd of Karak, who was supported by his father al-Muʿazzam ʿĪsa. After the death of the latter in 624/1227, his domains were claimed by his uncle al-Malik al-Kāmil of Egypt. The crisis that ensued threatened to engulf all the Ayyūbīd princes in war. At the end of that year, however, a treaty was signed redressing the Ayyūbīd territories, and according to this treaty, hebron, together with large parts of southern Palestine, were given to Egypt (Makrīzī, Sulāb, i/2, 235). Later it came once again under the rule of al-Nāṣir Dāwūd until 642/1244. In this year, during yet another war amongst the Ayyūbīds, southern Palestine fell into the hands of al-Ṣālīb Ayyūbī of Egypt, who sent many expensive gifts to the Muslims. Shortly afterwards, the Khwarazmians changed sides, joining Dāwūd, and Hebron was again returned to him (ibid., 318-22); and in 658/1260,
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When Mamluk rule was established in Egypt and Syria, securing the country from external danger for over 250 years, the sanctuaries of both Jerusalem and Hebron were given particular attention by the central government as well as by the local governors. Hebron came under the jurisdiction of the governor (nâbiḥ) of Jerusalem and its waqfs and other endowments were supervised by a special functionary (Nâṣir al-Ḥārâm). In one case, however, a special nâbiḥ is mentioned for Hebron (Makrīzī, op. cit., 699; cf. Khalqashandī, iv, 199). In 666/1266 Baybars visited Hebron and issued an order banning the Christians and Jews from entering the sanctuary. Until then they could enter the place in return for certain payments (Makrīzī, op. cit., 544). This ban continued in force until Israel occupied Hebron in 1967. In 666/1266 he allocated large sums and rich endowments for the Haram and its attendants and ordered extensive repairs to be carried out there, despatching the amir Djamal al-Dīn b. Nahār to inspect the works (Ndīr al-Haramayn al-Sharif ay n).

In al-Mansūrī after him, and a year later, he dedicated repairs to be carried out there, despatching the amir Djamal al-Dīn b. Nahār to inspect the works (Ndīr al-Haramayn al-Sharif ay n). He also ordered that the free meal, the diyafa of al-Khās, should be distributed from the sanctuary (Makrīzī, op. cit., 565). Kalâwûn built in 679/1280-1 a riḥâb opposite the citadel and adjacent to the Haram, which was called al-Riḥâb al-Manṣūrī after him, and a year later, he dedicated the Bismârristân al-Manṣūrī (Mudīr al-Dīn, 426). The ever-growing number of pilgrims that came to Hebron or passed through it on the way to Mecca necessitated the building of a large water reservoir.

Orders were given in 682/1283 that the poll-tax of the dhimmis of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Bayt Dālā and Hebron should be dedicated for this purpose; the construction was entrusted to the hands of the amir 'Alā' al-Dīn Ayydughī al-Ruknī (Ibn al-Furat, 739/1339, vii, 259; Makrīzī, op. cit., 712). In 713/1313 another water project was completed when the amir Abī Sūrūgī al-Ruknī (Ibn al-Furat, 745/1344-5) dedicated an aqueduct that conducted water to Ayn al-Tawāshī at the northern entrance to the Haram. The same amir built between 718/1318 and 720/1320 from his private funds the Djawulliyya mosque adjacent to the north-eastern wall of the sanctuary. Next to the Djawulliyya were the kitchens, the mills and storage places of the Simâ' (cf. Balawi, loc. cit.; Ibn Hāḍjar, al-Durar al-kāmina, ii, 117; Makrīzī, op. cit., ii, 231, 674; Mudīr al-Dīn, 58, 131). The walls of the covered mosque (al-mushâṭâ) were overlaid with marble by the amir Tankiz, the viceroy (nâbiḥ al-salānâ) of Syria, in 732/1332 (ibid., 55, 57). The citadel (kaftā) of the town was rebuilt and dedicated by al-Nâṣir Hasan (748/1347-51, 755/1254-61) (ibid., 426). In 796/1394, during the reign of Barkūk, the mikrâb of the Mālikyya to the right of the entrance to the covered mosque and the arcade along its western wall (the "Women's Mosque") were built by Shihâb al-Dīn al-Yaghmûrī (ibid., 57-8). Barkûk himself directed the village of Dāyr Istiya in the vicinity of Nâbulus solely for the expenses of the Simâ' (ibid., 440). Additional endowments for the Haram were ordered by al-Āṣīraf Īnâl (850/1444) and al-Zāhir Khushkadam, who also renewed the marble covering the walls of the Djawulliyya (867/1462). Khâlīl Bāy showed great interest too in the sanctuaries of Hebron and Jerusalem, and used to inspect them in person (Sakhāwī, Dāwa, vi, 205; Mudīr al-Dīn, 647; Ibn Iyâs, iii, 108). To this period belong three detailed descriptions of the Haram, that of Abu 'l-Fīdā' Ishāb al-Khalīlī (752/1352), copied by Suyûṭī and Mudīr al-Dīn; cf. Ibn Baṭṭûta, who visited al-Khalīl in 626/1232; and of Balawī, who arrived there in 732/1332. While the latter spoke sceptically about the location of the tombs, Ibn Baṭṭûta defended the traditional sites (Balawī, loc. cit.; Ibn Baṭṭûta, 32; cf. Le Strange, 319-20).

The proximity of Hebron to the desert put it and its environs in constant danger from the Bedouins. The roads leading southwards from the town came almost constantly under attack and travellers could rarely pass along them in safety. The Bedouins in Syria and Palestine preserved the old division into Kays and Yaman, which also divided the fellahin [see KAYS and YAMAN. In the Ottoman period]. The two factions were in constant strife; and from time to time the nomads used to attack the sedentary areas. The Mamlûks could not keep the Bedouins in check all the time, and their military expeditions against them were at best only a temporary remedy (cf. Sharon, The political role of the Bedouins in Palestine, in Studies on Palestine, ed. M. Ma'oz, Jerusalem 1975, 11-17. On a large Bedouin eruption in 750/1349, see Makrīzī, op. cit., ii, 790). Sometimes the Bedouins were invited to participate in the local rivalries, as happened with a quarrel between the Dāris and the Kurds when each side invited the Bedouins to help him and the town was almost destroyed (Mudīr al-Dīn, 632-3).

The Ottomans occupied Hebron in 921/1517 and made it the administrative centre of a nahiyya in the sandjak of Jerusalem (Ibn al-Furat, op. cit., 86 n. 1). Its Muslim inhabitants were exempted from government taxes (ibid., 71-2) and like the Mamlûks, the Ottoman sultans regarded the repair and the maintenance of the sanctuaries in it and in Jerusalem, as well as elsewhere in the country, as a major obligation. Large numbers of pilgrims from all over the empire and from other countries visited them and had to be protected and provided for. Fomenting outbreaks were issued from Istanbul concerning the proper management, repairs and upkeep of the holy places, and in case of want of funds, additional new lands were endowed as waqf and skilled workers sent from Damascus for repairs to the Harāms (ibid., 15). A document from 959/1552 reports that the domes over the tombs of Patriarchs, which had not been repaired since the time of the Circassian Mamlûks, had fallen to pieces, and orders are issued for their repairs (ibid., 155). From another unique document of the Mühimme defterleri dated 991/1583, it appears that the wardens of the Harām (tirbeddr) and its doorkeepers were traditionally eunuchs, so as not to disturb the women's tranquility of mind when they came to pray there (ibid., 157-8).

In 979/1571, an additional source of income was added to Hebron when saltpetre was discovered in its vicinity, and an extensive gunpowder industry was developed there for the Ottoman army (ibid., 129, 137-8). Large quantities of this gunpowder, as well as large quantities of arms, some of which were directly smuggled from the army arsenals in Istanbul, reached the Bedouins and other rebels in the country. Hebron continued to suffer even more intensely from both the Bedouins and the continuous warfare between the Kays and Yaman factions. The Ottomans tried in many ways to keep the Bedouins in check, in particular to safeguard the pilgrimage roads. These measures
included building fortresses along the roads, taking hostages from the tribes and nominating 40 timār holders, who were exempted from participating in the wars of the empire, but all this was to no avail. Hebron and its vicinity were at the mercy of the Bedouins until modern times. The towns and travellers to and from them had to pay special taxes to the Bedouins (ziyād), in order to gain some degree of safety. The mountain villages around the town relied for their defence on their own strength (ibn ṭārīq), and were hence less affected during the Napoleonic wars when the coastal towns were almost completely destroyed, Hebron flourished as one of the most important commercial centres in Palestine with the caravans from Egypt preferring the more southerly route through Sinai and Beer Sheba to Hebron and Jerusalem over the insecure coastal one. Glass manufacture also developed rapidly in the town, and the mountainous areas which opposed the Egyptians suffered. Hebron took an active part in the revolt of 1834. It was besieged by the Egyptians, its citadel destroyed by cannon fire, and it was occupied and sacked. Additional destruction was caused by earthquake that affected Palestine in 1837. Towards the end of Egyptian rule in 1840, a rebel from Dūrā near Hebron, ‘Abd al-Haqq al-Madīnī, a major Egyptian governor of the town, proclaimed the Ottoman sultan and made himself the governor. He terrorized Hebron, especially the Jews and Christians in the town, from whom he used to extort heavy taxes. In 1846 the Ottomans, in pursuit of him, destroyed parts of Hebron with gunfire and the soldiers looted it. The rebel was not caught and he continued to infest the area for many years to come, as we learn from the detailed reports of James Finn, the British consul in Jerusalem and the only source of help to the Jewish community during the 1850s (A. M. Haymson, The British Consulate in Jerusalem, London 1939, 1, 168-9, 171-2, 198 ff.).

The improvement of security in the country during the second half of the century, with the growth of the European Powers' interest in it after the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, brought recovery to Hebron. Its population grew from 8,000-10,000 in the 1870s to about 14,000 at the close of the century. This trend continued after the British conquest of 1917 and the establishment of the British mandate, when Hebron was made the capital of a subdivision in the Southern District (1922). It also became an important political centre, and its leaders have been fanatical opponents of the Jewish settlement in Palestine. During the riots of 1929, influenced by the Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin al-Husayni and by local agitators, the mob attacked the Jewish quarter and slaughtered 63 Jews. The rest of the community fled from the town. An attempt to renew the Jewish community in Hebron a few years later was cut short during the riots of 1936. After the war of 1948, Hebron came under the rule of Jordan, until in 1967 it was occupied by Israel during the Six Day's war. Until 1976 it was led by the ancient and powerful Diābārī family. Its population is over 38,000. During the present century, a large number of Hebronites have emigrated to Jerusalem, where they occupy a very prominent position in the commercial life there.


KHALIL ALLAH

KHALIL ALLAH (Šaḥ), d. 866/1460, the son of Shāh Niʿmat Allāh Kirmānī (730-834/1329-1431), "a great saint and mystic as well as a poet." Hearing the fame of Niʿmat Allāh's great piety and learning, the Bahmaní ruler Shāh Bihār al-Dīn Aḥmad I (825-39/1422-34) invited him to Muḥammad bāb-Bidār, his capital. The saint declined the invitation, but sent one of his disciples. The Sultān repeated the invitation with the request to send one of his sons, if he could not himself come. Niʿmat Allāh replied that, since he had only one son, named Khālīl Allāh, with whom he did not wish to part, he was sending the latter's son, Nūr Allāh, instead. However, after his father's death, Khālīl Allāh emigrated to the Deccan with his family and many of the followers. Aḥmad I received him with honour, and gave his daughter in marriage to the saint's elder son, Hābīb Allāh, and his grandson of the Jewish settlement in the Deccan, Mūḥibb Allāh. In addition, he accepted Khālīl Allāh as his pir and conferred on him the title of Malik al-Maṣlahī, thus
giving up his allegiance to the descendants of the famous saint of Gulbarga, Sayyid Muhammad Ghusul Daraz (721/1321-1422). Under the influence of Khalll Allah and his sons, who were Shi'i, not only Ahmad I became a Sh'ite, but Shi'i forces were strengthened in the Deccan.

Khalll Allah continued to be revered by Ahmad's son and successor, 'Alla? al-Din Ahmad II (830-62/1427-58) who also regarded him as his pir, and, on the occasion of his coronation ceremony, seated him on his right. Khalll Allah was not a poet or mystic like his father; he was a pious man, given to prayer and meditation, and, unlike his elder son, Habib Allah, kept aloof from war and politics. He was succeeded by his younger son, Muhibb Allah, as his sadidjada-nasih (spiritual successor). Over his grave a beautiful tomb was erected by Ahmad II. Another building called Takht-i Kirmâni, because it contained the takht or throne on which Khalll Allah used to sit, was also constructed in his memory during this period.


(Mohibbul Hasan)

AL-KHALIL B. AHMAD B. 'AMR B. TAMIM AL-FARAHIDI (AL-FURHUDI; see W. Caskel, Gamharat lichen arabischen Falkner literatur, Graz 1936; Muhammad Kasim HindiirShah, al-Layth b. al-Muzaffar al-Djumal fi 'l-nahw (fol. i: by Ibn Shukayr?), 65 folios; for a second (?) manuscript, also by Ibn Shukayr, (cf. a fragment, Lucknow 1281/1864). The work fills 75 folios and deals with nasb, rafâ', hâfâf, djam, aljif, lâmâl (cf. a fragment, Berlin, vi, 212 no. 6902), hâdâ, tâdâ, wâdâl, lâm-aljif, al-ikhilif fi ma'amikh, in connection with many, mostly anonymous verses (O. Rescher, in ZDMG, lxv (1910), 508 ff.; for the Incipit, see Rescher, Abriss, ii, 121, note 1). For a second (?) manuscript, see Kawala, ii, 118, no. 266 k: Kitab Wudhgh al-nasib (fol. 1: by Ibn Shukayr?), 65 folios; for a third (?) incomplete (?) manuscript, see Firristl-nushkhâhâ-i khatti-i Kitabkhâna-i Markazi-i Dânishgâh-i Tabrîzn; Tehran 1345/1967, xx, 4075 ff., no. 4951, 3: Tabrîzi al-Djumal al-ving, 16 folios. Ibn Khallikan, Waqâyû, Cairo 1367/1948, ii, 17 no. 206, may well be referring to the Kitab al-Djumal when he mentions a kitâb fi 'l-wâmiil among al-Khallil's works.

Further investigation is necessary into a short treatise of two pages by al-Khallil about the question why the root fâ is used as paradigm (ms. Bodeleiana, i, 230 no. 1047,4, dated 654/1256). The longer fragment of 24 folios of a Kitâb yar al-Khallil, dated 621/1428 (Berlin, vi, 215 no. 6909), is perhaps connected with this treatise.

Appreciation of the significance of al-Khallil's lexicographical activities has steadily increased as permanently influenced the broad field of philology in his capacity as grammarian, lexicographer and poet, but he also left impressive written testimony—though more indirectly than directly—of his competence, acumen and gift of presentation. There is a double reason why his output was so small. First, it was not yet at all common in those days to commit to writing scholarly discussion; secondly, it seems that al-Khallil had scruples about finally editing his material together with his explanations and commentaries. It is not correct to assume that he was unable to do so through incapacity to generalise from details. Recent investigations have shown clearly that al-Khallil had a fundamental part in the first systematic grammar of Arabic, the Kitâb of his pupil Sibawayh, not only as far as the material is concerned, but also in the systematisation. In this connection it must be remembered that al-Khallil had already found elements for a theory of the language. It is even possible that such a theory had already been formulated in a fragmentary way and noted down in lecture courses, in answers to questions about individual problems, and the like. But it started to take shape only thanks to the abundance of observations of individual cases, comparisons and proofs adduced by al-Khallil, which gave the impulse to systematisation. To give Arabic philology its first systematic written form, hardly surpassed later, was reserved for his great pupil, the Persian Sibawayh. This however does not alter the fact that al-Khallil was the real creator of this science (see G. Well in the Introduction to Ibn al-Anbari's Kitâb al-Insâf, Leiden 1913, 69), as may be seen clearly from almost every page of Sibawayh's work. For details see W. Reuschel, al-Khalll ibn Ahmad, se Lehrer Sibawayhs, als Grammatiker, Berlin 1959; G. Troupeau, A propos des grammairiens cités par Sibawayhi dans le Kitâb, in Arabic, vii (1961), 309-12; cf. also M. G. Carter, Les origines de la grammaire arabe, in REI, xi (1972), 69-97, esp. 74 ff.

It has yet to be studied how far al-Khallil's Kitâb al-Djumal is 'l-nasib corresponds to those passages which Sibawayh associated with al-Khallil's name; according to a statement in Yahyâ al-Dârar: his, the author of the Kitâb al-Djumal was Ibn Shukayr (d. 317/929) in the ms. Asyosyâla 4456, 2, dated 601/1204, the work fills 75 folios and deals with nasb, rafâ', hâfâf, djam, aljif, lâmâl (cf. a fragment, Berlin, vi, 212 no. 6902), hâdâ, tâdâ, wâdâl, lâm-aljif, al-ikhilif fi ma'amikh, in connection with many, mostly anonymous verses (O. Rescher, in ZDMG, lxv (1910), 508 ff.; for the Incipit, see Rescher, Abriss, ii, 121, note 1). For a second (?) manuscript, see Kawala, ii, 118, no. 266 k: Kitab Wudhgh al-nasib (fol. 1: by Ibn Shukayr?), 65 folios; for a third (?) incomplete (?) manuscript, see Firristl-nushkhâhâ-i khatti-i Kitabkhâna-i Markazi-i Dânishgâh-i Tabrîzn; Tehran 1345/1967, xx, 4075 ff., no. 4951, 3: Tabrîzi al-Djumal al-ving, 16 folios. Ibn Khallikan, Waqâyû, Cairo 1367/1948, ii, 17 no. 206, may well be referring to the Kitâb al-Djumal when he mentions a kitâb fi 'l-wâmiil among al-Khallil's works.

Further investigation is necessary into a short treatise of two pages by al-Khallil about the question why the root fâ is used as paradigm (ms. Bodeleiana, i, 230 no. 1047,4, dated 654/1256). The longer fragment of 24 folios of a Kitab yar al-Khallil, dated 621/1428 (Berlin, vi, 215 no. 6909), is perhaps connected with this treatise.

Appreciation of the significance of al-Khallil's lexicographical activities has steadily increased as
scholars have recognised him as the author of the first Arabic dictionary, the Kitāb al-'Ayn, and this notion (without considering the fact that the authorship of this work was rejected by a majority. Recent investigations have again considerably contributed to the solution of this problem. They have shown that the plan of the dictionary undoubtedly comes from al-Khalil. It is not arranged alphabetically but—probably under Indian influence—by certain groups of sounds (the phonetic-permutative principle), i.e., after the so-called “order of al-Khalil”1: 3, h, dh, dh, t, k, b, d, n, f, s, z, l, d, t, r, l, n, f, b, m, w, alif, y. Recent investigations have also shown that al-Khalil’s contribution to the dictionary is hardly more than that of a source, and that the Kitāb al-'Ayn in its present form, especially in regard to the bulk of the material, is to be considered as the work of al-Layy b. al-Muqaffa’ (q.v.). Al-Layy may have arranged his compilation soon after al-Khalil’s death. But a little later—probably not long after 200/815—this work was revised by an otherwise unknown Abū Mu‘ādh ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh Dāraysh. Additions and corrections, also in the form of refutations (rudūd), followed. Many abstruse methods have been made and it is well known that later lexicographers have repeatedly gone back—directly or indirectly—to the Kitāb al-'Ayn and have often been inspired from it. It is worth noticing that the Introduction to the Kitāb al-'Ayn, with the exception of editorial interpolations, may go back directly to al-Khalil. For details see Bräunlich, op. cit., esp. p. 94, on al-Khalil’s Kitāb Fā’id al-'Ayn, mentioned e.g. in Fihrist, 43; J. Kraemer, Studien zur altarabischen Lexikographie nach Istanbuler und Berliner Handschriften, in Oriens, vi (1953), 201-38; J. A. Haywood, Arabic Lexicography, Leiden 1966, passim (reviewed by A. Spitaler, in OLZ, xiii [1968], 50-8); above all Stefan Wild, Das Kitāb al-'Ain und die arabische Lexikographie, Wiesbaden 1965 (reviewed by J. W. Füeck, in Bi Or, xxiii [1966], 199 ff.; M. M. Bravmann, in ISL, xlvi [1971], 238-44). A first fascicule of the Kitāb al-'Ayn was published by Father Anastase al-Karmall under the title: al-Layth b. al-Muqaffa, ’I’tiqad, published in Baghdad 1914; of the new edition by ʿAbd Allāh Darvīsh, Kitāb al-'Ayn awal mu’ājim fi l-lguba al-arabīyya li-i-Khalil b. Ahmad al-Farāhīdi, the first volume appeared in 1986/1967 in Baghdad (reviewed by R. ’Abd al-Tawwāb, in al-Muḥād 4/2 [Baghdad 1388/1968] 127-51).

Al-Khalil’s small treatise al-’Ahrūf, also called Riṣāla fi ma’na ’l-ḥurūf, which is not listed by the ancient biographers and lexicographers (see Bräunlich, op. cit., 67), has been published by R. ’Abd al-Tawwāb, Cairo 1960. The author deals concisely with the ancient grammatical abstracts and systems of the alphabet and as a rule supports them by citing ancient verses. While working on old Arabic verses as evidence for the meaning of words, linguistic peculiarities and grammatical constructions (Fihrist, 43, mentions among his writings a Kitāb al-Sawāḥik), al-Khalil made a surprising and important discovery. The scanning of verses revealed to him that short and long syllables alternate and repeat themselves in strict patterns. He divided these unities, which can be distinguished according to their quantity, into five concentric circles. He thus found an adequate and telling graphical form, equally simple and brilliant, for representing the metre-order of the verses, following each other repetitively, while the rhythmical accent was also taken into account. Al-Khalil’s metrical system has been adopted by all later authors (see, e.g., the manuscripts and summaries Berlin, vi, 325-48 no. 7108-58). The names of the metres (cf. Marzubān, op. cit., 201 ff., 207 ff.) appeared in the early 3-4th century, while they reach undoubtedly back to him so that metrics were called simply ‘tim al-Khalil’ (see Hádhāj Khalifa under the title ʿarād Ibn al-Ḥajjīb; I. Goldzieher, in WZKM, xvii [1903], 187-90; see also al-Dāhibī, al-Mu’allimin, on the margin of al-Mubarrad, al-Kāmil, Cairo 1324/1906, i, 33; idem, al-Ḥayawan, Cairo 1356/1938, i, 150). Although al-Khalil’s original work, the Kitāb al-’Ard, does not seem to have survived, the content of this treatise (cf. Zubaydi, op. cit., 291) may be conjectured from later works, like Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih’s (q.v.) chapter on ʿarād (q.v.) in his al-ʾīyād al-farādī, Cairo 1365/1946, v, 424-518. For details see G. W. Freytag, Darstellung der arabischen Verskunst, Bonn 1830; G. Weil, Das metrische System des al-Xalil und der Thius in den altarabischen Versen, in Orissi, vii (1954), 303-21; and esp. idem, Grundriss und System der altarabischen Metern, Wiesbaden 1958 (reviewed by A. Bloch, in GGA, 213 [1959], 67-80). [See also ’Arūf.] Two other works by al-Khalil, the Kitāb al-Nāfṣah and the Kitāb al-Ibra’, dealing with tones and rhythmic tempi, are mentioned in Fihrist, 43 (see H. G. Farmer, The sources of Arabian music, Leiden 1965, i, nos. 5 and 6; E. Neubauer in Oriens, xxii-xxiii [1968-9] 197), 196 ff.

Among the works by al-Khalil enumerated in Fihrist, 43, a Kitāb al-Naḥw wa l-’Ikhār is mentioned, an otherwise unknown treatise on diacritical punctuation and vocalisation (in the ʿkurāʾ) (see Gesch. des Qor., iii, 262, note 1 and TA, iv, 411, 9 s.v. ʿbd). According to Dharrīa, i, 38 ff. no. 184, it is identical with the above mentioned Kitāb al-Drumal. Such a supposition is however as doubtful as another statement by the same Dharrīa, i, 325 ff. no. 1292, namely, that al-Khalil composed a Kitāb al-Imāmā, allegedly finished by Abu ʿl-Fath Muhammad b. Diyar al-Marāghi (d. 376/980). The correctness cannot be verified from the available sources and literature (see, e.g., Khābābā, i, 157; Brockelmann, S III, 1194 should be corrected accordingly). A so-called Kitāb al-Musūfī fi ‘l-amnāf, which is mentioned only by Zubaydi, Tabakī, 47, and then in connection with a quite unconvincing story (cf. Haywood, op. cit., 21 and 133).

Khalil B. Ahmad — Khalil
Nuzhat al-alibbd*, Cairo 1386/1967, 45-8 (with indications of other sources); Yakut, Gāyāt al-nihayāt fi tabādūl-al-khurrā, Cairo-Leipzig 1932, i, 275; Ibn Hādjar, Tahāhīb al-tahāhīb, Haydarābād 1325/1906, iii, 163; Suyūṭī, Bugāyda 243-5 (Cairo 1384/1964, 557-60); Ṭashkūpīzāde, Muḥfah al-ṣaʿīda, Cairo (ca. 1368), i, 106-8; i, 153-8; i, 216 (R. Sellheim).

Khalil B. Ishāk B. Muṣā B. Shʿyāyib, Abu 'l-muwaqqad da Ļī al-dīn, ibn al-qundū, Mālikī ṣahīh of Egypt, born in Cairo 13 Rabī‘ I 776/22 August 1374 (but other dates, in particular 767 and 769 are also given). His father was a Ḥanafī, and it was through the influence of his teacher 'Abd Allāh al-Manṣūr that he adopted the Mālikī law school. He performed the Pilgrimage, and then remained some time in Medina, studying and teaching at the madrasa Shaykhīmīyā. Although generally leading a fairly retiring life, he nevertheless took up arms in the defence forces, and thus took part in the recovery of Alexandria from the Christians in 767/1365-6.

From a juridical point of view, Khalīl represents, just like his model Ibn al-Ḥādjīb, a view of law somewhat tinged with Shafī‘ism, the result of a fusion between the Egyptian and the Maghribī aspects of the Mālikī school. He composed various works, of which manuscripts survive: al-Tawāfūhī, a commentary on the Mukhtāsir of Ibn al-Ḥādjīb, K. al-Manāṣirī, Manāṣir al-Shaykh 'Abd Allāh al-Manṣūrī, and Dāṭī al-muwaqqad da Ļī wa-ra’sīfah; but all these are today forgotten. His Mukhtāsir, however, called by some simply al-Kūhā‘ī, the Book by excellence, gained him a great fame, both in the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

This Mukhtāsir, then, so obscure because of its conciseness that it can only be understood by means of a commentary, is the most renowned manual in the countries of the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

This Mukhtāsir, then, so obscure because of its conciseness that it can only be understood by means of a commentary, is the most renowned manual in the countries of the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

This Mukhtāsir, then, so obscure because of its conciseness that it can only be understood by means of a commentary, is the most renowned manual in the countries of the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

This Mukhtāsir, then, so obscure because of its conciseness that it can only be understood by means of a commentary, is the most renowned manual in the countries of the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

This Mukhtāsir, then, so obscure because of its conciseness that it can only be understood by means of a commentary, is the most renowned manual in the countries of the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

This Mukhtāsir, then, so obscure because of its conciseness that it can only be understood by means of a commentary, is the most renowned manual in the countries of the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

This Mukhtāsir, then, so obscure because of its conciseness that it can only be understood by means of a commentary, is the most renowned manual in the countries of the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

This Mukhtāsir, then, so obscure because of its conciseness that it can only be understood by means of a commentary, is the most renowned manual in the countries of the Maghrib and also in the Mālikī centres of West Africa, and furthermore the honorific designation of Sāli Khalīl.

The battle for a strong sultanate that should be independent from the oligarchy of the amīrs left its stamp on Khalīl's short reign. Yet he failed to achieve his aim. In 693/1293 he was killed during a hunting-party in the Nile delta by his deputy Baydārā and a handful of other conspirators. In the beginning, Baydārā had been Khalīl's esteemed nābībi: still in 690/1291 the sultan had granted him the Syrian fortress of al-Ṣubayba (Alā‘ī, 29 ff.). But later he had been humiliated repeatedly by Khalīl, on one occasion in the presence of the assembled amīrs, probably in connection with Baydārā's unsuccessful campaign against the Maronites of Dājbīl Kasrawān in 692/1292. Other amīrs like Karāsunfīr, who later acquired fame for his flight to the Mongols, or the future sultan Ḥusnān al-Dīn Lāḏīn (see on him P. M. Holt, in BSOAS, xxxvi (1973), 521-32), were imprisoned. Although they were set free shortly afterwards, Khalīl failed to secure their loyalty.

Khalīl's closest adviser and confidant, his arrogant vizier Ibn al-Salā‘ūs, a Syrian merchant, did everything to estrange the high amīrs even more from the sultan. Under Ibn al-Salā‘ūs, the vizierate ceased to be in the hands of the military, the mukalwatun, and became the “second office of the state” (Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz, viii, 306; Kāshkandī, Ṣubb, iv, 17).
KHALIL — KHALIL ALLAH BUT-SHIKAN

Ibn al-Salih was the first of a long series of merchants who decisively influenced Mamluk policy between 1290 and 1450, particularly under Sultan Barsbay [q.v.; see KARIMI].

Khalil’s reign saw the beginning of the flourishing Mamluk trade policy. After the fall of ʿAkkāt [q.v.] in 690/1291 Khalil resumed and strengthened contacts with the Christian Mediterranean powers. He concluded treaties with Venice and Aragon. In his biography of Khalil, al-ʿAfāfī al-makhtūyiyya, 44 ff., Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir [q.v.] mentions a change-treaty of Venetian prisoners. Khalil renewed on January 29, 1293 the treaty which Kalâwûn had made with James’s predecessor Alphonso III, including its provisions concerning the delivery of such forbidden war-materials as iron, weapons, wood and pitch (see K. Müller, al-Malik al-Aṣraīf, 66, quoting Kalkaghandi, Sīāh, xiv, 63-70).

He also made contacts with the small principalities of Menteshe, Awīdīn and Karmām, which were developing in Anatolia under Mongol suzerainty (ʿAlīf, 15 f.).

Khalil won his greatest fame, however, in the Islamic and Christian world alike as the skilled commander of the Egyptian-Syrian armies who captured ʿAkkāt (St. Jean d’Acre) after a carefully prepared six-year siege. Only the timidity of the amir ʿUsām, al-Dīn Lādīn, the later sultan, before the walls of ʿAkkāt, jeopardised the Muslim victory for a short time. Saydā, Bayrūt, ʿAthlīth, Dībāyil and Sūr, the few remaining strongholds of the Franks, fell into the hands of the Muslims without a fight. All the captured Frankish fortresses were demolished; thus Palestine lost the basis of its economic prosperity. Contemporaries, especially al-Dīzārī [q.v.], probably the most important authority for this period, complain seriously of the destructive fury of Khalil, which fell even upon Damascus and the stronghold of Shawkah in the land of Moab. But it should be remarked that this policy was a calculated one, both on strategic and economic grounds: the Syrian cities should no longer serve as a foothold for Frankish invaders nor attract the lucrative Indian trade which was directed from South Arabia through the Red Sea to Alexandria and Damietta and further to Europe. The undisguised aversion of the Syrians for Kalâwûn and his successors reflects the political and economic centralisation of the Mamluk state after the capitulation of the insurgent amir Sunkur al-ʿĀqish of Ṣaḥyūn during Kalâwûn’s reign. The building of a fleet to protect the Syrian coast (ʿAlīf, 56-61) is not in contradiction with Khalil’s endeavours to monopolise the East-West trade through Egypt.

In contrast with his father, Khalil seems to have been inspired by religious motifs in his political and military activities. Certainly, the reproach that he was a vile libertine is unfounded. Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir pictures Khalil’s zeal in the Dīr al-salāt, the royal court of justice, and speaks highly of his equity and incorruptibility. As opposed to his predecessors and to most of his successors, the sultan had a command of Arabic and concerned himself actively with the dīwān al-inṣāḥ, until 635/1239 headed by the above-mentioned Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir. Khalil was eager to secure the homage of the sharīf of Mecca ʿNaḍīm al-Dīn Abū Nūmāy (ʿAlīf, 50), and gave new functions to the ʿAbbāsid shadow caliph al-Ḥākīm, the returning to its legitimate ruler of the old capital of the caliphs being one of the foremost aims of his foreign policy. Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir (ʿAlīf, 6 f.) records the text of the public dīwāḥād sermons given by the caliph—another indication of Khalil’s religious zeal.

Khalil’s strategy was mainly directed against the Mongols, “the vile enemy” (al-ṣaddaw al-makhtūhid), at least after the Franks had been driven away. After the death of ʿArghūn, the Ilḫāns [q.v.] lost their clear military superiority over the Mamlûks. Khalil grasped his chance, attacked the kingdom of Lesser Armenia and conquered the important stronghold of Kalʿat al-Rûm on the Euphrates (see ʿArūj al-ḥāṣīriyya). One year later, the Armenian king Hethūm II surrendered the fortresses of Bahāsān, Mārʿāsh and Tall Ḥamdōn, commanding the routes to Aleppo, to the Mamlûk ruler. The Bedouins, controlling the strategic Ilkhānid-Mamlûk frontier in the Syrian desert, were also, if only temporarily, subdued. But the great dream of the age, the recovery of Baḥdād, Khalil was not able to bring about.

Information on Khalil’s internal policy is scarce. Three times yearly the troops received a special pay (nafaka) (Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanṣ, viii, 152), which constituted an additional burden on the treasury, already heavily drawn upon by the costly campaigns in Syria. Only Khalil’s early death may have prevented him from redistributing the ʾiṣkās of the emirs, brought about by sultan Lādīn a few years later (al-rukṣ al-ḥusāmī). The small princely states staunchly resisted any interference with their privileges; Baydūr’s refusal to cede his share of the customs dues of the port of Alexandria to Khalil or his vizier aggravated the strife between the sultan and the most powerful amirs. Other sources of income were not easily accessible. The very lucrative confiscation of the fortunes of Turuntāy, Kalâwûn’s nāḥib, remained an isolated episode.

Khalil’s murderer Baydūr reigned only for a few days. Unable to capture the citadel of Cairo, the centre of political and military power, he was killed after a short fight against Khalil’s followers, led by the ustāḍār (majordomo) ʿUsām al-Dīn. The eight-years’ old al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, Khalil’s brother, was enthroned (for the first time), the real ruler being the new nāḥib Sayn al-Dīn Kītūbḡā, who usurped the throne in 694/1294 under the name al-Malik al-ʿĀdī.

province of Persia, on Friday 11th Sha‘bān 775/26th January 1374, and was the son and spiritual successor of the celebrated Shāh Nī′mat Allāh Wall of Kirman [p.6]. He was widely respected as the chief exponent of the religion of Ahmad (Abdus Subhān) the Well-Merited, who was also ordained as his spiritual vice-regent (khalifa).

Whether Sayyid Khalīl Allāh died whilst he was still in India or after he had returned to Persia has been a disputed point among the historians. Firīḍaṣṭa, Ta‘rīkh, 634-5, while asserting that the Sayyid had returned to Māḥān in Kirmān, where he breathed his last and lies buried, refers to the opinion of some persons that he could not return to Persia and that he died in India. Modern scholars such as Yazdānī (p.76), and Shershāhī have said that he died in Bīdar, the Bahmanī capital, in 864/1460 and that his tomb is still in India or after he had returned to Persia has been, according to the opinion of some persons, that he could not return to Persia and that he died in India. Modern scholars such as Yazdānī (p.76), and Shershāhī have said that he died in Bīdar, the Bahmanī capital, in 864/1460 and that his tomb is
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Besides a commentary, he left the Turkish translation of a part of the history of ʿAyyn (d. 762/1361). Of his sons and grandsons, some were notable theologians.


KHALIL GHANIM (1846-1903), journalist and author, born in Beirut of Maronite parents and educated at the Lazarists' school in ʿAynṭūra, where he acquired a knowledge of French and English, as well as Arabic and Turkish. Khalīl Ghānim began his career in 1862 as a member of the commercial court in Beirut. He was then appointed dragoman of the Beirut mutasarrīfiyya, and subsequently of the wilāyēt of Syria. A wāli under whom he served, Sakhlī Ahmad Asʿad, appointed him dragoman to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs when he became briefly Grand Vizier in 1873. He was promoted dragoman of the Grand Vizierate and its master of ceremonies when Asʿad once more became Grand Vizier in 1875. Following the proclamation of the Ottoman constitution, Khalīl Ghānim was elected a deputy for Syria, and sat in the chamber of deputies until it was prorogued in February 1878. He seems to have become a supporter of Midrāt Pasha, and thus to have attracted the displeasure of Sultan ʿAbbād al-Hamīd II. In consequence he took refuge in Paris, entered in the French embassy and fled to France, where he spent the rest of his life, becoming a naturalised French citizen and marrying a Frenchwoman. In 1881, in partnership with Fadl Allāh Dabbās of Beirut, he started in Paris an Arabic newspaper al-ʿĀṣir, which received a subsidy from the French government and which acted as the advocate of French interests and policies in Tunis and in the Ottoman empire; it was presumably in recognition of these services that he was awarded the légion d’honneur. Khalīl Ghānim was also a contributor to the Journal des Débats and the Figaro, and was prominent in anti-Hamīdīan and Young Turk activities in Europe. In Paris, he published a periodical La Jeune Turquie and in Geneva the Materiaux pour la biographie de Khalil El-Hanim, in two volumes (Paris 1902), and also the author of a Life of Jesus and of a work on political economy in Arabic.

development and the nature of his poetry. The stringent Catholic discipline must have served to enhance his sense of moral values, and the restrained attitude attributed to him ([Muḥāfāz, Nov. 1939, 407-78; Maqādilat Sarkīs, special issue, 1913; al-Kitāb al-Dhahabi, passim]). Mention should be made of the influence of his eminent master Ibrāhīm al-Yāzdī (d. 1906), from whom he gained his mastery of the language and his concern for perfection. (Evidence of the poet, Dinām, i, 290, 294, ii, 29, 326; and testimony borne by al-Yāzdī, Anis al-djalāl, ix, 371). He imitated al-Yāzdī in composing the bitter poem which hastened his departure from Lebanon in 1890 (for the poem of al-Yāzdī, see Arab awakening, 1955 ed., 54, and Makdisī 80-3; we have two verses from Muṭrān's poem, al-Tunāḥi, 45-6; see Djamāl al-Dīn, 46).

Muṭrān paid a visit to Alexandria and stayed some time in Paris, making preparations for emigration to Chile (Tunāḥi, 58-64; Muktaṭaf, June 1939, 91). To the time spent in Paris (1890-2), he owes his cultural sympathy with the West. There he discovered French romanticism, in which he became engrossed, and he exposed himself to the literary and artistic trends of the nineties. He became acquainted with a group of militant Lebanese and Syrian émigrés, and with Āhad Mīrāḏ, 1āḏut, the founder-member of the Young Tunis. Imbued with the impulses of the French Revolution, he was inspired and stirred by it. (The celebrations of the 14th of July thrilled him; see Āhad al-Ṣawī, Paris, the references to Muṭrān and Tunāḥi, 61-4.) Asked to restrain his political activities, he left Paris, made his way to Egypt and landed in Alexandria on 11 August 1892 (ibid., 71). The following day, the death of S. Tāqī, founder and proprietor of the daily newspaper al-ṭarīq (Muktaṭaf, ibid., 209), gained him access to the journal where he made his debut as a journalist with an obituary poem (unpublished, seven verses quoted in Tunāḥi, 72-3).

In 1899 he abandoned his duties, revisited Lebanon after an absence of ten years (see the poems where he evokes his memories and Kāfīr al-Raʾdbābakh, in Dinām, 97-101), returned to Cairo and on 1 June 1900 published the first issue of al-Tunāḥi ([q.v. in Suppl.], he became involved in the theatre as translator and producer (al-Risdīla, ix, nos. 288-96, 301; Tunāḥi, 280-9). A co-founder of the Society of the Arabic Theatre which he inaugurated on 30 Dec. 1920 (al-Hilāl, xxix, 465-72), he was appointed to the post of administrative director of the National Company (1935-42, Mūhammad Taṣmūr, Ḥāydūnīt al-amālīyya, 108-9; al-Hilāl, xxxvi, 303-4; al-Kitāb al-Dhahabi, 60-7; al-ʿAhrām, 14 Dec. 1937). The tour which he organised in 1924 (Lebanon, Syria and Palestine) increased his reputation. In 1947, he found himself covered in honours (the week of 26-29 of March; al-Kitab al-Dhahabi, passim). Disabled by attacks of arthritis, he succumbed to the disease and died on 30 June 1949.

Muṭrān left a varied corpus of work. Among his unpublished writings, there is mention of a study of Shībī al-Ṣumārayīl, scientist and philosopher. He also published the Dinām of Ibn Kalākūn (Muktaṭaf, ibid., 209), which for financial reasons was forced to cease publication in 1902, to re-appear temporarily seven years later, 17 January 1909. Meanwhile, on Friday 6 February 1903 he launched a daily paper, al-Dinām al-ʿAṣrīyya (a title borrowed from Fārīs al-Shidyāk, d. 1887), in which he pleaded for social reform and defended liberty and the public interest. To this period (1897-1903) belongs the story of his great love which inspired him to write many lyric poems (Tunāḥi, 126-8, 140-1, 153-4, 157; Dinām, i, 144, 184-222, ii, 10, 17, 298, 326). His attachment to Egypt, which he was wont to stress in order to consider a second homeland, became more pronounced (Dinām, ii, 13, 226, 295). A moderate partisan of the nationalist movement, he became committed to its cause. A foreigner, one of a minority, he found in Egypt his social equilibrium. The friendship and admiration which he showed towards Muṣṭafā Kāmil (1874-1908; Dinām, i, 308-13, iv, 292-6) attached him to his successors (Muhammad Farid, d. 1919; see Dinām, ii, 233; Saʿd Zaghīlī, d. 1927; see Dinām, ii, 320, iii, 207, 231, iv, 250; and see M. Khoury, iii, 261, iv, 250, 274). In 1955 ed., 54, and Makdisī 80-3; we have two verses from Muṭrān's poem, al-Tunāḥi, 45-6; see Djamāl al-Dīn, 46).
the predominance of lyrical and descriptive poems, narrative poems inspired by history (Diwan, i, 25, 47, 100, 179-83) or social conditions (ibid., 223-45), the militant tendency retained (ibid., 162-4, 308-13), and the poetry inspired by circumstances varying between authentic vigour (ibid., 271-4, 290-2, 308-13) and pale conventional urbanity (ibid., 118, 167-71). The traditional structure of the kašida with juxtaposed lines disjointed in sense, appears alongside poems where the line becomes an organised unit contributing to the overall effect of the whole. In some instances, the poet abandons metre and simple rhyme and makes use of takhbīs, of taklīūt, of madājī,2 complex or varied rhyming-schemes, and even comes to the point of writing prose poems (Diwan, i, 294-6). Other combinations of style produce new poems. The number of poems grows, but there is no apparently no radical change affecting the nature of his poetry. However, the narrative poem, drawn out to extreme length, finds its ultimate realisation in a long piece of 332 lines, entitled Nāyrūn (Diwan, iii 50-73). In this unique exercise he was aiming at a work of definitive nature (ibid., Introd. 48-50). Also, he immersed himself in a patient process of craftsmanship, seeking documentary evidence, researching details and ephemeral nuances, orchestrating sonorous alliterations, manipulating the language in an exciting manner, reconstructing the apocalyptic decadence of Rome (ibid., 61-8), depicting under the portrait of Nero an allegorical potentate embodying the tyranny of Ḥāfiz al-Ḥāfiz,3 al-Adīb, and walking on the tombs.4 A play on the senses of words, the gamut of romantic themes which are produced in a dignity of man, reality disguised as allegory, or symbol, lyrical experience which probes itself, dissects itself and emerges rationally from chaos, inspired songs of the human condition and cosmic transcendence meditating on matter; in fact, the entire gamut of romantic themes which are produced in a form that is sober, perceptive, charged with images and tending towards the overall unity of the poem.

Intimately linked to that of Shawkī (d. 1932) and Ḥāfiz (d. 1923), then in decline, his poetry, with its quality of neo-classicism, changed in many ways the beginnings of a new poetic era.


KHALİL MACNDARL. Ottoman Grand Vizier, the eldest son of Djandarlı İbrahim (d. 832/1429), who served as Grand Vizier to Mehemmed I (q.v.). He was serving as Kādī-lāṣker (q.v.) at the time of his father's death. Murād II (q.v.) raised him to the vizirate, and by 847/1443 he was Grand Vizier, becoming this sultan's closest adviser. He appears to have been the chief architect of Murād's policy of appeasing Hungary and the western powers in an effort to prevent a concerted crusader attack against the Ottomans in the Balkans. He was chief Ottoman negotiator in the discussions leading to the Treaty of Edirne, concluded with the Hungarians on 24 Safar 848/12 June 1444. On his abdication after the conclusion of peace, Murād appointed Khalīl Grand Vizier to his son Mehemmed (q.v.), and it was presumably Khalīl who recalled Murād on the crusader invasion of Dijmād II 848/September, 1444. Although he commanded a force which guarded the Bosphorus at the time of Murād's crossing to Rumelia with the troops of Anatolia on his way to meet the invaders, he himself was in Edirne (q.v.) as the young sultan's guardian at the time of Murād's
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Victory at Varna. He appears during the years of Murad's abdication to have regarded Murad as the true sultan. Having the loyal support of the Janissaries [see portlet], Khalil used the Janissary revolt of 850/1446, which he may himself have engineered, as a pretext for recalling Murad to the throne. On the old sultan's reaccession, he retained the post of Grand Vizier unchallenged.

On Murad's death in 855/1451, Khalil summoned Mehemmed to Edirne and at first retained the Grand Vizierate, despite the grudge which Mehemmed evidently bore him for his actions during the first sultanate. Khalil's cautious and pacific policies in fact suited the delicate political situation at this time of Mehemmed's accession, with a Karamanid attack [see KARAMAN-OGHULLARI] and the fear that the Byzantines might release the pretender Orkhân. Khalil appears to have played an important part in negotiating the peace with the Karamanids. It was he, too, who during the campaign, dismissed the Byzantine ambassador who sought an increase in the sum paid to the Emperor for keeping Orkhân in captivity. By securing peace on the borders and causing a breach with the Byzantines, Khalil created conditions favourable for the Ottoman siege of Constantinople. Perhaps in recognition of his diplomatic achievements, Mehemmed granted muhâl lands near Plovdiv or Filibe [q.v.], in 852/1451.

However, Khalil's continuous opposition to the siege of Constantinople both before and during the operations aroused the sultan's displeasure. He had, furthermore, a reputation of being a "friend of the Greeks". With the fall of Constantinople, he lost all remnants of his power and influence to Zaganos Pasha [q.v.] and the war-party around the sultan. Mehemmed had him arrested on 21 Dhu 'l-Mi'dd 857/30 May 1453. He was sent to Edirne and executed a few weeks later.

Bibliography: See DJANDARLI (V. L. Menage), and 'A. arts. Çandarlı, and Mehmed II (H. Inalcik), and Mehmed II (Inalcik); and ıst biographical and detailed full discussion of sources, F. Taescher and W. Witte, Die Vestrasten des der Genoese Republik (14.125. Jahrh.); and her Denkmaler, in Isthnik; xxvii (1929), 156-157. Inalcik also discussed here, see Ibn Kemal, Tavarih-i dî-i Osman vs. defter, ed. Şerefettin Turan, ii, Ankara 1957, 21, 34, 90, 93, for the crisis of 1444, with some details of Khalil's role; F. Babinger, Von Amurath zu Amurath, in Orientis, iii (1950), 229-250. Also, for an account of the crisis of 1444, Murad II's abdication and ascension to the throne, and events leading to the siege of Constantinople, with some details of Khalil's role, see Inalcik, Fatih devri üzerinde tarihler ve sessizalar, Ankara 1954, 134-136; and for a deed of fixing boundaries of Khalil's muhâl near Filibe, see op. cit., 215-233.

KHALIL PASJA HADJDJI ARNAWUD, Grand Vizier under the Ottoman Sultan Ahmet III. He was an Albanian from Elbasan born ca. 1655. At the time his elder brother Sinan Agha was Grand Vizier under the Ottoman Sultan Ahmad III. The latter's death in 850/1446, which he may himself have engineered, was a pretext for recalling Murad to the throne. On the old sultan's reaccession, he retained the post of Grand Vizier unchallenged.

On Murad's death in 855/1451, Khalil summoned Mehemmed to Edirne and at first retained the Grand Vizierate, despite the grudge which Mehemmed evidently bore him for his actions during the first sultanate. Khalil's cautious and pacific policies in fact suited the delicate political situation at this time of Mehemmed's accession, with a Karamanid attack [see KARAMAN-OGHULLARI] and the fear that the Byzantines might release the pretender Orkhân. Khalil appears to have played an important part in negotiating the peace with the Karamanids. It was he, too, who during the campaign, dismissed the Byzantine ambassador who sought an increase in the sum paid to the Emperor for keeping Orkhân in captivity. By securing peace on the borders and causing a breach with the Byzantines, Khalil created conditions favourable for the Ottoman siege of Constantinople. Perhaps in recognition of his diplomatic achievements, Mehemmed granted muhâl lands near Plovdiv or Filibe [q.v.], in 852/1451.

However, Khalil's continuous opposition to the siege of Constantinople both before and during the operations aroused the sultan's displeasure. He had, furthermore, a reputation of being a "friend of the Greeks". With the fall of Constantinople, he lost all remnants of his power and influence to Zaganos Pasha [q.v.] and the war-party around the sultan. Mehemmed had him arrested on 21 Dhu 'l-Mi'dd 857/30 May 1453. He was sent to Edirne and executed a few weeks later.

Bibliography: See DJANDARLI (V. L. Menage), and 'A. arts. Çandarlı, and Mehmed II (H. Inalcik), and Mehmed II (Inalcik); and ıst biographical and detailed full discussion of sources, F. Taescher and W. Witte, Die Vestrasten des der Genoese Republik (14.125. Jahrh.); and her Denkmaler, in Isthnik; xxvii (1929), 156-157. Inalcik also discussed here, see Ibn Kemal, Tavarih-i dî-i Osman vs. defter, ed. Şerefettin Turan, ii, Ankara 1957, 21, 34, 90, 93, for the crisis of 1444, with some details of Khalil's role; F. Babinger, Von Amurath zu Amurath, in Orientis, iii (1950), 229-250. Also, for an account of the crisis of 1444, Murad II's abdication and ascension to the throne, and events leading to the siege of Constantinople, with some details of Khalil's role, see Inalcik, Fatih devri üzerinde tarihler ve sessizalar, Ankara 1954, 134-136; and for a deed of fixing boundaries of Khalil's muhâl near Filibe, see op. cit., 215-233.
services delayed the sailing of the Ottoman fleet till July 1609. Khalil chased corsairs in the Levant seas, but his fame was established by the capture of a Maltese squadron off Cyprus and the capture of the “Red Galleon” of 80 guns called “Kara Djahannam” by the Turks, commanded by the Chevalier de Fraissinet.

On his return to Istanbul, Khalil was given by Ahmad I the rank of Vizier (1018/25 Nov. 1609). On 16 July 1610, Khalil set out to sea again to chase corsairs, but did not fight any major battle. In this same year, he began to work towards the formation of an offensive alliance against the Dutch Republic, Morocco and the Porte against Spain. His letter to the States-General in the Hague was sent off on 15 July 1610. Venetian and French opposition to this policy did Khalil no harm in entertaining good relations with both respective ambassadors.

From 1620/late 1621 till 1622/1623 Khalil was deprived of the admiralship, and the court favourite Dâmid Öktûz Mehmed Pasha [q.v.] took his place. Being out of office did not weaken Khalil’s position in promoting the Dutch alliance. Meanwhile, a Dutch envoy, Cornelis Haga (1612-20), had arrived in Istanbul on 17 March 1612. With Khalil’s help, the Dutchman was soon received by the Kâdim-makâm and other persons in authority at the Porte. Venetian and French intrigues were also rendered vain by his help, so that the Dutch envoy was given an audience by Ahmad I on 1 May 1612 and recognised as ambassador of the States-General. Khalil Pasha remained all along a supporter of Dutch interests at the Porte, but the States-General never entered upon a military alliance with the Porte because of their pacific policy towards Spain at that time (1609-21, Hispano-Dutch truce), and because of general political opinion in Europe being unfavourably disposed towards it.

On 8 Shawwâl 1022/22 Nov. 1612, Khalil became Kapudân Pasha for a second time. At once he started the re-equipment of ships in the Sultan’s dockyard. The Turco-Dutch-Moroccan alliance project was taken up again with the letters to Maulûﬂ Zaydân of Morocco (1012-3/1602-3) and to the States-General. The following year he went to sea and made a raid on Malta and continued to Tripoli (Tarabûlûs-i Gharb) on a punitive expedition against a local insurgent, Şafar Dâ’ûl, whom he executed. On the return journey, rebellious Greeks in the Maina district (southern Peloponese) were suppressed in cooperation with the local Ottoman Governor, Arslân Pasha. Khalil was back in Istanbul at the end of November 1023/1614 to be duly honoured by the Sultan. He continued the overhaul and enlargement of the fleet during the winter of 1614-15. A part of the fleet remained in the Archipelago on police duty against Spanish squadrons or other enemy war-fleets.

On 17 Rabî’ II 1024/17 April 1615, Khalil left with a small fleet for the Mediterranean. Off Calabria, a Spanish galleon from Sicily was taken but no great offensive was feasible. At the end of the season, murmurs in Istanbul rose accusing him of having avoided confrontation with the enemy fleet. After his return on 26 Shawwâl 1024/6 November 1615, Khalil counterattacked Habsburg intrigues of the Ottoman plenipotentiary in Vienna, Gratiani (d. 1620), against the Dutch, Venetian and French interests at the Porte. In 1616 Khalil once again started on the project of equipping a large fleet to ferry over the army of the Grand Vizier Murad Pasha to Asia for another campaign against the rebels. This and other
KHALIL PASHA KAYSARIYYELI

971

to the States-General to foster the alliance scheme
cherished by Khalll. These negotiations failed, how-
ever, because of Malaguer's family of Malagueño
established in Morocco and Holland at the time. Khalll
tried to reaffirm the Porte's authority in Algiers and Tunis and to curtail the
predatory raids of the Muslim corsairs of those places
against English and Dutch merchant-shipping in the
Mediterranean. Cossack raids on Black Sea coastal towns forced Khalll to send a squadron into
the Black Sea. He himself went on a short campaign
through the Archipelago in this season. Contribband
trade here had increased widely, especially that
carried by Dutch merchants. Upon advice given
by the Dibe, Khalll Pasha was appointed Grand Vizier by Ahmad I on 8 Dhul-Ka'da 1025/27 Nov. 1616.

As Grand Vizier, Khalll made an end to the levying of hurred's/ on subjects of the four capitolatory
nations in the Ottoman Empire, thus ameliorating
relations. Further, he ordered the equipping of the fleet against the menace of the Spanish navy. An
agreement between a delegation from Algiers and the
Dutch Ambassador was made under authority of the
Grand Vizier. His main task was, however, to con-
tinue the war against Persia in a more successful
manner. On 10 Djamād 1-awwal 1026/5 June 1617, as serddr-i ekrem, he left for the Turco-Persian
border. Consequently Khalll played no role in the
succession to Ahmad I, who died on 23 Dhul-Ka'da 1026/1617, and he remained cruising till November. In June he left with the fleet on its
yearly cruise of 1618. In the beginning of 1623
he was still admiral, and supported the policy of
peace with Poland. But the new Grand Vizier, Mere Huseyn, dismissed him as a rival to power and banished Khalll to Malkara (Thrace) in April 1623 (thus Haga's letter dated 30 April 1623/5 June 1623; Cey's of 14 April 1623, FF 1615 fol. 56; also Sagredo, 615 f.).

It was at this time that Khalll's fate became linked
with that of Abaza Mehmed Pasha [q.v.], who, leading the sivāhis, had revolted in Erzurum to averge the murder of Othman II and to punish the rival corps of Janissaries for it. Abaza was a protégé, a spiritual
son (as he was called by the Dutch ambassador Haga) of Khalll. It was now either the hatred and
terror of the Janissaries or the fact that Abaza kept him out of office, or the support of the sivāhis which pushed him towards it, in the years following 1623. His influence on
Abaza was much counted upon. Some time after his
accession in 1623, Murad IV, or rather the Wālide Sultan Kösem [q.v.], reappointed Khalll as a vizier (Sagredo, 636 f., calling him "la miglior testa della Turchia"). Khalll remained for a long time out of higher office now, operation to his becoming Grand Vizier being too strong.

On 2 Dec. 1626, Murad IV at last appointed Khalll to be Grand Vizier once more. His orders were to
bring Abaza Mehmed Paşa into submission, the latter being still in revolt in Anatolia. Furthermore, Khalll had to put an end to the war against Persia by a treaty. It was a hard journey to the winter quarters of the army. In August 1627, Khalll opened
negotiations with Abaza at Erzurum, but to no avail; furthermore he could not be subdued, being strongly
trenched in the fortress. Akhisårıya [q.v.] was lost to the Persians, and the siege of Erzurum was given up by Khalll in November because of the lack of siege artillery. He thus moved to Tokat for the winter, and the only result of his campaign was the restoring
of order in Anatolia and Syria.

The failure on the Persian front, and the failure to negotiate with or force the submission of Abaza Mehmed Paşa, caused Khalll's dismissal on 1 Shaban 1037/6 April 1628. Only then was it possible to find a paşa ambitious enough to take over. This was Khusrav Paşa, the Agha of the Janissaries, who
was able to make Abaza surrender later in the same
year. At the end of May 1628, Khalll returned to
Istanbul retaining his rank of vizier, with his prestige still great. In the next year on 7 August 1629/15
Dhu'l-Hijjah 1038, Khalll Pasha died.

In private life, Khalll Pasha had links with various
mystical orders or groups, the Malami-Hamzawiyya, the Ḡジャriyya of Ẓiyyah, and especially with the Djilwatiyya order and its shaykh Mahmūd b. Hūdatī from Uskudar (950-1038/1543-1628), a famous and influential mystic of the period and a religious poet. This holy man was his lifelong spiritual guide, and in the crisis periods of his existence gave him refuge in his tekke in Uskudar, notably in 1628/1629, and in 1637/1638. Often Hūdatī gave his blessings to the outgoing Ottoman fleet under Khalīl. Curiously, the disappearance of Khalīl’s last appointment in 1626. This same mystical bond must have attached him to Abāzā Mehmed.

Even Christians like the Dutch ambassador Haga were admitted into Khalīl’s spiritual friendship with Ḥūdatī. It was rare for an Ottoman of the early 17th century to entertain friendships with foreigners and Christians. Undoubtedly Khalīl used these friendships with diplomats like Šišmanec, Haga, Čēs, the Venetian bāli Nani and Valier, as sources of political information. These and other contacts like the dragonem in his service, the renegades of his household, and his Jewish physician, helped him to play the role in foreign policy of the Porte that he did.

On the whole, historians, Turkish and non-Turkish, have praised Khalīl Pasha as a wise and moderate statesman and a good admiral. His constant anti-Spanish policy brought him the favour of the Venetian, Dutch and French historians and contemporaries, as did his loyal fulfilling of the capitulatory information. These and other contacts like the diplomatic relations with diplomats like Salignac, Haga, Čēs, the Venetian, and French historians and contemporaries, as did his loyal fulfilling of the capitulatory obligations of the Porte. Great successes did not come to him, however, either in diplomacy or on the battlefield. His türbe still stands near the tekke and mausoleum of Hūdatī in Uskudar.


KHALÌL PASHA KUT. [see under PASHA].

KHALÌL SULTAN [see Timurids].

KHALÌL (ca. 810-90/1407-85), Ottoman Turkish poet and mystic. Apparently a native of Diyarbakır, where he studied theology, he then moved to Iznik for further study, where he remained for the rest of his life, apart from one year in Istanbul (870/1465-6). He established a dervish convent or maḥābāt-i Hādīdji Kemal’s Điāmī of İsfâhān (918/1512). Khalīl thus forms an interesting and significant figure in 16th/17th century Ottoman literature.

Bibliography: Latifi, Tedhkere, Istanbul 1234/1626-7, 147-8; Sehí, Tedhkere, Istanbul 1235/1627, 64-5; Ediznelli Medvilli, Şahîde-i muḥàniyye terdžumesi, Istanbul 1269/1653, 324; "Ali Emnî, Tedhkere-yi şūr-ārâ-yi Āmid, Istanbul 1327/1909, 277-91; Bursall Mehmed Tahir, Othmanlı müvel-lîfeleri, ii, 155; Gibb, HOP, ii, 370-3; Fevziye Abdullah (Tansel), in IA art. Hallit; idem, in Türk anıkhodopisi, s.v., xviii, 388-9; Şevket Beyaşeroğlu, Dîyarbâkîrî fişek ve sanat adamları, Istanbul 1957, 33-5; Roquefort, "Milletli İsfâhânilerin biyografları, i, 129-33. (A. Karahan)

KHALÌSA (pl. khalîsâ) [see under KHALÌS], as a term signifying crown lands comes into general use in Persian sources in the middle ages. It is also applied to lesser rivers, handîs [q.v.] and wells belonging to the crown. In early Islamic times the term ʿawāfî [q.v.] is used to denote crown lands in general, while the terms diyâ al-khâṣṣa, diyâ al-ṣâlîdân and diyâ al-huṣûfîn are used to private estates of the caliph. Under the early semi-independent dynasties which arose in Persia on the fragmentation of the caliphate, the terms khâṣṣa and khâṣṣa are used of the personal possessions of the ruler with special reference to the revenues paid into his personal treasury from land and other sources. The funds controlled by the ʿâsâfî were known as māli-i khâṣṣa in contradistinction to māli-i maqâlîth, which were the funds controlled by the diyân (cf. Rawandi, Râḥat al-ṣudar, ed. Muhammad Iqbal, GMS, London, Leiden 1921, 382). From the reign of the Ilhâmi Ghāznâ Khan (694-703/1295-1304), the term khâṣṣa is used as well as khâṣṣa and khâṣṣa, with which it may sometimes have been synonymous, though it appears to have been applied especially to crown property consisting of dead lands. Under the early Safawids the terms khâṣṣa and khâṣṣa are used indiscriminately, but from the reign of Shâh AḥÂmâd I (995-1038/1587-1629) khâṣṣa is applied to royal
estates while khāssa is used of provinces and districts under the direct administration of the central government in contradistinction to provinces (mamālik) alienated from its direct control. With the fall of the Safavids the distinction between khāssa and mamālik disappears and under the Kādījars the terms khālisa (pl. khālisdād) and amlākh-i khālisa are used to signify crown lands. The term amlākh-i sawāfi al-ītād is also used in contradistinction to amlākh-i khāssa (private estates).

In both times of Islamic crown lands, originating from conquest, confiscation from rebels and tax defaulters, gift, purchase and reclamation, formed an important category of land in Persia. The basic theory of crown lands goes back to the Kur'ānic prescription that one fifth of the booty (fāy), (q.v.) was to be set aside for the Prophet Muḥammad while the remainder was to be divided among the combatants. Under the orthodox or rightly guided caliphs, the Rāshidūn, there was general agreement that the caliph might retain in the same way one fifth of the booty, and so far as this concerned land it became crown land, sawāfi. Special diwāns were from time to time established to administer crown lands and their revenues, but in practice if often happened that little distinction was made between the revenue from the private estates of the caliph, and later of the temporal rulers, on the one hand and the revenue from land which belonged to the community or the state on the other.

With the spread of the Islamic conquests, modifications were made in the theory of what constituted fāy and its use. ʿUmar I and ʿĀlī are both represented as reserving the division of fāy land in the Sawād (Tab., i, 2371-2, 2469), while the people of Kūfah sought to exclude their lands from fāy, alleging that fāy land was to be found only in the Sawād (Tab., i, 2375). Drained marshes and swampy property belonging to fire-temples and post-houses, princes and their wives, and those to whom fell in battle, and mills in Mesopotamia were exempted from fāy by most authorities. Such lands became sawāfi al-īstān or crown land. Some authorities, however, maintained that the estates belonging to the former Persian royal house and the property of those who had fallen in battle were not so exempted (Tab., i, 2468; Taxation in Islam, iii, Abā Yāsūf’s Kitāb al-kharrāj, ed. A. Ben Shemes, Leiden, London 1969, 75; Balāḏūrī, Futūḥ, 272-3; Taxation in Islam, i, Yaḥyā b. ʿAbd allāh’s Kitāb al-kharrāj, Leiden 1967, 53-4; N. P. Aghnides, Mohammedi an theories of finance, New York-London 1916, 508; F. Lokkegaard, Islamic taxation in the classic period, Copenhagen 1950, 50-224; M. van Berchem, La propriété territoriale et l’impôt foncier, Geneva, 1886, 41-2). It is not to be assumed, however, that all former Sasanian crown land in fact became Muslim crown land. Some estates, at the time of the conquests, were usurped by local daḥkhān (Lokkegaard, 111). In the reign of Muʿawiyah there was an increase in crown land (cf. M. A. Shaban, Islamic History, A.D. 600-750 (A.H. 132), Cambridge 1971, 89). Grants of crown land in Lower ʿIrāk were made by him in the form of baṭṭa (q.v.) to his relatives and supporters. Resentment at this was one of the factors in the revolt of Ibn ʿAṣḥāb against Ḥādīdāh in 82/701. At the time of the battle of Dayr al-Dīljājamīn the register of sawāfi lands was burnt and some crown land was temporarily usurped. ʿAbd al-Malik and his son Walīd further extended the principle of sawāfi in order to appropriate lands reclaimed from desert, marshes or sea, and granted much of it to members of their own family, though some of these grants were later annulled by ʿUmar II (Shaban, op. cit., 124, 132). In the reign of Walīd I more land was reclaimed from the desert (lower ʿIrāk by Mālam b. ʿAbd al-Malik and became his baṭṭa and the owners of many of the estates (diwān) along the two Sīb canals entrusted these to him for his protection. These eventually became the estates of the caliph when the heirs of Dāwūd b. ʿĀlī b. Abū Dālāh b. al-ʿAbbās, to whom the Sībayn estates were granted after the fall of the Umayyads, sold them (Balāḏūrī, 294). Reclaimed and other public lands and endowments in the Hīdājāt were assimilated in the reign of Muʿawiyah to sawāfi land (W. Schmucker, Untersuchungen zu einigen wichtigen bodenrechtlichen Konsequenzen der Islamischen Eroberungsbewegung, Bonn 1972, 142).

The measures taken to deal with the conquered territories were often of an ad hoc nature. There were wide divergences in practice, and many controversies arose concerning their extent and their administration and the right of the caliph to dispose of them. The main question at issue was whether they were the joint possession of the Muslim community, held by it in common and administered by the consent of its leaders, or were held by the imām for the community and were at his disposal (see further Schmucker, op. cit.). The jurists in their expositions were concerned primarily with the practical consequences of the ownership of land rather than its legal status. They attempted to regularise and unify the various practices which had grown up during the conquests, basing their classification of the land upon their varying interpretations of separate incidents in the conquests, in particular the conquest of the Sawād. Extensive Sasanian crown lands had existed in this district, and under the later Sasanian rulers grants from these had been made to members of the royal family. Registers of Sasanian crown lands were apparently kept, though it was not until the reign of Muʿawiyah that lists of the crown lands which had been in the possession of the Sasanian ruler and the royal family are alleged to have been obtained for Muʿawiyah from Ḫūlān (Yaḥyā b. ʿAbd allāh, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden 1883, ii, 258; Balāḏūrī, 290, 295).

Social and political conditions in Sībā, Sīrā, and Transoxania at the time of the conquest differed from ʿIrāk and the neighbourhood, as also did the circumstances of the conquest, and did not affect the evolution of the theory of crown lands. There was no development of crown lands there comparable to what happened in ʿIrāk and the neighbourhood.

There appears to have been a great increase in crown lands under the ʿAbbāsids (P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, nach den arabischen Geographen, Leipzig, 1929-36, vii, 876). In some cases, the owners of land in the conquered territories transferred their property into crown lands, sharing the proceeds with the caliph in order to obtain protection from lawless elements or unjust tax-collectors (cf. Balāḏūrī, 310-11; Lokkegaard, 68-70; Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Qummi, Ṭāḥib-i Qumm, tr. by Persian by Ḥasan b. ʿĀṣī b. Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Malik, ed. Sayyid Djalāl al-Dīn Tehrānī, Tehran 1934, 187). The revenues from crown lands were paid into the bayt al-khāṣṣa, a distinction being made, in general, between what belonged to the caliph and the state revenue. It was, however, by no means without precedent for money from the bayt al-khāṣṣa to be used to defray expenses made for the benefit of the whole realm (Lokkegaard, 51, 157. Cf. also D. Sourdël, Le vizirat ʿabbāsid, Damascus 1960, on the diwān al-dīyā, ii, 591-2).
The classification of the land by the jurists was affected both by the concepts of communal ownership [see IMĀM] prevalent among the early Muslims and the theories of the functions and position of the imām. Land conquered by force (sawādī) and abandoned by its inhabitants, who had been killed, captured or had fled, was, according to al-Shāfi‘ī, treated as property for the public good. Malik on the other hand considered that such land belonged to the community, while Abu Ḥanifa held that the imām could divide it among the captors, who would pay ‘ushr on the land so divided, return it to its original owners and levy khandi on them, or immobilise it for the benefit of the Muslim community. Since land conquered by force constituted booty, the caliph had the right to one fifth of it as sawāfī. Land acquired peacefully because its owners had abandoned it formed a second category. This paid khandi, which represented a dominium paid by whoever exploited it, while a third category was constituted by land coming into Muslim ownership by virtue of a treaty, such land remaining in the possession of its original owners on condition they paid khandi.

Crown land, deriving in part from lands conquered by force and in part from the former crown lands of the Persian kings, was thus distinguished from both land belonging to the community and administered by the imām and land occupied by its original owners, the ownership of which was vested in the Muslim community. Land belonging to the community could not be sold, though in some cases, possibly irregularly, hereditary grants on such land were made to Muslims. Kaffa grants, on the other hand, could be made from crown land, which, from early times, was also granted to individuals as ḥāk al-famili (see further Løkkegaard, 58 ff., and 191 A).

In practice, there was a general tendency for the land belonging to the community to become assimilated to crown land and for both to be looked upon as the property of the imām (cf. Wellhausen, Das arabischische Reich und sein Sturz, Berlin 1927, 171-2). Cases could be found in which both were common. (See further A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant in Persia, Oxford 1953, 17 ff.)

The Shāfi‘ī theory of crown land, formulated rather later than the Sunni, differs only in matters of detail. Land acquired in any way other than war, whether abandoned by its owners or voluntarily handed over to the imām, or land which had ceased to be cultivated by its owners, belonged to the imām. He could dispose of it to individuals to cultivate, the latter becoming responsible for the tax on the land. Land which was unoccupied and without owners, such as beaches and shores of the sea, and the summits of mountains, also belonged to the imām. Similarly, after the conquest of enemy territory all the effects, moveable and immovable, of the conquered ruler, provided such property had not been seized formerly from a Muslim, ally or tributary, became the property of the imām (Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, al-Nihāya fi muḍjjarād al-fīh wa-l-fatāwah, ed. Sayyid Muhammad Bākr Sabzawārī, Tehran 1954, 130-1, 133 A; Nasir al-Dīn Abu’l Kāsim Dā‘far b. ʿAlī Yahya al-Muḥākkik al-Awawl, Sharā‘ī al-Islām fi masāli‘ al-hiql al-wāl wa-l-haram (Droit musulman), tr. A. Querry, Paris 1871-2, i, 179-80, tr. into Persian with the title Muḥkamāt al-nāfī‘, ed. Muhammad Taqī Dānishpārzād, Tehran 1964, 145). There was, however, some difference of opinion as to the disposal of the “fifth” of the booty during the concession of the imām (al-Nihāya, 133-4). Dead land or abandoned land belonged to the imām and no one could take possession of it except with his permission. He could take possession of it himself, give it away or sell it, though in the case of dead land it was preferable that he should give it to whoever had reclaimed it; he could also buy such land (al-Nihāya, 131). All land conquered by force became the property of the Muslim community as a whole and not only of the combatants. It could not be sold, constituted into waṣf or given away. Its administration belonged to the imām alone. Its proceeds were to go for the public good (masāli‘) (al-Nihāya, 130-1; Sharā‘ī, i, 337; Muḥkamāt al-nāfī‘, 144-5).

In view of the special position of the law in the life of the Muslim community, no independent theory concerning the legal status of the land or its ultimate ownership was to be expected. The formulation of the jurists, whether Sunni or Shi‘ī, based on their interpretation of the conquests, remained the standard theory, though practice diverged even more widely from theory than in early Islamic times. Just as confusion had existed in early times between sawāfī and jayyīland, and lack of clarity as to what constituted ownership, to what extent the ruler enjoyed rights of disposal, and to whom and on what terms rights of use might be given, so in later times there was often confusion as to whether the land be held by the ruler as the head of the state (diwānī land) and crown land, though the nature of his ownership of the one clearly differed from that of the other. The conception of the community as the owner of the land disappeared and was, as it were, swallowed up in the conception of the ruler as the owner of diwānī land. But whereas under Islamic law the ownership of land held by the community and that held by the ruler was able to make permanent, temporary and life grants on diwānī land. It may, perhaps, have been argued that such grants were merely a right of use, but diwānī land was also sometimes constituted into waṣf, which implies full rights of disposal. Crown land, as in the case of the earlier sawāfī, was not all of the same kind: some was acquired by the ruler in his “official” capacity, which had then been transferred to the former rulers, and some by purchase or gift. The latter constituted his “personal” estates. In either case, however, he appears to have enjoyed full rights of disposal over the land. So far as the ruler’s “personal” estates were transmitted by inheritance or gift to minor members of his family and not to the succeeding sultan, they became ordinary private property (milāḥ). Permanent, temporary and life grants were at all times made from crown land, as from diwānī land, and crown estates were also frequently constituted into a charitable or personal waṣf. The fact that crown land could be thus disposed of makes it extremely difficult to estimate its extent at any given moment. Moreover, the registers in which crown land was entered were often destroyed in the upheavals and disturbances which accompanied the transfer of power from one dynasty to another.

When the caliphate fragmented in the 3rd and 4th centuries, the local rulers also acquired by conquest, confiscation, purchase, or gift lands which they converted into crown lands. A similar process took place in the various empires and kingdoms which arose in Persia after the fall of the caliphate. During the reassembly of the temporal power of the caliphate by al-Nasir billāh (575-622/1180-1225), his waṣir, Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn (d. 592/1195-6), attempted to assert the caliph’s ownership to all land. He called in title-deeds (kabālāhā) in Khūzestān and
said “The land belongs to the Commander of the Faithful” (Rawandl, Rabat al-sudur, 381-2, Bartold, Turkestan, 186).

According to Gardizî, ʿAmr b. Layîš, the Şaffârîd (265/887/890), had four treasuries. One was for its weapons and the other three for funds obtained from various sources and expended on different purposes. One of these was for the monies (mâl-i ḵaṣṣ) deriving from grain and estates (diywāʾ), which were expended on his personal expenses (māfābāt wa māfābāt wa māfābāt ūnān) (Yaʿqûb al-Kindî, Mūʾajjâl al-Mustawla, ed. Muhammad Nâṣîrîn, Berlin 1928, 135; Bartold, Turkestan, 221). One of the nine government offices of the Šām from the time of Nâṣîr al-Dîn mentioned by Nâṣîr al-Dîn in the Târîḵ-i Buhârî is the diwân-i mamîlîk-i ḵâṣṣ, which was presumably concerned either with the ruler’s personal estates or with lands whose revenue was paid directly to him (transl. into Persian by Abû Nabî Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Kuchâvî, adapted by Muḥammad b. Zufr b. ʿUmar, ed. Mudarris Râdîvâl, Tehran 1938-9, 31). Nâṣîr al-Dîn also mentions the purchase of estates by Ismâʿîl Šâhânî (ibid., 33-5), and an occasion when crown lands (diywāʾ-i sultân) were exempted from kharâj after a flood (ibid., 40). The Ghaznavids also had extensive royal estates (diywāʾ-i ḵasni-i ḵâṣṣ). These were under a special official, who appears to have had an important position (Nâṣîr al-Dîn, Qâṣimî, ed. G. Leiden 1921, ii, 96; Ibn al-Athîr, viii, 342). Expropriation was widespread, but it is not clear whether expropriated estates became crown land or state land, though in all probability no clear distinction was made between the two. The diwân al-khâṣṣ in Baghdad is mentioned by Hâfîz ibn Âlî Shâhânî (in Kâlamânir al-Khâṣṣ, ed. Khanbâbâ Bahâruddîn, Paris 1894, ii, 45). Aḏud al-Dawla (who ruled in Fârs from 338/949 and over ʿIrâk also from 367/977 to 372/982) probably owned many personal estates, some of which he made into ḵâṣṣ for his sons by his chief wife. At the time of Kâzîrîn to the ruler (in hârîz bi ḵâṣṣ-i diwân-i ḵâṣṣ-i nāṣîrîn, ed. Fâṣâl, Strang and R. A. Nicholson, GMS, Leiden 1911, 145-6). Alp Arslân appears to have held a number of private estates, some of which had been newly created (Nâṣîm al-Mulk, Nâṣîr-i nāṣîm, ms. in my possession, f. 30b). Mention is also made of estates held by the sultan (ḥâṣṣ al-sultân) in Kûfâ in the reign of Tughrîl Beg (Ibn al-Athîr, x, 8) which may, however, have been the private estates of the caliphs surviving from earlier times. There are also references to property belonging to the diwân-i ḵâṣṣ of Sandjar in Bâstâm, Marv and Ray (ʿAtâbât al-kâtâba, ed. Muḥammad Kâzîwâlî and ʿAbbâs Ikbâl, Tehran 1950, 56, 67, 72), to peasants on his estates (Қazâzîr-dawâb-i ḵâṣṣ) in Marv (ibid., 67) and to the diwân-i ʿamâli va ʿabâb-i ḵâṣṣ in Ray (ibid., 73).

The rulers of the Saljuq successor states also acquired, like others before them, crown land. Part of Fârs, for example, was held by the Atabegs (543/1148-1287), as their personal estates (amâkî) (Shâhîzâd-nâmâ, 94).

The Mongol invasion, in contradiction to the Saljuq, brought about a large increase in crown lands. Much land, both at the time of the conquest and later, became dead or unclaimed land and this became crown land (Ibn ʿAbî ṬâṬîs, ed. Schefer, Paris 1891-3, Persian ed. Schefer, Paris 1891-3, Persian text, 28; Landlord and Peasant, 61), but crown land, as such, appears to have had small importance. There is little evidence to show that former crown land, which belonged immediately to the ruler and to land which belonged in perpetuity to the ruler and to land granted as apancies to his relatives (cf. Doerfler, Türkische und mongolische elemente im Neupersischen, Wiesbaden 1963, i, 325). The term ḥâlây rapidly went out of use, but the term ḵâṣṣ continued to be used throughout the Ilkân period to designate land primarily, though not exclusively, granted to the family and to land which belonged immediately to the ruler and which belonged in perpetuity (ibid., 325-32). Gradually the concept of ḵâṣṣ land became assimilated to existing concepts of crown land and came to signify land over which the ruler had full rights of disposal and which he granted on a hereditary title to his family and others. Whether the grantees then had full rights of disposal themselves is not clear. Much of Fârs became ḵâṣṣ. When Abûdâbî beg was appointed Abîbî bint Saʿd over Fârs (ca. 683/1283-4), her wazīr Nâṣîm al-Dîn urged Abîd to issue a yirîlîq declaring the former khâlîsîa of the Atabegs, much of which had been resumed by the diwân, to be ṣâyi and to share its proceeds with the Atabeg. A yirîlîq was duly issued and on this pretext Nâṣîm al-Dîn converted much land in Fârs into ṣâyi, although it had not, in fact, formerly been khâlîsîa. Among the estates confiscated by the Mongols were those of the Tabâtabaʾi sayyids. Eventually some of these estates were re-granted to Sayyid Kûtâb al-Dîn Abîd and the Tabâtabaʾi sayyids of Fârs were thenceforward known as the ṣâyi sayyids. Eventually some of these estates were re-granted to Sayyid Kûtâb al-Dîn Abîd and the Tabâtabaʾi sayyids of Fârs were thenceforward known as the ṣâyi sayyids of Fârs (Fâṣâl, Fârs-nâmâ-i Nâṣîrîn, lith., Tehran 1894, ii, 42). Ṣâyi al-Dîn states that Ghažân Khân assigned ṣâyi lands to each horse to provide for its upkeep and that of the Mongol princes. These lands were separated from the diwân and given into the possession of the horses. He made his own ṣâyi lands into ḵâṣṣ for his sons by his chief wife. At the time of
the composition of the Tārīkh-i mubārak-i Ghāzānī all īndja lands were alleged to have been in the possession of the deputies (umāmā) of Ghāzān Khan’s wives. Drafts were made on them when money was required for the army (Tārīkh-mubārak-i Ghāzānī, 330-1). In 703/1303–4 when Ghāzān decided to give iḥṣā’s to the soldiery, these were granted on īndja, dālāy and dead land (ibid., 305; Landlord and Peasants, 89–90).

The Persian ministers of the Īlkānids were, no doubt, largely responsible for the assimilation of the concept of dālāy and īndja respectively to the concept of state land and crown land which existed in the conquered territories. Among them was Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṣūrūtī, who discusses crown land in a brief essay on finance. He states that one of the forty tax units of īndja land was, as Chardin pointed out (Voyages du Cheva-

lire Chardin en Perse, et autres lieux de l‘Orient, ed. L. Langës, Paris 1811, v, 382), potentially khāṣṣa, since the shah could, whenever he wished, declare it so. In a sense, therefore, there was in theory no difference between the ultimate ownership of dālāy or īndja land, (māl-i maśāliḵ-i pāḏavāshāliḵ) and that destined for the needs of the kingdom (māl-i maśāliḵ-i pādāshāh). The former came from the reclamation or improvement of places which had been in a ruined or bad condition (after the right of the owner or owner’s representative had been redeemed) and landed estates (mīlḵ-i āh) which had been bought and from various other sources. (Madmūs-i roudhī, Proc. of the University of Tehran, No. 308 (1956), 32. See also M. Minovī and V. Minorsky, Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūṣī on Finance, in BSOAS, v/3 (1942), 51 ff.

As in the case of the earlier savāfī there appear to have been different categories of crown land. At the time of Ghāzān Khan, in addition to īndja land and amālāk-i khāṣṣa (royal estates), mention is also made of īndja-i ghāzānī (state lands) and īndja-i Ghāzān Khan (cf. Rashīd al-Dīn Fadl Allah, Mukta-

bāšt-i Rashīdī, ed. Muhammad Shaffī, Labore 1945, 224–5). Dead land also constituted a special category and was called khāṣṣa. Its extent was very considerable, and Ghāzān Khan, in his efforts to revive agriculture and to restore prosperity, established a special divān, the divān-i khāṣṣa, for the registration and classification of dead land.

Reclamation, as in Islamic law, carried with it rights of ownership and sale (Tārīkh-i mubārak-i Ghāzānī, 353–4, 356. Cf. also ibid., 204, and Landlord and Peasants, 91). According to Waṣṣafī, in or about 698/1298–9, 20,000 faddāns of land, including 3,000 ploughlands (dūfī) in Baghdād and the neighbourhood, and 3,000 in Shīrāz were transferred to the divān-i khāṣṣa. The latter supplied seed, draught animals, and implements to those who undertook their cultivation. In return so much per ploughland was to be paid annually to the divān-i khāṣṣa. The contracts for cultivation were apparently for a limited period only and on the expiry of this period the seed, draught animals and implements, or a sum of money in lieu thereof, were to be returned to the divān-i khāṣṣa (Tārīkh-i Waṣṣafī, 349). What success attended Ghāzān’s efforts to reclaim khāṣṣa and how long the divān-i khāṣṣa existed as a special divān is not clear.

When the Īlkān empire broke up into a number of successor states, their rulers also became possessed of crown land. For example, the Muzaffarids had estates in Kirmān (Muṣṭafā al-Dīn Nātasī, Mumākhabal al-tawārīḵ-i Muṣīnī, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 181). Hāfīẓ Abūrū mentions the amālāk-i khāṣṣa of Amir Mūḥammad Shāh Īndjū (Dhayl-i ḡāmān-i al-tawārīḵ-i Rākhīdī, 187) and Ibn Zarkūb makes an interesting statement to the effect that when Mūḥammad Shāh became independent in Fārs “īndjū and dāla became one” (Shīrūs-nāma, 101). Between the decline of the Īlkān empire and the rise of the Šafawīs in the 16th century there does not appear to have been any major spread of crown lands such as occurred under the Īlkānids, though further research may cause this statement to be modified.

Under the Šafawīs the general distinction between khāṣṣa or crown land and divān or state land, which was now known as mamālīḵ (provinces), continued to exist, but was not so much a question of the ownership and the legal status of the land as of the control and expenditure of its revenue. All divān (mamālīḵ) land was, as Chardin pointed out (‘ibid., 308-1038/1597–1629), if not earlier, it appears to have been assumed that all property was owned by the shah, and that only its usufruct, not its outright possession, could be granted (cf. A chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, London 1939, ii, 1032).

The separation between khāṣṣa and mamālīḵ districts was not absolute, and it appears to have been possible for divān dāla to have been drawn on khāṣṣa land and for transfers to have been made between the khāṣṣa and mamālīḵ treasuries. A decree given by Shāh ‘Abbās for the gift of land along the Zāyanda-Rūd of Isfahān to the Armenians of Dūlāh in 1028/1619 suggests that no very clear distinction was made at that time between crown land and state land. It states that the land to be given to the Armenians was “our royal property (mīlḵ-i mawlaḵi- humayyān-i māl)”, and instructs the mustawīf of the divān to delete the land from what belonged to the divān (milkiyat-i divān) (Hunarfar, Gandjina-i āthār-i tārīkh-i Isfahān, Isfahān 1966–7, 505–6).

Within the general category of crown land there was, as in earlier times, a confusion between land directly administered under the crown and the personal estates of the ruler. Prior to the reign of Shāh ‘Abbās, the terms khāṣṣa and khāṣṣa appear to have been applied indiscriminately to provinces and districts which were under the direct administration of the state in contradistinction to provinces which were alienated as tuyāl from its direct control. Broadly speaking, khāṣṣa appears to have been applied to large districts or provinces, whereas khāṣṣa was more often applied to smaller districts reserved to the khāṣṣa administration within provinces which were granted as tuyāl (K. Rohrborn, Provinzen und Zentralgewalt Persiens im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert, Berlin 1966, 131). Shāh Tahmāsp (930–89/1524–76) is alleged to have remitted the khāṣṣa for eight years from districts which were khāṣṣa (Haydar b. ‘Abbār Rāzī, Tārīkh-i Haydārī, quoted by Rohrborn, 132). On the death of Tahmāsp, Iskandar Munshi states that Mūrcḥid Kūč Khan appropriated most of the khāṣṣa estates (amālāk-i khāṣṣa) which had belonged first to Tahmāsp, and then to Sultan Hamza Mirzā and Abū Tālib Mirzā (Tārīkh-i ḡāf-
Other members of the Safavid family also held private estates in different parts of the empire: Sayyid Begum, Tahmasp's daughter, held estates (amalak wa rastabat) in Yazd and the neighbourhood (Muhammad Mufid, Djamisi-i Mufidi, ed. Tradi Afsari, Tehran 1951-2, ii, 262, 701). Shah Abbass also possessed extensive personal estates and in 1635-9 or 1640 (abadi, ii, 761-2). The administration of khassa land was under waizirs appointed by the central government, each khassa district or province having its own waizir. In a waizir dated 975/1567 entrusting the waizariate of Gilan to the waizir of Khurasan, the latter was instructed to make, with the knowledge and approval of the minor waizirs of Gilan, payment orders on the taxes and monies (mali va dighat va wudjihat) of each district (mahall) for the wages (masadid) allotted by royal decrees to the great amirs. He was to take possession on behalf of the khassa administration, of whatever remained (B.M. Or. 4698, ii, 17b, quoted by Rohrborn, 110). In general, it seems that local administration and defence was the first charge on the revenue of the khassa districts. If the revenue of a given district was insufficient for these purposes, it was possible for an additional draft on khassa revenue from some other source to be made available to make good the deficit (cf. Rohrborn, 109).

From the reign of Shah Abbass onwards a distinction was made between khiliska and khassa. Muhammad Mufid, for example, mentions the khilisadidt of the khassa administration (Djamisi-i Mufidi, ii, 173). He also states that a certain Mawlana Muhammad Shafi (d. 1063/1652-3) was entrusted by the shah with the annual distribution of 1,000 tumsan in cash and kind from the khiliska to the deserving of Yazd (ibid., iii, 308-9). Rohrborn considers that the distinction between khiliska and khassa became clearly drawn under Shah Abbass who had decided to pay the standing army and the provincial militia by assessments made on khassa land ("Amadari, ii, 924; Rohrborn, 110, 134. Cf. also Chardin, Voyages, v, 250-2, 279, 205-9, 303-4, 380-2). Rohrborn gives lists of the khassa provinces up to 995/1587, the year of Shah Abbas' accession, and after (177-8). In either case the outlying provinces tended to be mamalik and the central provinces khassa. In the second period the number of khassa provinces is greater. The most important and richest of them was Isfahan, which became the capital under Shah Abbass. Defence of the khassa provinces was the concern, not of the provincial governor or tawaldar, as it was in the mamalik, but of the standing army and local militia (Rohrborn, 118-22). Under Shah Safi (1038-52/1629-42) Fars became khiliska but, contrary to Chardin's assertion (v, 279), he did not initiate the policy of resuming mamalik into khassa. This policy reached its height under Shah Abbass II (1055-77/1642-67), who, according to Chardin, resumed Kavvin, Gilan, Mazanderan, Yazd, Kirmn, Khorasan and Aghardvar (v, 251). The resumption of a province was, however, sometimes only temporary. After the reign of Shah Abbass II the tendency was for the mamalik to expand at the expense of the khassa and at the same time for the distinction between them to become, perhaps, less sharp.

Chardin states that various types of grant were made on khassa land. These were (i) grants in lieu of salary, such grants being sometimes attached in perpetuity to an office, (ii) grants to officers and servants of the royal household and for the pay of the standing army, and (iii) temporary and life grants, which were sometimes converted to son over several generations. What remained after the allocation of such grants was administered under the waizirs for the benefit of the khassa administration. So far as crown estates were not rented they were worked on a crop-sharing system, which probably differed little from that in operation in privately owned property. The main difference was that both the mali (the taxes) and the kind (what remained after the payment of taxes) belonged to the crown. Kaempfer gives an account of the crop-sharing system prevailing in khassa land round Isfahan in or about 1684 (Amonestatam exoticarium politico-physico-medicum, fasc. v, Lemgo 1712, 91; Landlord and Peasant, 127). Du Mans, writing in 1660, states that most of the land was crown land, "moulki chahy", as opposed to privately owned (arabbi) land. He gives an unfavourable account of the administration of crown land, alleging, like Chardin, extortion by the waizirs and comptrollers (Estat de la Perse en l'an 1660, Paris 1890, 227, Chardin, v, 250-4, 276-7, 279).

Sanson, on the other hand, alleges that the whole of Persia was the property of the shah, that all estates were held by his grace and that he could, when he wished, resume them (Voyage ou relation de l'état present du royaume de Perse, Paris 1695, 192). This, however, would seem to be an exaggeration. It is possible that both Sanson and Chardin, whose evidence on the subject of land tenure is not wholly consistent (cf. Rohrborn, 113), in their interpretation of the legal status of the land, were influenced by their knowledge of western European feudal tenure.

Two administrative handbooks, the Tadkhirat al-muluk (ed. V. Minorsky, GMS, London and Leiden 1943) and the Dastuir al-muluk (Muhammad Taqti Diniqapazhui, Dastuir al-muluk-i Mirda Raftif, in Rev. de la Faculte des Lettres et des Sciences humaines, University of Tehran, xvi/5-6 and xvi/7-6), belonging to the late Safavid period and possibly going back to a common original, make a clear distinction between the khassa administration and the mamalik administration. The duties of the mustausfi of the sarkari khassa give an indication of some of the matters (in addition to those pertaining to the royal household) which came under the khassa administration. These were not confined to the administration of crown land. The main duty of the mustausfi was to keep the records and files of the taxes and monies (mali va dighat va wudjihat) from the mahall of Isfahan, Gilanat, Mazendaran, Kishan, Bandar (? "Abbass), and Yazd, and certain monies (wudjihat) from other provinces (sair-i wilayat), and monies from the djizya of the Armenians, the sale of tobacco, road tolls (rakhdari), ad hoc levies on sheep and goats in Isfahan, customs at the ports (wudjihat-i 'ushr wa khurudi-l bandar), the mints, psakhak from kalantar (v.o.), fees (daghuhih wa psakhak-i mukarrari), and other monies according to the assessments made by the khassa administration (? sair-i wudjihat-i djamisi-i sarkari-khassa), and to clear the accounts of the taxpayers with that administration (Dastuir al-muluk, xvi/3, 312). The khassa administration was not, however, wholly independent from the mamalik administration, since the mustausfi al-mamalik could, it seems, make drafts on khassa revenue (cf. Tadkhirat al-muluk, ii, 28a-b, Dastuir al-muluk, xvi/3, 312). The grand waizir exercised supervision over both administrations, and documents for the appointment of scribes to the royal secretariat and private house-
hold (daštarḵhāna-i humāyūn wa ḥaḵṣa) and of workers in the royal workshops (buyūtāt) were issued by the grand wazir with the approval of the mansūfī al-mamālīk, the nāẓīr-i buyūtāt, and the mustawfī-ī ḥaḵṣa. Applications for remissions of taxation from taxpayers in ḥaḵṣa districts also had to be sanctioned by the grand wazir (Tadhkirat al-mulūk, f. l0a).

One of the main tasks of the ḥaḵṣa administration was to administer the land round ʿĪṣāhān, known as the muḥāli. This consisted of ḥaḵṣa, awḵāf, and mustawfī-ī-ḵandāt. The first was under the wazir of the capital. His duty was to arrange for the cultivation of ḥaḵṣa land either by concluding tenancies or crop-sharing agreements with the peasants, to ensure that no place lacked peasants or what was needed for its cultivation, to see to the repair of kandāt, and buildings (shops, caravansarais, baths, etc.), to protect the peasants from oppression from whatever quarter, to investigate agricultural disputes, to collect the revenue and produce of the ḥaḵṣa districts, and, after the deduction of his own salary and the expenses of the administration, to see that what remained was expended upon its proper purposes (Dastūr al-mulūk, xvii/3, 319-20; Tadhkirat al-mulūk, ff. 72a-74a; Landlord and Peasant, 119). The second, awḵāf, came under the wazir of the fāyṣāḏār department, whose duty was to see that the land concerned was cultivated according to capacity, to provide whatever was needed for its cultivation, to see that gardens, buildings, mills, and kandāt were in good repair (Dastūr al-mulūk, xvii/3, 321; Tadhkirat al-mulūk, ff. 71a-72a; Landlord and Peasant, 121). The third, which came under the wazir of the initiḏātī department, possibly consisted of land newly transferred from the diwān to the ḥaḵṣa administration (cf. Dastūr al-mulūk, xvii/3, 540). The duties of the wazir of the awḵāf-i initiḏātī were similar to those of the wazir of the capital (Tadhkirat al-mulūk, ff. 82a-b; Landlord and Peasant, 120).

With the fall of the ʿAfāfids, the distinction between ḥaḵṣa and mamālīk, which had concerned the administration rather than the legal status of the land, disappeared. The sources use again, from time to time, the term diwānī for land which belonged to the state opposed to ḥaḵṣa. The ruler and deriving from earlier times, confiscation or purchase. The difference between them is not always clear, however, especially since confiscated land sometimes became diwānī land and sometimes ḥaḵṣa. The situation became further confused by later dynastic changes. New ḥaḵṣaḏātī were created, mainly by confiscation, while some old ḥaḵṣaḏātī were usurped. In 1135/1728-9 Nadīr Shāh (1148-60/1236-47) issued orders for the resumption of the awḵāf of Fārs by the diwān-i ḥaḵṣa (Fārs-nāma-i ʿĀḏīl Shāh, i, 87-93, cf. also i, 66, 86), and in the last year of his reign promulgated a decree for the resumption of all awḵāf. Consequent upon this decree a considerable number of awḵāf were taken over and entered with ḥaḵṣa estates in the land register subsequently known as the rābakht-i nāḏīrī (Hasan Khan Shāhīdkhāna-i Aqšerī, Tārkīḵ-i niṣf-i diḵān wa hamāta-i diḵān, līth. n.d., 36-8; Landlord and Peasant, 131-2). The decree was revoked by Nādīr’s successor, ʿĀḏīl Shāh. Some of the confiscated estates were returned to their former owners (Tārkīḵ-i niṣf-i diḵān, 49), but Sir John Malcolm, writing at the beginning of the 19th century, states that the lands were never fully restored (History of Persia, London 1829, ii, 353).

Under the Kāḏārs, ḥaḵṣa, deriving partly from earlier periods and partly from confiscation for ar-
KHALISA — AL-KHALISA

Khalisa land, as at earlier periods, was either
directly administered on a crop-sharing basis or let
on a tenancy, which in effect amounted to a revenue
farm, the farmer concluding crop-sharing agreements
with the local peasants (Landlord and Peasant, 148-9).

Tuyuls were also frequently assigned on the revenues
of Khalisa land either to officials in lieu of salary
or as allowances and pensions to the ruler's sup-
porters, tribal leaders or religious dignitaries (cf.
Rawlinson, Notes on a journey from Tabrīz through
Persian Kurdistan to the ruins of Takhti-Soleiman, in
JRGs (1841), 5). In the provinces, the taxes on
Khalisa land and the government's rent or share of
the produce were collected by the provincial gover-
nors, provided that they had not been otherwise
assigned. Grain obtained in this way was used
primarily to provision the army, but also to prevent
the creation of artificial shortages and hoarding in
times of grain shortages.

By the second half of the 19th century much
Khalisa land, which still occupied a considerable part
of the country, was in a state of decay and made
little contribution to the revenue. Some estates had
been abandoned by their peasants as was the case in
Māmālūk (cf. Rāznī, i, 207-8; Sīāhkhānyā, 29
Djmādā I 1269/2 March 1853). Many villages in the
province of Isfahān, some of which were Khalisa,
also fallen out of cultivation. At the beginning of
the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn (1848-96) a large sum
of money, together with a considerable quantity of
grain, was made available on the revenue of Isfahān
to Mīrzā ʿAbd al-Husayn, the head of the finance
department of Isfahān, to enable him to bring them
back into cultivation. Instead, he spent the money on
military supplies and rebelled. After the ensuing
disorders were put down, the estates of those im-
plicated were confiscated and became Khalisa. Sub-
sequently, however, their former owners regained
them by various means.

In 1861, Eastwick wrote that a third, or according
to some, half of the land of Persia was Khalisa, but
that it was said to be much neglected. Advances for
the expenses of cultivation at enormous rates of in-
terest were made to the cultivators, who, subject to
innumerable arbitrary exactions, were unable to
accumulate capital to make improvements, and who
would, in any case, not make them if they could
"knowing that their rent would be raised or their
leases rescinded" (UK. British Parliamentary Papers,
58 (1862)—Accounts and papers: Manufactures and
commerce, and trade of foreign countries, Session
6 Feb.-7 Aug. 1862, LVIII (1862). Report by Mr.
Eastwick, Her Majesty's Secretary of Legation, camp
near Tehran, 5 July 1861, 70). Some two years later,
in 1863, an attempt was made to develop Khalisa
land in Isfahān, and an order was issued that the necessary
expenses should be provided by the government and
that they should be let on a five-year lease (Rāzmāna-i
dawlat-i ʿalām-i ʿIrān, 18 Dhūl Kaʿdā 1270/7
May 1863). The measures were abortive. Wālik al-Mulk,
who had been sent about the same time to Kirmān
to look into the condition of Khalisa, property was
apparently more successful (ibid., 14 Djmādā II
1280/26 Nov. 1863).

More land fell out of cultivation during the famine
years of 1871-2. No control was exercised over Khalisa
land and further confusion followed. Finally in 1874,
Zill al-Sulṭān, when he was appointed governor of Isfahān, concluded mukādaʿā contracts for a ten-year period (instead of the more
normal three years) for the Khalisa of Isfahān, presumably hoping that a long-term contract would
encourage the lessees to improve the land (Tarikh-i
nīsīf-i ʿIrān, 51 ff.).

Nāṣir al-Dīn and his successor, Muṣṭafā al-Dīn,
were repeatedly in need of money and on several
occasions lots of Khalisa land were sold, including, in
the latter years of Nāṣir al-Dīn's reign and the early
years of Muṣṭafā al-Dīn's reign, most of the Khalisa
round Isfahān (Tarikh-i nīsīf-i ʿIrān, 63 ff.). Much
of it was bought by the rich notables and the ʿulāmā
(see further Landlord and Peasant, 153-4, and cf.
also UK. Consular reports 2260/1899, No. 2260 An-
nual series. Preece "Isfahān, 1897-8", 13). In 1901-2
there was another major sale of Khalisa land, when
the ʿadr-i aʿṣām, Mīrzā ʿAlī Aṣghar Amin al-Sulṭān,
disposed of most of Shūlāstān to Muʿīn al-Tujjiğār
Bushīhīrī (Gašter of Persia 3, Calcutta 1910, under
Māmālūk, 65)). For the rest, no effective steps
were taken to improve the cultivation of crown lands
or to exploit them effectively for the benefit of the
state (cf. A. Destrée, Les Fonctionnaires belges au
service de la Perse 1898-1915, doctoral thesis presented
to the Free University of Brussels, 1973, 1, 423).

In the 20th century new political exigencies led
to the disappearance of some categories of Khalisa,
the creation of new categories and legislation
apparently more successful than what it replaced
with it. This legislation, however, was mainly con-
cerned with the sale, acquisition, and administration
of Khalisa and no general legal principles underlying
the existence of such land were formulated. The
dichotomy in the administrative field between dawānī
(state land) and Khalisa (crown land), so far as it
had survived, disappeared after the grant of the
Constitution, and in due course the term Khalisa
to be applied to crown lands in the sense of state
lands and no longer signified the personal estates of
the ruler, which were referred to as amāk-i Shāh
or amāk-i ʿalāmāt (see further Landlord and Peasant,
238 ff., for an account of the history of crown lands
since 1906, and A. K. S. lambton, The Persian land
reform 1902-6, Oxford 1969, index).

Bibliography: given in the article. It is not possible to give here an account of all texts which might
contribute to the history of crown land in Persia
since they would include most chronicles and local
histories.

(A. K. S. LAMBTON)

AL-KHALISA, Fatimid citadel built in 326/937-8 by ʿAlī b. Iṣḥāk b. ʿUmar, who had been sent by the Fatimid caliph al-Kāʿīm [q.v.] to suppress a rebellion of the Sicilians against the amīr Sālim b. Abī Rāshīd.

For strategic reasons, in particular, the possibility of receiving with ease reinforcements by sea, the town was constructed opposite the ancient Cassaro (al-Ḳāṣr) of Palermo [see BALARM] and near to the port. Its construction, at the inhabitants' own expense, was achieved by demolishing a large part of the ancient urban centre, whose walls were carried off, according to Ibn al-ʿAṯīr (for the information of this historian, and of the geographers cited below, see the BAS, cited in the bibliography, index). The town, called by its founder al-Khāliṣa ("the Pure") (Xελισα in Greek diplomas of the Norman period, Chalcia, Halicia and more rarely Chaleasa in Latin documents down to the 14th century, and Alza or Alca at the end of the 13th century, a vulgar form from which is derived the present name Ausa), was encircled by walls provided with gateways, apart from the eastern side. Al-Muṣṭafādīs gives the names of the four gates as Bāb Kutāma, Bāb al-Futūḥ, Bāb al-Bunūd and Bāb al-Šināʾa (Bāb al-Brāʾ in al-Idrīsī). In the Fātih-
mid and Kalbid periods, it was the residence of the Muslim governor and his entourage, and at this time, according to Ibn Hawkal who visited it in 365/976, it possessed neither markets nor hostels, but was provided with administrative services, a small Friday mosque, an arsenal, a prison and baths. This new “external” town, whose prestige as an administrative centre was linked with all the fortunes of the Muslims in Sicily, is mentioned as one of the five sectors of Kalbid Palermo visited by Ibn Hawkal (in addition to al-Khalisa, they are named al-Asrār al-Harāq, al-Triq al-Djiydi, al-Harr al-Shaqlība). It was then described by al-Idrīsī as part of the rażd of Palermo, and by Yāḵūt (d. 626/1229) as a mere mahāl in the centre of Palermo.

The disappearance of the walls, from the 14th century onwards, makes identification of the former Fāṭimid citadel difficult within the urban sprawl of modern Palermo, where the name of Kalsa has been extended to a quarter which goes from St. Francis of Assisi square to the port. If the reconstruction of the former urban limits done by Amari (BAS, i, 12 n. 3) seems to posit too great an extent for al-Khalisa, the hypothesis of Columbia seems more acceptable: he proposed an area trapezoidal in shape and covering some 8 hectares, which would be enough to make Kalsa into a citadel including the amīr’s residence, administrative buildings, a small Friday mosque, baths and a certain number of other buildings.


**KAHLAK (a.), creation.**

1. Lexicographical data.

Khalak, noun of action of the verb khalaka, which properly means the act of creating, can also be used to designate Creation in its entirety: wa-l-khalak yahān al-masād wa-yakān al-makhlūk (L.4). The noun of the agent, al-khali̱l, defined by the article, is applied only to God and is one of His Names. According to the L.A., in the speech of the Arabs al-khalk is used to designate the production of some new thing (ṭabbaṭ) on a pattern which has not been previously employed (ʿalā miṣghāl lam yusbab ishaṣ). Abū Bakr b. al-Anbārī, a philologist of the 4th/10th century, gives a slightly different definition: khalak is either a product (ingaṣḥ) designed on an invented model (abbaṣa), or it is the act that determines the proportions (tkādir) of something which is to be brought into being; thus when ʿāš b. Maryam (Kurān, III, 49) says: “Yes, I will create (abkḫuṭu) for you from clay the likeness of a bird”, he does not wish to say that he will bring into existence that which does not exist (lam yurūd annahu yuḥāṣu maḏmuṭ). Ibn Ṣidāh (5/11th century) considers that for God to create is to bring into being a thing which previously was not (baʿḍ an lam yakan). It should be noted that some commentators (al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Muḥādīdī) give the meaning of din (religion) (the totality of classes of the Law) to the word khalak in the verse (IV, 119): “They have tampered with God’s creation”. The reasoning behind this is that God has stamped on creation a nature (jamlaʾ l-khalak) that conforms with Islam; cf. Kurān, XXX, 30: “nature created by God (jāfrāt Allāh) according to which He has stamped the nature of men: there can be no change in God’s creation”, that is, in the truth of religion (ṣiḥḥat al-dīn). Elsewhere, khalk can mean a mendacious forgery (Kurān, XXVI, 137); three commentators indicate the reading, “It is nothing but a forgery (khalak) of the ancients” instead of the customary khulūl. Khalak is therefore equivalent to ṣāṣīr al-aḥwālīn, the legends of the ancients, which is found in a number of sūras (cf. al-Zamakhshari, Kashf al-hīdūl). There is also the expression abāḍīth al-khalak, which is synonymous with ḥurrāfīt, old wives’ tales.

Most of these meanings are supplied by relatively late lexicographers and bear the clear stamp of theological reflection on the word khalak. But the L.A. gives uses which seem to haste back to the primitive meaning of the root. Thus the Arabs say: khalākāʾl-adīm, which means: “to determine before it is cut how much leather is needed to make what is required, and to size it up with a view to cutting out a shopping-bag, a water bottle or a boot”. Ibn Manẓūr gives, as an example, one of Ẓuhayr’s verses and a ḥādīth from the sister of Umāyya b. Abī Ṭaḥlib, both evidence from early times, and a verse by al-Kulaynī (d. 224/743). With the meaning of a lie, the form ikhlṣīlāt is also used (Kurān, XXXVIII, 7). Moreover, although with other ṣaṣādār than khalak, the word ḥallak (or ḥalluka) means to be worn out (= baliṣya). The root subsequently carries the meaning of being smooth, polished, without cracks (the L.A. gives ṭayyin, amlas, musmar as synonyms of ḥallak: equal, harmonious). All these meanings are found in the corresponding Hebrew root, ḥālōt: to shave, distribute, assign a part to; to be flat and polished. In the pl. ṭifel, ḥallak signifies to differentiate separate, specify (cf. ṭakādir); in the hīpīl, ḥallak means to smooth, to polish, to plane. It seems therefore that the original sense of ḥallak expressed on the one hand the idea of determining parts (as does ṭakādir; cf. ṣaṣādar l-arṣāb, to determine sustenance), and on the other the idea of polishing, equalising. These very concrete etymological values can be found in certain Kurānic terms associated with ḥallak, and in the speculations of theological commentators. The latest and most abstract meanings, grafted on to the earliest ones, constitute one of the bases of speculative and mystical kalām, as well as of falsafa.

II. The Kurānic vocabulary and the ideas it carries.

Before considering what creation is in the Kurān, it must be stated first of all that the words khalak and khali̱l are the most frequently employed. On only three occasions, in two verses, do we find the usage al-Bāriʾi, the Creator, the agent noun from the Semitic root which appears at the beginning of Genesis: B'rēshit bāraʾ Elohim. These passages are: “He is God, the Khāli̱l, the Bāriʾi, the Maker (al-Musawwir)” (LIX, 24): “Return therefore, towards your Creator (lā Bāriʾītum); it is best for you in the sight of your Creator (idem)” (II, 54). It is pointless to look for two English words to translate these two terms, which the lexicographers give as synonyms. Nevertheless, according to the L.A the Bāriʾi is he who creates without imitating a model (lā ʾan miṣīḥ); moreover, it is nearly always used for the creation of living beings in particular. In the same way, barīyya is synonymous with khalak. The former term is found
twice in two verses (XCVIII, 6 and 7) and the context clearly underlines that the subject is human creatures. In the Kur'anic, the verb *khalaka* is used twice in two verses (XCVIII, 6 and 7), which is not Kur'anic, although the Kur'anic uses the verb *dhara* with complements which designate living things: plants and cattle (VI, 136), djinn and men (VII, 179). Abû Ihsân and Thâtab accord it the sense of God multiplying (yukaththir) the beings in creation. Parallel with *baryya* we find *dhariyya*, which has a similar meaning but is not used in the Kur'anic. The Hebrew *šēt* has the etymological sense of "cutting and putting into shape" (The Jewish Encyclopedia, art. Creation).

Only once do we find the words "work of God" (sunūt Allāh); in the context of mountains which seem inert but which God causes to travel like clouds (XXVII, 88), a context that led R. Blachère to translate the expression as "miracle". The commentators (al-Zamakhshâri, al-Djalalîn) consider it a strengthening verbal noun of the verb (masdar muhlakh) which refers to the entirety of divine acts enumerated in the preceding verses. By these means God has worked a work of God, he has acted as God "who makes all things good" (ultama: abhanna). In this sense, merely accentuating the idea of a verb, which is retrenched (muhkâm) in other respects according to the Kâshfî, although it can be found in *dsūna* (we have established) in verse 86, the word sunūt has no grammatical value alone and does not expressly designate the divine work of creation. Nevertheless, the presence of this term in the Kur'ân has authorised those who allow God to be given names formed by deviation (išbâk) to call the Creator al-Sâni" the Artisan, the Demiurge of the Greeks, the *djalal*; for "ordering" (*xoa*rodoc); afterwards, the word *khalak* has no parallel with *kaddara* (cf. above, the meaning of *khalaka*).

One important root is *s.w.r*. We have already met al-Musawwir following on from al-Khâlik al-Bârî. *Taswîr* is an action brought into being by the creative act proper: "We created you, and then We gave you form" (wa-lakad khalakaka, thumma sawwarndkum, VII, 12). The same verb is employed for the act of a man in his womb's movement (III, 6). One verse is particularly rich in philosophical meaning: "In the very shape (心仪) He withholds;" (XXVIII, 89, VI, 2), or "of potter's clay" (salsâl, LV, 14), to note an example of usage of archaic "of" not "from" clay (*jin, XXVIII, 89, VI, 2), of clinging clay (*min *fin lâzîb, XXXVII, 12), of an extraction of clay (sulâla *min *fin, XXXII, 12) and of earth (*turâb, XVIII, 37, XXX, 20, etc.); stinking mud (*hamsa* masâni, XV, 28); "He created the djinn of smokeless fire" (LV, 15). But these examples indicate clearly that the preposition denotes the matter with which these created beings are created, and not a pre-existent matter from which they would be created. This can be seen specifically in the statement of Iblîs who, because he is made from fire, considers himself superior to men, who are made from mud. On the other hand, when *khalaba* designates the idea of observation (*atkanâ: ahkama). The preposition *min* does not seem to mean "from", as in expressions like "He created you from a single soul" (*khalalâna* min nafs, TV, 1, VII, 89, XXXIX, 6). Here, however, the meaning is clear: the text refers to the children of Adam from whom Eve was drawn forth, who are themselves created; also clear is "We created you from a male and a female" (XIX, 13).

In a word, God's every action on one of his creatures, the beings in creation, is retrenched. This can be seen in the statement of Iblîs who, because he is made from fire, considers himself superior to men, who are made from mud. On the other hand, when *khalaba* designates the idea of observation (*atkanâ: ahkama). The preposition *min* does not seem to mean "from", as in expressions like "He created you from a single soul" (*khalalâna* min nafs, TV, 1, VII, 89, XXXIX, 6). Here, however, the meaning is clear: the text refers to the children of Adam from whom Eve was drawn forth, who are themselves created; also clear is "We created you from a male and a female" (XLI, 13).

But in a broader sense *khalaba* appears to mean "to create" like the Hebrew *bârî* as it is understood by the Jewish exegetes. Many Kur'anic verses are the exact replica of the first verse of Genesis; such as "Praise be to God who created the heavens and the earth . . ." (VI, 1). Sometimes the text adds, "and what is between the two" (XXV, 5, 15). In a word, God's every action on one of his creatures can be called creation. Similarly, the different developmental phases of a created being are also creations: "He created you in your mother's womb, creation after creation (*khalâna min ba'd *khalâni*)" (XXXIX, 6). The same word is used for the act of creation in general, the heavens and the earth encompassing all creatures, and for the particular...
creations of each category of beings. This second usage explains the extension of meaning brought by the word khalaka, which is weak; the Tafsir al-Djalālayn makes khalaka synonymous with basha' (creation) and interprets it by lā ilāh-ghayb). The word khalika is very strong; it evokes all the futility of error and in the Kurʾān itself is opposed to ḥāk. Examples are: "Do not cover the true reality with the futility of error" (II, 42, III, 77); "And say: the truth has come and falsehood has vanished. Yes, falsehood by its nature, must vanish" (tahāk; which marks the instability and inconsistency of basha').

Thus the creative Word, the kun (equivalent to the biblical fiat), is not a flatus vocis: it brings about something in factual truth. Creation has an end, although God has no need of anything apart from Himself: He is sufficient unto Himself (cf. wa-staghāna 'ilāh, LXIV, 6). He is learned, wise, living, determined. Creation, say the theologians, does not issue from God without a natural and necessary process. The Tafsir al-Djalālayn expounds bi 'l-ḥākī (in XLIV, 39) in these terms: "that is to say, We have created by allowing Our Truth (muhākikīn) to triumph, so that Our power and Our unity may be proven." Elsewhere the Kurʾān assigns a purpose to the work of creation: "I have created not men and djūms except to worship Me" (II, 36). This worship profits God nothing, but it is the greatest good of mankind. This good is "in the hand of God" (III, 26); "that which is with God is the good of the pious" (III, 198). All the names of God by which he is designated as He who gives, who pardons, who pours out his bounties in favour of believers, who fear Him and obey Him, are therefore associated with this ultimate end of creation, the return to God. Verse XXIII, 115 (cited above) states this clearly, a point which recurs in XXX, n: "God by which he is designated as He who gives, who pardons, who pours out his bounties in favour of believers, who fear Him and obey Him, is therefore associated with this ultimate end of creation, the return to God." Verse XXIX, 115 (cited above) states this clearly, a point which recurs in XXX, n: "God by which he is designated as He who gives, who pardons, who pours out his bounties in favour of believers, who fear Him and obey Him, is therefore associated with this ultimate end of creation, the return to God."
over, the Kur'an alludes to a first beginning of creation. The expression badā* 'l-khalq, therefore, does not always refer to an absolute beginning, as in, for example, the case of “He began the creation of man from earth” (XXII, 7). Elsewhere we read: “As we originated the primordial creation (badā*na awwala khalq*), so will We repeat it” (XXI, 104; X, 4, 34, etc.). This refers to the creation of the visible world in its entirety and to a second creation in the hereafter. Al-Zamakhshari, followed by the Ḍalā'ilayn, explains that the primordial creation is the fact of giving existence to the world by making it emerge from the void (idīdūn hān an-l-adam). But this raises a grammatical problem: Why “a creation” in the indefinite form? “This is because it is said: awwal al-khalq* means awwal al-khalq*aḍ in the sense of awwal al-

khalq* means awwal al-khalq*aḍ in the sense of awwal al-
hadīlak, the first of creatures, because khalq* is a masdar which cannot be put into the plural.” The aim of this commentary is not just to point out the idea of creation ex nihilo but also to pose the problem of the first creation drawn out of the void, a problem we shall encounter again.

Another term corresponding to ibtīdā, noted by the Tafsir al-Djaldlayn (IV, 117), is ‘l-anwdr. Apart from the allusion in XIV, 48, the Kur'an poses several other problems: of the creation in six days, of the first created being, and of the process of creation. These will be dealt with under ḥadīth and Tafsīr.

III.—Khahl in ḥadīth.

The Prophet was often questioned about the Beginning. One tale recounts this reply: “God was and there was nothing else with Him; His throne was on water (cf. Kur'an XI, 7). Then he created the heavens and the earth.” When someone asked the Prophet where (ayna) God was before he created the creatures (ḥabla an yaddibun), he said: “He was in a mist (luḥm); there was no atmosphere either above or below Him, and He created His throne on the water, that is, there was nothing with Him (layasa ma’ahu ghay).” The role of water in creation is important (cf. Kur'an XXI, 30, XXIV, 45, XXXII, 8, LXXVIII, 20, LXXVI, 6). Several ḥadīths relate how when water boils it becomes a vapour which constitutes the sky, while it forms on its surface a smoke which constitutes the earth, while it forms on its surface a frot which becomes the earth. The vapour, called smoke (dukhān = bukhār mutaṭfī), al-Djaldlayn plays a part in the Kur'an (XLI, 11) in the creation of the sky. On this subject, the narratives are simply picturesque amplifications of the Kur'ānic text conveying any number of mythical traditions of Oriental peoples which were transmitted by way of rabbinical haggādā or Iranian and Hellenistic gnosticism. A large number of them are found at the beginning of al-Ṭabarī’s Amālas, in al-Mas‘ūdī’s works, and, much later, in Madā‘īyatīs’s Bišārī. A sea beneath the seven heavens, eight asā’il beneath the sea, and a throne carried on their backs are also
described. This image is an extension of the verse: “And on the borders of the sky shall stand the angels, and on that day eight shall carry above them the throne of their Lord” (LXIX, 17). The word waṣṭīl designates the chamois goat which lives on the mountain tops. The plural asṣāl or waṣāl is applied to those beings dwelling on the height, the asghāfīs, here the angels (LA, māla‘īka ‘alās sūrat al-aswāl). At this stage, the distance which separates each rung from the next is a 7, 72, or 73-years’ walk (500 according to other versions). But in some texts, the figure 500 represents the thickness (khilāt) of each sky.

There are many, though differing, narratives about the days of creation and their duration in terrestrial years, about the first day (Saturday or Sunday), and the division of the creative work between the different days. Many of them are designed to refute the Jewish concept of the sabbath day of rest: God never rests because tiredness can never affect Him (cf. Kur‘ān L, 38). Concerning the successive order of creation the Prophet said: “God created the earth (turba) on Saturday, the mountains on Sunday, the trees on Monday, the makrūh on Tuesday and light on Wednesday. On Thursday he dispersed the animals (dawābb) over the earth, and he created Adam at the end of creation, after the ‘āṣr of Friday in the last hour of the last day, during the period which separates ‘āṣr from ‘ishr.” But some, i.e. the Prophet replied to Jews who were quizzing Him that God had created the earth on Sunday and Monday, the mountains and all the useful matter they contained on Tuesday, trees, water, cities, the prosperity of cultivated lands (‘umrān) and destruction (kharāb) on Wednesday, which makes four days (cf. Kur‘ān XLI, 9-10). On Thursday He created the sky, on Friday, up to the last three hours of the day, the stars, sun, moon and the angels (cf. XLI, 12: “In two days, He, by his decree, established the heavens in its stages, the distance which separates each rung from the next is a 7, 72, or 73-years’ walk (500 according to other versions). But in some texts, the figure 500 represents the thickness (khilāt) of each sky, but God would not have “spread it out” (dahdhal) before creating the sky, since tashīya is the act of displaying or unfurling (bast) not of creating. But, he said, this explanation raises two objections: the first is that since the earth is an immense expanse it is impossible to separate its khalīf from its tashīya, and if one occurs later so must the other. The second objection is that verse II, 29 proves that the creation of the earth and all it contains seems to follow that of the heavenly corners after the creation of all that is on earth. According to Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, the earth must have been created before the sky, but God would not have “spread it out” (dahdhal) before creating the sky, since tashīya is the act of displaying or unfurling the earth before the creation of the sky. There was an attempt to counter this by distinguishing between the creation and the “leveling” (taswīya) of the sky, particularly its division into the seven heavens. The creation of the sky was before the creation of the earth, but its tawāyi came afterwards. Unfortunately verse LXXIX, 26 makes the construction, lifting of the vault and levelling of the sky all part of the same thing, and all take place before the spreading out of the earth. As a last resort, al-Rāzī suggests extending the preposition thāmma (and then) in verse II, 29 to mean not an actual order of succession, a tāriba, but a simple list of bounties (ni‘ādū al-mā‘ām), which enumerate in second place something which could very well actually have been first. The aim of this discussion is to show that there are processes like tawāyiya and tashīya, which come into the general category of tādir, are, with a few exceptions, conceived of as creative acts, or at least as aspects of khalīf.

Another contradiction, between XLI, 9-12 and L, 38, concerns the total number of days of creation. The first text seems to give a total of eight days; two for the creation of the earth, four for establishing (taswīya) the mountains and diversifying (kharāb) its nourishment, two for the seven heavens. The second
text states quite precisely that six days sufficed for the creation of the heavens, the earth and what is between them. All the commentators solve this by saying that in XLI, 9-12 we must not make the addition $2 + 4 = 6$. The Kur`ānic sentence wa-điṣ'āla ... is an isti'naf, a new sentence which goes back to the beginning and means that the creation of the earth and all it entails (mountains, foodstuffs) took place in four days. Likewise, explains al-Rāzī, when we say that it is twenty days' walk from Kūfah to Medina and thirty to Mecca, it does not mean that the distance from Kūfah to Mecca is $20 + 30 = 50$, but that Kūfah to Medina takes 20 days and (isti'naf) Kūfah to Mecca 30. Here the d̄a'iʿ and tabādīr are considered as creations. Ibn Ḥazm, however, in the Refutation of Ibn Nağhrīla, separates them from ḥālāk: "The two days during which God created the sky in seven heavens are the last two of the four days when he distributed the crops on the earth, for this distribution is something other then creation." Hardly a satisfying explanation! Finally, some commentators also echoed theological or philosophical conceptions.

V.— Ḥālāk in kalām.

With the theologians, especially the Muʿtazilīs, the vocabulary of creation grew richer. In the first place, the creative act was expressed by the term ḥālād, the fact of giving existence to that which did not exist. God is He who also gives existence (al-Mādiyā). But in order to endure, existence (waḍīd) needs subsistence (baḥād), and that in abundance; ḥālāk is not only ḥālād but also baḥād, the gift of subsistence. Al-Rāzī related this second idea to the one expressed in the Kur`ānic term rūḥ, the act of catering for, providing for, sustaining. God is Raḥīk and Raṣāk just as He is Ḥālāk and Ḥālālāk. The Kur`ān brings together the two ideas: "Is there a creator other than God who gives you sustenance (yarsuḵubum") (XXV, 3). And, more explicitly: "He who originated creation and repeated it, and He who gives you sustenance from the sky and the earth, is there another than God?" (XXVII, 64). The sustaining power, like the creating power, is associated with the oneness of God. The act of creation is not simply an original snap of the fingers; it must be repeated at each moment of the existence of creatures lest they should sink into the void. This is the Muslim doctrine of continuous creation, which is illustrated to perfection in al-Bakillānī's atomism and occasionalism, though it is not a prerogative of Ashʿarism alone. Al-Bakillānī thinks that an accident cannot last two minutes in succession on a body which God has created in each of those two moments. The Muʿtazilīs are not unanimous on this point: some, the disciples of Muʿṣammār, deny that God can create an accident; other affirm it. ʿAbd al-Dijābār belongs to the second group, since he speaks of bāḥādī (generation of a new thing in time) of accidents, which are therefore mudāḥtī and must have a mudāhīt, who is God. Nevertheless, the existence of accidents is a weaker proof of the existence of the Creator than that of bodies (Sharh, al-uṣūl al-khamsa, 39 f.). Ḥālāk is an attribute of God; it is an attribute of action and for the Muʿtazilīs, it is like the realisation of an act of goodness (lāḏān) or the exercise of justice (lāḏād). But it is necessary to know if God was thus eternally "creatory" (lām yasaʿl khālāk), or if before the creation of the world He was, in pre-eternity, eternally "non-creatory" (ghayr khālāk). In general, the Ashʿarīs think that khālāk, as a name of God, was eternally applied to him, but they do not press the analysis of the problem any further. All and what the Muʿtazilīs do not deny that God was eternally "non-creatory", "non-providing", "non-operatory". They think that this is true of all those attributes of action which are unambiguously styled (lāṣy af nāṭiṣi kāmā): in fact, God can be just either because justice is of His essence or because He exercises it. Thus, states al-Dijābār, it is not said that He is eternally "not-just" and eternally "not-injust", for as long as the ambiguity lasts, that is, for as long as the object of his justice does not exist. But in the case of the creation there is no such ambiguity: The Creator is He who creates in reality. ʿAbd b. Sulaymān takes another stance: when he was told that God had never ceased to be khālīk, he denied it; he denied it also when he was told that God had never ceased to be ghayr khālīk. By this double denial, ʿAbdūthād touched on the philosophical problem of the eternity of God and the temporality of his creation. He maintained in fact that God is before (kabh), but not before things or after things, just as it is not said that He is the First with regard to things (awwal al-ṣaydi̇). The question of divine will was asked in this context of ideas. ʿAbd al-Dijābār (Sharh, 440) writes that God is "willing" by an "innovatory" will (bi-trāda muḥdatha). We will not dwell here on his evidence, but will observe that if, as ʿAbū Ḥāṣim thinks (Sharh, 548), the act of creation is none other than the act of will (al-kalām innamā kuwa l-trāda) and the act of creation cannot be realised without the realisation of a created being (mahbūl, īḥād, 549), this way lies the trap which philosophical reflection has spotted in connection with muqaddaḏīh, that is, the thing which swings the balance in favour of creation. Is it eternal? Creation must then be eternal. Is it not so? It must therefore be created in its term, and the question stretches back into infinity. Or, perhaps the muqaddiḥ, eternal though it is, was hindered from acting? Therefore there must have been a hindrance, a tark al-muqaddiḥ. And was that eternal or created? This notion leads to the same labyrinth as the previous one.

But theological speculations, by Muʿtazilīs at any rate, never went to these lengths. For them, the essential problem was to know what could be said of God from what the Kur`ān teaches. They had not the least doubt that the creation, as regards creatures, was "innovatory". Creation was produced in time and cannot be eternal. The question of the eternity of the creative act, however, underlined in their eyes the general problem of the attributes of essence and action. ʿAbd al-Dijābār thought (Sharh, 115) that God had the power to create and to will by His essence; but saying that His will to create is muḥdatha does not imply that He needs a muqaddiḥ in order to create, just as from our own experience (fi-l-ḥākī, 116) we know that man does not need the will to will something in order to do it.

Relationships between attributes exist. Khālāk is obviously connected with the Almighty (kudrā). This latter substantive is not Kur`ānic, but theologians consider that the word kuwawa, which occurs in verse II, 165 (al-kuwawa li-lāḏā ḍi̇mānī), is its equivalent. God is khālīk in respect of bāḥīr (Kur`ān, XVIII, 99, XXVI, 61, XLVI, 33). ʿAbd al-Dijābār writes: "The proof which demonstrates that God is the Innovator of the world proves this attribute, His Almighty Being, acting without intermediary" (Sharh, 151). This is why the Muʿtazilīs say that it was the Almighty who conceived us originally. Creation also proves that God is wise, through the
intermediary of the harmonious company of creatures (ta*lif), the marvels of the animal world and the ordering (tarkib) of the celestial spheres (ibid., 157), in short, well-conducted processes (al-afqāl al-mukhama).

But the relationship between creation and knowledge did present the Mu'tazilis with a serious problem. Did God know his creatures before He created them? Did He have any knowledge of what these essential beings must be before He gave them existence? Is it permissible to speak of a "beforeness" at all? We have already looked at 'Abbad b. Sulaymân's thesis. The disciples of Abû 'l-Husayn al-Šâlîh claim that the Creator does not cease to be eternally "within the beforeness of things" (lam yastal kabla l-ʾaḫyār), but not "before things" (kabla l-ʾaḫyār). Following the Makâlî al-islâmiyyîn, most Mu'tazilis nonetheless think that He has been eternally before things. Despite the various shades of opinion, this does not indicate a belief in the eternal simultaneity (ma'yya) of God and things. Consequently, the preceding question is asked legitimately in this school. All the scholars agree that God is eternally knowing (dâlim). But does He have eternal knowledge of the elements? Are those things which can be known (cognissibles, maṣ'ānîs) in fact known before they come into being (kabla kawāntî)? Furthermore, have "things" (a very general term corresponding to ρόδα) never ceased to be (albeit as pure cognissibles)? Various different answers are given. Al-Fuwâṭî, for example, thinks that God knows eternally what He is, but to say that He knows things from all (cognissibles, maṣ'ānîs) in fact known before they come into being (kabla kawântî) is not possible to devise what exists. The name thing can only be applied to that which God has created or destroyed, mabhlûk and maṣ'âlîm. The pure void ('adam) is not so named and cannot be known.

Abû 'l-Husayn al-Šâlîh, however, is of the opinion that God knows things eternally, but "in their moments" (fi aḥâlibîhî), that is, that motionless eternalities embraces all (aḥâlibîhî) of the moments. The knowledge of God is eternal, immutable, but the objects of this knowledge are subject to a temporal factor. 'Abbad b. Sulaymân acknowledges that God has eternal knowledge of the creative act (al-mâhkîkātî) elements or results of acts (al-mafṣūlātî). Al-Šâbîbî subscribes to a similar doctrine.

What does this mean? If God has knowledge of substances and accidents before they are created, why does He not also know the elements which are the substances that transmit the accidents? The stress laid on the ideas of action (ṣâkhîl, af_qâl) leads to the notion that God has eternal knowledge of the power which He has to create certain sorts of being without knowing these beings themselves in their concrete and transient reality. Eternal knowledge of the eternal Almighty Power to create, this creative knowledge, can neither, by the preceding definition, be a posteriori knowledge of creation nor a knowledge of creation in the a priori of His Idea. In fact, these speculations encompass the problem of Platonism's exemplary Ideas, mutâbul, which the Mu'tazilis reject. If such models existed in the divine mind, the creatures would resemble their Creator; but "nothing resembles God" (Kûrîān XLII, 11). If there was ever in Islam a ṣâkhîl that God created man in his image, it was either rejected as unæthentic or interpreted as meaning that man was created in accordance with his own form.

These speculations led to the theory that essences were eternal in the state of nothingness (fi bâl al-ṣâdam). He did not create them for a nonexistent essence before making them exist in things, because to create essences in this way implies that they are known beforehand, and this leads once more to the Platonic error they were anxious to avoid. If to create is to bring into being out of the void, it is reasonable to suppose that the essences of created things, like the things themselves, are in the void before creation. They must at least have the determination to be possible, meaning by possible that which is not but could be. This corresponds to God's almighty power, and its mukmînîdât are makâlîd. Thus what God knows eternally is His power. The problem, therefore, is to know if God creates all possible beings or if He makes a choice, or again if His power wears itself out in the creation of that which He creates. Djamh thinks that the objects of God's power and knowledge have an end and a limit (ghâya wa-nihâya) and that His acts will end in a final act (wa-li-afqālîhî āḏâqir). But, agreeing with Islam's deepest conviction, the Mu'tazilis as a whole believe that God's power is limitless and that the created world does not exhaust it.

VI.—Khalîf in falsafa.

As a general rule, the falsâfîs used the word khâlîf in the sense of creation ab aeterno. Proclus formulated this conception precisely in the Commentary on the Timaeus and it was elaborated upon by commentators on Plato and Aristotle. It was revived by al-Šârîf and Ibn Sînâ. Al-Ghâzâlî criticised it in his Tahâfût al-falsâfîa, and his theological arguments were refuted by Ibn Rushd in Fahdât al-tahâfût in the name of a pure Aristotelianism which differed significantly from the Avicennan ideas on this question [cf. KID AM]. Ibn Sînâ often uses the term ibdâ (g.v.). It is the extent to which a thing owes its existence to something other than itself, and is subordinate to this other thing and no other, without the intermediary of matter, instrument or time (fârâdîl namâ, v, section 9). "The Prime Innovator is an intellectual substance (dâ'if al-šarîq) of the accidents (maṣ'âlîm) in the true sense of the word. By his intermediary He (God) innovates an(other) intellectual substance and heavenly body (ibdâ, VI, 21)." Here we have the theory of the emanation (fâyâd) of intelligences and spheres which comes directly from al-Šârîf. Quiddities exist in concrete form in things, abstractly in human thought and as an exemplar in God's knowledge. But, unlike the Platonic Ideas, these are not individualised as if divine thought was their "intelligible place" (tôpôs noûptòcç). God had prior knowledge of the "exemplary representation of universal order" (lamâlîd al-nîfat al-kullî) from which this order is unfolded in its disposition and divisions (ṣu'd tartîbîs wa-taṣârîfîsî), in the intelligible course of its emanation. The two major Neoplatonic principles adopted by the Muslims are present here; that nothing can come from the One but one, and that God has no knowledge of details as such, neither in their material reality nor in their individual essence. Yet verse LVII, 3, which states that God is the Manifest and the Concealed, gives rise to the notion that worldly beings are simply manifestations of God (cf. al-Fusûs fi l-šâhîm: "In as much as He is manifest, He extracts All from His essence... His knowledge of All multiplies in a multiplicity which comes after His essence, and All is included in His unity... He is therefore manifest in as much as He is concealed and Concealed in as much as He is..."
Ibn 'Arabi systematised this concept: Being had an interior reality and an exterior expression which are inseparable and dialectically united. This gives rise to the cosmological pair khalq-habhkx corresponding to the ontological pair sahr-bisl. Creation is an expression and a manifestation of God; it is the “epiphany” of God. Beings are manifold mirrors of the divine Essence, which is absolutely one, ineffable and without end. The most beautiful names of God are the patterns from which and for which all the beings in the world are “created” (Fusihd, i, ch. 4). “The first divine step in creation was resolution (labdr), even before the existence of creatures: it is the manner in which creatures are qualified in being manifestations of Divine Reality (bi-hawwihim mas'hir bi-l-T habkx)" (ibid., ii, 11, ch. 3, question 30).

The Ikhwan al-ṣafwa also believe in emanation, but of a different type than Ibn Sīnā’s. They call the Creator (al-Barī) muhdth, mubhth, mubdi, mubkt, mutammim, mukammil. The Intelligence, the prime innovator, has existence (wudjud), sustenance (bi-kawnihim mazdhir li-’l-Hakk)” (ibid., V, 45). They explain that khalq designates corporeal things and amr spiritual substances. Their general term for creation is ibdā.

A distinction of this type is even more marked among later Ismā’īlis. In Kanz al-walid, Ibrahim b. Husayn al-Ḥamidī also speaks of an ibdā which arose from a single stroke connected with the Prime Innovator (al-mubda’ al-a’wval) or Prime Intelligence; then came successively the first emanation (al-Muna’bth al-awval), al-Kalam, which subsists in action, and the second emanation, which subsists in power. Both are derived from the Prime Innovator, which was not created (muhktarti) as a result of “something which can be called an act of innovation”, but which is “the very act of the Highest (al-Munbas’hī), gushing from Him towards existence.” The first emanation glorifies, worships and sanctifies the Prime Innovator, and together they testify to the Highest. It too is perfect in its essence and completed in its act. The second emanation, however, while occupied second place and did not acknowledge the first emanation’s prerogative. For all these reasons, although perfect in its essence, it is defective (mubkṣi) in its action, which is therefore power. Here we notice the appearance of a fault committed by the upper world, and the idea of a culpability that is inserted into the process of creation, which is not found in the Ikhwān’s thought, gradually develops in later Ismā’īlism. Evil is therefore born in the spiritual world, that of the ‘ibāl and the angels, although at the “emanatory” (imha’didhī) level and not that on the ibdā. In his article “The Ismaili Vocabulary of Creation” in SI, xi (1974) 75-84, a study of the Kitāb al-yanabī’i, a manuscript of Abū Ya’qub al-Sijī’s Muḥaddith and al-Kirmanī’s Kitāb al-Riyāḍ, P. E. Walker concludes: “In sum, the creation process . . . divides into three distinct levels, each corresponding to the level of reality being created.”

He cites the Ṭabād, which makes a distinction between asyiyyīya muhkmawna, asyiyyīya mulamawna and asyiyyīya maḥda. At the sensible level, things are created by the passage of time and things come to be out of things that were. On a higher plane, things in the intelligible world come forth by emanation or the special process of al-imʿād. Above all is creation by al-ibdā. He defines creation by ibdā as “the radical coming to be of being from what is not being.” It is “an eternal, timeless existentiation.” H. Corbin compares this theory with al-Kindī’s in Hist. de la philos. isl., 220. The source of such innovation is a God there is a recognisable will, one which does not more can be said than what He is not, while adding that He is not what he is not.” Ṭabād is outside the realm of intellectual speculation and is not a process arising from an intelligible act; this gave rise to the voluntarist conception of it. God innovates through a commandment that is also will (amr-irdda). Oddly enough, we have here in the use of words a reflection of Ibn Rushd, who, for other reasons, also thought that God, immobile Prime Mover that He is, moves the world through His amr. He acknowledges that in God there is a recognisable will, one which does not resemble man’s will at all but is for Him analogous to it. Ibn Sīnā, and especially his commentator Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, rejected the intervention of will in the creative act, for to will is to strive for something missing and God does not lack anything. He creates through pure generosity (djud), which these philosophers consider the exact mean between a natural production (tabfī) and a willed creation.

VII—Creation in the thinking of the Shi’ī Imāms.

Imāmī teaching introduces the concept of a pre-eternal creation of “forms of light, precosmic entities” (H. Corbin, op. laud., 75). Many traditions speak of a pleroma of five of these: Muhammad, Fāṭima, ‘Ali, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn. The universe is made from them, governed by them and constructed to receive their temporal manifestations. The Muḥammadan Light is the Prime Innovator of all creation. There are many accounts of this topic in Bihār al-anwār. But all the Imāmī sources speak of a pleroma of five: Muhammad, Fāṭima, ‘Ali, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn. The universe is created from these and given breath by the two Spirits. Another text says that they are created from the sublimest of the ilāyīn (cf. Qur’ān, LXXXIII, 18-19). Clearly, while based on Kur’ānic verses, all these tales embody elements alien to Muslim Revelation and obviously showing Gnostic influence.

VIII.—Supplementary questions.

Some ṭabād state clearly that God created evil and the pains suffered by mankind. Theology, particularly Aghārī’ī theology, supported this doctrine, justifying it by saying that creation does not entail that normal causality where effect issues from cause. God can therefore create evil, but it is not necessary to call Him evil. Associated with this question is that of the creation of human actions, a concept which the
Djabriyya upheld, which asserts that God created belief and unbelief, worship and disobedience. All that exists and is not God is created by God. Evil exists and is not God. The conclusion is inescapable.

Elsewhere, we find the doctrine of creation by the Word (the imperative hun, the amr), and creation by generosity (djid). It should be added that some mystics, such as al-Hallāgh, believed that God created by love. In al-Hallāgh's eyes, says L. Massignon, concluding his study of the developments of khahl and ʿārah, "the mystery of creation is love, essence of the divine essence" (Passion, iii, 116 and index s.v. khahl.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(R. ARNALDEZ)

**KHALKEVI** (Modern Turkish orthography, Halk, pl. halkevi, Halk's, People's House, the educational and social centres founded by Mustafâ Kemal (Atatiirk) to replace the "Turkish Hearths" (see Türk Odalan) which were active, with some intervals, between 1912 and 1932. The Odalan represented originally the Pan-Turkist ideology of the Committee of Union and Progress (Itihad ve Terakki Dümmüviyeti [q.v.]). Although the government continued to support them after the foundation of the Republic in 1923, they were gradually looked upon as an obsolete institution, out of keeping with Kemalism, which rejected "unrealistic" ideologies (i.e. Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism, Pan-Turanianism) and cultivated a nationalism based on the National Pact (Miithâk-i Millî). Hence they were dissolved on 10 April 1930. In the meantime, the Republican People's Party (RPP, see Dümürviyeyet Halk âradi) Convention of May 1931 formulated the six fundamental principles of Kemalism: republicanism, nationalism, populism, statism, secularism and reformism, which were going to be disseminated all over the country through a new organisation, the People's Houses. Founded on 19 February 1932, they developed rapidly and their number in cities and towns reached 379 in 1940 and 478 in 1950. In 1939 they were expanded into villages, where they were under direct control of the RPP, which appointed the heads of the houses and Rooms were abolished on 12 April 1961 set up Turkish Cultural Associations (Türk Kültür Dernekleri). On 21 April 1963, these non-political associations changed their names to Halkevi. The revived People's Houses have not yet (1976) recovered their former important position in the country.


**KHALKHA**, the name of a river. It rises on the western slopes of the Great Khingan in Mongolia and empties into the Buyir-Nor; this river appears in the Chinese atlases in the forms Ha-lo-hin or Ha-er-ha, which render the name Khalkha. It is mentioned in the 12th century by the "Kin dynastic history" (Kin-she) in ch. 94, 3, under the name Ha-lo, very likely an incomplete transcription of this same name for the river. It is cited on a few occasions in the Mongol period and the Ming one, appearing very frequently in the Manchu period in the Chinese, Mongol, Russian and western sources. Naturally, it is cited in the Mongol period by Rashid al-Din, ed. Berezin, in Trydu VORAO, xiii (St. Petersburg 1868), Persian text, 216, Russian tr. 134: Kalâ, and xv (1889), text, 3, i. 14, tr. 3. For the greater part of its course, this river forms the frontier between the province of Khingan (former Hei-long-kiang) and the Mongolian People's Republic. Since the 16th century, the term Khalkha has designated the northeastern part of Mongolia, from the actual province of Khingan to the eastern frontier of the province of Kobdo, and from the Russian frontier to the territory of Inner Mongolia. The name Khalkha is also used at the present time for the language spoken in almost all of the Mongolian Republic.

Sanan Setsen, Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen, ed. I. J. Schmidt, St. Petersburg 1829, 191, 197, and also the later Mongol chroniclers, speak of 12 Khalkha tribes, and they distinguish five "nearer tribes" and seven "further tribes" (op. cit., 205, also 191, 285. The Mong-hu she-hi p'u "Genealogical tables of the Mongols" (L. Hambis, Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Mongols, Paris 1969, 235) relates thus: "The eighth son of Batu Mongâ Dayan-Ḥan was called Gârošâna; he himself had seven sons who lived among the Qalqa tribes, whence their name of the seven Qalqa banners". On the other hand, J. B. du Halde, Description . . . de l'Empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise, The Hague 1736, 75, mentions thus in regard to the Khalkha: "This name is taken from the river Kalka. At Peking, they are called Kalka tase and Kalka Mongu". The ancestor of all the Khalkha princes was thus Gârošâna (or "Ge-resente"), son of Dayan-Ḥan (d. 1543?); cf. on his genealogy, A. Pozdnyev, Mongolia i Mongoli, following the end of the single-party régime in 1946, the RPP made great efforts to turn the People's Houses into non-party institutions. After the victory of the Democratic Party [see Demokrat Parti] in the general elections of May 1950, the RPP suggested to the government a compromise to "to save this heritage of Ataturk"; this was nevertheless rejected, and the People's Houses and Rooms were abolished on 8 August 1951 (by law No. 530) and all their property confiscated. After the revolution of 27 May 1960, the military régime, which stood for the principles of Kemalism, on 12 April 1961 set up Turkish Cultural Associations (Türk Kültür Dernekleri). On 21 April 1963, these non-political associations changed their names to Halkevi. The revived People's Houses have not yet (1976) recovered their former important position in the country.
KHALKHA — AL-KHALLÁL

St. Petersburg 1896, i, 472, and especially the genealogy in the Sara Tudzi, ed. N. P. Shastina.

The Mongol inscription of Dolon-Nor, inscribed on the occasion of the submission of the Khalkha to the emperor Kang-hi in 1691, published and tr. by A. Pozdneyev, op. cit., ii, 292 ff., mentions seven sons of "Geresentse," amongst whom the Khalkha were said to be divided in seven divisions (khoşun, in Arabic script köşûn); these would be the seven "further tribes" of Sanan Setsen. Around 1355, the Khalkha appeared to have adopted Lamaist Buddhism, and the Dalai Lama appointed for them a "Kutuktu." The five "nearer tribes" are essentially the Djarayut (< Djarod) and the Bardin, who live today in the southern part of the Khingan province on the borders of the former Manchuria (cf. B. Ya. Vladimirov, Gde "pyat" Khalkhaskikh pokolenii—Tabun otoj yaşa ("Where are the five tribes of the Khalkha") in Dokl. Ak. Nauk (1930), 201-5).

After the proclamation of the Chinese Republic in 1911, the Khalkha proclaimed their independence, but despite Russian intervention, were brought into subjection again by the Chinese government. After many vicissitudes, and after having received aid from the Soviet army in order to suppress the attempts of Ungern-Sternberg, they became independent under the name of "People's Republic of Mongolia," thus acquiring this independence as de jure, as official maps show, the Khalkha have undergone a radical transformation through the revolution and through socialisation, having suffered bitterly during the Stalinist period.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(L. Hambis)

KHALKHAL, in mediaeval times a district and town, now a district only, of Ardabyl province, has four component sub-districts; the Farhang-i digrafiyya-yi Iran (1330/1551) estimates the population of the whole district at 110,000. The administrative centre is Harawabad, which lies on a relatively easy route across the Talish mountains to the Caspian, and which seems to have existed as such for some three centuries, though Minorsky surmised that the al-H. of Biruni's Khánun was probably the modern Haraw(dab), see his Transcaucasia, in J.A., ccxvii (1930), 73. The present population is largely Turkish, ethnically and linguistically. The Farhang, ii, 104, also mentions a place Khalkhah-lyun in Talish, doubtless in origin a settlement of Khalkhalis, and Mustawfi, tr. 206, records a fishing village called Kalkhal on the eastern shore of the Caspian where the Oxus channel debouched from the direction of Khabzam.

Bibliography: The information of the mediaeval geographers is given by Le Strange, Lands of the eastern Caliphate, 156-71, and Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, viii, 173-4, see also Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire geographique, historique et litteraire de la Perse, 210-11, and Minorsky, Et art. Tàrom. For the modern period, see Admiralty handbook, Persia, 55, and Farhang-i digrafiyya-yi Iran, iv, 193-4, 549-57.

AL-KHALLÁL, ABU BAKR AT-TUŻ, better known as Abû Bakr al-Khalil, d. 311/923, traditionist, legal scholar and theologian, and an outstanding figure in the history of Hanbalism. Very little is known of his life, however. He was a pupil of Abû Bakr al-Marwâdî (d. 275/889), the author of the K. al-Wara', himself one of the famous adherents of Ahrâm b. Hanbal. He further followed the teachings of the genealogy in the Sara Tudzi, ed. N. P. Shastina. He himself one of the favourite pupils of Ahrâm b. Hanbal. He further followed the teachings of the genealogy in the Sara Tudzi, ed. N. P. Shastina,
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AL-KHALLÁL, ABU BAKR AT-TUŢ, better known as Abû Bakr al-Khalil, d. 311/923, traditionist, legal scholar and theologian, and an outstanding figure in the history of Hanbalism. Very little is known of his life, however. He was a pupil of Abû Bakr al-Marwâdî (d. 275/889), the author of the K. al-Wara', himself one of the favourite pupils of Ahrâm b. Hanbal. He further followed the teachings of the genealogy in the Sara Tudzi, ed. N. P. Shastina.
the traditional enemies of Ḣanbalism and, more generally, against the committee of evidencing and disorder (faṣād) likely to threaten the caliphate and the Sunna order.

He also composed various manuals setting forth Ḣanbal doctrine, whose importance is attested for us. Ahmad b. Taymiyya tells us in his K. al-Imām (ed. Cairo, 158) that Abū Bakr al-Khāllal's K. al-Sunna was the supreme work of the Ḣanbal school for the study of its ideas on dogmatic theology (waṣf al-din) whilst his K. fi ʿl-Imām was moreover the best Ḣanbal manual for setting forth the ʿImām Ahmad's doctrines in moral theology (waṣf al-fikḥiyya). Al-Dhahabi also held the opinion that Abū Bakr al-Khāllal had written the first summa of Ḣanbal law, and emphasised the importance of his K. al-Yisal on the effects of ḥadīth (Tabākht al-Buhfāf, iii, 7-8).

Finally, Abū Bakr al-Khāllal wrote a history of Ḣanbalism, of which a few leaves survive in the Zāhirīyya library at Damascus. The greater part of this work, however, was incorporated in two classic histories of Ḣanbalism which are still extant: the Tabākht al-ḥanābilah of the hādi Abū l-Ḥusayn (d. 526/1132), and the Dhayl of Ibn Raḍajāb (d. 827/1327). This work was transmitted, continued and to some extent completed by his chief disciple, Abū Bakr Abū al-ʿAzīz b. Dīfār (d. 936/1527). Abū ʿAmr al-Khāllal (Dhahabi, op. cit., i, 117-27; Ḥikṣar tabākht al-ḥanābilah, 334-40).

Abū Bakr Abū al-ʿAzīz completed the K. al-Dāmāmī by his Zād al-Musīrijī in which he sets down the masāʿīl which had escaped his master. The work is now lost, but we do have two texts by this same author. One is a K. al-ʿAmr, preserved in the Zāhirīyya, in which there is a strong criticism of the life of luxury and ease enjoyed by the caliphal circles and the Turkish amīrs which formed part of them; the other is a list of masāʿīl concerning which the author diverges from the doctrine of al-Ḵirākī (Tabākht al-ḥanābilah, ii, 75-118).

Bibliography: Tāʾrīkh Baghdad, v, 112-13; Tabākht al-ḥanābilah, ii, 155; Tabākht al-Buhfāf, iii, 7-8; Ibn Khaṭīb, Bilāsya, xi, 148; Ḥikṣar 295-7; Ṣadḥarāt, ii, 261; Loaut, Le Ḥanābilisme sous le califat de Bagdad, in REI (1959), 79-80, 91.

(II. Loaut)

KHALWA, technical term of mysticism, meaning "retirement, seclusion, retreat" (from khalwā "to be alone"); and, more specifically, "isolation in a solitary place or cell" (ṭawāf, [bayt al-khalwa], involving spiritual exercises. "Seclusion" or "solitude" in general (waṣla, waḥda, inšīfād, ḥikṣā) is one of the fundamental principles of asceticism (ṭuhd); and the predilection of early Muslim ascetics for the solitary way of life is a prominent topic of Sūfī hagiographic literature. The example of Christian ascetics is likely to have exercised a certain influence in the formation of this ideal, though orthodox Muslim authorities, e.g. Sūlyān al-Ṯawrī (d. 661/778), are also quoted as favouring a life in separation from society (Abū Nuʿaym al-Īshāhī, Ḥiyāt al-ṭawāfīd, Beirut 1387/1967, vi, 376, ll. 20-2). The Sūfī Dhu l-ʿNūn al-Mīṣrī (d. 745/860) learned from a Syrian hermit about the "sweetness of seclusion, invocation (dākhr) and of secret conversation with God in private (al-khalwah bi-ṣannalāhītāh)" (Ṭīfāl al-ṭawāfīd, i, 356, ll. 14-15). The same Sūfī is frequently quoted as "knowing no better inclination to bring about spiritual sincerity (ṣāḥiḥ) than khalwah"; and another celebrated Sūfī, Abū Bakr al-Shībīlī (d. 334/945), is said to have given this advice, "Cleave to solitude, abolish your name from the (memory of the) people, and face the wall (of prayer) until you do so" (al-Kuḫayrī, Ṣūsūl, Cairo 1379/1959, 55 f.; Abū Ḥāṣ al-Suhrawardī, Ḥiyāt al-maʿārif, Beirut 1966, 210; cf. Rümi, Maṭnawī, i, vv. 643-9). However, the statement of classical early Sūfīs quoted by Kuḫayrī (Ṣūsūl, 54-6) and Ḡazālī (Iḥyāʾʿulām al-dīn, Cairo 1332/1933, ii, 197-210) reflect a wide spectrum of opinions as to the relative virtues of "solitude" and "community" (ṭuḥtah). Spiritual isolation from the world was considered higher than material seclusion; and it is clear that periodic retreats rather than permanent seclusion were practised in reality. The Sunna certainly does not favour the solitary way of life, and community life was, in fact, increasingly becoming a characteristic feature of Sūfīsm itself. Thus, Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Nāṣirī (d. 925/1517) is said to have strongly commended "community" as a means to practise "altruism" (īḥār) (ʿĀṭār, Ṭabākht al-ulayyīd, ed. Nicholson, London-Leiden 1907, ii, 46, and Abū Yaʿṣīkī al-Sūsī of Baṣra (ca. 449/1050) is quoted with this statement: "Only the strong ones are able to support solitude, whereas community life (al-īqūm) is more beneficial for people like us, so that each individual's behaviour is controlled by each other" (Abū Naṣr al-Sarrajī, Kitāb al-lumā, ed. Nicholson, London-Leiden 1914, 207, ll. 19-21; Kuḫayrī, Ṣūsūl, 56, ll. 1-3).

In post-classical Sūfīsm, the situation is essentially the same. According to Abū Ḥāṣ al-Suhrawardī (q.v.), d. 632/1234), it is community life which distinguishes the Sūfīs from the ascetics, but Suhravardī explains this difference by claiming that the Sūfīs prefer community because, due to their spiritual "health", they are free from the temptation of which the ascetics tried to escape by choosing the solitary way of life (ʿĀṣūrī, 108). Still, the Sūfīs' spiritual sustenance is "solitude" (ibid., 221), and even in the "common room" (bayt al-dāmāmī) of the Sūfī ribāf (q.v.), they are supposed to sit on their prayer carpets as if these were their individual retreats; and the practice of periodic retreats, which plays an important role in Sūfī education (tarbīya), is developed into a real institution. Suhrawardī devotes three chapters of the ʿĀṣūrī to its description (op. cit., 207-27). Special emphasis is also placed on it by the Kubrawīy, the Shadhiliyya, the Kādiriyā and, of course, the Khalwatiyya. This khalwah involves the "Major Holy War" (cf. Rümi, Mathnawī, i, vv. 378-6), i.e. ascetic discipline, notably vigils, gradually increased fasting, and concentration of the mind, mainly by means of ḥikṣā [q.v.]. On entering khalwah, one should free oneself from worldly possessions and be in a state of ritual purity. Being in the cell should evoke the idea of being in the grave (ʿĀmmār al-Bidlaṣ, ca. 600/1200, in Kubrā, Fawāʾith al-dāmāl, ed. F. Meier, Wiesbaden 1957, text 60, introd. 32); the cell itself should be a "dark room prohibiting the entering of daylight. Its purpose is the "closing up of the external senses" (wakaʾw al-khalwah) and the "opening of the internal senses" (Kubrā, in M. Molé, Traités mineurs de Naʾm al-Dīn Kubrā, in Annales Isamolalogiques, iv (1963), 25; cf. Fawāʾith al-dāmāl, text 18), i.e. readiness for mystical experiences. However, warnings against attaching too much value to such experiences (waḥda ṣīk al-khalwah) are voiced frequently; the guidance of a spiritual director is, therefore, considered vital. According to Suhrawardī, visionary experiences and extrasensory perceptions in general may serve a certain purpose
on the mystic way, but the ultimate goal of khalwa is rather the experience of the "dhikr of the divine Essence" through consubstantiation (taklouk) of its light in the heart ('Awdrif, 216, 219).

This institutionalised seclusion is normally limited to periods of forty days, which is why it is also called al-arba'inatiyya, or šilla (from Persian šišil); it should not be interrupted except for ritual community prayers, and it should be repeated once every year ('Awdrif, 221). It is conceived as an imitative practice of retreat is only a means to an end, and the experience of the "dhikr of the universe, which is the scene of the mystic "journey" ('Awdrif, 207 f.; 'Aṭṭāf, Muṣḥābat-nāma, cf. H. Ritter, Das Meer der Seele, Leiden 1955, 18 ff.). At the same time, the khalwa extends ideally over the whole life of the Sufi ('Awdrif, 221, 226). The practice of retreat is only a means to an end, and the goal of Sufi education is khalwa "in spirit" (khalwat al-ma'nd), i.e. being spiritually with God in spite of material presence in the world (Kubra, Fausūdāl-dāmāl, 60). The same idea is expressed in the Nāṣirī 'awādī formula of khalwa (tadhawur al-ma'nd), (solitude in society). Similarly, Ibn Ṭarabī is not speaking of the common practice of retreat when he considers khalwa as the highest makān; he takes it to mean the absolute "emptiness" (khālī) of the Perfect Man, i.e. the state of being "filled" with the Absolute (al-Futiifrdt al-Makkiyya, Cairo 1270, i, 86 ff.).
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Faydiyya, named after Fayd al-Din Husayn Ghunaym, was active in Istanbul, where its founder lived most of his life and died in 1309/1891 (cf. Tībīyān, i, 306a). Al-Bakrī's Khalīfa and direct successor in Egypt was Muhammad b. Sālim al-Hifnī (d. 1181/1767, Cairo). The spectacular spread of al-Khalwatiyya in Egypt in the 19th and 20th century is due to the latter's students and their khullas (cf. al-Djabarti, "Aqīdah, i, 298). For details on the various branches which developed in Egypt, see F. de Jong, The Sāfī orders in post-Ottoman Egypt (in preparation).

Out of a Syrian branch of the Djamālīyya, introduced in Damascus by 'Uways al-Karamānī, a khulīfa of Celebi Elendi, two fariḥas emerged: al-Assāliyya, named after Ahmad b. 'Aṭī al-Harrī al-Assālī (d. 1048/1638, Aleppo; cf. al-Muhībbī, Khaṣṣāṣ al-Aṣghar, i, 248 f.) and al-Balāghīyya, founded by Muhammad al-Bakhrī al-Halābī al-Balāghī (d. 1098/1686, Mecca), which had its centre in the Iklaṣīyya tekhe in Halab (cf. Tībīyān, i, 108b). The remaining Khalwatiyya branches all have sīlasas going back to Ahmad Shams al-Dīn b. ʿĪsā al-Marmarāwī al-Dīgītbašī (d. 910/1504, Maqqanīa). He had founded his own order, al-Abmādiyya, which had spread mainly in and around Maqqanīa. His shaykh ʿAlī al-Dīgītbašī (d. 910/1504, Maqqanīa), was a student of ʿĪbrāhīm Kāṣāriyya, who was initiated by Mehmēd Erzindjiānī, one of Yābūy al-Shīrwanī's khullas.

Further details, including the sīlasas of most of these orders, are given by Kissling. From al-Harrī's mention of his initiation into the majority of the branches, which had emerged prior to the middle of the 19th century, it appears that many had active nuclei, or propagators of the khulīfas, taken with respect to the idea of wahdāt al-wujūd varied over periods of time within the same branch and between the branches. Mehmēd Nīzhārī al-Mīṣrī, e.g., taught that wahdāt al-wujūd is restricted to certain levels of being (cf. Tībīyān, iii, 132a). Hasan Rūdīwānī (d. 1330/1912), a khulīfa of ʿĪbrāhīm al-Shalqānī al-Shāmī, openly adhered to Ibn al-ʿArībī's ideas (cf. Roud al-Kullāb al-Mustawīd, Cairo 1332). Muṣṭafā Kamāl al-Dīn al-Bakrī opposed monist views altogether (cf. E. Bannert, La Khalwatiyya en Egypte, in MIDEO, viii (1964-6), 11 f.). He stressed the separate identities of God and the human soul, hence conceiving unity with the divine as a conjunction (ittīdāl). Shī'a conceptions have occasionally been incorporated and elaborated, e.g. by Dā'ūd al-Shāmī (cf. Kissling, ZDMG, cii, 260; idem, Zur Geschichte der Deutschen in der Byzanzzeit, in Südostforschungen, xv (1956), 248-9). In early as well as later Khalwātī writings it is stressed that the order is basically the fariḥa of al-Di-nayd (cf. Tībīyān, ii, 65a; Sirāḍī, 160; al-Adawī, 67; Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Mutawal al-Buḥūfī, Itḥāf al-Basṭār bi-Ṣāhīr Wird al-Sāhīr, Cairo 1953, 13). The foundations of this order are considered to be voluntary hunger (dīḥ), silence (ṣamā'), vigil (ṣaqār), seclusion (ṣīrah), dhikr, meditation (fikr), permanent ritual cleanliness and tying (fārāb) one's heart to one's shaykh. In some treatises only the first four are mentioned as such (cf. Muhammad al-Munīr al-Sanāmī, Tuhfāt al-Sālikīn, Cairo 1932, 26 f.).

In most of the Khalwātīyya fariḥas periodic retreat, Ṣāhīr, is required of the murid. The shortest period recommended is three days and the longest forty days (cf. al-Bakrī, Hadiyyāt al-Abābī sīdāl-liʿliʿ al-Ṣāhīr min al-Sāhib wa ʿl-Abābī, in Sirāḍī, 179 f.). Various sets of rules, regulating the murid's behaviour before, during and after the period of Ṣāhīr, have been elaborated (see, e.g. E. Bannert, Über den Stifter und Sonderbrauch der Demirdīsīyya-Ṣāhibīs in Kairo, in WZKM, lii (1969), 225 f., for the Ṣāhīr rules of this order). Opinions about who may enter the Ṣāhīr have varied among the various fariḥas. According to some branches it is necessary to prepare for initiation, while others hold it to be appropriate only for those who have reached a specific makām or stage of the soul (see nāṣ), generally the fifth. Al-ʿĀṣīa is recommended to those in the lower makāms (cf. ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīz ʿĀlī al-ʿAzharī, Luḥādat al-Ṣaḥīḥa wa Tuḥfāt al-Ilkānī, Cairo 1323, 5, 23). In al-Khalwātīyya seven makāms are postulated. To each makām, ʿdhīr, of one of the seven names (al-ṣabīʿa), viz. al-Ṭahālī, Allāh, Ḥā, Ḥāyy, Ḥākīm, Kayyūm and Ḥakārī is appropriate. On this point, al-Khalwātīyya differs fundamentally from al-Shadhiliyya; in the latter only three makāms are postulated. The first makām of al-naṣf al-ammār, is conceived as a part of the preparatory stage of taubah and only the fifth, sixth and seventh makāms are conceived as reality. These cannot be reached by ṣiddāhāt but only by divine grace (cf. ʿĀlī Muhammad ʿAmīr al-Muḥādīdī, al-Fīyūdídīl-Ikhaṣīyya wa ʿl-Tadnīḏīl al-Iṣṣānīyya wa Sayr al-Ṭarīq al-Khalwātīyya, Cairo 1301, 15, 21).

ʿDhīr of the names is surrounded by a number of ritual prescriptions set out in the manuals. For communal ʿdhīr exercises or ḥadras, similar rules apply, although the ritual itself, the formulas, and the names recited may be different. Ahmad Shams al-Dīn b. ʿĪsā al-Marmarāwī (see above) is credited for having added five names, (al-furūʿ): Wāḥīd, Nūkhād, Wāḥīd, Ṣamād) to be recited after completion of the other seven names. This practice is common in the Abmādiyya branches. It was incorporated by some Bakriyya branches as well (cf. Muhammad Fuʿād al-Ṭawfīlī, Maṣāmī̂a al-Fawā'id al-Muḥimmah, Cairo 1930, 108 f.; Ahmad b. Ahmad al-Djuyendi al-Maymūnī, Risālāt al-Sayr wa l-Suḥāl l-Īlāh l-Ilāh . . . , Cairo 1938). There are differing opinions about the ʿdhīr of names not transmitted by the šaykh to the murid, ranging from the point of view that any name is allowed as well as any noise or sound to the view that only the ʿdhīr of a clearly pronounced allāh is permissible (cf. Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Sammānī, al-Nafṣah al-Ikhyāyya wa Kayfīyyat Suḥāl al-Ṭarīq al-Muḥammadiyya, Cairo 1326, 26; Tībīyān, iii, 59 f.; al-Munīr, Tuḥfāt, 21). In addition, other prayer-tasks, fasting and nightly vigils may be required from the murid, which differ considerably between the branches. An element of ritual which all Khalwātīyya ṣariḥas have in common is the reading of Yābūy al-Shīrwanī's Wird al-Saṭṭār at set times and occasions. It consists of three sections which glorify the oneness of God, the Prophet and his prophethood, and the Companions. According to Muṣṭafā Kamāl al-Dīn al-Bakrī, it is the pivot of Khalwātīyya ritual. It should be read aloud by a single person, while the others are listening; this is held to be more beneficial than reciting. It equates silent ʿdhīr, the ʿdhīr of the heart. The external union on these occasions is believed to lead to an internal
union, which equals mudidhada and should lead to mushdhada. It is the shaykh who, as object for murid, leads to mushdhada. Some Khalwatiyya groups however take the latter position, e.g. al-Diidiyya (cf. al-Diibar Ahmad Mu‘ammarr, Mankal al-Warrad ‘al-Bahjat al-Tirghad il-man arada Tarbta al-Ragdad, Cairo, n.d., 430), where this is expressed by stating that the faith al-murid is proportionate to one’s belief in his shaykh. Within Turkish Khalwatiyya branches, notably within the Karabashiya, the role of the shaykh in guiding the murid is conceived of as necessarily a passive one. He is for participation in the community is conceived of as union, which equals mudidhada and should lead to mushdhada. (cf. al-Bakrl, al-Manhadi al-‘Adhb al-‘Amir, Beirut 1964, 63-4. The Egyptian Silsilat ‘Aliyye Khalwatiiyyinins usita, Istanbul 1288. For literature and detailed information about the Khalwatiyya orders in Egypt, see F. de Jong, The Safi Orders in post-Ottoman Egypt (in preparation). Muhammad al-Makti b. ‘Azn, al-Nafakat al-Rahmaniyya fi Mankhqt ‘Urfi al-Khalwatiyya, Istanbul 1327 (partly published), 11-8, gives a list of Khalwatiyya writings. Kamal al-Din Muhammad al-Hafri (d. 1299/1882), Tibriin Wasdiil al-Habak al-Bayd Saliiil-al-Tairb, Mu‘alb Fatih, mss. 430-2, is as valuable for the study of the Khalwatiyya as it is for the study of other orders. Muhammad b. Shiib al-Bousnawt al-Randjli, al-Diabukar al-Asma fi Taridtim ‘Ummiyya, Dervishkota red Khalseti vo Makedoniya, in Zbornik Shtipskiot naroden Musesy, i (1958), 105-19). In 1971 hadras took place regularly in tekkes in Ohrid, Struga, Kirkovo, Stip (all Haytiiya) and in Peć, Djakovice, Orhovac and Prizren (all Karabashiya). For a description and historical information about the latter two tekkes see Muccabot Asiim, Kosova’dar Esirgenmis Islam Amurtlar, Çevreci il, Priglia 1974. In Greek Thrace active groups with a tekke existed in Xanthi, Komotini and Echinos.

No data are available for the Khalwatiyya in Turkey after 1925, when the orders were abolished and all tekkes and shaykhs were closed. In the Middle East various Khalwatiyya groups are active in Lebanon (Beirut, Tripoli) and Syria (Aleppo, Damascus). Some of these groups have a silsila going back to Mustafa b. Muhammed b. al-‘Aziz, founder of the Rahmaniyya shaykh in Nafta (Tunisia); cf. al-Baydan fi ‘Amal al-Lisian, Beirut 1964, 63-4. The Egyptian Khalwatiyya al-Dinuaydiyya claims substantial membership in Syria (cf. Ma‘dalla al-Islam wa’l-Taqawuf, l/5, Cairo 1958, 82). Khalwatiyya and other tarikas active in Egypt are listed in Muhammed Mahammed al-Wadna, al-Taqawuf al-Islami, Cairo 1958, 71 f. In addition to these tarikas and the murids mentioned by Bannert, the following branches were active in Egypt in 1973: al-Dawmiiyya (two branches), al-Diidiyya, al-Fu‘adiyya, al-Haddadiyya, al-Kasabiyya, al-Haytiyya, al-Nimriyya, al-‘Ashkariyya, al-Shawadiyya and al-‘Imarniyya al-Kubaysiya. Al-Sammaniyya has its own shaykh al-tadjudad for Egypt. Some Egyptian Sammaniyya, however, consider themselves as a part of one or another of the Sudanese branches of this order. In Ethiopia, it is the only active Khalwatiyya branch. Little is known about its present functioning beyond what is reported by Trimmingham (Islam in Ethiopia, Oxford 1952, 247). Nothing is known about the present state of al-Sammaniyya in Indonesia. P. Fauxque (Où en est l’Islam traditionnel en Algérie?, in L’Afrique et l’Asie, lv (1961), 17-22) provides the most recent information on al-Rahmaniyya, and he states its membership in Algeria as 230,000.

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text, see the literature mentioned in the articles by Kissling and the bibliography to Bannert’s article, which gives information about Khalwatiyya orders active in present-day Egypt and includes a translation of Ahmad al-Dardary, Tu‘fat al-Ikhwan (a set of rules for the murid). Literature not mentioned in these studies may be found in B. G. Martin, A Short History of the Khalwatiyya order of Dervishes, in N. R. Keddie (ed.), Scholars, Sainds and Sufis, Muslim Religious Institutions since 1500, Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1972, 275-305, which is largely based upon the work of Bannert and Kissling. A Turkish source not mentioned by these authors is the anonymous Taridtim ‘Aliyye Khalwatiiyyinins usita, Istanbul 1288. For literature and detailed information about the Khalwatiyya orders in Egypt, see F. de Jong, The Safi Orders in post-Ottoman Egypt (in preparation). Muhammad al-Makti b. ‘Azn, al-Nafakat al-Rahmaniyya fi Mankhqt ‘Urfi al-Khalwatiyya, Istanbul 1327 (partly published), 11-8, gives a list of Khalwatiyya writings. Kamal al-Din Muhammad al-Hafri (d. 1299/1882), Tibriin Wasdiil al-Habak al-Bayd Saliiil-al-Tairb, Mu‘alb Fatih, mss. 430-2, is as valuable for the study of the Khalwatiyya as it is for the study of other orders. Muhammad b. Shiib al-Bousnawt al-Randjli, al-Diabukar al-Asma fi Taridtim ‘Ummiyya, Dervishkota red Khalseti vo Makedoniya, in Zbornik Shtipskiot naroden Musesy, i (1958), 105-19). In 1971 hadras took place regularly in tekkes in Ohrid, Struga, Kirkovo, Stip (all Haytiiya) and in Peć, Djakovice, Orhovac and Prizren (all Karabashiya). For a description and historical information about the latter two tekkes see Muccabot Asiim, Kosova’dar Esirgenmis Islam Amurtlar, Çevreci il, Priglia 1974. In Greek Thrace active groups with a tekke existed in Xanthi, Komotini and Echinos.
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KHAMIS MUSHAYT, also Khamis ibn Mushayt, the main town in interior 'Asir [ytr]. In Saudi Arabia, almost due east of Abha on the coast, known as Khamis Mushayt or Khamis Mountains. It is a town and a market, and is called a chief town of the 'Asir, on the east bank of the principal branch of Wadi Bih in the far east of the 'Asir. The Kh. Mushayt market is held on the plain between these two villages. Mushayt is a favourite staging point for military campaigns, e.g. those of 1338/1920 and 1353/1934. Its agricultural produce grows on terraces to the west and on gently sloping land to the east, irrigated by wells and some eastward-draining monsoon precipitation, and is quite varied, including spring wheat, autumn millet, alfalfa, and a number of fruit trees such as apricots, peaches, plums, pomegranates, and figs. Cattle are more common than camels, and dates must be imported. Khamis Mushayt has thus become the most important interior trading centre between Bih and the Yaman. It is also worthy of note that it is here where a traveller from the north first encounters the...
The prohibition of wine may, however, also be looked upon from a wider aspect, as Islam is not the only monotheistic religion which has taken a negative attitude towards wine. It is well known that, according to the Old Testament (Numbers vii, 3-4) the Nazarite who had wholly devoted himself to Yahweh had to abstain from wine and spirits, just as the priests before administering the sacred rites (Lev. x, 9). The Nabataeans, according to Diodorus Siculus (xiv, 94, 3), likewise abstained from wine and one of their gods is called in their inscriptions "the good god who drinks no wine". Likewise the abstention from wine belonged to the rule of many Christian monks. All this has its roots in remote Semitic antiquity which ascribed a demonic character to wine and spirits. The same is true for music, especially singing, which is also prohibited by Islam. It is not improbable that negative feelings of this kind may have worked, together with the motives mentioned above, to induce Muhammed to prohibit wine.

The prohibition of the Kur'ān has been taken over by the jurists; all madūkhās, and also the Shī'a, call wine harām and the wine-trade is forbidden. For an exposition of the Shāfi'i view, see al-Nawawi, Minhāj, ed. van den Berg, iii, 241; for that of the Ḥanafis, Fātūdū al-'Alāmīrī, vi (Calculta 1853), 604, it is a great that of the Madīnah, schol. on the Mawṣū'a, Cairo 1280, iv, 26; for that of the Shī'a, Shārāf al-İslām, Calculta 1839, 404. Theology reckons the drinking of wine among the grave sins (ḥabā'ir).

Hadīth has many utterances regarding this theme. Wine is the key of all evil (Abd al-Kays went to Abd al-Rahmān b. Abd Allāh, he said: Wine has been prohibited by the Kur'ān; it comes from five kinds of fruits, from grapes, from dates, from honey, from wheat and from barley; wine is what obscures the intellect (wa 'l-khamr md khdmara al-ţālī; Bulhārī, Ağrıba, bāb 2). The question remained, whether beverages prepared from grapes in a different way were prohibited. There was e.g. a kind of syrup. "When 'Umar visited Syria, the population complained of its unhealthy and heavy climate and they added: This drink alone will heal us. Then 'Umar allowed them to drink honey. Then they said: Honey cannot heal us. Thereupon one of the natives of Syria said to him: May we not prepare something of this drink for you? It has no inebriating power. He said: All right. Then they cooked it till two-thirds were evaporated and one-third of it remained. They brought it to 'Umar, who put his finger into it and licked it. Then he said: This is tilā' like camels' tilā' (viz. the pitch with which they smeared their skins). Then he allowed them to drink it" (Mālik, Ağrıba, bāb 14). According to the first chapter of the same kitāb, however, 'Umar forbids a man to become drunk on tilā'. Juice from grapes, prepared by pressing them only, is considered as wine. Tāriḳ b. Suwayd al-Ḥāḍrāmī said to the Prophet, We have in our country grapes which we press. May we drink the juice? He said: No. This negative answer is given three times and when Tāriḳ asks whether the juice may be given the sick to drink, Muhammed answers: It is no medicine, it is sickness (Abd b. Hanbal, v, 292 f.). And not only those who drink and sell wine are cursed by Muhammed, but also those who press grapes and have them pressed in order to drink the juice (Ibn Māḍāja, Ağrıba, bāb 6).

Another question of importance arose, in connection with spirits: Had they to be considered as wine or not? All the madūkhās, except the Ḥanafis, have answered the question in the affirmative sense. They have consequently extended the prohibition of wine, in accordance with the intention underlying it. Tradition, which is the best source for the history of the origin of several institutions, shows that the question belongs to the much-debated ones. The standard hadīth, which is found very frequently in the classical collections, runs as follows (Muslim's version İmām, trad. 26 is cited, because it contains important details): "Some men of 'Abd al-Kays went to the Apostle of God and said to him: O Prophet of God, we are a tribe belonging to Rabī'a; between us and yourself dwell the infidels of Muḍar, so that we can only reach you in the sacred month. Tell us therefore what we have to tell our tribespeople which will open Paradise for us if we to cling to it. The Apostle of God answered: I order four things and I forbid four things. Serve God without associating anything with him. Perform the salāt, pay the zakāt, fast the month of Ramadān and deliver the fifth part of booty. And I forbid four things: dubbā', antium, musaffat and naktī. They asked: O Apostle of God, how do you know what the naktī is? He said: Well, it is a palmtrunk which you hollow out; then you pour small dates into it and upon them water. When the process of fermentation has finished, you drink it with the effect that a man hits his cousin with the sword. —Now among these men there was someone who had received a blow of the sword in this way,
It would take us too far to give here a detailed survey of the opinions of the fakhips of all madhhab[s]; it would be superfluous, to some extent at least, because the more important differences regard chiefly nabīth only. The following rapid survey is based on the Fatāwā 'Alamgīrī, vi, 604 ff. (cf. Shā'ānī's Miṣrīn, Cairo 1279, 192-3).

Allowed according to the iṣlām[4] is-fermented, very sweet drink.

Prohibited (ṣāīm), according to the iṣlām[4], are wine and sakar of every kind. As to wine, there are six cases: to drink it in any quantity or to make use of it is ḥarām; to deny this is kuf, to buy, sell, present it, etc. is ḥarām; no responsibility (dimān) rests on him who spoils or destroys wine (mulisfāh); whether wine is a possession (māl) is an unsettled point; it is mājīs just as blood and urine; he who drinks any quantity of it is liable to punishment.

Several kinds of products prepared by means of grapes (bādhik, munassaf, etc.) are prohibited according to the majority (ṣāima) of the fakhips.

Allowed, according to the majority of the fakhips are the ḥaṣb (see above) or muskallīth and nabīth from dates with the restrictions mentioned above. So is juice from grapes when the process of cooking has made to evaporate two-thirds. Muhammad (al-Shaybānī[a]) has a special exception in this point. As to the punishment of him who drinks wine, kādīth tells us that Muhammad and Abū Bakr were wont to inflict forty blows by means of palm branches or sandsals (Buḫārī, Ḥudūd, bāb 2-4; Ḥudūd, trads. 35-7). Under 'Umar’s caliphate, however, Ḥālīb b. al-Walīd reported to him that people were indulging in prohibited drinks. Thereupon 'Umar consulted the Companions, who advised him to fix the number of blows at eighty, a number suggested by the Kurān which prescribes that those who accuse muhāsatuṣ of sīna, without being able to prove their accusations by the aid of four witnesses, shall be punished with eighty blows (Sūra XXIV, 4).

Repeated drinking of wine, according to some traditions, was punished by death at Muhammad’s order (Abū Dāwūd, Ḥudūd, bāb 36; Ibn Māḡī, Ḥudūd, bāb 17; Abū Idrīs, Ḥudūd, bāb 36; Ibn Ṭāhir, Ḥudūd, bāb 43; Zarkaḥ, Abu Nuwas, etc., and see Muṣṣarīyāh, and at the court of the Caliphs wine was drunk at revelling parties as if no prohibition existed at all (see e.g. The 1001 Nights, passim.). Even the common people could not always and frequently; see e.g. Bukhari, Ashriba, bdbs, trads. 16-29; Nasa’ī, 36, etc.). Of special traditions prohibiting fermented drinks, there may be mentioned the following. It is forbidden or disapproved of to sell raisins if they are to be used for preparing nabīth (Nāsā‘ī, Ashriba, bāb 51, 51). It is prohibited to mix together different kinds of fruits so that the mixture should become intoxicating. This tradition occurs frequently; see e.g. Buḫārī, Ashriba, bāb 11; Muslim, Ashriba, trads. 16-29; Nāsā‘ī, Ashriba, bābbs 4-17; Ibn Sa’d, viii, 360; Ahmad b. Hanbal, i, 276; ii, 456; vi, 242, 292. But each of these kinds may be used separately for preparing a non-fermented drink (Muslim, Ashriba, trads. 81-3; Nāsā‘ī, Ashriba, bābbs 14-18, etc.).

It can easily be seen that the difficulty in this matter was caused by two circumstances. People were accustomed to prepare from all kinds of dates, from raisins and other fruits, drinks which only became inebriating if they were preserved a long time, and probably also if they were prepared after special methods. Where was the line of demarcation between the allowed and the prohibited kind to be placed? Several collections of traditions went so far as to mention nabīth among the drinks prepared by Muhammad’s wives and drunk by him (Muslim, Ashriba, trads. 79-99; Ahmad, i, 232-3, 240, 287, 320-1, 336, 355, 359, 372; ii, 35; iii, 394, 307, 374-4, 326, 379, 384, etc.). Abū Dāwūd (Ashriba, bāb 10) and Ibn Māḏīja (Ashriba, bāb 22) have preserved a tradition on this subject which is instructive. Ibn Māḏīja’s version is given here: ‘Aṭīṣa said, ‘We used to prepare nabīth for the Apostle of God in a skin; we took a handful of dates or a handful of raisins, cast it into the skin and poured water upon it. The nabīth we prepared in this way in the morning was drunk by him in the evening; and when we prepared it in the evening he drank it the next morning’. In another tradition of the same bāb, Ibn ‘Abbas says that the Prophet used to drink this nabīth even on the third day; but what was left then was poured out.

All this could, however, not persuade the majority of the fakhips to declare nabīth allowed; three of the madhhab[s] as well as the Shi‘a prohibit the use of nabīth. The Hanafī school, on the other hand, allows it, when used with moderation, for medicinal purposes, etc.
everywhere refrain from their national drink, date wine of several kinds; the caliph Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz deemed it necessary to promulgate a special edict in order to abolish his custom (see von Kremers, Culturgeeschichte der Streitfrage, Leipzig 1873, 68-9).

Wine has a special place in the literary works of the mystics, where it is one of the symbols of ecstasy. In this point they only took over the language of their Christian and non-Christian predecessors. As early as Philo of Alexandria ecstasy is compared with intoxication (see especially his De Vita Contemplativa). Among the Ibāḥiya, language may have been a reflex of practice; but this cannot be said of Sūffis in general, who, on the contrary, cling to the ascetic methods of the via purgativa. As to Ḥāfiz’s wine- and love songs, it is an unsettled point whether they are merely metaphorical or not.


(A. J. Wensinck)

2. As a PRODUCT.

Wine has been known in the Orient since the earliest times, and Arabic literature preserves vague memories of its legendary origin, not omitting to recall the demonic aspect, in accordance with Kurān V, 90-2. It takes account, on the one hand, of Babylonian traditions linked to Biblical characters such as Adam and Noah (cf. the Midrash based on Babylonian elements; Tankhām, Lublin 1879, 28-9) and, on the other hand, of the Aramaic-Syriac extra-Biblical tradition, thus symbolising that ancient culture of the Fertile Crescent inherited by the mediaeval Muslim world. Certain versions link the origin of wine to the two great civilisations which were neighbours to Islam, that of Rūm and that of Thailāl (cf. al-Mas‘ūdi, Murādī, ii, 88-92, § 518-9; al-Ra‘īk al-Kayrawānī, Kūb al-sūrūn, B.N. Paris, art. cit., f. 42; al-Nawāḍī, Ḥalab al-kumaytī, Cairo 1938, ii, 11-12; al-Badrī al-Dimaghī, Rāḥat al-arādā, B.N. Paris, art. cit., f. 54a-59a; Bahb al-hikāyāt, B.N. Paris, art. cit., f. 358f., 107b-108b; on the strap 1, a pouz (q.v.), notably Istanbul, Reisülküttab, 899, f. 96b; Topkapi, E. H. 1329, f. 69; B.N. Paris, art. cit., f. 96a-97a, 5931, f. 252a.

The Book of Agriculture attributed to Ibn Waḥṣīyya (q.v.) points out the importance of the vine in the Fertile Crescent, and alludes to wines in speaking of the various types of grape which are suitable for their manufacture (Leiden ms. or. 303, ii, 87-291).

The Arabs who settled in agricultural regions had no real tradition of viticulture; in fact, in pre-Islamic Arabia vineyards were rare and wine-vaults even more so (however, there were some in al-Ṭa‘if). The quality of the wine was mediocre, and a certain amount must even then have been imported, mainly by Jewish and Christian merchants (after the birth of Islam, this commerce was practised exclusively by these two communities, as a result of the Kurānic prohibition). One should not suppose that the Be- douin knew nothing of wine (as is claimed by the Shu‘ūbīs [Bashshār, Diwān, Cairo 1950-6, i, 378, l. 2, and especially Abū Nuwas, Diwān, Cairo 1898, 244-5; cf. Ibn Kūtayba, ‘Uyūn, iii, 237; Ibn Ḥamdūn, Tādhkira, Istanbul Ragib, 1083, iii, l. 287a; Ibn Ghārīsīya, in Nawādīr al-makhlūdīlī, Cairo 1951, 250), nor that they drank it to excess (Ibn Ḥāwi, Fann al-gh‘īr al-khamrī, Beirut n.d., ii. 11). The truth is that the ancient Arabs were acquainted with wine, though tasting it only on rare occasions such as inter-tribal fairs (cf. G. Jacob, Studien in ar. Dichtung, Berlin 1895, 95-109; H. Lammens, Le berceau de l’Islam, Paris 1914, 54-5; H. F. Lutz, Viticulture and brewing in the Ancient Orient, Leipzig 1922, 32-7; 143-57; Diwān ‘Alī, Tarīkh al-‘Arab haβl al-islāmī, Basbūd 1951-2, viii, 162-5).

The expansion of Islam enabled the Muslims to familiarise themselves with new regional types of wine, and the taste of the consumers gained in refinement to the extent that connoisseurs were able to appreciate and distinguish between wines of diverse origin; al-Dība‘ī (Ṣāhirī) speaks even of various "wine-producing regions" (bulādan). The poets of the Islamic era speak of countries renowned before the advent of Islam for the quality of their wines (for Beirut see F. Gabrieli, in RSO, xv (1935), 39; for Ḍā’n, in Upper-Mesopotamia, see al-Ḏakkāl, Diwān, Beirut 1891, 117; F. Gabrieli, art. cit., ii, 51; J. Ben- cheikh, in BEO, xviii (1963-4), 18-20; cf. Ibn Ḥawkal, tr. Kramers-Wiet, 223; for Iran see F. Gabrieli, art. cit., 62; for the viticultural tradition, very often of Sāsānian origin, cf. the wine-producing regions mentioned by al-Ṭa‘lā‘lībī, in J. M. Unvala, King Husayn and his boy, Paris 1926, 45; and J. Bencheikh, op. cit. There were also renowned wine-producing districts in Egypt and in other parts of the Muslim world.

As regards the wine-making process, the information that we have is not very extensive. The grapes were trodden, with a light jumping movement, in a maṣṣara (shallow vat), according to an ancient procedure. Wine presses of circular motion were not introduced in the Orient until very late (some ancient specimens still exist in certain monasteries in the Lebanon). A poet of the 4th/10th century (apud al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyā, iv, 144), describes the maṣṣara as a sea of red flames in which the labourer stands, the lower half of his body soaked with the grape-juice. From the 7th/13th century onwards, miniatures provide the best illustrations of the process (see D. S. Rice, Deacon or Drink, in Arabic, v (1958), to which may be added Leningrad ms. S. 23, p. 76); here labourers are seen carrying the grapes, others press them by treading them in a vat, hanging on strips in order to jump more easily; in the vat there is an aperture, allowing the juice to flow out into a receptacle; against a wall stand the amphorae (dann, pl. dinīm) with tapered bases, in which the fermentation takes place (in vats, seldom in the open), and the maturation (on the storing in amphorae, cf. Leningrad S 93, pp. 44, 193; yet what are
involved are perhaps not wine amphorae, but large water containers, see G. Le-Bon, La Civilisation, Paris 1884, 397, and cf. the *khazān* described by Kugäh-djm, *Diez*., 1313, 83, and al-Suyūtī, *al-Hayā' al-saniyya*, Univ. of Istanbul, Arap 1476, f. 50. These various stages are described in works of literature, while religious treatises aimed at prohibiting the consumption of certain drinks, concern themselves at some length with the various types of vessel used for fermentation.

The medieval anthologies and the treatises of *fīh* list various ingredients for the manufacture of alcoholic beverages; fruits: dates (see *tamr*), figs, apricots, cherries, mulberries, and various berries; cereals: wheat, barley, maize, millet; honey (hydro mel is called *bīr*); sugar cane; milk (Ibn Kutayba, * Ağrib*, speaks of the making of alcoholic drinks from different kinds of milk), especially mares' milk (for making *kūmīs*, introduced at an early stage by the Turks, and attested from the 5th/11th century onwards, which was to become the favourite drink of the Mamlūks [see *kumīs*]). On all these beverages, see *sharāb*.


**KHAMRIYA (A.),** designates a Baccic or wine poem in modern critical terminology, at least since Tâhâ Husayn in 1923 (*Fāʾilat al-ʿArbiq*., ii, 71). This name does not seem to be attested in the mediaeval nomenclature of the genres. The usual expressions *al-kawi fīl-khamr*, *lauh maʿānī fīl-khamr*, *wasṣāfī fīl-khamr*, indicate the existence of themes, but do not include any willingness to organise them into an independent poem. In fact, the problem of appellation conceals the problem of evolution, of which the principal stages will be traced here.

1. *In early times: the inserted statement.* The state in which the works of the *Dârikīya* have been transmitted to us forbids our pronouncing on the problems that the working of the Baccic framework poses. It is possible, despite that, to put forward observations which are not without interest. The first concerns the insertion of statements in compositions with many themes, sc. the *muṣallaḥāt* of Labīd (vv. 57-61), *ʿAntara* (vv. 37-40), and especially *ʿAmr b. Kūlīqīm* (vv. 1-8), where the person involved already has a closer relationship with this type of inspiration. With the elegiac poet Muraqkīsh al-ʿAsgār, uncle of ʿAṭāf, the Baccic statement presents itself in the *nābī* as a syntactic and semantic intrusion. As a tool for comparison, it does not have as an autonomous form. Several other poems offer examples of instrumental, inserted statements: in an amorous evocation of *ʿAw b. ʿAtiyya* (*Mufād-
**TABLE 1**

- **Preparation**
- **Harvesting**
- **Vineyard**
  - **Wineharvest**
  - **Time**
  - **Pressing**
  - **Fermentation**
  - **Ageing**
  - ** Fire-embers-torch-lamp**
  - **Stars-lighting-morning-dawn**
  - **Jewels-gems**
  - **LUMINOSITY**
  - **Aspect**
  - **Colours**
  - **Reflections**
  - **COLOURATION**
  - **Mingling**
  - **LIMPIDITY-TRANSPARENCY**
  - **Purity**
  - **Immateriality**
  - **Liberated soul**
  - **Saliva of the beloved**
  - **Towards erotic speech**

- **Bouquet**
  - **Perfumes**
  - **Fruits**
  - **Flowers**
  - **Breeze-odours**
  - **Sweetness**
  - **Smoothness**
  - **Lightness**
  - **Pungency**
  - **Effects**
  - **Mingling**

- **Taste**
  - **Savour**

**TABLE 2**

- **Preparation**
- **Harvesting**
- **Vineyard**
  - **Wineharvest**
  - **Time**
  - **Pressing**
  - **Fermentation**
  - **Ageing**
  - ** Virgin cloistered wine.**
  - **Fight against darkness impurity, evil**
  - **LIMPIDITY-TRANSPARENCY**
  - **Purity**
  - **Immateriality**
  - **Liberated soul**
  - **Saliva of the beloved**
  - **Towards erotic speech**

- **Bouquet**
  - **Perfumes**
  - **Fruits**
  - **Flowers**
  - **Breeze-odours**
  - **Sweetness**
  - **Smoothness**
  - **Lightness**
  - **Pungency**
  - **Effects**
  - **Mingling**

- **Taste**
  - **Savour**

**Notes:**
- In the shelter of every contact.
- In the shelter of light and fire-time.
- Virgin cloistered wine.
**TABLE 3**

**PERSONAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Love</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mughanniya</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ghulamiyya</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masmi'a</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Khammara</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dihbana</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sabi</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ghalayn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mughanni</strong></td>
<td><strong>Masculines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Khammar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dihbana</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**

- Artificial paradises
- Voluptuousness
- Happiness
- Eternity of passion
- Resurrection
- Ecstasy
- Lightness
- Unconcern
- Courage
- Intelligence
- Generosity
- All-powerfulness
- Deliverance from the every day
- Escape out of time
- Disincarnation
- Search for love and purity
- Mystic speech
- Spiritual
- Spirit delivered from the carnal husk
- Psychological
- Metamorphoses of the drinker
- Illusions of drunkenness
- Drunkenness chasms
- Physical
- Force and violence
- Healing of ills
- In the body

**KHAMRIYYA**

- Love
- Sakiya
- Kayna
- Djariya
- Ghulamiyya
- Masculines
- Nadim
- Masculines
- Dihbana
- Feminines

**TABLE 4**
Youth Unconcern Aristocracy Culture
Beauty Grace Courtesy Good-breeding
Elegance Vivacity Generosity Discretion

Pleasure: vital function
Search for enjoyment
Amorous relations
(hetero- and homosexual)
Love of nature
Participation in the joys
of the universe
Pacifism
Quest for freedom
Snatching at life at the time, being
carried off to oblivion
Belief in divine mercy

Cynical and insolent debauchery
Indifference to opinion
Frenzy for scandal
Despair of exhaustion
Rejection of moral and
religious precepts
Rape of the Kur'anic prescriptions
and pretended submission
Satanic pact

Gold-silver-alabaster-topaz
crystal-glass

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibrik</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadh</td>
<td>Glass-cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka's</td>
<td>Glass Goblet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jar
Djerra
Dann
Khâbiya
Râhîd

Recipients
keeping

pitcher-jug
Bâtiyya

vase

vat-cask
Hiyâ

leather bottle
Zîbî

KHAMRIYYA
Futuwwa.
Batdla.
Beauty Grace
Elegance Vivacity

Nadîm
Rejection and provocativeness

Râhîd
Djerra

TABLE 5

TABLE 6
philosophy of intoxication appears in relief (Mu'allalat, vv. 45-57). Although still attached to the fa'akb, included in a heterogeneous hasida written in the Bedouin context, this poem introduces a particular treatment of Bacchism.

It is in this sense that several other poets are regarded rightly as true precursors. The Tamimi Christian author of combined Arab-Iranian culture, 'Adî b. Zayd (q.v.), produced poems of which fragments survive. Their writing foreshadows unquestionably that of the later great tradition. The work of Abû Mîbdjân (q.v.) is badly mutilated, but his personality may be viewed as a means to illustrate the attitude of refusal that would characterise his successors. Finally, the hasîn of al-'Ahsâî Maymûn (q.v.) includes about ten pieces, important because of the number of lines devoted to the Bacchic framework, which, however, never constitutes the whole of the poem. We have before us here an autonomous discourse which is written in the space of the hasida similar to other frameworks. The poet expresses in it a genuine pleasure without a bad conscience or aggressiveness. The monsters of Bacchism, who will appear later, do not dwell there. Moreover, its language is strong, still rough and one may speak of an inspiration still sustained by the Bedouin environment. But the use of numerous Persian words must also be noted, especially when flowers are mentioned —there is the beginning of a poetry of nauvîyyât or nauvîyyât which was to develop later. Thus an Iranian influence is felt which also affected 'Adî b. Zayd. The work of al-'Ahsâî reveals how the tendencies are entangled or juxtaposed and makes therefore hazardous any hypothesis which would claim to distinguish them. One must be content with the observation that several elements of the Bacchic framework are set there and that there is an evolution towards a specific kind of writing and the characteristics of a genre.

ii. The First Century: consolidation of a framework. While set entirely under the sign of a historic mutation, the first century of Islam is still a period of transition and, as such, marked by great complexity. In a purely operative manner, it is possible to distinguish two types of production:

(a) Hîdjarî Bacchism. In a Hîdjarî disappointed in its ambitions, which history made of marginal consequence and immobilised as sacred, it is well-known how hedonism developed among the representatives of an idle aristocracy. This was a decisive stage for amorous poetry and Bacchic poetry, which lent support to one another and shared between them some large thematic areas. In view of this, Hassan b. Thâbit is a forerunner, especially as the local trend is linked with the influence that the court of al-Hîra had on him. Even if his work is in part apocryphal, and even if his Bacchic statements survive scattered in mainly laudatory compositions, he was capable of some audacities, of which posterity preserved the memory (Yâkût, Udhâdi, xv, 164-6).

Hîdjarî Bacchism is well represented by Ibn Saybân (q.v.), a not very productive poet, but one who dedicated himself to wine and love and was often punished for it. Al-Ahwâs is the type of aristocrat of whom it could almost be said that he combined several features of the libertine, while taking care not to give to that word a meaning which would exceed the socio-cultural realities of the time. A great lover of the pleasures of drink and music offered him, he put an adventurous insolence into his pursuit of them, saw how far he could go with morality or even with religion, and arrived at a political attitude that was critical of the régime that brought him to the pillory and exile. It is a great pity that the state of his works hardly allows judgement to be made, for certain fragments are significant, notably those that are concerned with the combined treatment of the elegiac and Bacchic frameworks.

(b) 'Irâkî Bacchism. Due to the copiousness of his Bacchic work, al-Aghâlî (q.v.), another Christian connected with the milieu of al-Hîra, appears as the successor of al-'Ahsâî, and that despite the harsh evaluation that certain modern critics have placed on his real importance. But once the necessary cautions have been given as to the present state of the hasîn, it must be acknowledged that we are analysing here an important treatment of the framework studied. Indeed, Bacchic development is inserted in a hasida. But the variety of the themes (concerning the preparation of wine and its effects), the diversity of the descriptive processes, and, generally, the coherence of the scheme, allows some interesting observations to be made (M. S. Benani, Bacchic themes and personalities in the hasîn of al-Aghâlî, thesis [in Arabic], Algiers 1965, and Madjallat Kulisiyyat al-'Adâb, Algiers, i (1967), 59-78). One might mention here the overlapping of the themes of water and wine, which compose very rich semantic constellations. Beneficial or destructive, abundant, rare, calm, or wild, occupying space with their sound and perfume, leading to drunkenness or suspending it, water and wine join together or confront one another to impose a framework of liquidity which continues in strict relationship with reality. Later poets were to depart from this reality and their work was to become enriched with symbolic significance.

The poetry of al-Aghâlî preserves some characteristics of traditional Bedouin Bacchism as it continued in this first century in a few poems of al-'Udjâyar b. 'Abd Allâh al-Salûl (Aghâni, xiii, 60, and al-Djumâbî, Tâbaabî, 517 ff.) and al-Nâbîgâh b. Shaybân (Aghâni, vii, 107-8, 110); cf. Blachère, HLA, iii, 505). But it is also connected with another type of inspiration that develops in 'Irâk, especially at al-Kûfâ, which sets itself up as heir of al-Hîra. With this type, it must be linked the works of 'Hârîgâh b. Badr al-Ghûdânî (q.v.), comprising about 80 lines, which certify that numerous Abû Nuwâs-like processes were already in use. A great drinker ('khimir), this noble Basran of Tamlâm defied the prohibition on drinking where Bedouin bragging takes on quite significant tones of rebellion. But the poet is mediocre and his Bacchism has few nuances, finding only inadequate expression.

Mâlik b. Asmâ` b. Khâridjî (Aghâni, xviii, 158-67; Ibn Kutayba, Shîrî, 666-7), a senior official of al-Hâdîdî's with few scruples, sings of the pleasures of love, music and wine in this light language which was soon to impose itself on khâmiriyyât.

But it is above all another Kûfân, a pure Arab, al-Mujhîr b. 'Abd Allâh, called al-Ukayshîr al-Asadî (Aghâni, xi, 234-59; cf. Blachère, HLA, iii, 515), who represents one of the first truly Bacchic personalities of the literature of the first century. This writer was first of all a picturesque Bohemian with little to recommend him, but amusing and quick-loving, who haunted the taverns and monasteries of al-Hîra, and formed with several companions a group called the madjâdir al-Kûfâ. We are here at the beginning of the libertine school of al-Kûfâ which was henceforth to be exposed to the repression of official morality.

Al-Ukayshîr is moreover an excellent poet, who describes wine in beautiful language, still strongly
marked by the Bedouin lexical tradition. In this poetry, which is very true to life, describing tavern adventures, the relation is skilful and lively, the Bacchism vigorous and sympathetic. This type of inspiration can be connected with the brief and rather dull pieces of the Kūfān Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Thawrānī (al-Shabuḥši, Diyarād, 49, 176, 230–2), an inveterate drinker and lover of young men, found dead among the leather bottles of a low tavern. So, in the first century, various tendencies exploited a well-established framework to which great poets were soon to give fuller expansion.

iii. The Second Century: the assertion of a literary style.

(a) A great forerunner: al-Walīd b. Yazīd.

The second century, which was to end with the glory of Abū Nuwās, had at its outset that of the caliph al-Walīd b. Yazīd. Between the two men the line of descent is direct. Everything is included between these two poles: a philosophy of existence, the conception of an art, the practice of a language.

A style of writing defines Bacchic poetry as a major mode of speech.

Al-Walīd, a controversial personality if ever there was (see our brief sketch of a counter-portrait in Encyclopaedia Universalis, Thesaurus, s.v.), Arab prince, poet and composer linked with the musical school of the Hijāz, throwing himself into the passions of life, free with a lordly freedom that could not conceive of any limit and, hence, of any morality, is doubly important. He gathered around himself a literary group, in which were Ibn Māyyāda [q.v.]; Ibn Shūrāṣ; Yazīd b. Dabba, an excellent poet, the inseparable friend of the prince (Aghdāni, vii, 92–100); Yāḥyā b. Ziyād al-Hārījī, and many others. Also, conspicuous personalities like Mutīf b. Iyās, Ḥammad al-Rawīya and Ḥammad ‘Adrājī, the famous libertines of al-Kūfā frequented his salon. The composition of this literary group is significant, and makes understandable the literary admiration of al-Walīd for ʿAdī b. Zayd and for Bāshshār b. Būr, whose personality and work incontestably dominates this century.

Moreover, al-Walīd is recognised as the master of modern Bacchism. The author of Aghdāni asserts it already: this poet composed numerous poems which were plundered, notably by al-Ḥusayn b. al-Dāḥbāk [q.v.] and Abū Nuwās (Aghdāni, vii, 21). The quality of the borrowers is itself a homage rendered to a work of which only some fragments have been preserved. The Bacchic inspiration is here very close to the amorous inspiration which predominates. Features of exquisite delicacy in the sentiment of finesse in the expression, are neighbours to excesses which still go to set off an insolent elegance. The language by its simplicity and its naturalness breaks away from the heavy machinery of conventional poetry. Bacchism finds suddenly a personality which animates it and a way of writing, even more, a style— that is to say a depth—able to exploit the richnesses of its register. Bacchic speech has combined all its mediums.

(b) The libertines of al-Kūfā. The poets of al-Kūfā form a group whose homogeneity is such that it is permissible to speak of a school which becomes notable in the second half of the second century. Al-Kūfā became the centre of a poetical activity, of which the components are complex and the characteristics diverse. Its motivations originate at many levels, and their interactions do not allow them to be disentangled easily. Everything comes within the conception of what could almost be called a counter-culture: the political, the religious, the racial, the economic and the social. It is here, and at its best, that Bacchism appears as the expression of a rebellion, that the attitudes of the poet take on subversive overtones. The rebellion is spectacularly directed against religious precepts: it is not an accident that most of the poets of this group fall under the accusation of sandāba (cf. for example, Aghdāni, xiii, 280, 335, but all the sources underline this point), and several of them paid with their life for their desire to reject a constraining socio-cultural system. For it goes without saying that the subversion did not only aim at the Kur'ānic law; it was in fact the entire system of a culture that was threatened.

This group includes famous luminaries of the literary milieu, such as Wāliba b. al-Hūbāb; the three Hammāds: ‘Adrājī, al-Rawīya and al-Zibrīkān; and Mutīf b. Iyās, who all died between 155/772 and 156/787. Their freedom of morals, their anti-religious spirit or their indifference towards religion, their Shu‘ābī tendencies, are a mark of this period. Bāshshār b. Burd is their great contemporary. But his work, fundamentally amorous, touches only slightly upon the Bacchic framework, and, if his companions are sometimes drunk, he loves above all to sing of the beauty of the mulkhanīya or singing girl.

Among the libertines one notices the presence of poets who are little-known, but who are nevertheless of great interest for the study of the genre. Such is Bakr b. Khāridjā (Aghdāni, xiii, 66 ff.; al-Shabuḥši, Diyarād, 424–3), a Kufān mawla of Asad, a poor Bohemian who was deprived of his reason by drink and misery. He spent most of his time in taverns, and took refuge to drink amongst the ruins of al-ulā. He is the author of small pieces which al-Dāḥbāṣ and Dībil enjoyed.

‘Ammār b. ‘Amr, whose kunya is poorly established as Dīḥū Kināz or Kubār (Aghdāni, xiii, 366 ff.), was the friend of Hammād al-Rawīya and Mutīf b. Iyās; his wife, a shrew, shared in his drinking. A minor poet, he is the author of numerous love poems and some khamriyyāt.

Appearing here also is Yāḥyā b. Ziyād al-Hārījī (Diyārāt, 247 ff.), who gave himself over to some unbridled orgies with his friend Mutīf b. Iyās. The two were accused of sandāba, and it is true that their provocative attitudes do not leave any doubt as to the unbelief of Mutīf who was absolutely passionate in his anti-religious activities.

With the Kūfān milieu of this period is associated Abī Dūlāmā (q.v.), a habitué of taverns and a great lover of joyful evenings spent far from the palace where he was kept as a buffoon. Exasperated by the religious duties, he hurls several vigorous gibes against Islam. There must be noted in his production some characteristics, notably linguistic, which make one think of an inspiration of popular origin. This fact, attested also in Hammād ‘Adrājī, shows firstly that the Bacchic genre is directly opposed to laudatory poetry, whose official function is specific. But one is also led thinking that the poetry of rebellion, based on an existential attitude, and transcribed in a literary or non-literary form—according to the dominant norms—has perhaps drawn vigour and vivacity from a people absolutely excluded from the cultural system (cf. J. E. Bencheikh, Politique arabe, Les voies d'une création, Paris 1975, ch. i).

We may note finally that the works of this group are quite sparse. But they played a decisive role in the maturation of a genre which eventually found its masters in the second half of the century.
(c) The Pre-Nuwāsians. Emphasis must be placed on the most original, the most striking of these, and preparations be made for an injustice that posterity commits against him, sc. Abu ‘l-Hindī al-Riyābī (it is difficult to establish his exact name: Ḡqādānī xx, 293; al-Kutubi, Fāṣadī, ii, 240 ff.; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbiḥ, Ṭibī, vi, 342; al-Ma‘arrī, Ghurfān, 168, 208; Ibn Kutayba, Šīrī, 572; Ibn al-Mu‘tazzazz, Tabābālī, 136-45, etc.). A poet of Arab origin, he lived mostly in Ḳhurāsān and Sigjūštān, and this remoteness explains how he can be forgotten. His talent was nevertheless real. Ibn al-Mu‘tazzazz, who composed in the 3rd century the first anthology of Bacchic poetry that has come down to us, asserts that Abū Nuwas, al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḍabḥāk and Abū Ḥīfān were able to establish themselves in the genre only after reading his poems (Ṭātabālī, 142). The author of the Ḡqādānī quotes the judgement delivered by Abū ‘Ubayyād and confirmed by Isḥāḳ al-Mawsīlī, according to which Abū Nuwas drew all his inspiration from Abu ‘l-Hindī (Ḡqādānī, xx, 29). Even anecdotes of which he was the hero are attributed to other personalities who were living in a similar way. Remote from cultural centres, Abu ‘l-Hindī was unable to defend himself against being pillaged, and it seems that it did not worry him. He was one among these poets whose work contributes to the growth of a trend, to the putting of his own plan in effect, but who, melting into the collective effort of creation, leave little trace in memory. All his importance must be due to this transmission function in Arabic poetry.

Abu ‘l-Hindī never wrote anything but khamriyyāt, which impels Ḳ-Isfahānī to assert that he was the first Bacchic poet of the Islamic period (Ḡqādānī, xx, 293, copied by Fāṣadī, ii, 242). This is clearly false, but not useless for the understanding of an evolution: Abu ‘l-Hindī is considered in fact as the first to give independence to the genre, and we must concur in this judgement. In a plain and harmonious language, this poet chisels poems of an excellent workmanship, highly representative of this lively, exciting spirit, that was also to be that of Abū Nuwas.

Abd b. Ṭibī al-Ḫūrāsānī (Fihrist; Ibn al-Muṭazzazz, Tabābālī, 306 ff.; Ibn al-Ḍirrāb, Warāṣa, 58, etc.) was, according to Abū Nuwas, the origin of the public practice of debauchery (mudājin) and of the composition of verse describing his drinking bouts and varied sexual activities. He was thus to open a path that his young contemporaries were to develop, that his word forms an experience. With a talent made up of sensibility, elegance and intelligence, he wrote poems which do not always have the merit of originality, but often have the sparkle of exceptional success. Thus a unique work of its genre, through its abundance, its variety and its quality, comes to crown a long evolution. Abū Nuwas mastered a speech that others had forged for him, and nobody in this field can dispute with him for first place. Such was the domination that he exercised during his lifetime that he was able to force Ibn al-Ḍabḥāk, for example, to cede to him some of his lines, and posterity was bound to attribute to him much that did not belong to him. A personality of remarkable prominence, he gave to Bacchism its existential significance, one which did not reduce it to the simple pleasure of drinking (cf. J. E. Ben-ceiver, Thèmes bachiques et personnages dans le diwan d’Abū Nuwas, in BEQ, xviii (1963-4), 1-84).

In the very incomplete diwan of Muslim b. al-Walī, a score of poems contain important Bacchic developments. These entail two observations. The first, in certain pieces, relates to the Bacchic note being given priority treatment and becoming a framework in which other themes are inserted. The second deals with the language, Muslim is a master of the badi‘, and does not forget it even in these poems. This concern for formalism makes the expression heavy and goes against the nature of the inspiration. Ibn al-Ḍabḥāk produced some verse which is better-developed (cf. Muhammad al-Munifl, al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḍabḥāk, aṣḥāb khamriyya ti wa-ḥākima ti, Faculty of Letters of Algiers University thesis, 1965). Despite the fragmentary state of his diwan, it is possible to place him among the poets of the first order. One should mention with him Abu ‘l-Sḥāb [q.v., cousin of Dībil, friend of Muslim and Abū
Nuwas, author of long Bacchic poems revealing a great mastery of the language (Ibn al-Mu'tazz, Tabākāt, 77-86). They are furthermore interesting to study, as the survivors of the Bedouin language are quite marked in them. Finally, 'Amr b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Warrāk (al-Sāḥib al-Shaghili, Diyarāt, 172 ff.; al-Marzubān, Muṣqām, 218; etc.) was a companion of Abu Nuwas, a lewd drunkard, a wicked rogue of a fornicator and pederast, an arrogant mocker of religion, who wrote a poetry with his genius more closely connected with the drinking song than the poem.

The Khamriyya after Abu Nuwas: the playing-out of a style of writing. It seems that, having attained glory, the genre became fixed in the academic. While the formalists reduced poetry to the set exercise, the khāmriyya was drained of its subversive function. Having become a stylistic exercise, it is not surprising to find it composed by any hand. Some poets whose temperament was as far removed as possible from Bacchism attempted it (al-Butṭurī, for example, wrote a dozen khāmriyyāt). This evidently contributes to the playing-out of the genre. The surprises, quite rare, come from obscure authors in whom is found a note of sincerity or a felicitous expression.

Besides, the Bacchic tone becomes diversified— and some of its strong indications—with the development of the rawdīyya, floral poems, of the dayrīyya, poems describing evenings spent in concerts or monasteries, and of the ṣāḥīhīyya, versified friendly letters, whose respective domains are not always easy to delimit. These different forms competed to render familiar a light poetry, with a descriptive tendency, which expressed a pleasure in living surrounded by a byzantine and happy nature. The force of the Bacchic theme becomes insipid in this gentle culture of the Muses.

The 3rd century is dominated by Ibn al-Mu'tazz [q.v.] who composed an important Bacchic anthology (Fusūl al-tamādhib fi tābākīr al-surūr). He wrote poems of youth, whose delicacy recalls that of the other talented aristocrat, al-Walid b. Yazīd. But the well-born adhīb Ibn al-Mu'tazz, an enemy of every passionate outburst and concerned with an elegant measure, was unable to exploit in depth a framework whose indispensable vitality he did much to lessen.

The voluminous work of Ibn al-Rūmī [q.v.] contains several khāmriyyāt in which he attempts, not without difficulty it is true, a more spontaneous and sensitive language than that of his great compositions. But it must be noted that in the dayrīyya, the Bacchic themes become more and more secondary. Associated with this tradition is Muhammad b. al-'Abbās b. al-Bāṣrī, called Sāhib al-Rākūba, a drug seller in the service of the Ikhshидīds of Cairo (Diyārāt, 292, 294-7). He is presented as a debauchee (mādīn). But in his eclogues, the themes, reduced to commonplace stereotypes, serve above all to introduce here the description of a lake peopled with birds, and there that of narcissi and roses growing on the banks of a stream. In this poetry of a smiling nature, wine is described in it as a supplementary excellence to verses to the great themes well-known in the register and in rediscovering, sometimes with felicity, the Nuwāsian inspiration. But we can feel that in this 4th/10th century, still honoured by the works of al-Mutanabbi and Abu Firas [q.v.] (cf. the poems of the latter's diyārāt, nos. 150, 171, 178 and especially 364, his great ṣāḥīhīyya which finishes in a Bacchic development), Arabic poetry has nothing more to invent, so that it becomes set, worn out by nearly six centuries of an exceptionally abundant production. The few poets that remain to be cited wrote a poem worthy to be cited in an anthology, and reveal only a fanciful spirit already too familiar; they approach as well as possible these great masters of the past, of whom some are still cited by al-Ma'arrī in his Risālat al-ghyfār, 134-45.

In the 5th/11th century Ibn Shībī [q.v.] (and in addition, al-Kiftī, al-Muḥammadīn min al-fursīrān, 938, 127-134). In fact, these figures provide material for the anecdotal literature which flourishes around Bacchic poetry, but do not leave any striking work.

From this point of view, more interesting is Abu l-Ṭayīb Muḥammad b al-Kāsim al-Nu'mayrī. A close friend of Ibn al-Mu'tazz, he exchanged with him a whole correspondence (Agābhī, ix, 137; al-Shābuquītī, 71 ff.; al-Marzubānī, Muṣqām, 336-7; etc.). It consists of ḥawāniyyāt, friendly invitations to profit from the pleasure of love and drink, where the poet shows himself skilful at making glittering promises, and subtle in expressing his joy in accomplishing them with friends. These notes are sometimes in ṣādī (Diyārāt, 74). They deal with the same themes as poetry and offer samples of a Bacchic prose for consideration; it reveals an atmosphere and way of life. Here it is a case of well-born companions who have nothing to do with the "Fauvists" of the preceding century. They handle drunkenness like love, sc. with delicacy and good taste, in an allusive language which suits the courteous elegance of the salons. The ṣādāb of the mundūdā, already defined by Abu Nuwas, finished by imposing its rules on the ṣūrāfāt of polite society.

In the 4th century, Kushādīm [q.v.] confirmed this insertion of Bacchism in a poetry of social relationship. This nadīm-poet was capable of describing a flower, a cup, a musical instrument in an exquisite, light, delicate language, closely related to a way of life. The social discourse, inspired by the inspiration and the poem is subjected to an essentially descriptive plan (cf. al-Shabūshī, Diyarāt, 251 ff.). On the last point, this approach becomes clear in the production of al-Ṣanawbārī (Diyārāt, 218-24, which cites several poems that do not figure in the diyarāt). Here appears very clearly the relationship existing between the khāmriyya and the poetry of nature. But it must be noted that in the dayrīyya, the Bacchic themes become more and more secondary.

On the other hand, Abu l-Faraqī Muḥammad al-Wāwā'ī al-Kutbī, Fawād, no. 357, ii, 301-6), a Damascene poet of simple and harmonious language, returned to the Bacchic tradition in dedicating certain excellent verses to the great themes well-known in the register and in rediscovering, sometimes with felicity, the Nuwāsian inspiration. But we can feel that in this 4th/10th century, still honoured by the works of al-Mutanabbi and Abu Firas [q.v.] (cf. the poems of the latter's diyarāt, nos. 150, 171, 178 and especially 364, his great ṣāḥīhīyya which finishes in a Bacchic development), Arabic poetry has nothing more to invent, so that it becomes set, worn out by nearly six centuries of an exceptionally abundant production. The few poets that remain to be cited wrote a poem worthy to be cited in an anthology, and reveal only a fanciful spirit already too familiar; they approach as well as possible these great masters of the past, of whom some are still cited by al-Ma'arrī in his Risālat al-ghyfār, 134-45.
the pleasures enjoyed in a monastery. But the Bacchic note is minor in his work, as attested in the great philosophical poems where he gives himself up to a reflection on existence and the fate of man. Muhammad b. Khalifa b. al-Hasayn al-Numayri (al-Kutubi, *Fawâdi*, no. 403, ii, 402), a poet of Sa'ïf al-Dawla's circle, strove without success in the genre. Ibn al-Nabîh [q.v.], a poet of the Ayyûbidids, revived a few of the most frequently-repeated statements without introducing the slightest new view. We may conclude this list, which could be filled with the names of several minor authors, by citing three poets of the 7th/13th century.

Nûr al-Dîn Muhammad al-Isârî (1619-56:1222-58: *Fawâdi*, no. 377, ii, 329-34; *Shâhârîd al-Âshâb*, v, 284), who grouped the libertine part of his *diwân* under the title of * Sulûtât al-sâdîfân fi l-Âshâb wa'1-muʕâbân*, a work which also comprises an anthological section. This poet loved wine, and he speaks of it with passion in some quite long poems running to more than 20 verses. He asserts especially the superiority of alcohol over *hadâqâz* for the quality of intoxication which it provides. But his poetry is prosaic, heavy, often trivial, deprived as it is of the Nuwâsîan brilliance which lent glamour even to obscure compositions. A little later, Ibn Nuhâtta [q.v.], poet of the Ayyûbid sovereign Abu 'l-Fïdâ', inserted Bacchic formulae in heterogeneous compositions. But it is above all Sa'îf al-Dîn al-Hilli who, at the end of the 7th/13th century and in the first third of the 8th/14th one, rediscovered a real inspiration with a richness of themes and remarkable images. The fact is so much more notable, since this poet took a great interest in the strophic poetry of classical or colloquial language, e.g. poems nos. v. Mystical intoxication or substituted speech. It was, paradoxically, the mystics drunk with their love for God who gave to Bacchism a new impetus. They took possession of a well-established framework and activated it by substituting for hedonistic motivations the decisive quest for happiness in God. From there, a whole symbolism became established. Wine becomes a divine emanation which spreads its rays from one form to another, a symbol of the supreme love which manifests itself in creation. Drunkenness is forgetfulness of all that is not He. Under the effect of this application of meanings, an inner discourse is substituted for a text apparently set in its formulae. For, it must be noted, the mystical poet is not anxious to renew the writing of the Bacchic framework, or he does not care to do so; instead, he adds to it another meaning. At the same time as he accepts and pronounces the fixity of a language, he enlarges his conceptual field. Thus constellations of symbols appear around original themes. A thorough study of these appropriations—it is necessary to reverse the order of things, says al-Nâbulûsî—would show how a new inspiration was able to arise from within an old language, to illuminate it, but not destroy it. No more than the Bacchic poets of the 2nd/8th century did the mystics conceive a poetic theory. In going beyond the Islamic orthodox vision, they imposed a style of speech, not a writing.

The operation had been attempted with success as early as the middle of the 2nd/8th century in the poems of Râhîn al-'Adawiyya. The importance of the zones common to the erotic and Bacchic frameworks was to mark out the *khâmriyya* for serving the passionate quest of the mystics. The *diwân* of al-Hallâdî contains only one quatrain of this type, which is furthermore also attributed to Ibn al-Ḍabbâk and Abu Nuwas (*Diwân*, ed. Massignon, 73, no. 38), but several anonymous poems were later dedicated to the description of mystical intoxications (*ibid.*, 127-30). The saint from Tilimsân, Abâ Madîyan [q.v.], composed some *sadji* of very marked popular inspiration, illustrating also an ancient tendency of the Bacchic genre to distinguish itself from classical poetry. It is also true that the mystics had at their disposal two keyboards, that of esoteric composition, and that of popular incantation which was to become fundamental in the practice of the brotherhoods. An entire production of *khâmriyya* was to see the light of day in the East and in the Maghrib, where a representative sample is supplied by Hurayfîsh al-Makî (d. 801/1398-9; cf. *Diwân al-Halladî*, 140 ff.).

But it is Ibn al-_FARîd [q.v.] who draws attention with his great *khâmriyya*. In this, indeed, he gives himself to a masterly re-interpretation of the whole Bacchic theme and deepens its symbolic range. Moreover, he does this without renouncing the artifices of a formalistic rhetoric. The mechanisms of poetic writing continue to be used, but here they injure neither the feverish palpitation of the substituted speech nor the powerful rhythm of the incantation. In the 11th/17th century, 'Abd al-Qâni al-Nâbulûsî was to write a commentary on this poem, composed according to the comments made on it by the author of the *Tafsîr*, which Al-Jâmi al-'Arabî. Al-Nâbulûsî reveals also the secret significance of wine in pieces where Bacchic themes are intertwined with developments of love themes. In the mystics, the overlapping of the two registers becomes total in order to express passion and ecstasy. The *diwân* of Abu 'l-Hasan al-Shu'âbartî, very few poems do not have recourse to Bacchic statements (*Dîwân*, ed. al-Nabûsî, Alexandria 1924; cf. ibid., nos. 5, 8, 9, 12, 20, 26, 31, 38, and the majority of *muwâshâhât* and *sadji*; cf. also Massignon, *Recherches sur Shu'âbartî*, in *Mélanges W. Marçais*, 1950, 251 ff.).

The quest for the intoxication of love is a central theme which catches in him the nervous rhythm of a popular language. Moreover, he exploits the vein of an Ibn Kûmân, and the narrative of visits to a monastery, or evenings in a tavern, could easily lead to confusion, the language being to such an extent that of the *khâmriyya*. There could not exist here any of those deceits which sometimes inspired pornographic poems with a pseudo-mystical aim. But it is interesting to note this second substitution of speech, by means of which we return to the origins.

The mystical *khâmriyya* continued to be practised, anonymous or obscure, in classical or dialectal language, until the 10th century, where it is attested, for example, in the *diwân* of the Algerian amîr 'Abd al-Kâdir (cf. A. Ben Harrath, *Maghdalat Kulliyyat al-Âdâb*, i (1967), 47 ff.), and even in the 20th century in its popular form.

vi. *The khâmriyya in Muslim Spain: atomised speech.* The Andalusian environment suited the fading of Bacchic poetry especially after the proliferation of the kingdoms of the Tarîqât. On the literary side, the creation of strophic forms such as the *muwâshâhât* and the *sadji* offered a more supple and effective structure to capture this type of inspiration. The use, especially in the *sadji*, of a semi-popular language, assured a very appreciable source of invention. Linked with the pleasure of life, with the quest for love, with a profound communion with nature, Bacchism competed to express a certain mode of existence in the world.

Paradoxically, the conjunction of these favourable elements provoked, it seems, a contrary result. The Bacchic framework, already exhausted in the East,
falls into such common use here that it becomes increasingly worn out. Used to love or the joys of nature, it is instrumentalised and hardly requires an autonomous plan and specific style any more. If one adds to all this the proliferation of poets, and especially the mutilation that time has wrought in their work it is understandable why it is necessary to speak here of “pulverised” or “atomised” speech, echoing E. García Gómez.

As early as the 5th/6th century, during the period of the amirs, then of the caliphs, Ibn Darrādī [g.v.] included Bacchic statements in some khamriyya, floral poems, which augur the coming of Ibn Khafṣīdī. The prince Abū 'Abd al-Malik Marwān, great-grandson of Abū al-Raḥmān III, also followed this path, and Bacchic themes came to sustain in him an inspiration of an erotic or descriptive order.

But it is in the 5th/6th century that Bacchism finds its full extent, as much from the point of view of poetic creation as from that of ontological activity. To the latter, Ibn Ṣūḥayd assigns the setting of a visit to the valley of the ta‘wūbī, where he meets especially the inspirational genius of Abū Nuwās during a succession of very interesting poetic confrontations. For his part, the historian Ibn al-Raḳīk al-Kayrawānī [g.v.] dedicated to the Eastern khamrīyūd his Kāḥib al-sa‘rūn fi wasf al-anbīḍa wa'l-khuḍrī, still in manuscript, and a Kitāb mu‘ṣbahār al-ṣ̄̂kārāb which has not come down to us. The vizier Abū ‘Amīr Ibn Maslama [g.v.] for his Ḥikāṭat al-irṣyāḥ fi ḫāṣṣat al-rāḥ, draws upon the Andalusian works, his own notably, of which a few fragments survive devoted to largely banal forms of enjoyment.

In that which concerns poetry properly so-called, we must make a choice among numerous poets whose works are often known only by a few lines in anthologies. Ibn al-Abbār [g.v.], also an author of floral poems, dedicated a few pieces to the madājīlī al-ʿunṣ, in which an aristocratic taste delighted the tastes of love, walks and friendly evenings. The striking personality of the century was the sovereign of Seville al-Muṭāmilī (cf. R. H. Souissi, al-Muʿātim Ibn ‘Abbād et son œuvre poétique, doctoral thesis, Paris 1973, 135-48). He drank with pleasure and describes the joys of drunkenness in poems where the themes of liquidity and luminosity are touched upon. But the statements do not represent an organised view, even if the signs of an existential anguish often appear. The author’s attractive personality does not succeed in giving life to a language that has been over-used. The same observation applies to Bacchic mentions noted in the work of those faithful to the unfortunate prince, sc. Ibn al-Labbān [g.v.] (cf. Dār al-Ṭīrās, 55; M. al-Karīmī, Fann al-ta‘wūbī, 1297 etc.) or Ibn Hamdīs [g.v.]. The Kāḥīb ‘All b. Ahmad (al-Kutubī, Fawādī, no. 304, ii, 140-1; H. Pères, La poésie andalouse, 154) composed short pieces where the astral themes play an important role in the description of the spark of the wine.

Bestriding the 5th/6th and 6th/7th centuries were several poets who attempted the khamriyya. Ibn Khafṣīdī [g.v.] (cf. H. Haddījīdī, Vie et œuvre du poète andalou Ibn Khafṣīdī, typed thesis, Paris 1969) did not detach himself in any way from the Nuwāsīan vein, which he exploits in brief developments and without originality. His tavern outings supply the opportunity for imitation, and he remains incapable of rendering an atmosphere and painting a living picture. His talent is elsewhere. His nephew Ibn al-Zakkāk [g.v.] wrote mostly love poems or pastoral verse, a genre in which his uncle was famous. The sole aim of the Bacchic statement in his work is to under-
for a long time the Maghrib and the Near East, were
to fill with languishing echoes the great silence of a
bloodless poetry. After the nakḥa, Bacchic statements
are rediscovered at the band of a Amin Nakha or an
Abu 'l-Kāsim al-Shābbī in elegies with accents of
Lamartine, aghānī al-hayāti. But the time of another
poetry had by then come.

vi. The khāmriyya: the scope of the poem. The
evolution which led from the technique of inserted
statements to the composition of homogeneous
khāmriyyā, then to the "pulverisation" or "atomisa-
tion" of a style of speech was first accompanied by
the enactment of any rules which defined a genre or
determined the architecture of a fixed form. The
general characteristics that one can discern, belonging
to a very much mutilated corpus (except perhaps in
the case of Abū Nuwās), do not have an informative
value.

(a) Brevity: the requirements of a style of writing. The
khāmriyya is a relatively brief poem. Only 41
poems of Abū Nuwās out of 299 have more than 14
lines. In his work, the tendency to conciseness is
found again in conventional genres. But this brevity
characterises all the Bacchic poets of different
periods. A need was felt to keep to a number of lines,
ranging from 4 to 15 as a verifiable average, even
when it involved inserted statements in multithematic
kasidas. Bacchic writing was composed in a limited
comprehension, but that of mechanisms which determine
the setting of the poem. For the khāmriyya, this
involves the choice of a certain compass—a poem
written in the plan of the creation at the level of the
language and notably the phono-semantic organisa-
tion.

(b) The organisation of an allotted space. There is
no rule for the thematic regulation of a khāmriyya.
If we accept the poem that is ordered around a
narrative and so of a chronology, the poet handles
the statements freely (cf. the six thematic tables
pp. 999-1001 above). The unity of the inspiration,
the fairly strict limits of the framework, assure
homogeneity to the whole. We have noted the
frequent recourse to amorous or floral themes. It is
a matter of common areas exploited by several
frameworks. It is possible, moreover, in refining the
analysis, to disclose an entire rhetoric of Bacchic
discourse which governs small units of this discourse
without denying the frequency of the use of so-called
"light" metres such as the sari* and the khafif,
a "light" metres such as the sari* and the khafif,
its occurrence even, in poets as little

Problems of metric specificness. The problem of
the adequacy of the metre for the framework is a
matter of common areas exploited by several
frameworks. It is possible, moreover, in refining the
analysis, to disclose an entire rhetoric of Bacchic
discourse which governs small units of this discourse
without denying the frequency of the use of so-called
"light" metres such as the sari* and the khafif,
a frequency confirmed elsewhere even in poets as little

* (n%); and in al-Akhtal, by the
wafir (15.7%), the kamal (15.4%) and the
kasida. The airān of Abū Nuwās, the only
Bacchic corpus sufficiently important to lend itself
to analysis within the field of hypotheses most of the
time. In the case of developments inserted in a kasida,
it cannot be a question of specificness. In al-Aḥṣā,
the group of four major metres is formed by the
jawil (34%), the kamal (14.5%), the mutabārib (12%)
and the basāt (11%); and in al-Āqītal, by the
jawil (53%), the wafīr (15.7%), the basāt (14%)
and the kamal (9.2%). The airān of Abū Nuwās, the
only Bacchic corpus sufficiently important to lend itself
to enumeration, supplies the following results, drawn
from 993 poems: jawil (45.45%); basāt (14.21%);
sari* (15%); wafīr (13.11%) and kamal (8.75%). This
general percentage, compared with a percentage
drawn from only conventional poetry (panegyric,
panegyric, elegiac, etc.) brings out a perceptible decline of the
jawil and the kamal, and a slight increase of the basāt
and sari* (cf. op. cit., the curves of metric use drawn
from three centuries). The one is a long metre, the
other a short metre, which leaves the problem intact.
Without denying the frequency of the use of so-called
"light" metres such as the sari* and the basāt, a
frequency confirmed elsewhere even in poets as little
modernist as Abū Tammān and al-Ṭuḥṭūrī, it is always worth asking ourselves the real nature of the concept and the theme treated. It will not be possible for any suggestions to be made in this matter as long as no serious analysis has been made of the connections established between the structures of the phonic chain in operation and the stylistic organisation of the verse which is wedded to the scheme. At this point, we return to the fundamental problem of the language of the khamriyya, which has unfortunately not been the object of study. Considerations as to the use of a simple vocabulary and the clarity of a syntactic organisation have certainly not been taken place.

The study of Baccich literature remains to be undertaken. Such a study ought to show how its expression was fed by a variety of philosophic tendencies, and how it analysed a series of spiritual attitudes in historical relationship with given socio-cultural situations. From materialism to the search for the absolute, the khamriyya was the field for a certain type of force, and to the art of the 14th century, from the 16th to the 18th century, from the 18th to the 19th century, and to the art of the 20th century, from the 19th to the 20th century, and to the art of the 21st century.

Bibliography: DJamiil Sa‘īd, Tañawur al-
khamsiyyya fī-šī‘r al-‘arabī, Cairo 1945; Muḥam-
dad Mu‘aṣṣar, Al-‘asāf al-‘arabī, Ṭbrīz 1953; Ṭabān, Ṭr al-khamsa wa-nīnba ba‘n al-‘āsāf wa-džāhīliyyin, Alex-
andria 1960; Iyyā Ḥāwil, Fann al-šī‘r al-khamsi, Ṭbrīz 1960; M. al-Ṣādik al-Ṣāfi‘ī, Thawarat al-
khamriyyāt, Ṭbrīz 1971. All these are very unequal
studies. Several monographs on authors or periods
dedicate sections of varying length to the kham-
riyya.

KHAMSA (A.), "five" still possesses, in several
Muslim countries, as amongst peoples of ancient
times, a magical value in connection with the use
of the fingers of the hand as a defence against the
evil eye (see ‘AYN). An efficacious method of protec-
tion against the evil eye, especially in North Africa
but also in certain parts of the Near East also,
consists essentially in stretching out the right hand,
with the fingers spread out, towards a person
whose glance can harm, and in pronouncing a formula
containing the word khamsa, e.g. khamsa fi ‘ayn-h
"five in your eye". This gesture is supposed to send
the evil to its source, but since it is not always possible
conveniently to do, pronouncing the formula in the
mind retains also a certain prophylactic force, and
has in any event the force of a curse.

Various representations of the hand, which were
formerly current also in ancient civilisations, may
be attached to this belief (see A. MacCulloch, in
Hastings’ Encycl. of Religion and Ethics, vi (1913),
495). One of the best-known is the piece of jewellery
called "the hand of Fatima", used as an amulet and
called māhkamān, khamsa, khamsa, etc. (see W.
Maqās, Textes arables de Tanger, 205; J.-H. Prost-
Biraben, La main de Fatima et ses antécédents symbo-
liques, in Revue anthropologique, xiii (1933), 370-5),
but one often finds, on the walls of houses and else-
where, the mark of a henna-painted hand, or a more
schematic pattern with five branches. Also, many
amulets contain patterns made up of five elements.

In certain countries, notably in North Africa,
the name of Thursday (al-khamis) likewise possesses
a prophylactic value, and it is combined with "five"
in formula against the evil eye, above all the henna-
wa-khamsa. Furthermore, Thursday is a day eminently
favourable for undertaking enterprises (e.g. travel-
ing) or ceremonies (e.g. circumcision, marriage), and

is referred to euphemistically by means of quali-
ficative terms like mabrūk or mubārak "blessed". The use of these terms against the evil eye makes
them in practice to a large extent inconvenient to
use. Thus the reply of khamsa pure and simple to a
question requiring such a response is avoided, and
various euphemisms are employed: yaddaš "your
hand", ad‘ā‘dād yaddaš "the number of your
hand", etc., or else two numbers whose sum or
differences is equal to 5; e.g. at Rabat, ta‘āla u-ta‘āla = 3 + 2.

Bibliography: E. Doutté, Magie et religion,
317-8; E. Westernruck, Ritual and belief in
Morocco, ch. viii; idem, Survivances païennes dans
la civilisation mahométane, Paris 1935, index s.v.
"cinq"; E. Panetta, Pratiche e credenze popolari
lìbiche, 88, and bibl.; W. Maqās and A. Gufla,
Textes arabes de Tabrūna, Paris 1925, 337-8, 366,
393-4, 396-7, and bibl.; W. Maqās, L’aphémisme
dans les parlers arabes mahgrbins, in Mélanges
Isidore Loys, Brussels 1955, 375-6.

KHAMSA is in the technical language of Persian
and Turkish literature a set of five maḥnawi
poems. The term is used, first of all, to designate
the five epic poems of Niẓāmī [g.v.] of Gūrja which
were composed between ca. 570/1174-5 and 600/
1203-4. The set contains one diwan poetic piece
al-asrār, in the metre sar-i muṣāfī-yī mabrūk; three
romantic poems: Layāl u Majdzān in the metre hasāṣā-i musaddas-i mabrūk-i mabrūk, Ḵurṣāv u Ṭārīn in the metre hasāṣā-i musaddas-i mabrūk, and Ḥaft Pāykar in the metre khafī-fi mabrūk-i mabrūk; and the Iskandānā in the metre mulākābīr-i muḥman-i mabrūk consisting of two parts, the Ḵurṣāv and the Ḵhān-i Ḵurṣāv. This last work belongs to the genre of the heroic epic
as well as to that of the literature of wisdom. There is
no general concept connecting these five poems. That
they were traditionally regarded as a whole may have
been caused by the exceptional brilliance displayed
by Niẓāmī in all of them, but it may also be a result
of their being transmitted almost exclusively as a
complete set in so-called kālīliyyāt manuscripts. An
earlier example of a similar name was applied by
Unsuri (Lúbāb, ii, 32). The enlargement of the khamsa
pattern to a set of seven poems by DJamiil constituted in its
form a model for so-called sābās which were written
by a number of poets from the 10th/16th century
onwards. Occasionally, the sūta, a set of six
poems, is used for collections of the maḥnawi-poems
of Ṭaṭṭār and Sa‘ādī.

The entire Khamsa as well as its individual poems
have from the late 7th/13th century onwards inspired
many imitators in Persian as well as in the main
literary languages of the Turks (i.e. Cağhatay, Azeri
and Ottoman Turkish) and, more rarely, in Kurdish.
The attempts to write a parallel (nāẓira) to the
Khamsa of Niẓāmī can be classified into two main
types. To the first type belong those efforts which
were indeed efforts of a new kind, and to that of the
literature of wisdom. There is
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accepted this challenge, only very few of them succeeded in finishing more than one or two parts of the proposed scheme. The earliest imitation of the *khamsa* was written by the Indo-Persian poet Amir Khusraw Dihlawi [q.v.] between 688-701/1288-1301. It contains the poems *Majna* al-anwar, *Shirin u Khusraw, Magdun u Layla, Haft bihist* and *Din-i Iskandari*. The last poem of this *khamsa* consists only of one part dealing mainly with Iskandar as a seeker of wisdom. The second successful *khamsa* of this type was written in Caghan-Turkish by *Ali Phir Nawat* between 888-90/1483-5. The poems are entitled: *Hayrat al-abhur, Farhad u Shirin, Layla u Magdunin, Saba-i sayyari* and *Sad-i Iskandari*. Nawat’s work was inspired by both the examples of Niẓāmī and Amir Khusraw.

The second type of *khamsa* is formed by those collections of *mathnawis* which only contain some imitations of Niẓāmī’s works. The number of five is achieved by adding poems which are either entirely original as far as their subject-matter is concerned or may be regarded as imitations of the works of other great *mathnawī*-poets such as Sanā’ī or Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār. In the *Khamsa* of Khwādigi Kirmānī [q.v.], for instance, which was written between 732-46/1331-41, only the first poem, *Rawgat al-anwar*, is a *nasīra* of Niẓāmī’s *Makhzan al-asrār*, whereas the four others, *Humād al-maktab, Gul u Naqūs* and *Dīvān nāmā* deviate from the Niẓāmīan pattern both as to their subject-matter and, partly, their metres. Collections of this latter type very soon contain even more than five poems, like the six poems in the *kulūydi* of ʿImād al-Dīn Fakih-i Kirmānī (d. 773/1371-2) [cf. Ahmed Ates, *İstanbul kültüphanelərinde farşə mansum ersəler*, Istanbul 1966, 279f.]. His mystic-poet, Kirmānī’s *Diyah* show the influence of the works of ʿAṭṭār. The most celebrated instance of an extended *khamsa* however, is the *Haft awrang* of Dījām [q.v.] (written ca. 890/1485). These seven poems are entitled: *Sīsīlat al-khākhah, in khafīf, Salāmān u Abās in ramal, Turhāt al-abhur (a *nasīra* of the *Makhzan al-asrār*), Subhāt al-abhur in ramal, Yūsuf u Zaḥī, taking the place of *Khamsa u Shirin*, Layla u Madīnun and *Khwarad-nāmāi* Iskandari). The last five poems are sometimes taken together as the *Khamsa* of Dījām, but even in this way the scheme does not confirm to that of Niẓāmī. Other notable *khamsa* writers in Persian literature were Ḥāṭifī [q.v.] who introduced a historic theme in his *Timūr-nāma* taking the place of the *Iskandar-nāma* and *Fayḍī* [q.v.], among whose incomplete set of five poems there is a treatment of the Indian love story of Na-Dāman. In Ottoman-Turkish poetry prominent authors of *khamsas* were Bihīghī; Lāmī, who composed in fact a *sāba* to the model of Dījām; Vābyā Boy; ʿAṭṭāṭ; and Nergisi [q.v.], who composed his *khamsa* in prose. All these collections consist mainly of poems which do not belong to the canon of Niẓāmī. The imitation of Niẓāmī’s poems was particularly popular during the hey-day of the Indo-Persian literature in the 10th-14th century.

The numerous imitations of the individual poems of Niẓāmī’s *Khamsa* are to some extent parts of unfinished *khamsas*, but this is not necessarily always the case. The most frequently imitated works were the *Makhzan al-asrār* and *Layla u Magdunin*. Some of the best *nasirās* can be found among the parallels to the latter poem, e.g. the *Magdun u Layla* of Maktābī (written in 895/1489) in Persian and that of Fuṣūlī [q.v.] in Azeri. Most of these imitations, however, were not very successful. They have either disapp-
communication routes such as the Sardis to Susa highway. These staging-posts which Herodotus calls xocTaX6-nae; Ctesias calls emporia were numerous in the Byzantine empire, where they were set at a distance of 50 parasangs one from another. Little is known of the architectural evolution of these structures in ancient times, for the oldest khan built of unfired brick have disappeared.

The appropriate term to describe the type of building which provided lodging for caravan traffic on the main trade routes is caravanserais, transcribed by Pierre Belon of Le Mans as "Carbaschara"; khan, with which it is often confused, being applied rather to an establishment where commercial travellers could lodge for a period of time and where facilities were provided for the sale of their wares. A stopping-place for caravans is often called manzil in the ancient Arabic texts.

As communal buildings for public use, mentioned by all the travellers who testify to their vast number in the east, the khan marked the commercial highways once followed by caravan traffic in an area comprising Asia Minor and the "isthmus region", to borrow the phrase of Maurice Lombard, usually set at a distance apart of a day's journey, about 20 miles, the khans of plain and mountain, varying in number according to the degree of prosperity of the regions, provided staging post for animals. Often the khan was more than a shelter for travellers, pilgrims and itinerant traders; it was indeed a centre for the exchange of ideas from individuals from different parts of the world.

The institution flourished greatly from the 7th/13th century onwards in Iran, Syria and Anatolia; in this region alone, Erdmann has listed 119 khans belonging to that century. Sometimes it happened that over a period of time there developed around the khan a congregation such as at Khan Shaykhun or at Dîsir al-Shughûr in Syria.

The term appears for the first time in Arabic epigraphy in Syria on the occasion of the foundation of the Khan al-'A'kaba in 610/1213 (RCEA, No. 3720). The plan of construction of the highway khan, which was most often located in an isolated position, needed to provide for the security of pack-animals and of warehouse goods stored there for long or short periods. The construction material varied according to the regions: it might be brick, fired or unfired; it might be limestone; lastly, it might be basalt. The building comprised rooms for the accommodation of travellers, an oratory and sometimes a bath-house. There were places for the stabling of pack-animals and saddle-animals, covered stables for horses and donkeys, stalls for mules and camels or dromedaries, according to the area. The installations needed to take account of the temperament of each species, for horses cannot endure the smell of dromedaries and mules do not readily accept the proximity of donkeys.

From the outside, the khan appears as a quadrangular structure, often having two storeys, with massive towers at each corner and exterior walls supported by buttresses. It resembles a small fortress from which it is distinguished by an entrance protected by sallents framing a monumental gateway, decorated to a greater or lesser extent according to the period. This gateway gives access to a deep vestibule on which there open, on either side, the warden's quarters and sometimes shops from which items of basic necessity could be purchased. From here there is access to a large central courtyard, usually square, with a water-cistern. Around the
courtyard on ground level there would be storerooms and shops, living-quarters and stables, sometimes a forge for the shoeing of animals. In many khan, the travellers would sleep in a communal hall on raised platforms. In a khan of some importance there is an upper floor laid out on the same plan as the ground level, to which there is access by an internal stairway. The dimensions and number of rooms vary, the plan differing according to the region and the period.

The khans of mountain districts are on a smaller scale than those of the plain. They are built square with corner buttresses; against the inner wall of the outer wall there are installations for the accommodation of animals, while the travellers' quarters are built on the inner wall, opening on the central courtyard. There are also, in cold regions, very simple khans without courtyard, consisting only of a hall with one or more aisles, whose archways, with openings for light, rest on columns or pillars while a bench runs the length of the interior, providing sleeping or sitting space. The prices paid by the traveller for accommodation, storage of goods and shelter of animals would very according to the quality and facilities of the highway khan. Some khans received wa6ufs, enabling them to entertain pilgrims free of charge.

The khans which have survived enable us to identify the characteristics distinguishing the various types. At the time of the expansion of Islam in the Near East, there were two types of staging-post in existence; the one, consisting of oblong hululs running parallel to the central courtyard, is specifically Iranian. Soon axial bâbus appear and the gateway takes on a particular importance. The other consists of a quadrangular structure with galleries enclosing a central courtyard. This "Mediterranean" type existed from the early times.

The oldest known Muslim highway khan would seem to be, according to the hypothesis of Oleg Grabar, the building dating from the Umayyad era known as Kasr al-Ḥayr al-Sharkî (q.v.). It consists of a structure with a windowless façade, corner towers and buttresses on the walls, on the inside two floors opening on a courtyard, a peristyle on the ground level and a gallery on the upper floor. It is thus built in the "Mediterranean" type.

There are distinctions to be drawn between the Seldjûk khans of Iran and Anatolia, the Ayyûbid khans of Syria, the Mamûl khan of Egypt and Syria, the khans of the Pilgrims' route, the Ilkhanid and Safawid khans of Iran and the Ottoman khans of Asia Minor.

From the Seldjûk period in Iran, where there was a flowering of commercial activity at the end of the 13th century, we know the Khan ZafaranI, between Nishapur and Sabzawar. It is built on a square plan, the exterior walls 75 m. in length, built of unfired brick on foundations of fired brick, with circular towers at the corners. In the centre of the façade a high gateway flanked by towers gives access through a vestibule to the almost square inner courtyard (36 × 38 m.) on to which, as in the madrasas, four open fora. Those of the lateral sides are enclosed by four rooms on each face, while those of the rear and the vestibule have three rooms on both sides. The lay-out of the courtyard resembles that of the cruciform madrasa; it is only the purpose of the rooms which is different. In the case of the qanat they are designed for study, in the other for the accommodation of commercial traffic. On the right hand side of the entrance is a mosque, and on the exterior there is a bath-house attached to the building.

There are some excellent examples of Seldjûk
Khan from the 7th-8th/13th-14th centuries in Anatolia. They are of four types. There are khans with a monumental entrance and a vestibule giving access to a central rectangular courtyard surrounded by arched galleries and rooms, as at Evdir Khan (606/1210-19) near Antalya, Kırkgöz Khan (633-43/1236-46), Sultan Khan (633/1236) between Sivas and Kayseri, or Yeşi Khan (717/1317) on the road from Tokat to Sivas, and the Khan of Marand in Ardabil (750/1350). There are covered khan like Susuz Khan (644/1246) near Burdur, measuring 25 m. by 26 m., with five cradle-vaulted girders and a central cupola. Some khans combine the courtyard surrounded by rooms and the covered building, bringing together the "Mediterranean" and "Iranian" types, as at Sultan Khan (626/1229, restored in 677/1278) 40 km. southwest of Ak Saray, not to be confused with its namesake near Kayseri. This Khan, which is entered through a gateway decorated by stalactites, has two sections, one measuring 50 m. by 62 m., with a courtyard bounded by a portico upon which the living-quarters open and by a warehouse as well as a bakehouse and a hamam; in the centre of the courtyard is an oratory with a cupola standing on four pillars; to the south of the courtyard is the other section; a huge hall measuring 33 m. by 55 m., with five cradle-vaulted aisles and a door at each end, in which the animals were quartered. It is the most important Khan of the 7th/13th century. Ak Khan, to the north-east of Defizli, built in 680/1282 by sultan Kay Kâwûs, is of a rectangular plan with a square inner courtyard bounded by porticos on two sides and by a vaulted hall supported on ten lines of pillars. Finally, the Alara Khan to the north-west of Alaniya is of yet another design: the inner courtyard is nothing more than a corridor open to the sky with seven rooms on each side, the whole enclosed by long cradle-vaulted halls. Differing in design and dimensions, the Salğûk khans are alike in having corner towers and walls supported by buttresses; they are remarkable for their large gateways, having broken arches decorated with stalactites, framed by intricately worked geometric patterns often consisting of figured decoration.

The Ayyûbid type (6th-8th/12th-14th centuries) in Syria is of square or rectangular plan with central courtyard and a peripheral gallery with cradle-vaulting, broken along the principal axis by an entry corridor, with, in some cases, a room on either side of the vestibule. The gate may be preceded by a salient. In the axis of entry there sometimes opens on the opposite side the wide bay of an indah. The design of Ayyûbid khans is almost always identical, the only variations being in the proportions of the various parts (e.g. Khan al-ʿArdis, Kutayfa, and Kara to the north of Damascus).

In the later Mamlûk period (9th/15th century) commerce in the Orient was most active and the khans multiplied in Syria, especially on the Aleppo to Cairo highway; there is, however, no particular architectural evolution to be noted. The khans of this period are rectangular with windowless walls and a central courtyard containing a water-cistern and surrounded by a gallery, cradle or groin-vaulted, there is a mosque and often a bath-house, the main door-way opens in the façade or in a fore-projection of the wall, and the entry corridor is flanked by two vaulted chambers. Worthy of mention are, in the vicinity of Damascus, Khan Ayûb to the north and Khan Dunnûn to the south, in Palestine Khan al-Abmar, Khan Rastân on a bridge over the Orontes between Hims and Hamat, and the Khan of Kaflat al-Mudîl (40 m. by 40 m.) at Apamœa. There are examples of the same type from the 11th/17th century at Khan Tûmân and at Karamurt (1048/1638), and an enormous Khan (161 m. by 122 m.) near Baghrais [q.v.].

In Iran, the Khan evolved more rapidly and with more frequent changes than in Syria. In the 8th/14th century, in the time of the Il-Khanids, a new type of Khan appeared. This is a building on a rectangular plan with the exterior wall reinforced by circular corner towers, and there is a monumental entrance in the form of a basilica with a solid vaulted doorway in an ornamental setting of brick such as that of which traces survive near Marand (730/1330). Within, one enters a vast courtyard bordered by lodging-quarters with indahs in the main axes. A fountain, cisterns and a mosque complete the installation. These khans often have two stories with gallery, on the ground floor there are the stables, and the shops, and there is access by an interior stairway to the first floor and the merchants' quarters, sometimes furnished with fire-places as at Sin (730/1330).

Under the Safawids, in the 10th/16th century, wealthy caravans, signs of the significant progress made by the economy of Central Asia since the Timurids, moved along the trade-routes. Shâh ʿAbâs I

nature tend to disappear. In the period following the death of the great sovereign, a concern for symmetry dominates the building-style and huge hypostyle stables appear. At the end of the 12th/13th century, khan on an octagonal plan with circular corner towers are found in mountainous areas. We shall mention three examples, at Aminabadh, at Khan-i Khurra and at Dabhid on the road between Isfahan and Shiraz.

In Agharbaydjan, the khan typical of the 9th/10th century is that of Sangatchali, near Baku, with its window-less walls, designed on a plan identical to that of the Mamluk khan. In the 10th-11th/16th-17th centuries there existed in this region two types of khan: one, on a square plan with a central courtyard and a lay-out resembling that of the Mediterranean khan, and the other, on a rectangular plan, having a long hall open at both ends divided into three aisles, open at both ends with a single entrance in a pilared projection.

In the same period in the Ottoman empire, a large number of highway khan continued to appear, some consisting of one section containing installations bordering on a courtyard open to the sky and another section covered against the winter, others constructed according to the Saljuq prototype, but decorated in a more sober fashion.

A new type appeared, built on a plan almost square, with a long central passage lying along an east-west axis and bounded by shops; in the middle of the passage, two doorways each giving access to an oblong hall running parallel to the passage, with four aisles and three sets of pillars. The chamber on the north side of the passage, provided with a bench, was intended for travellers, while that on the south side sheltered animals and merchandise. Of this type were the Yeşi Khan (10th/16th century), which has recently disappeared, but was formerly on the road from Tokat to Sivas, and Khan Mehmed Pasha (1028/1619) at Ulukışla to the east of Konya. Finally, at Gebze, on the road from Istanbul to İzmit, there is a khan of classical Ottoman type having a rectangular structure, without a central courtyard, and consisting of a double hall with six pillars marking off two sets of seven twin sections.

The last great highway khan was built in Iran in

Plan and section of the khan of Māder-i Shāh [M. Siroux, Caravansérails d'Iran et petites constructions routières].
the reign of Shah 'Abbās II (1052-77/1642-66). It is the imposing khan of Mādar-i Shāh, a grim and impressive work of architecture 45 km from Isfāhān.

Two instances of the structural evolution of the khan should be noted, one in Syria, the other in Iran. In the first case, we observe the transformation of a highway khan into an urban khan: in fact at Dījār al-Shughur, to a khan built in 1070/1660, in the course of time a refectory was added, later a hospital; this collection of buildings, on the left bank of the Orontes at the approaches to the bridge, became in the 19th century the nucleus of an urban settlement which grew up around it. The second case is that of the khan of 'All-ābād, between Tehran and Kum which became at the end of the 19th century the nucleus of a flourishing oasis settlement; with the addition of a hamam, a flour-mill, two ice-houses and some shops, the khan lost its original character, ceasing to be a highway institution and taking on the functions of an agricultural centre.

II. The urban khan. While the highway khan is a staging-post and a relay-station, the urban khan lies at the end of a journey; it is a depot, a place for commercial transactions and brief stay.

In fact, the term khan has been applied to hostelries and urban depots in the Near East only since the Mamlūk and Ottoman periods, more especially the 12th/18th century. In the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries in Bagdad and Damascus, the large depots bore the name of dār with the name of the commodity for which the establishment was noted. The urban caravanserai would have been called dār al-wakāla (the house of procurement or agency), before this became a synonym for funduk, which at the end of the 7th/13th century began to be replaced by wakll as a designation for suburban hosteleries. Later, in the 11th/17th century the khan began progressively to take upon itself exclusively the functions exercised within the city-walls by the dār al-wakāla, the funduk (fundukou) and the kaysariyya (q.v.). In fact, to the town, the khan gave lodging to travellers who could lodge there in exchange for a fee paid to the warden who provided bedding and straw. In the present day as in the past there is installed there, in the courtyard, a vaulted warehouse protects the goods; bales and packing-cases are stacked in the courtyard.

The most common type of depot, the khan, providing the means to await the time for the transfer of merchandise, is designated either by the name of the founder or by the name of the principal commodity to be sold there. Thus there are to be found in most towns a khan al-sabūn (khan of soap) or a khan al-tayy (khan of oil).

In the second half of the 9th/15th century, the Mamlūk sultans provided certain facilities for European traders visiting Alexandria. After the grant of capitulations by the Ottoman sultans [see iMTRAYZAT], the urban khāns flourished greatly in the Near East. The number of visiting Western merchants grew and, from the start of the 10th/16th century tended to be replaced by wakll as a synonym for the agency and office of attorney, before this became a synonym for the urban khan.

This description by Jean Sauvaget applies to the classic type of khan which has prevailed in the lands of the Oriental basin of the Mediterranean since the Mamlūk epoch, and subsequently throughout the Ottoman empire, as is attested by a picture of Raffet, depicting the khan of Bucharest in the 15th century. The khan could be a pious foundation set up by a rich and illustrious person; it would then be either one of the sources of revenue of a wafrf to the benefit of a madrasa like the khan Mādar-i Shāh in Isfāhān, or for the upkeep of a mosque, such as the two khans of Bursa which supported the Green Mosque (Yeşil Cami), or the beneficiary of fixed revenues, attributed to it when it served the specific purpose of sheltering pilgrims. Being a profitable business, the khan could represent an investment, and more than one amir was proprietor of a khan in the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries. At the end of the 9th/15th century, at Damascus, out of five new khans, three were built by amirs and two by merchants; at Aleppo, as against nine khans built by amirs, only one was founded by merchants. The managers of khans would often be the descendants of the founders, and the principal official was the wakil al-tawdijar, the agent of attorney who attended to the storage and sale of the merchants' goods; the khan also received visits from an inspector appointed by the muhtasib. At nightfall, the leaves of the door were always closed while a guardian kept watch in his lodge.

In the Ottoman period, according to J. Sauvaget, the plan is "uniform in principle: around two courtyards of unequal dimensions there are juxtaposed, on ground-level, shops rented by the foreign merchants lodging on the upper floor in rooms opening on a gallery, while a vaulted warehouse protects the stocks of merchandise against theft and bad weather." In some khans the central courtyard is replaced by a covered hall, as at Khan As'ad Pāshā at Damascus, or sometimes the central courtyard instead of being square becomes a long rectangle, divided crosswise into three suites, as at the Valide Han of Istanbul.

At Aleppo, the oldest khans were situated in the suburbs of the city; Ibn Shaddad (end of the 7th/13th century) mentions eight of them. Within the city-
walls, the oldest khans date from the Mamluk period; they are in the centre of the city. The Khan Bayraktar was constructed by two amirs in 827/1424. Between 815/1412 and 874/1470 numerous khans were constructed. Ibn al-Sjina (d. 890/1485) mentions 25 of them within the city-walls and 13 outside. There were other khans built, such as the Khan al-Zayt constructed by the amir Khayr Bek, the Khan al-Kashabiyah begun by the amir Atrak in 916/1510 and completed in 938/1532, and the Khan al-Sabun with its two façades, attests to the amir al-Saidamur. Aleppo benefited, on the economic plane, from the expansion of the Ottoman empire. The buildings were situated on the edge of the commercial centres, and it was possible to set up on the exterior façades of the khans rows of shops forming a souk, assured by its location of a good supply of business. “The prime example of the type at Aleppo is the Khan al-Kumruh (Khan of Customs) built in 986/1574, which combines within a single structure 58 shops, and 77 rooms as well as two stone-built souks lit by two cupolas, a total of 344 shops.” It had two fountains, a mosque and a monumental entrance. Dating from the end of the 11th/17th century, the Khan al-Wastir (1092/1682), now in ruins, still has its monumental entrance. In this period d'Arvieux counted 68 khans at Aleppo; in the mid-20th century Sauvaget counted 38 still in existence.

At Damascus, the first khans seem to have been built outside the city-walls as at Aleppo. In the 7th/13th century, in the northern suburb of al-Ukayba, was the Khan al-Zindar; reputedly a place of debauchery, it was destroyed in 632/1236 and replaced by the al-Tawba mosque. The inner-city khans are situated to the south of the Great Mosque in the western sector of the old city. Ibn Sjira mentions five khans at the end of the 8th/14th century, including the Khan al-Habdalin and the Khan built by the amir Mandjak al-Yusufi. In the 10th/16th century the khans replaced in the city certain fundusbi and kaysariyyas; thus we have the Khan al-Zayt (Khan of Oil) and the Khan al-Harir (Khan of Silk), a vast building constructed by Darwish Pasha in 980/1572. The Khan al-Kumruh (Khan of Customs) was built at the end of the 10th/16th century and the start of the 11th/17th century. Of the two biggest khans, the one, covered by two cupolas, is attributed to Sulayman Pasha (827/1424). In the 11th/17th century, the Khan al-Basha became an important caravan centre. In 1089/1678 Ahmad Bushnak built the famous Khan Bani Sa'd. In 1823 the madrasa al-Mustansiriyya accommodated the Customs service and took the name Khan al-Ortm; in this period European travellers testify to a great number of khans at Bagdad.

At Isfahan, which knew a period of great economic prosperity after the accession of Shah Abbâs I, Chardin counted in the 11th/17th century 1,802 caravanerais. Many have disappeared but the khans adjoining the madrasa Mâdar-i Shâh remains and testifies to the prosperity of the capital at the end of the start of the 18th century.

In Asia Minor, the Ottoman khans are mainly concentrated at Bursa and at Istanbul. The khans of Bursa, the first Ottoman capital, rectangular in form with a central courtyard surrounded by a portico with arcade, are of classic Mediterranean type. The most ancient of these is the Bey Khan (mid-8th/14th century), which at the present day has lost its original form but survives under the name of Emir Khan. Mention should be made of the Ipek Khân (Khan of Silk) dating from the start of the 9th/15th century which, like the Geyye Khân, was constituted as a mek to the advantage of the Green Mosque and of which only a few traces remain. The Kosa Khân (Khan of the Cocoon), with a central water cistern in the courtyard and an octagonal mosque, was built at the end of the 9th/15th century. The Pirinc Khân (Khan of Rice) with two stories, in ruins today, was built in 913/1507.

At Istanbul, the two most ancient khans whose ruins are known to us in the vicinity of the Rustum Paşa Mosque, the Harmali Khân (Khan of Dates) and the Balkapan Khân (Khan of Honey), date back for their origin to the Byzantine era. The most ancient of the sixteen khans of the Grand Bazaar is the Çubaci
Khān (Khan of Cloth); it dates from the 9th/10th century. These khāns are in most cases spinning-shops at the side of warehouses and retailers’ shops. One of the largest warehouses is the Kūrḵūḵāl Khān (Khān of the Furriers) constructed by the grand vizier Māhmūd Pāsha in 872/1467; the building is of impressive dimensions (130 m. by 65 m.), with one courtyard measuring 40 m. by 45 m. and another pentagonal in shape, with a perimeter of 140 m. As many as 167 rooms open up the porticos on the ground-level; on the upper floor there are barrel-vaulted rooms with windows opening on the gallery, and in front of each door there used to be a miniature cupola covering the portico. The building remains, but has deteriorated beyond recognition. In the mid-16th century, Sīnān built in the name of Rūstum Pāsha two khāns on the banks of the Golden Horn, Cūkur Khān (Khān of the Ditch) at Istanbul and Kūrḵūḵāl Khān (Khān of Lead) at Ghalaṭa. As elsewhere, the term stems from the dimensions of the installations. In the mid-11th/16th century, the buildings could not all have been large, for Ewliya Čelebi counted 556 khāns at Istanbul. It was no longer a question of vast warehouses, but rather of places of sale for provincial and foreign traders.

The two finest specimens from the 11th/16th century are the Wālīde Khān with its three courtyards and all kinds of offices, and in front, the Büyük Yeni Khān with its long rectangular courtyard bounded by two galleries with arcades; this stone-built edifice underwent modifications in 1178/1764. From the 13th century, we have the Khān Shirmakesh (Khān of the Silversmiths), whose façade has alternate rows of stone and brick and which was completed in 1215/1716 on the foundations of a mint. The original feature of this building is the fact that the rooms are set on both sides of a large corridor on the upper floor and do not open on the courtyard. Taking the examples of Ūskūdar, the terminus of caravan-routes on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus, we may note in the 17th and the 18th centuries different categories of khāns: there are large buildings with many rooms and multiple stalls for saddle-animals such as the Mihrimah Sultan and Orta Khān, and the large luxury establishments like the Kösem Wālīde Khān. There are numerous khāns of more modest dimensions, reserved for “merchants of land and sea.” There are khāns for pilgrims, some of them offering lodging free of charge, but most often the Muslims would be accommodated in the town in madrasas or ḥāḵmāḵās, while Christians would lodge in monasteries. The Wakf Khān (1918) of Istanbul, with its offices and commercial facilities, bears witness to the functional evolution of the contemporary khān.

Bibliography:
Front, sections and plan of the khan of Aminabad [P. Coste, *Monuments modernes de la Perse*, Paris 1867, Pl. lxvi].
1610 the Emperor decided to send Khan Dajhan Lodt to help Khan Khanan’ Abd al-Rahim Khan in the Deccan statesman and commander Malik Anbar, the commander of the forces of Ni'am Shah offered submission, but this peace did not prove to be a lasting one, and it was not long before the new regent of Ahmadnagar, Hamid Khan, again declared war. Khan Dajhan promptly opened a vigorous campaign, but instead of subjugating the enemy completely he granted him peace, restoring his territories for the very moderate sum of three lakhs of mans; some writers have, therefore, accused him of accepting this money as a bribe. It has also been suggested that by granting exceptionally easy terms, he wanted to place Ni'am Shah under obligation so that he might if necessary seek refuge with him.

At the time of Diahangir's death (October 1627), his son Shahdajhan was in the Deccan. After some hesitation, Khan Dajhan Lodi recognised his succession, and the new Emperor appointed him Governor of Berar and Khansdesh. He was directed to recover the lost territories in the Deccan; but noting his reluctance, Shahdajhan transferred him to Malwa and ordered him to co-operate with the forces of the enemy and sustained a defeat. The other army was also subjected to harassment by Malik Anbar's men who had cut their sources of supplies, and managed only with difficulty to withdraw to Dabdab, in the vicinity of Burhanpur, where Prince Parwiz was encamping (Turuk, 107-8).

Diahangir castigated the commanders who were responsible for the defeat, transferred them to other places; Khan Dajhan was also demoted and posted as Thandar in Thamlr, but a year later he was restored to favour. He was again sent to the Deccan with Mahabat Khan, and in 1031/1622 and had been appointed Sihindah of Gujaraj in the following year, was now ordered to take the place of Mahabat Khan as Subahddr of Partab, and later, on his death in Muframm 1036/October 1626, was entrusted with the supreme command of forces in the Deccan with the title of Sipah-Saldr. On the death of Malik Anbar, the commander of the forces of Ni'am Shah offered submission, but this peace did not prove to be a lasting one, and it was not long before the new regent of Ahmadnagar, Hamid Khan, again declared war. Khan Dajhan promptly opened a vigorous campaign, but instead of subjugating the enemy completely he granted him peace, restoring his territories for the very moderate sum of three lakhs of mans; some writers have, therefore, accused him of accepting this money as a bribe. It has also been suggested that by granting exceptionally easy terms, he wanted to place Ni'am Shah under obligation so that he might if necessary seek refuge with him.

In the account of the fifteenth year of his coronation, Diahangir says that Khan Dajhan, who was a heavy drinker, suddenly abandoned this habit and “thenceforward did not touch wine despite my advice that he should give it up gradually”; possibly this action and a general change in his approach to life were due to his association with Shaykh Fa'd Allah of Burhanpur (see Dakhsha, 115). However, in the same year he was appointed Sibahdral of Multan because reports were coming from the direction of Kandahar of threats on it from the Safawid Shah 'Abbas of Persia (Dakhsha, 118). However, in the same year he was appointed Sibahdral of Multan because reports were coming from the direction of Kandahar of threats on it from the Safawid Shah 'Abbas of Persia (Dakhsha, 118). However, in the same year he was appointed Sibahdral of Multan because reports were coming from the direction of Kandahar of threats on it from the Safawid Shah 'Abbas of Persia (Dakhsha, 118).
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Shaykh Farid Bhakkari, who had served under him, nevertheless praised some of his personal qualities and says that he was a pious person, who passed hours in the society of the 'ulamā' and shaykhs.


KHĀN: DJAHAN MAḴBŪR, KĪWĀM AL-MULK, minister and confidant of the Dīhlī Sultans Muḥammad b. Tughlūk and Fīrūz-Shāh in the 8th/14th century.

Of Hindu origin (his original name was Kannū “flower”), he stemmed from Tīlangānī in South India, and was converted to Islam in 722/1322 when the Hindu Rāja surrendered his besieging army to Dīhlī under the amīr Uḥūb Khān, the latter came to power, the new Sultan rewarded the former for his services. Khāṭfī Khān himself, after a few years in Mūltān to Dīhlī, was appointed governor of that important frontier province. He was subsequently transferred to Dīhlī and being therefore utterly dependent on the Sultan’s favour. Thus he cultivated the friendship of Fīrūz-Shāh’s favourite slave Bāghrā, who held the office of Amir-i-ʿĀrāf or Inspector-General of the Army with the personal title of ʿĪmād al-Mulk, even though the latter was notoriously corrupt. Khāṭfī-ī-Djāhān himself acquired extensive ikāds for the support of his official duties and rank, to the value of three million tānkūsdars per annum, and he built in them numerous markets and caravanserais and constructed irrigation canals.

He died, aged over 80, in 770/1368-9, and his office, ikād-i Khāṭfī, the title of Khān-i Djāhān and all his other privileges were made over to his eldest son Diwān Shāh.


KHĀN KHĀNAN, a high military title in mediaeval Indo-Muslim usage. The term Khān [q.v.] became popular as the designation of a high officer or nobleman and in a technical sense it was used for a commander of ten thousand soldiers. In reproducing the instructions of Būghrā Khān to his son, Kāykhūs, Barānī (Taʾrikh-i Fīrūzshāhī, Bibl. Ind., i45) makes the former speak of a book, Adāb al-salāṭīn, which had been especially brought from Bāghdād for the sons of Iltūmīsh and which he had studied with Khāṭfī-Djāhān al-Dīhnī-Bahārī. In this the legendary Persian ruler Djamshīd speaks of the decimal chain of command, in which a khān commands ten maliks. More historical, however, are the statements of Ibn ʿAdī al-Umārī in his Māšāl al-əgbār fi mamālīk al-amsār, and al-Kalāqghāndī, ʿṢubḥ al-ʿagāʾī, that a khān commanded ten thousand soldiers, a malik one thousand, and an amīr one hundred; this decimal system probably came from Central Asia to the subcontinent.

Khān Khānān (Khān of Khānāns) was the highest title conferred upon a governor of the State, at least up to the time of Akbar, for Dīḥāṅgīr says that there was no title higher than that of Amir-i-ʿĀrāf, shown also by the fact that normally the title of Khān Khānān was held by one person only. The first person to bear this title as recorded in the historical sources on the Dīhlī sultanate was Māmūd, the eldest son of Sultan Djjāhān al-Dīhnī Fīrūz Shāh (Barānī, 172); another case is that of the brother of Khāraw Khān
the usurper (Barani, 410). Under the Mughals, this title was conferred rather more frequently, the first person to receive it at the hands of Bâbûr being Dilâwar Khân, son of Dawlat Khân Lodi. Humâyûn had conferred this title on Bayram Khân; on his dismissal early in the reign of Akbar, Mun'în Khân received and held it till his death in 983/1575. Nine years later it was conferred on Bayram Khân’s son, Mirzâ ʿAbd al-Raḥîm, who died in 1036/1627. Maḥbûl Khân (d. 1043/1634) held it in the time of Dja-dja Humam al-Dîn Muhammad b. Khânamir entered Khânbalik even more late it was conferred on Bayram Mîn; on his 1020

Notes on Marco Polo, i, 10-1. On the town and its situation on the Imperial Canal cf. Rashîd al-Dîn, ed. Dj. Fadil, Tehran 1340 sh., iii, 430. The earliest patron of his life (Zap., xv, 251). It is also known as a place-name (cf. Yakût, ii, 476; al-Bâbûl Hûrî, Fuṣûl, 85). Its best-known application is to the so-called “expedition of the Khânbalik” (besides the references in the text): Ch. Schefer, Notices sur les relations des
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KHÂNDARIM, surname of the Persian historian Ghiyât al-Dîn who was born ca. 880/1475 into a family of high officials and scholars. His father, Khâtja Humân al-Dîn Muhammad b. Khâtja Burhân al-Dîn Muhammad Shârîz, was for many years the minister of Sultân Maḥmûd b. Abl Saʿîd, who at the end of his political career became the Timûrid ruler of Samârkhând from 899-900/1494-5. The historian Mirkh*and [g.r.] was his maternal uncle and took an important part in his primary education. It is, therefore, likely that Khânâmir was actually born in Herat where his grandfather lived, although the maḥkât ibn (ed. Dj. Fadil, Tehran 1340 sh., iii, 430) enters him under Bukhârâ. The earliest patron of his own career was Mir ʿAli Shîr Nawâʾî, who put his vast library at his disposal and to whom Khânâmir dedicated his first three books. Shortly after the death of ʿAli Shîr in 906/1500, Khânâmir entered the service of Mîrzâ Badi’ al-Zamân, the eldest son of Sultân ʿUsâyn Baykârâ, who succeeded his father in 921/1516. During the years of the Uzbek invasion of the Timûrid lands which ended with the conquest of Herat by Shâybanî in 931/1527,
Khâmundâr was entrusted with diplomatic missions to potential allies of the Sultan. He was also appointed to the office of šâdî. When the Uzbeks were marching on Balkh, he wrote at the request of the citizens of Herat, he wrote at the request of the citizens of his times but applies the rhetorical embellishment with such moderation that he served his son and successor Humayun until his death from an expedition of Humayun to Gudjarat, which was left unpublished thesis).

The most valuable work of Khâmundâr is the Habib al-siyar, a general history from the earliest times down to near the end of the life of Shâh Iskâm I (died 930/1524). The title refers to Karîm al-Dîn Habîb Allâh, the Şafawid governor to whom the work was eventually dedicated, after the death of the original patron of the writer, Sâyîd Ghiyât al-Dîn Amîr Muhammad. The work consists of an introduction (dibâqa), three books (muqallad), dealing respectively with pre-Islamic history, Islamic history up to the end of the Fatimids caliphate, and the period of Mongol and Timurid rule till the foundation of the Şafawid state in Iran, each book being divided into four sections (dîjâ'), and an epilogue (khâtima) containing geographical information. An interesting feature of the composition of the Habib al-siyar is the occurrence of a great number of biographies at the end of the treatment of each major historical period. This innovation in Persian historiography was imitated by writers of the Şafawid period (cf. 'Abîd al-Şâhus Navâ', Rîdî'î-ši Dibdî Habîb al-siyar, Tehran 1324/1945). The original version of the chronicle (represented by the text of the literary edition, Tehran 1271/1854-5) was written in 927-30/1520-4. Khâmundâr continued however to make other, revised copies, the last we know of as yet being marked by a note added to the first volume in Şâbân 935/4 April 1529. His first work, Ma'âthîr al-mulâkâ, a collection of historical maxims attributed to Pre-Islamic kings and sages as well as to the Prophet, the Imâms and the secular rulers of the Islamic period, was completed before the death of his uncle Mirkhând, which occurred in 903/1498 (cf. Storey, i, 102; Brogel' Persiske studier, Moscow 1972, 380, 1398; A. Munzawi, Fihrist-i nuskhah-yi khafti-i farsî, ii, Tehran 1349/1970, 1675 ff.).

The Khâdsât al-aḫbâr fi bayân al-ḥâl al-aḫşâyâr, which was completed in 903/1499, is a concise world history digested from the Rawâdat al-safa' of his uncle but also based upon other historical material which was put at his disposal by 'All Shir Navâ'. The most original contribution of the author is his description of Herat and of the contemporary divines, scholars and artists living there (cf. Storey, i, 102 ff.; Brogel', 380 ff.; Munzawi, iii, 1398). An autograph of this work has been described by A. M. Piemontese, in RSO, xlvi (1972), 40-6.

Just about the time of death of his patron, in 903/1499, Khâmundâr completed a panegyrical biography of 'All Shir Navâ' entitled Makârim al-akhkhâr (cf. Storey i, 795; A. Khayyâmî, in Nâṣrîyya-i Dânishkâda-i Adabiyyât-i Tabrîz, iii (1329/1950), 3-4, 41 ff. and 7, 68 ff.). A collection of biographies of the famous ministers, entitled Dastûr al-nezâvî, was dedicated to Khâmundâr's patron, the Şafawid governor of Herat, on Herat, he wrote at the request of the citizens of the town a letter of submission to Shaybân. He remained in Herat after its capture, and he has given an account of how he and other members of the local aristocracy were squeezed by the Uzbeks (cf. Habib al-siyar, Tehran 1333 Shb, iv, 381 ff.). His verdict on the rule of the Şafawids, who took possession of Herat in 916/1510, was much more favourable, yet he seems not to have entered her service, but to have been the author of an account of how he and other members of the local aristocracy were squeezed by the Uzbeks (cf. Storey i, 92 f.). The historical value of the Habib al-siyar is enhanced by the fact that the author was a close witness, and some-
it does not obscure the factual contents of his text (cf. Storey i, 104-9, 1237 f.; Bregel', 383-93, 1399; Munzawi, vi, 4127-46).

The last work of Khwandamir is the Čahāni Humāyūn or Humāyunnamā, a description of institutions, ordinances and buildings introduced or erected at the order of that ruler, made at the latter's request and completed probably in 940/1534 (cf. Storey, i, 1386, 1313; ed. by M. Hidayat Hosain, Calcutta 1940).

In the introduction to the Habīb al-siyar, Khwandamir claims also to have made an abridgement of the general history of Wassaf [q.v.], but there are no manuscript copies of this known to exist.

The historiographical tradition of Khwandamir's family was continued by one of his sons, Amir Mahmūd, who wrote a history of the reign of the early Safawids (cf. Storey, i, 304, 1279; Bregel', 854, 868).

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the article, further references to manuscripts, editions and translations of Khwandamir's works as well as to secondary sources may be found in the works of Storey and Bregel' mentioned above and in the introductions to text-editions, notably those by M. Hidayat Hosain to the Čahāni Humāyūn, i-xxxvi, and the introduction by Djalal al-Dīn Humāyūn to the edition of Tehran 1333/1954 of the Habbīb al-siyar, i, 2-43.

(2. BEVERIDGE — J. T. P. DE BRUIJN)

KHANDÉSH, a region of west-central India lying to the north-west of the Deccan [see Dakhān], the upper valley of the river Taptī (also called Tāptī), and the surrounding plain and forest country bounded on the north by the Satpura hills and the river Narbādā, on the west separated from mainland Gujārāt [q.v.] by the northern ranges of the Western Ghāfs, on the south by the Sāmālā hills which separate it from the Deccan tableland, and on the south-west by the Laling and Gānā hills which divide it from the Nāsīk district of Mahārāstrā. There is no well-marked eastern natural boundary, and the governed district, whether under the Dihlī sultanate, the Fārūkī rulers, the Mughāls, or the Marāṭhās, has frequently included territories outside the natural boundaries. The region owes its name to the Fārūkī rulers who, not being admitted by their more powerful neighbours of Gujārāt, Mālwā and the Deccan to the status of sultans, were known by the lesser title of Čhān; but it has been suggested that the name Khandēsh is a convenient Islamicisation of an older form. The Mughal sāba of Khandēsh was for a time renamed Dandēsh after Sulṭān Dāniyal [q.v.], youngest son of Akbar.

The Taptī, an ancient river flowing in a deep bed, is of no value for navigation or irrigation, although perennial; but its tributaries, all the more important of which lie on the left bank, provide irrigation water, and there is an abundance of wells in the central region. This is a 250 km. stretch of rich alluvial plain, ideal for cotton and foodgrains. The northern tract is hill forest, inhabited chiefly by Bhils; the west and south-west are also well forested. In Mughal times the region was famous for its sugar-cane, indigo, the snow-white rice of Nawāpur, and its fine cotton and the cloth trade, especially the gold and silver brocaded cloth produced at Burhānpur (J. de Thévenot, Voyages . . . en Asie, Paris 1727, v, 212 ff.; —J. B. Tavernier, Voyages . . . aux Indes, Paris 1676; although Bernier points out that the labour was exacted almost by force and that the labourers were wretchedly poor). Much of its prosperity derived
from the trade-route from the north through the Burhānpur gap, along Khāndēsh, and to Sūrat.

1. History.—The Khāndēsh region was in the time immediately before the first Muslim conquest held variously by the Yādavas of Devagiri (= Dāwar-lataṭābād) or a branch of the Cawhāns at Aslīr. (The latter displaced the Tāks, a tribe (Tāks̄hāka) of Scythian origin; the statement s.v. asīrgārān identifies Tāks and Cawhāns needs correction.) In 693/1295-6 Aslīra was taken by ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khālqī on his return north from the Decan; apparently the peace was not laid under tribute; although the Cawhān ruler and his family were killed. Asīr seems to have been occupied by another Hindū king. In 705/1306 Malik Kāfūr [q.v.], sent from Dihlī to exact the tribute from Devagiri, occupied Sūltān-pur in the north-east of Khāndēsh; six years later Kāfūr, again collecting tribute, established a governor at Devagiri, and hence presumably at least controlled the western part of Khāndēsh for Dihlī. Muslim power was reinforced firstly by Kūṭ Khālīn Mubārāk Khālqī, and later by Muḥammad b. Tughlūk. The fact that Malik Rādījā received this region in dājurāh from Fīrūz Shāh in or before 722/1320, and that the region does not figure in the fourth dājurāh of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Bahman Shāh’s kingdom, implies that it continued to be regarded as part of the Dihlī dominions; but many petty Rādījūtī chiefs held sway even within the central Tāpfān valley region, and Malik Rādījā’s first task as dājurdār (later sipah-salar) for Dihlī was bringing them under tribute. Malik Rādījā’s independence from Dihlī did not come until about 784/1382 (it is worth stressing that this fell before the independence of both Gūdjarāt and Māwlā); for the history of the region from then until the capture of Asīr by Akbar in 1099/1682, see the article Fīrūzshāh.

The Aḥīn Akbari (tr. Jarett, li, 222-7) describes the district and its products and revenues at the time of its absorption into the Mughal empire, and European travellers (Fitch, Newberry, Jangigny) supply further information: it was highly fertile and well populated, and its markets well stocked. The Aḥīn enumerates its sub-divisions (Nandurbar and the western districts of Haydarābād in return for the guaranteed safety of the centre, and when in 1173/1760 Aslīra fell to the Peshwa Bādīl Rāo the Marātā possession of Khāndēsh was complete. For some years it remained peaceful, and recovered its prosperity, but later suffered in internece Marātāh struggles, and from plundering by Bhīls and by disaffected Arab mercenaries in Marātāh employ. The British, first appearing in 1779, took Burhānpur and Asīr in 1803, and eventually the district was ceded to them in 1818. For the general history of the region under the Pešwās and others see Mārātāh.

The British assumption of power was met with sporadic resistance from Arab bands (especially at Amañēr, Sōngir fort), and everywhere from Bhīls (two tribes of whom, the Tādvī and the Nīrdhī, are Muslim, at least nominally), and it was not until 1846 that the district was finally pacified. With the reorganisation of district boundaries under the British, the Burhānpur-Aslīra region became part of the Nimār district of the Central Provinces (1864). In 1906 the district was divided into two new districts, West and East Khāndēsh; these are now known by the names of their headquarters towns, Dhuḷī and Jalgaon respectively.

Bibliography: For the early period of Khāndēsh history see Bibliography to Dihlī Sultānāt; for the Fārūkī period see that to Fārūkīs, also asīrghārān, burhānpur, thālmēr. To these now add H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds.), History of medieval Deccan (1225-1724), i (1926); W. Foster, Early travels in India, London 1921, for Fitch, Hawkins, Finch, Coryat; ed. idem, The embassy of Sir Thomas Roe in India, Hakluyt Soc. 2nd ed. 1926; ed. idem, English factories in India, 13 vols., Oxford 1906-27. On trade routes: J. Deloche, Recherches sur les routes de l’Inde au temps des Mogols, Paris 1968 (some detailed maps on travellers’ itineraries). Systematic geography of the region in O. H. K. Spate, India and Pakistan: a general and regional geography, 2nd ed. London 1957, index s.v. Khāndēsh. Now out of date in many particulars, but still very valuable for detailed descriptions of sub-districts, towns, products, ethnography, and history of British period up to 1880: Gazetteer of
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the Bombay Presidency, xii (Khandesh), Bombay 1880; also Imperial gazetteer of India, xv, Oxford 1908, 225-39 (J. Burton-Page). AL-KHĀNDI (see Handiç in Suppl.).

KHĀNFū, an Arab name, denoting what was in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries, the most important port of China, and centre of the maritime commerce with the peoples of western Asia. Certain scholars have in the past (from J. Klaproth, in J.A., v (1824), 40, up to I. Hallberg, L'Extrême-Orient, etc., Göteborg 1906, 213) tried to prove that Khānīfū should not be identified with Canton, but the identification of the two cities seems certain. This view derived support from the fact of the confusion between Khānsā (Hang-čū) and Khānīkū (Khānīn) made by the informants of Abu 'l-Fidā (tr. Guyard, ii/4, 122-3); but in fact, Khānīn was the name by which Canton was known in the 3rd/9th century to the Arabs, since Khānīn is the rendering of Kuang-fu, the popular form of Kuang-ču-fu. According to Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, i, 272, s.v. "Chin", there is a piece of information in Yi-tsing which states that "Chī-na (Chin) is Kuang-fu (Canton); Mo-ho-čē-ma (Mahācīṇa) is the capital (Ch'ang-nan = Si-ńg-fu)"; cf. Chavannes, Religieux éminents, 56. Again following Pelliot, thirty years after Yi-tsing (in 730), an ancient passage can be found in the Siu Ku-Kin Yinchou-či (Tripitaka, kie, iii, 93b): "The kingdom of Yiu-ťu (India) generally calls Kuang-fu (Canton) 'Čhe-na' (Chīna), and gives to the imperial capital (Si-ńg-fu) the name of 'Mo-ho-čē-ma' (Mahācīṇa)". This note has passed into the Song kiao-seng čum (Tripitaka, che, iv, 76b); cf. Bagchi, Le canon bouddhique en Chine, ii, 551-2.

In his commentary on the Haddād al-Ālam, 224, Mincrsky gives some information concerning Khānīn not cited by that source. It was only in the 8th/14th century that Khānīn was confused with Khānsā [q.v.] by the Arab travellers and by historians of the Mongols. Ibn Bāṭṭāta, iv, 92, 271-2, calls the city Sin-Kālān (cf. Yule, Cathay, etc., iv, 109, 120); this name is the Arabic form equivalent to the Indian name of Mahācīṇa, whilst the Persian form was Cin-Kalan. Wāṣāf, ed. von Leiden, ii, 278-9; Ferrand, Relations de voyages, 43b; Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Blochet, ii, 493, writes "Kongi (?) which the Persians call Cin-Kālān", which according to Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, 276, should be corrected to Kōnūfū, since this is one of the popular forms of Kuang-fu (cf. J. A. Boyle, The successors of Genghis Khan, New-York-London 1971, 283-4, "Chin-Kālān"). Finally, Abu 'l-Fidā, in his Geography, ed. Reinaud, 363-4, tr. Guyard, 122-3, writes Khānīkū, which may be read as Khānīfū (see above); this town (Ferrand, Relations de voyages, 30, 123) is said to be four days' distance by boat from Lūṅkūn-fū, i.e. from Lūṅkūn, which is mentioned in the 10th century as the land whose people had recently invaded Čampa. Lūṅkūn should be corrected into Lūfū and identified with Long-pien = Hanoï, and as being 20 days by land.

Ibn Khurāsān's information (text, 69, tr. 49) on the site of Khānīfū (at a distance of 4 days by sea and 20 by land from the more southerly port of China Lūṅkūn, modern Hanoï) can only apply to Canton, as was also noted by H. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill, Chau Ju-kua, St. Petersburg 1911, 22; cf. also Idrisī, ed. Jaubert, i, 84, 90.

Among the western sources, the name of Chin-Kālān appears in Odoric of Pordenone (Van den Wyngaert, Sinica-franciscana, 458) in the form "Censcala", probably to be read "Cencala"; in John of Marignoli (ibid., 343) in the form of "Cynkalan", in a context which opposite this name, of which he says "it is Greater India", to that of "Cynkali", of which he says "it is Lesser India" and which he calls "Mynibr"; and finally, in the Catalan Map under the form "Cincalan", probably borrowed from Odoric (cf. on all these facts, Pelliot, op. cit., 275-6, s.v. "Čin", and 583, 590, 595-6, s.v. "Čaïton", also 833, s.v. "Silinguī").

Under the Tang, Canton was an extremely important port, where numerous Muslims settled, who in 778 plundered it (cf. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-hiue (Turcos occidentaux), St. Petersburg 1903, 173), an event not mentioned in Arabic sources. These last (Abū Zayd al-Sirāfī, in Reinaud, Relations des voyages faits par les Arabes et les Persans dans l'Inde et la Chine, Paris 1845, 64-5; Sauvaget, Relation de la Chine et de l'Inde, Paris 1948, 6, 40; Mas'ūdī, Marāqīā, etc., iv, 109, 120); this name is the Arabic form derived from the fact of the confusion of Khānīfū by the rebel general Huang-C'ao in 264/878-8; according to the Chinese sources, Canton was captured by this latter general in 879 (cf. S. Levy, Biography of Huang Ch'ao, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1935). It is in reference to this event that the "Flâng" of this city of overseas commerce is stressed (Pelliot, note on Ferrand's Voyage du marchand arabe Sulayman en Inde et en Chine, réédité in 85t suivi de remarques par Abū Zayd Ḥasan (vers 916), in T'oung Pao, xxı (1922), 410).

According to the Arabic information, the city gave 50,000 dinār each day to the government (Reinaud, op. cit., text 41; Ferrand, op. cit., 58). When a foreign vessel arrived, the Emperor sent his eunuchs there to select the best goods (Reinaud, text, 73-4); the journey between Khānīn and the capital Khūnda (Si-ńg-fu) took two months (ibid., 77, 103). The ruler (malik), i.e. the governor, of Khānīn bore the title of dīfū (ibid., 38; according to Reinaud, n. 81, ii, 27, for Chinese Ci-ču); cf. on this title, R. des Rotours, Traité des fonctionnaires et traité de l'armée, Leiden 1948, ii, 534 ff. c'e-fu "army of the capital cities"—one should certainly understand here "the chief of the armies of the city", hence the governor. Concerning the treatment of the Chinese of merchants who had come from across the seas, cf. T. Lewicki, Les premiers commerçants arabes en Chine, in RO (1935), 173-86 (bibliography), and the Persian text of 'Awfi in Bartholdt, Turkestan, i (texts), 98.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

KHĀNĪN, a town in al-Ṭirāk, on the Heiwan-Cay. The statement that Nu'mān V, king of al-Hira, was kept here a prisoner till his death on the order of his overlord, the Sāsānian Khusrw II, suggests that there was a fortress here in the period. The bridge of Khānīn must also go back to Sāsānian times; it is built of brick and plaster in several arches across the river valley. At the Muslim conquest, a battle seems to have been fought at Khānīn, for a "day of Khānīn" is mentioned in Ibn al-Fākīh. Under Arab rule Khānīn was a small town and an unpretentious station on the road from Baghādād to Khurāsān. Ibn al-Mu'tazz praises the wine of Khānīn. According to Abū Dulāf, a napthha well at Khānīn yielded a considerable revenue to the state. The Zuṭṭ were deported to [the region of] Khānīn after their rising in lower Mesopotamia had been suppressed in 279/893.

Bibliography: al-Yaṣḥūbī, i, 245, ii, 576;
al-Baladhuri, Futuh, 376; Ibn al-Fakih, BGA, v, 272; al-Tabar\textsuperscript{11}, i, 1028; iii, 1168; Ibn Rustah, BGA, vii, 164; al-Makrizi, ed. Bülk\textsuperscript{2}, ii, 35, viii, 186; al-Mukaddasi, BGA, iii, 122; al-Bakr\textsuperscript{1}, ed. de Slane, 320; Yâkût, Buldân, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii, 393; G. Le Strange, The lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 61, 62, 80. (P. Schwarz)  

**KHĀNKHĀH**, a composite word of Persian origin meaning a building usually reserved for Muslim mystics belonging to a dervish order. The terms ribâb, tekhâ, and khanfr\textsuperscript{3}, are generally called by him (44, 118, 188, 415, 430) Su\textsuperscript{7}fs, distinguished by him into specific groups and linked only with musâfi\textsuperscript{3}d or ribâb of the countryside. If one takes this information into account, it must be admitted that the early history of the khānkhāh cannot be properly elucidated until the early evolution of the Karrāmiyya and their eventual connections with the Manichaean saints are examined [see KARRAMIYYA].  

However, from the end of the 4th/10th century there seems to be an evolution of the khānkhāh (appearance of directors of them in Nishāpur, Frye, i, 360, 414, 468, 55b; al-Sam\textsuperscript{14}ānī, nisba of Khānkhāh; al-Sulki, Tabābāt, iii, 137, 344, iv, 127) into establishments connected with Sufi-\textsuperscript{8}fī links. These groups which become almost totally identified with them and largely disguise their origins. These groups are those of the Su\textsuperscript{7}fs, often allied to Shāfi\textsuperscript{9}i and Ash\textsuperscript{13}ar\textsuperscript{13}i; the emergence together of these and their links in eastern Persia has been too little studied (but see H. Halm, Die Ausbreitung der schaftischen Richtschriften, Wiesbaden 1974, and for the Sufi-Sâfī Add. 243 ff. (1972), 36).  

The first half of the 5th/11th century is one of founding and organisation. The Sūfī Ābū Sa\textsuperscript{15}d [see ĀBŪ SĀDIB ABÛ 'IΣYAR] (d. 440/1048) drew up a code of ten rules for the people in the khānkhāh (Achena, op. laud., 324, already noted by Nicholson, Studies in Islamic mysticism, 46). He was considered by the next generation as the first to have regulated the communal life in the khānkhāh. He links them with "a second source of evidence which still in use today" (Frye, ii, 74a). Such an enterprise inevitably led to the fabrication of references to it in the past. This is doubtless the reasoning behind the legend of the first khānkhāh, allegedly built at Ramla at the opening of the 2nd/8th century (al-Anšāfī, Tabābāt al-Ṣā\textsuperscript{12}bīyya, 9; in fact, according to al-Mukaddasi, 164 ff., the district of Ramla was sprinkled with coastal ribâb). Moreover, the terminology was still indefinite; madrasa could mean a centre for Sūfis (R. Bulliet, The patricians of Nishāpur, Cambridge, Mass. 1972, 253-4), and dina\textsuperscript{13}wān often alternates with khānkhāh to denote the same establishment (dina\textsuperscript{13}wān/khānkhāh of al-Sulami, in Frye, ii, 82a, iii, 6a, 18a, 274, 42a, 73a). Finally, from this period onwards, certain khānkhāhs are also burial places, a fact which enabled them to benefit from the largesse of pious pilgrims (Frye, ii, 47a).  

The second half of the century is marked by the alliance, in effect, of the people of the khānkhāhs with the Sālājūk ruling power. The ideological linkage of Šâfīfī with Šâfīfī-Ash\textsuperscript{13}ar\textsuperscript{13}i in Karrāmān now enjoyed an unprecedented expansion, not only on a local scale, but also outside the region (naturally, Ḥanafīfī was also able to adapt itself and integrate itself within this movement). Sālājūk expansionism, far from being territorial and political only, was often linked with an ideological expansionism, based in

Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV
the first instance on the spirited policies of official patrons. Nizām al-Mulk and his Khurāsānī imitators were not the only ones to found madrasas and khānkhāhs (examples of such patronage at Nishāpūr in Frye, ii, 278, iii, 192). The Sālḍūqīs of the west and their slave commanders, masters of Syria in the third quarter of the 5th/11th century, speedily imitated them at Aleppo and Damascus (lists of Syrian khānkhāhs in al-Nuṣayrī, Dāris, ii, 139-91, for Damascus; this list repeated with another for Aleppo and other towns by Elisseeff, op. cit., iii, 766, n. 1). From that time onwards, ribāt and khānkhāh seem to become synonymous; at the end of the 6th/12th century, Ibn Djuwayr was concerned about Ayyūbid Syria, "As for the ribāt, called here khānkhāh, there are many of them; they are meant for Sūfīs, and are splendid palaces, since Sūfīs are real Kings in this country" (Rībā, 256). In ʿIrāq, the word ribāt predominated (J. Chabbi, F. l. c., 1974; Achena, op. cit., 351).

In Egypt, the founding of the khānkhāh tradition, began logically under the Ayyūbids after the fall of the Fāṭimid dynasty in the later 6th/12th century. It continued under the Mamlūkīs, but with some slowing down after the second half of the 8th/14th century. The khānkhāh were then gradually transformed into official institutions, hence controlled and not always linked to the Sūfī orders, which accordingly tended to move into institutions enjoying more autonomy. Often they became part of complexes containing several institutions, e.g. masjīd-madrassa-mausoleum. Nevertheless, terminology remained still imprecise, and mediaeval historians could not always agree on the name for such and such institution (see for all this period, art. AL-KAHIRA, list of monuments shown on map, and section on Mamlūk khānkhāhs; al-Makrizī, Khīrāt, ii, 1, 41-47). From the Ottomans period onwards (10th/16th century), khānkhāh were still founded, but they appeared more and more in the form of the Turkish institution of the tekke (Pers. takiyya, Ar. tahriyya). A good number of these various institutions have survived to the present days (see AL-KAHIRA, section on the Ottoman period, Madrasas, tekkes).

There is, however, a general conclusion to be drawn here; that whilst the khānkhāh did not pass beyond Egypt, constituting the last wave of the original Šaldjuk expansion, the Turkish tekkes were carried along by the Ottoman conquests and reached the Maghībīs.

During this time, in the east the Khurāsānī khānkhāh swiftly spread beyond the Sālḍūqī domains and reached the eastern Iranian fringes and Afghanistān, sc. the territories of the Ghurānīs and then the Ghūrūds (middle of the 6th/12th century). The severe local upheavals involving these powers seem to have affected them little, but the opposite became true with the Mongol invasions of the early 7th/13th century. The last Ghūrūds, soon replaced by their slave commanders, founders of the Dihlī sultanate, fled to India. There followed a migration, which included the Sūfīs, comparable to that accompanying the westwards advance of the Sālḍūqīs. This does not of course imply that all the Persian khānkhāhs disappeared during the Mongol period, nor that new institutions were not built (Cambridge history of Iran, v, 372, 374).

But from the course of the 7th/13th century onwards, two new dervish orders, the Ḥiǧriyya and Subhāvardiyya, founded by refugees and soon based upon a widespread network of khānkhāhs, appeared in the new sultanate (Kh. A. Nizami, Some aspects of Khaŋghah life in medieval India, in St. Isl. viii (1957), 52-69; see also ĀṬĪYYA and OMDĪ). In the 8th/14th century, the reforms imposed on the Sūfī movement by Sultan Muhammad Tughūk took the form of a resumption of khānkhāhs but also of the extension of their network in the Indian territories [see DIĀLĀL AL-DIN AL-BUKHĀRĪ]. This type of institution, brought from Persia in the 7th/13th century, prospered more there than almost anywhere else right down to modern times and constitutes one of the characteristic manifestations of Indian Islam (see IIKMND, v [a]).

Constitution and functions. It is impossible to give here more than a few bibliographical references, since such a study would be intertwined with the immense and complex question of the links between Sūfism and its various forms and the contemporary society and ruling institutions. The most exhaustive work is J. S. Trimingham's The Suṣī orders in Islam, Oxford 1971; for the way of life in Khurāsānī khānkhāhs, Achena, op. cit., 79, 84, 97, 115, 120, 286, 289, etc.; for Egyptian ones, al-Makrizī, Khīṣ, is a rich source; for Indian ones, Nizami, op. laud.

Architecture. Since they were institutions meant both for leading the communal life (rooms for prayer, corporate sessions) and also for sheltering individual mystics, often in significant numbers, all khānkhāhs contained both types of accommodation (and frequently too various annexes and dependent buildings permitting self-sufficiency). However, there was a great gulf between the sumptuous buildings founded under official patronage (Syria, Egypt) and the first Indian khānkhāh. But neither of these gave rise to a special type of architecture distinct, for instance, from that of the madrasas (Elisseeff, Nūr ad-dīn, iii, 265, 266). Moreover, at the end of the Circassian period in Egypt (the 15th century), the khānkhāhs were integrated within great funerary complexes; they ceased to have individual living-rooms within them, and became non-residential centres for Sūfī activities [see AL-KAHIRA, section on the Mamlūk period, Khānkhāhs].

Bibliography: given in the article.
21-2, writes Khinzay (or Khanzay, Blochet, op. cit., 499, Quatremer, op. cit., LXXXIX) and (apud Barthold) Khinray. Hamd Allah Mustafa Kazwini, Nukka, ed. Le Strange, 235, 1. 10 and 261, 1. 10, writes Khinsay. Ibn Battûta, iv, 284 ff. has Khansa (as in F. Ferrand, Rel. de voyages et textes géogr., ii, 1914, 429), and connects it with the poetess al-Khansa5 [q.v.]. Abu 'l-Fidâ', tr. Reinaud, Geogr. d'Aboulfida, 124, has Khansa and also Khinza, as in Ferrand, loc. cit., and Blochet, in JRAS (1917), 9. Amongst the other sources, as well as Marco Polo, tr. in Hambis, La description du monde, 195, 206-14, 217-18, 398, is Oderic of Pordenone, in Van den Wyngaert, Sinica Franciscana, i, 463 (with apparatus criticus), who writes "Canssy", "Canssay": Marignolli, in ibid., i, 548, who writes "Campsay"; Pegolotti, in G. F. Pagnini, Della decima..., Lisbon and Lucca 1766, ii, 1, and Yule, Cahay, iii, 148, 172, "Chassai"; and in the Livre du Grant Cason, sometimes attributed to John of Cora, in J.A, vi (1830), 60, "Cassay". On the other forms in various sources, see I. Hallberg, L'Extrême-Orient dans la litt. et la cart. d'Occident, Göteborg 1906, 428-9.

**Bibliography:** The best data can be found in A. C. Moule, Quinsars, Cambridge 1957, 1-53, to which may be added the Islamic sources: Quatremer, op. cit., LXXXVII ff., and in Ch. Scheler, Centennaire de l'Ann. des Indo-Erman., 19, 20-34. On the foreign colony at Hang-ču, see Hirth and Rockhill, Chao Ju-k'ui, St. Petersburg 1911, 16; and on the town, Hirth, Uber den Schiffverkehr von Kinsay zu Marco Polo's Zeit, in TP, v, 186-390. (L. Hambis)

**Al-Khansa**3 ("the snub-nosed one" or "the gazelle"), sobriquet of Tumadir bint 'Amr, of the tribe of Sulaym and the clan of Sharld, Arab poetess of the pre-Islamic and early Islamic periods. She was born ca. 575 A.D. in the 'Aliya of Nadj, where her tribe was encamping. Only a few outlines of her predecessors. The basic stock-in-trade of images and in the eulogising of the dead poetess of Sulaym, apart from her undeniable personal sagacity, eloquence in tribal contests of oratory, etc.), which still remained fairly stereotyped in al-Khansa's poetry, was enriched by her with new expressions; these became fixed in the history of the genre after her, but she brought in addition to these new stylistic and metrical embellishments which assured her a primacy in the elegiac genre which none could later dispute with her. One should nevertheless add that her verses make striking reading (there are about 1,000 of them, some of doubtful authenticity), especially the most famous of them, not only by their technical accomplishment, but also by the intensity, violence and tenderness of feeling, all of which place al-Khansa well above the average level of accomplishment. She herself proudly summed this, at the same time, of 'Ukâ' and elsewhere, by her insistence on a primacy in grief, no doubt along with a consciousness of her calibre as a poet. Although tradition makes her welcome Islam and even exhort her sons to fight to the death for the new faith, her poetry is wholly pagan in feeling, and her view of life and death is invariably that of the ancient Dâhiliyaa.

Al-Khansa's elegies were gathered together into a Diwan in the 'Abbasid period, probably by Ibn al-Sikkît, and enjoyed great fame amongst the Arabs as models of the genre. Apart from the citations in Ibn Sallâm, Ibn Kutaibâ, the Aghâne and other authors of 9th and 10th centuries, the poems have come down to us in several manuscripts of varying value, on which (and above all on the excellent Cairo ms.) was based the edition with commentaries of Père L. Cheikho (Beirut 1886, preceded by another edition of the same author, Beirut 1888). Père Coppier provided a good French translation (Beirut 1889), and there are other examples in Italian by G. Gabrieli in the book cited below.

**Bibliography:** T. Noeldeke, Aklansâ, in Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Poesie der alten Araber, Hanover 1864, 152-82; G. Gabrieli, I tempi, la vita e il concorrere dei poeti arabi della Dlwan aqwal al Khansa, Florence 1899, 2nd ed., Rome 1944; N. Rhodokanakis, Al-Khansa und ihre Trauerlieder, in SBAW, cxvii (Vienna 1904); R. Blachere, HLA, 290-2 (very sceptical, as always, about the poetess's life and the authenticity of a part at least of her work). (F. Gabrieli)

**Khwânsâr, Sayyid Mirza Muhammed Bâsîr Mosâfî Châh-rûskî b. Mirza Zayn al'âdhnî** (1811-95), was born into a religious notable family in Persia. He studied Arabic and theology under his grandfather, Sayyid Abu 'l-Kâsim, and others. After his grandfather's death in 1824, however, Khânsâr moved with his father to Isfâhân where he studied fiqh, hadîth, and other religious subjects under Shaykh Muhammad Ta'âlî, the grandfather of Aka Nadjâfî (q.v. in Suppl.), Sayyid Muhammad Shahâhâhâni, Muhammad Ibrahim Karbâshi, and Sayyid Muhammad Bâsîr Raghtî, known as "Hudjdjal al-Islâm". During a visit to the shrine cities of 'Irâk, Khânsâr continued his studies under the religious authorities, from a number of whom he received his degree of idjâthâd. As a mujtâhid he became expert in both traditional and rationalist sciences and gradually received a widely-based recognition as a religious leader in Isfâhân. Apart from leading congregational prayers and performing other religious functions, Khânsâr lectured regularly before a sizable number of students in the field. Several great religious leaders and sîlos, al-tâbî'îs whom we know of have been mentioned among his disciples, such as Sayyid Muhammad Kâ'îm Tabâtaibâ'î Yazdî (d. 1919) and Mirzâ Fath Allâh Shaykh al-Shârî'î Isfâhânî (d. 1920) (see A. H. Hâiri, Shi'ism and Constitutionalism in Iran: a study of the role played by the Persian residents of Iraq in Iranian politics, Leiden 1977, 62-3).
Khansari was also an active and productive writer; the classical journal al-Murshid has ascribed to him 14 books and treatises on Arabic syntax, Islamic dogmatics, jurisprudence, and ethics, and other related subjects (All Wāgī Khīyabānī, Khīābī ‘ulamā’-i muṣūrīn, Tabriz 1947, p. 7). The grandson of Khansari’s brother, Sayyid Muhammad Mahdi Mūsawi, has added in his Aṣāṣan al-wadā’i, i, Nadjaf 1968, 102-28, another four items to the list of Khansari’s works, the most well-known of which is, of course, his biographical dictionary, Rawdāt al-‘ulamā’ fi aḥādīth al-‘ulamā’ wa l-ṣādiq, Tehran 1889.

Khansari compiled his Rawdāt in 1869, after having worked on it for over ten years. This book, which contains the biographies of over 700 learned men including the author’s own (pp. 126-8), was compiled in an unusual manner which makes reference to it fairly difficult. The following authors therefore compiled separate guides to the book: Mīrza All Rawṭatī, Khān-Allah and Sayyid Muhammad All Rawdātī, Khansari’s son and great-great-grandson respectively, Muhammad Bākīr Ulfa, and Muhammad All Mu’ālim Ḥabīb-bābī (Lutf Allāh Hunafar, Gānjina-yi ortex-rī tākht-yi Isfahān, Isfahān 1965, 825).

Khansari’s approach to the subjects discussed in his Rawdāt was not always objective; it was in fact overshadowed by certain sectarian tendencies, especially when he dealt with delicate problems such as the possibility of Ṭaḥṣī’s active role in the extinction of the ‘Abbāsid caliphate in 252 (Rawdāt, 605, and Abdul-Hadi Hairi, Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭāḥṣī: his alleged role in the fall of Baghdad, in Actes du 7e congrès International d’Arabistants et d’Islamistes, Bruxelles, 31 août-6 septembre 1970, Bruxelles 1971, 235-66).

Since its appearance, however, the Rawdāt has enjoyed a great reputation among the students of the field; it has been described by the journal al-Murshid as “the best and the most useful” (aṣāṣan wa anwa anfā) source among 14 other biographical dictionaries, such as the Wafaydt al-a’yan of Ibn Khallikān and the Amal al-Āmil of al-Hurr al-Āmilī (Wāgī, ‘Ulāmā’-i muṣūrīn, 34). The fame of the Rawdāt has reached such an extent that its author himself has often been identified by the book and has been referred to by some biographers as Ṣāḥib-i Rawdāt al-Djinnāt (“the author of . . .”) (Muhammad All Muddarīs, Raybānāt al-‘adāb, iii, Tehran n.d., 366-7). Many of his numerous descendants also took their last name from the title of the book and called themselves “Rawdātī.” Khansari, who was buried in the Taḵt-i Fālid of Isfahān, left seven sons, five of whom succeeded in occupying certain distinguished religious positions.

KHAN-ZADA BEGUM — KHVAR

KHAN-ZADA BEGUM, the title (“Princess”) of Sevin Beg, a grand-daughter of Ozbeg, the ruler of the Golden Horde, and the wife successively of Timur’s eldest son Djahangir and his third son Miranâghâh. After Miranâghâh’s outbreak of madness at Tarbriz she came in person to Samarkand to report his behaviour to Timur. Daulatâghâh describes the interview with their father-in-law “with colourful details which are not in the other sources and can hardly be true”.


KHANDIT (Grk. Antizene, in Yâkut Hinzit), name of the province and of the basin enclosed between the great bend of the Eufrates to the NNW, Sevin Beg, a grand-daughter of Ozbeg, the ruler of the Golden Horde, and the wife successively of Timur and Firdûshâ. (Houtum-Schindler, cited in bibliography). After Miranâghâh’s outbreak of madness at Tarbriz she came in person to Samarkand to report his behaviour to Timur. Daulatâghâh describes the interview with their father-in-law “with colourful details which are not in the other sources and can hardly be true”.


KHAPUTS (Russian designation—Khaptuttsî, Gupatuntsî, Khaputuntsî from the ail Khaput); other designation—Khaptul. A small Caucasian ethnic group, forming with the Krîz [q.v.] and the Dzhek the Dzhek subdivision of the Samurian group (Lezhgin, Agul, Rutul, Tsakhur, Tabasaran, Budukh, Dzhek) of the Northeastern Ibero-Caucasian language family.

According to the Soviet census, in 1926 there were ethnically 12 Khaputs, and linguistically 4,284 (including speakers of Dzhek and Krîz dialects); in 1933 (estimation) there were 3,000 Khaputs, living in several auls in the Shahdadag area, southwest of Konkahkend (Azerbaijand S.S.R.). The Khaputs are Sunni Muslims of the Shâfîite rite.

The traditional economy of the Khaputs was based on sedentary animal husbandry, agriculture, and horticulture. The Khaput language is only a variant of Dzhek (as is Krîz), which is a purely vernacular language; Azeri is used as the literary language, and the Khaputs are being culturally and linguistically assimilated by the Azeris.


KVAR, a group of villages in northern Persia, at present in the jâhristân of Garmârs in the Central Province (ustân-i markazi), centred on approximately lat. 35° 15' N. and long. 52° 20'E. and lying at an altitude of 2776 feet. It is bounded on the north by the mountain districts of Damâwâd and Fîrûzkûh, on the east by Simnan, on the west by Varâmdin and on the south by salt desert stretching away to Khług and Ardîstân. It was often called Khîrîrî-Ray to distinguish it from another Khîrîrî in Fârs about which little is known. As a district, Khîrîrî was generally considered to include the historically known villages of Ahrâdân and Dîh Namak (earlier Karyat al-Milb), but not Lasgird to the east or Aavyânkây (Ayyân-i Kayf) to the west.

Khîrîrî lies on the plain just east of the pass which is now identified with the Caspian Gates of the Ancient World, and constitutes a stage on the old arterial route that skirts the southern slopes of the Alburz from Rayy to Khurâsân. It was reckoned as three marches from Rayy and three from Simnan. An important route to the Caspian Sea leads north from Khîrîrî up the valley of the Ḥabîla Rûd, and the stone road (sangfargh) that was built under Shâh ʿAbbâs to shorten the route from Ṣafâhân to Khurâsân starts some 10 km. to the south of the fields of Khîrîrî and leads south over salt flats (kâvir) to Sīyâh Kûh. Much of the sangfargh is still intact. The name Khîrîrî was characteristically applied both to the district and to the primary village; today, the name Garmârs is similarly applied to both. Historically, the present centre was known as Kishlâk, and this lies 114,5 km. from Tehran by the railway line that was completed in 1938. Kishlâk remains the formal name of the bakhsh (administrative division) of the district. The name derived from the fact that Khîrîrî has historically served as the kishlâk (“winter quarters”) for the population of Fîrûzkûh in the mountains to the north, with which it has always been closely connected. Garmârs is probably simply an iranisation of Kishlâk, although Garmârs is the more common equivalent. Paradoxically, Khîrîrî was considered to be the coldest part of the province of Kûmîs.

Khîrîrî was a flat, well-watered plain surrounded by mountains on the north and west and looking out on to the great salt desert on the south and east. Alberts, in Social structure and culture change in an Iranian village (see bibliography), estimates the total area of the district at 2,000 km.² of which 230 km.² were the cultivable lands of 73 villages, and 185 km.² were cultivated in 1956. Twenty of the villages were khâlisâ (q.v.). According to the 1966 Census, the population of the district was 35,678, an increase of some 2,000 over the figure given in the first Census a decade earlier. This population was by no means homogeneous. Apart from Persian-speaking cultivators and transhumants from Fîrûzkûh—some of whom are said to speak a Samî dialect—there are several tribal groups which are mostly Turkish speaking. Of these the most significant are Pazuki, Osanlu, Alikahi, and Koti (transliteration uncertain). The Pazuki were traditionally a landowning élite in Ahrâdân, and appear to have split from a larger Pazuki grouping and settled in Khîrîrî at the beginning of the 19th century (see Houtum-Schindler, cited in bibliography). The other groups are pastoralist, and in 1958 the Koti still lived exclusively in tents (see Alberts).

Khîrîrî owes its existence as an agricultural centre
to the Habla Rūd which flows down from Firūźkūh. Curzon, Persia, i, 293, writes of an "abundant stream" that "descends from the mountains and separates into many channels, of which I must have crossed twenty in the space of half a mile. Cultivation improves in the same ratio, and at Kischlak ..., which is khālīsah, or Crown property, is responsible for the grain and fodder with which the royal stables are supplied at Teheran".

In the late 1950s, 59 of the 73 villages of Khwār took all their water from the river. Three were supplied exclusively from ḫandāts while the remainder used both. There were 30 functioning ḥandāts and 15 in disrepair. The water was regulated for irrigation purposes by the Independent Irrigation Authority (Bungāḫ-i mustabbil-i ābāyrī). Regulation and supervision were essentially apparent; when the water was low during the summer season, the villages would send representatives to watch upstream distribution points to prevent theft, and during the spring floods, damage was common (see Alberts).

Khwār provides an excellent example of a small-river irrigation system from the Iranian Plateau. The annual statistics of the Bungāḫ-i mustabbil-i ābāyrī for the 1950s show that the average monthly flow of the Habla Rūd at the point where it enters the plain varied between a low in late summer of 1.2 and a high in spring of 22.6 cubic metres per second. (For comparison: during the same period the most important river on the Plateau, the Zayanda Rūd at Isfahān, showed a low of 13 and a high of 202 cubic metres per second).

The existence of such a good and reliable supply of water at an isolated point on a major arterial route makes it a priori likely that Khwār would have been one of the earliest centres of agricultural development on the Iranian Plateau. This hypothesis is corroborated by the known antiquity of the name Khwār and the abundance not only of ruins but of impressive archaeological mounds; unfortunately, however, no intensive archaeological research has yet been undertaken that might confirm it.

Because of its position as a stage on the route to Khūrāsān, most travellers' accounts, geographies and histories, from the earliest to the most recent, contain some reference to Khwār, yet it seldom seems to have stimulated more than a passing reference to its pleasantness or unpleasantness. It may never have supported a town large enough to engage the traveller's attention, although Ibn Hawkal does use the term ḥāvr to describe it. Generally, its fortunes seem to have varied with the long-term trends of the Plateau. Before it was occupied and plundered by the incoming Oghuz in the first half of the 5th/9th century, it was considered populous and fertile. It generally had an independent but low-ranking governor, and much of it became khālisah under the Šafawīds. Under Rīdā Shāh, the district became a bahās of Tehran, and was only restored to its relatively independent status as a khāristān during the 1960s.

The district of Khwār is unique as the site of the only detailed village study that has yet been carried out on the Iranian Plateau (by Alberts, see bibliography).


KHWĀR — KHARĀDJ

Kharādj, a word derived, via Syriac, from Greek ἱγγούτα, but attached by the Arabs to the native root ḥ. r. d. Contrary to its original meaning, the word seems in the current usage of the Near East, to have denoted "tax" in general, and is in fact found with reference to various specific taxes, thus causing considerable confusion (see ḏijzā).

Arabic technical and legal literature uses it more specifically, at least in the period before the formation of Turkish states in the sense of a tax, and it is this sense which is exclusively discussed in the present article. For other taxes, see Bāyt al-Mal, Darība, Darība, ḏay'ā and ḏijzā.

I.—In the Central and Western Islamic Lands.

At the outset of their conquests, the Arabs—whatever agreements had been made with the conquered towns—were in general willing to levy some kind of tribute which would reflect their own sovereignty and lordship, whilst leaving to the indigenous authorities the task of raising the taxation according to their own traditions, as being the only authority capable of doing this. Even when a financial organisation more integrated with the new regime was set up, they were unable, or were largely unwilling, to do anything but follow the old traditions here, which were adapted to local circumstances and inherited from a long background of bureaucratic state organisations. It was of little importance that for the Arabs, these taxes were an acknowledgement of Islamic domination; for the populace, it was simply a case of the old taxes going to new masters. Because of this continuity, the Islamic fiscal system varied from region to region in such a way that it would never be able entirely to absorb the conceptualisation of the fitḥ or the centralising efforts of the ʿAbbāsid administration. It is accordingly all the more necessary to bear this basic truth in mind, since the paucity of information means that there is a risk in applying the state of affairs in certain regions which were privileged in this respect, above all Irāk and Egypt, to other parts of the Islamic world, whose individual characteristics must on the contrary be brought out.

Whether the texts of treaties handed down by later authors like al-Baladhūrī are completely authentic or whether they have been put together later in order to explain the actual existing differences of organisation, known as such but not actually explicable, they undoubtedly convey the ideas of the first generations of Muslims. Some general principles emerge from amongst the particular practices. The first is the guaranteeing of their lands to all proprietors—at this time non-Muslims—in such a way as
to assure their value. They paid tax on these lands, apart from certain groups of owners on the frontiers, from whom some form of military service was required in lieu of tax, and apart from some pastoralist groups who paid in other ways, e.g. in slaves, beasts, manufactured products, etc. It is true that at the outset, there was a feeling amongst the Arabs that they should acquire the lands, which would then be liable only to the voluntary precept (takāt) paid by the Muslim to the Islamic community; but the first caliphs assured the victory of the principle of the ḥārādji paid by the convert had to pay the zakāt [q.v.], the benefit allowed for in the whole operation became very debatable. It was only later, under the pressure of an evolution of the state of affairs, that conversions took place collectively by whole villages, without the fiscal structure being however changed.

From the technical point of view, there were two great problems in the administration of the ḥārādji: those of perception of the tax and of its method of collection. In all directly administered districts, a land survey or cadaster had been made [see ʿamār]. But whilst in the lands under the Sasanid tradition and in others like Egypt, the basis was a fixed unit of land surface, the ḥārādji in the East and the faddān in Egypt, in other, former Byzantine lands—as in the greater part of Europe—the unit was the amount of land which could be ploughed by a pair of oxen, which meant differences in actual area involved, according to the differing geographical conditions. In the latter case, the same amount of tax could be levied on two different amounts in area of land; but in the first case, the unit of surface area had to be adjusted in order to fix a level of taxation suitable to the land's potential. The factors involved here were essentially those of irrigation, natural or artificial, but also the general fertility which could be estimated experimentally through a periodic survey of the average yield over a certain number of years, with reductions and even exemptions being granted in the case of natural disasters; this procedure of estimating was called ʿibra.

This question was, in fact, linked with that of the method of payment of the tax. In ancient times, there had been, ʿgrosso modo, no other possibility except the sharing of the crop, according to fixed proportions, between the cultivators and the state. But, as a money economy developed, the inconveniences of this procedure began to be felt, e.g. transport difficulties, fluctuation of prices and consequently of the real income accruing to the state, profits for speculators and injustices for the tax-payers. Hence the Roman and Sasanid governments introduced a system involving a fixed tariff of payment, and where possible, payment in money. Conversely, the disadvantages of the new system were not long in appearing: the peasants, rarely having immediately at hand the monetary sums demanded by the treasury, were obliged to borrow, often under ruinous conditions, and grain merchants could speculate on the difference between the low prices at harvest times and the high prices of the stocks of grain subsequently released. The Muslim régime at first retained as they were the Roman and Sasanid usages which they found in the conquered countries, but under the first ʿAbbāsids there was a reversion, at least in the Sawdāʾ of Baghdad, to a proportional payment in kind, which furthermore best corresponded to the requirements of provisioning the great city; whatever one may say, it does not seem that this reform was generally applied elsewhere, and especially not in Iran. Indeed, in many provinces there was a mixed system, i.e. proportional payment in kind was exacted on certain products of the ground (especially grain), whilst others were taxed on a monetary basis (especially plants used in manu-
facturing, hence of more commercial utility). Moreover, even in the case of payment in kind, there was allowed, by means of a table of equivalences (ta'sir), the substitution, at least in certain cases, of one product for another, e.g. a quantity of wheat for a double quantity of barley (barley cost usually only half that of wheat), etc. The system of payment in kind had various names, the most general being *muḥāsama* (lit. “sharing”), that of *kharāḍj* itself, and at the same time others specially connected with a particular technical term or usage (in Egypt, *mufādana*, taxation by *faddān*), meaning taxation in kind generally. In effect, *muḥāsama* brought the taxpayer into the same status as the share-cropper, especially the share-cropper on state lands, because the latter always paid his dues to the landholder in kind on a basis of proportional sharing-out. It is possible that the *muḥāsama* system spread *pari passu* with that of the military *iḥdā* [q.v.], since in general the *muḥā* was a person already accustomed in other circumstances to control property exploited by métayage, and found the direct delivery of grain useful for his animals. Various lesser taxes were added to the *kharāḍj* proper, despite the lawyers’ protests, in order to compensate and remunerate the different officials involved in the perception and collection of the tax.

In Egypt, where various authors dispute whether there ever was properly speaking any *kharāḍj*, taxation in all forms had its own special features, due especially to the rise and fall of the Nile floods and the use of them by the state since the time of the Pharaohs. In Egypt, the survey made at the time of the seasonal fall of the waters showed not only the area of land involved but also the necessary amount of cultivation to be done in the season and the sum that could normally be expected. It is because of the misunderstanding of this system that it has been thought, on the basis of a passage in Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, that this involved a tax system by apportionment, with a global total fixed arbitrarily in advance and then divided out by quotas on the districts and then villages. It was in fact nothing of the kind, but it was possible to calculate in advance the expected total, and for the process of perception, the accountancy offices of the time noted first of all the total and then the details.

In districts where administration was difficult, or simply when it was desired to favour some exalted person, *iḥdā* [q.v.] reductions or *muḥāsama* tax-farming contracts were granted to be set against the *kharāḍj*. In many cases, and especially in Egypt, where the system worked to the benefit of the army leaders, a notable guaranteed in advance the sum of taxation which the area was obligated to pay the exchequer (the *kabila* [q.v.] system). In Egypt, there was a kind of adjudication process, and the sum handed over was not that of the tax, but of the tax with the subtraction of the equivalent of a salary for the beneficiary, an original local adaptation of what was later where the *kabila* [q.v.] which was to lead to the *iḥdā*. Furthermore, it appears that the peasants were compelled to cultivate certain lands belonging to the state, on which they paid taxes (rusūm) distinct from the *kharāḍj*, and this was also the case with pasture grounds. There was also added to the tax proper, on all the village, various small exactions in kind (straw, chickens, etc.). Inevitably, many places were in part or wholly bankrupt; in that case, the remaining amount (*kād*) was noted down and carried over to the next assessment. Since this in itself reduced the chances of attaining solvency, a compromise was usually reached after a certain time. In regard to collection of taxation in kind, it often happened that the peasant had not enough seed left from his own share of the crop to sow for the following year; he might then be lent, perhaps as a simple advance, a quantity of seed (*badrān*). The later development of the *iḥdā* system was to affect the levying of the *kharāḍj* but not its organisation, which was a miscalculation, *muḥā* had to respect. A tax paid in kind or narrowly dependant on the harvests was naturally paid according to the solar year; but in the case of tax-farming by contract or of a fixed amount, the exchequer made as many as possible of its demands by the lunar year, as with all other taxes not linked with the land. It appears also that payments were often made not all at once, but e.g. in three installments; this was especially the case for taxes paid in cash, which the tax-payer had more latitude in obtaining. But apart from this, the taxes levied in kind or in cash on cultivated land were naturally paid over at different times and for the crops ripened at various points of time.

For the ‘Abbāsid caliphate, we possess four budgets, bearing almost exclusively on the land tax, and leaving aside the other taxes. These budgets have been discussed in the article BAYT AL-MAL (add to the Bibl. there S. al-‘Aff in the present Bibl., below).

The various modes of tax-levying have already been alluded to. In general, administration and perception of taxation by a state agent (‘damīn) was distinguished from tax-farming (*damān*), which, as explained, should be distinguished from *kabila*. Whatever régime was involved, the tax-collector arrived accompanied by police officers and various technical staff, such as the surveyor (*waṣīţ*) and the assayer-money changer (*iṣḥābād*), for whose benefit the minor taxes mentioned above were exacted. Naturally, these all had to be given hospitality, which was also done according to a tariff. The various operations stretching from the preliminary survey to the actual collection generated mounds of papers setting forth the situation from the exchequer’s point of view on one side, and the tax-payers’ one on the other, and the final demand handed over to the payer had to be paid and a receipt obtained.

All that has been said so far rests on a purely eastern documentation and thus concerns the Muslim east exclusively. In the west, the information available and the studies so far made do not seem to admit such precision. A fairly strong impression may nevertheless be gleaned that at the time of the Arab conquests there was not so strong a division made between the possessions left to the indigenous peoples and the Muslim share of property, and that very often the Arabs and Berbers had to acquire lands to which they would have had no right in the east. Whence there resulted, it seems, both in terminology and in practice, a certain confusion between *waḥr* and *kharāḍj*, as much in the Maghrib as in al-Andalus. It does not appear—unless perhaps for a while under the Fātimids in Idrīsīya—that the efforts of the Spanish Umayyads or the Almohads in Morocco and Spain had any result in this direction. The word *kharāḍj* itself is only used rarely outside Fātimid and Zirid Idrīsīya, and only in a vague sense. Other terms appear instead, whose precise meaning is uncertain, and it seems that the tax-payers had in fact to pay much much more than an *waḥr*. In regard to Sicily, al-Dāwūd’s treaty bears witness to the confusion of the jurists themselves.

Further confusions appear to have resulted in the
east itself, in the Anatolia wrested from the Byzantines by the Seljuk Turks. Since most of the lands there were considered as state property, there was no kharādī properly speaking, but the peasants, assimilated in some degree to the share-croppers on public lands, did not thereby pay any the less taxation, which was combined with the ḡīṣyā which they had to pay as non-Muslims. In practice, the term ḡīṣyā came to denote the whole complex of their obligations, essentially pertaining to the land, and the word kharādī, taken at first in a vague sense, was applied progressively to the personal poll-tax. This inversion of the state of affairs in classical Islamic times was to be extended in time and area all over the Ottoman empire. One is tempted to conclude that, in the general context of the Muslim east, where the Turks were nurtured and formed, the meaning of terms in current usage never corresponded exactly to the official definitions; one may find a confirmation of this in the preservation in Syrian usage of the Byzantine dimāsājdāmosīn to denote the basic taxation, which one never finds used thus in official texts before the Crusades, but after then till the Ottoman conquest.

**Bibliography: 1. Sources.** The first specialist treatises devoted to the kharādī and related questions which have so far been given in the course of studies on the texts by the authors mentioned above. One might add, for example, Yabābā b. ʿĀdīm, ed. Juynboll, Leiden 1896, Abū Yūsuf (written for Hārūn al-Rašīd) and, on a larger scale, the K. al-Amwāl of Abū ʿUbayd b. Sallām, ed. Cairo 1535. To these should be added, from a century later, the K. al-Kharādī (with a wider range of contents, but incompletely preserved) of ʿUdāmā b. ʿAbdallāh, unedited. The essential core of these texts is the point of view of taxation, has been tr. by A. Ben Shemesh, *Taxation in Islam*, i (Leiden 1958), ii (1965) and iii (1969), but with a commentary of very unequal value. Abū Yūsuf has been tr. into French by E. Fagnan, Paris 1921. There is a whole chapter on the land tax in Māwārid's al-ʿAkbām al-sulṭānīyya (5th/11th century). Apart from these, there is important information in various other types of work: historical, like Balādhurī's Ṣulṭān al-baladān and Miskawayh's Ṭadhārīb al-ʿumām; encyclopaedic, like Khārazmī's Majāfīt al-ʿulām (ʿIrāqī and Khārusānī) matemathical, like the K. al-Manāṣīs of Abu ʿl-Wafāʾ al-Būzāqīdī (see Ehrenkreutz, *Al-Buzaidī on the maṣfer*, in JESHO (1965), 90 ff.) and the K. al-Ḥāṣibī, studied by Cahen in AIEOAlger (1952); administrative, like the histories of viziers by al-Dīnahshīyāt (q.v.) and Hilal al-Ṣabībī (q.v.) and the Ṭarīkh-i Kumm, preserved only in Persian, by Ḥasan b. Muhammad al-Kumī, ed. Tehran 1934; and finally, all the great classical geographers, especially Iṣṭaḥkhrī for Fārs. For ʿIrāq in the 8th century, see also the Syriac *History* of Dūnios of Tell-Māhīr, analysed by Cahen from this point of view in Arabicia (1954). We have further some versions of official correspondence archives like those of Abū Isbāk al-Ṣabībī, and especially of the ʿAbbāsīb Ibn ʿAbbād, for the Bāyūd period. In the last century, A. von Kremmer brought together from various sources four Abbāsid budgets and studied them, partly in his *Culturesgeschichte*, and partly in the *Denkschr. der Akad. der Wiss. Wien*, Phil.-Hist. Cl, xxvii (1923); on the oldest of these, see now Sālidī al-ʿAbbāsī, *A new version ...*, in JESHO (1972). H. A. R. Gibb derived material from the *Sirāt ʿUmar b. Abī al-ʿĀsīs* of Ibn ʿAbbād Hakam (brother of the historian) for his *The fiscal rescript of ʿUmar II*, in Arabica (1955). See also, Ibn al-Mukaffaʾs Risāla fi ʿl-ṣaḥāba, ed. and tr. Ch. Pellat, Paris 1976.

Egypt is a special case, partly because of the preservation of numerous papyri (or paper documents), and partly because of the original nature of its administrative literature. The interest of the papyri for the study of taxation was first demonstrated by C. H. Becker in regard to his publication of the Papyrus Saqḥ al-Muharramīt. Most of the subsequent publications emanate from A. Grohmann, who has himself published a commentary concerning this and has commissioned the economist C. Leyerer to make a synthesis, in ZDMG, ciii (1933), 40-60. Some complementary information can be found in the subsequent papyrological works of A. Dietrich (Arabische Briefe aus ... der Hamburger ... Bibliothek, 1955), and of J. David-Weill (JESHO 1965, 1971). Finally, Greek papyri should be taken into account (see especially, Bell in Isl. (1921-13) and Rémondon in Chronique d'Égypte, 1965).

Furthermore, the centralised character of Egyptian administration allowed the composition of highly-detailed administrative and financial treatises which fill out for us the information of the published papyri, especially the Mafīth al-ʿĀdiqī of al-Maḥmūdī (6th/12th century), financial content analysed by Cahen in JESHO (1962), and the Kawānim al-dawānim of Ibn Mammātī (Saladin's period), of which the administrative passages have been tr. and studied by R. S. Cooper in his unpublished 1973 Berkeley doctoral thesis. Their information may be completed by the K. al-Fayyūm of al-Nabulusi, ed. Morita, cf. Cahen in Arabicia (1956); Nuwayri's Nihāya, viii in four, and Makrīzī's Ḥokūt. The Secretary's guide early used by Sauvage for his researches on money and numismatics (= ms. arabe, B.N. Paris 4445) and the ch. on finance and administration of the Rawdat al-arīb of Muhammad b. Ibrāhim al-Ḥamawi set forth by M. al-Ḥila in the Cairo millenary volume, ii, 1043-95, are adaptations from the Mamlūk period of Ibn Mammātī.

There is important information on the Yemen in the Mulākkāhās al-fisān studied by R. B. Serjeant and Cahen in Arabicia (1957), and also in other administrative documents in the hands of the first of these two authors.

For the Maghrib, there are extracts from the K. al-Amwāl of al-Dāwūdī by Ṭabīb al-Wahhāb and F. Dachraoui, in Études d'orientalisme Lavoisier, ii (1962), 401-44.

2. Modern studies. Some pre-1950 works may still be mentioned: M. von Berchem, *La propriété territoriale et l'impôt foncier*, 1886; Becker, *Die Entstehung von 'Uṣr und Ḥarāfland in Ägypten*, in ZA (1904), 301-19, also in Islamstudien, i, 318-33 (see also his papyri studies mentioned above); and A. N. Pollak, *Classification of land in the Islamic law*, in AJSL (1940).

The contemporary works are F. Lekkegaard, *Islamic taxation in the classic period*, and D. C. Dennett, *Conversion and poll-tax in early Islam*, both from 1950, of whose existence Divāʾ al-Dīn al-Raʾīsī, K. al-Khārīdī fi ʿl-dawār al-islāmīyya, Cairo 1957, is unfortunately unaware. A. K. S. Lambton's *Landlord and peasant in Persia*, London 1953, has an interest, for the pre-Mongol period, which goes beyond Iranian territory. The main corrections or partial additions to the information given in the course of studies on the texts by the authors mentioned above. One might add, for

On Egypt in the Ayyūbīd period and the beginning of the Mamlūk one, there is now a fine synthesis by Hassanī Rabī‘, The financial system of Egypt, London 1972 (cf. Cooper, cited above). For Syria, see a forthcoming article by Cahen in JESHO.

On Salahīdūn Anatolia, see Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, London 1968.

For the Muslim world, see the classic works of Lévi-Provençal for Spain and R. Brunschvig for Ḥafsīd Tunisia, to be completed by H. R. Idris, Les Zirides, 1959; R. Arie, L’Espagne musulmane au temps des Nasrides, 1973; and J. F. P. Hopkins, Medieval Muslim government in Barbary, 1960.

(Č. Cahen)

II.—IN PERSIA.

Terms. Kharādī was the basic term for land tax in mediaeval Persia, as in earlier times. By extension, it sometimes came to mean tax or taxes in general. Kharādī-i ahrīshūm in the sense of a tax on silk, or possibly a tribute paid in silk, is found in Ikhtān and later times (Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, Tārīkh-i gustīda, ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Nawā‘ī, Tehran 1957-60, 607; Ḥādī-‘Abdu, Ḥādī-i īlāmī-i Rasqīdī, ed. Khān Bābā Bāqir, Tehran 1957-60, 115). Kharādī is also used in mediaeval Persian in the sense of tribute; and khardī is also used in mediaeval Persian in the sense of a tax on silk, or mdli wa mdliyydt, which in mediaeval Persian occurs in the sense of tribute; and khardī- gūdhdh, in modern Persian means a taxpayer in the broad sense (not simply one who pays tribute or land-tax).

By Ikhtān times the terms mdli, mdliyydt and mlīyydt-i ardī were also used to denote land-tax (though mdli had in addition a wider significance). In Dīlāyīrid and Timūrid documents the phrases mdli wa mdlaa wa mlaa wa mlāwadīghīshīt and amudī wa mlawadīghīshī occur and (probably) mean land tax(es) and other taxes (cf. Muhammad b. Hindubāḥ Nakhādīvānī, Dastur al-ādil, ed. A. A. Ali-zade, Moscow 1977, ill., 150, and passim; M. al-Sā‘dī, ed. Muhammad Shaftī, Lahore 1941, 1, 322-3), while in Kārā Kūyunlū, Āk Kūyunlū and Safavid documents the phrase mlī wa mlīzzīt wa wdgīshīt is commonly found. Its precise meaning is not clear, but is probably land tax(es), other taxes, and dues (or fees). The phrase mlī wa mdliṯī, first found in Ikhtān times and in frequent use thereafter, means the tax on a landed estate and that which remains (for the owner) after the tax has been paid. Under the Kūšārīs, the terms mdli and mlīyydt signify “regular” or “fixed” taxation, consisting of taxes on the land, animals, flocks, herds, shopkeepers, artisans and trade (cf. Sir John Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1829, ii, 336 ff., and see also Great Britain, Public Record Office, F.O., 881/7364, Report on the Persian Army by Lt. Col. H. P. Picot, Jan., 1900 (pt. i, chs. i and 2, written by Sir A. Houtum Schindler), 11; C. H. Markham’s statement that mlīyydt meant “fixed” revenue derived from the land, i.e. that it was exclusively derived from land taxes, is probably in error due to the fact that land taxes formed the major part of the “fixed” taxes, A general sketch of the history of Persia, London 1874, 561). Curzon, writing towards the end of the 19th century, defines mlīyydt as fixed revenue deriving from (i) regular taxation, i.e. land tax, taxes on animals, flocks and herds, and taxes on shopkeepers, artisans, and trade, (ii) revenues of crown lands, (iii) customs, and (iv) rents and leases (Persia and the Persian question, London 1892, ii, 470). By about 1900, kharādī, as distinct from mlīyydt, no longer appears as a separate entry in the revenue accounts (Report on the Persian army, op. cit., 11).

Land taxes and the theory and practice of government. Until modern times agriculture was the main economic activity of the country. The governing classes sought their material foundation in landed property and animal husbandry. The wellbeing of the land was closely affected by the existence or otherwise of “good” government and stability. Further, since the revenue of the state was derived primarily from taxes on land, the financial wellbeing of the state was dependent upon agriculture prosperity. Governments were concerned to raise as much revenue as possible, but the fact that the ability of the land to provide revenue on a long term basis depended upon its being cultivated and upon the wellbeing of those who tillled it, set, in normal times, a limit to their demands. The peasant was not a serf and was free, at least in theory, to leave his land, though some rulers attempted to curb his freedom. If the burden imposed upon the peasant by the government’s demands became intolerable, they would have recourse to flight and leave their lands uncultivated. The state could, in theory, leave the land to someone else or cultivate it itself at the expense of the public treasury (for which cases the jurists laid down certain conditions). But often neither course offered a practical alternative. The possibility of flight was, therefore, to some extent a restraining factor (see further below).

Many writers on the theory of government recognised the connection between stability and the financial wellbeing of the state. The tradition “no kharādī on land in a bad (ruined) condition”, although not accepted by all schools of law, was widely held and demonstrates the general recognition of the financial dependence of the state on agriculture, and also, implicitly, the significance of “good” government, because one of the most common reasons for the land being left uncultivated was the flight of the peasants provoked by extortion. Ḥāmid al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Ḥāmid Kirmānī, addressing Kawām al-Dīn Zawānī, who took possession of Kirmān ca. 613/1216-17, states “The king of Islam (may God exalt his dignity) has acquired an extensive kingdom and there is no question but that it will prosper and that produce and benefit from it will accrue to his treasury”. He then warns him that there could be no security or prosperity in the province of wellbeing among the peasants “as long as every six months or every year a new governor or mubāhā comes, because
every mukja’ who arrives will take possession of any produce or stocks he sees and will demand kharāḍj, in advance, or by force on produce not yet to hand; and when another mukja’ comes, hungry and unclothed, with an empty pocket to fill, he, too, will impose similar burdens and begin to torment the peasants all over again” (al-Mudāfūdū sūbū badā‘īs al-samān fn waqā‘yīs Kīrmān, ed. Abūbās Iklbāl, Tehran 1952-3, 46). ‘Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. Kiyā al-Māzdārānī, writing in the middle of the 8th/14th century, makes a similar point. He states, though hardly with complete accuracy if one considers the arbitrary nature of Ilkhānīd taxation practices in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, “Formerly the custom was that no alteration should be made [in the tax] of any place for which an assessment had been made, so that the subjects (ra‘ā‘iyā) paid to the disun, year by year, the tax as laid down in the assessment (madū‘-i mukannān) and, with their minds at ease, occupied themselves in agriculture and the development of the country. Now, since the assessed tax is not permanently fixed [by the disun] and every year the tax-collectors, when they come, demand the tax in a different way, the subjects, since they have no confidence, withhold their hands from cultivation and the provinces are becoming ruined” (Die Residie-ye falsafer, ed. W. Hinz, Tehran 1952, 308), underscores the importance attached to the land tax as the sinews of the administration and to the observance of justice in its collection. Husayn Wa‘īq Kāshīfī, writing in 900/1494-5 under the Timūrids, makes a similar statement, but substitutes for the sāhib kharāḍj a waṣīr “who regulates financial affairs”, which suggests a decline in the relative importance of kharāḍj compared to other forms of taxation, even though it was still, no doubt, the largest single item (Abbāb-i mu‘āsinī, ed. Ibrāhīm Tājīr Shīrāzī, lith. Bombay 1890-1, 265). A 19th century writer, Nadīm Bārfu‘rūshī (d. 1241/1825-6), asserts that one of the main causes leading to the destruction of a kingdom was the demand for the payment of taxes when the rains failed (Mufarrī ‘al-kulūb, B.M. Or. 3499, f. 205a), from which it is to be inferred that agriculture still provided the economic basis on which the state rested.

Many writers recognise the fundamental importance of proper order in the assessment and levy of kharāḍj. The advice alleged to have been given by ‘Allābādī Tālibī to Malik al-‘Āshārī when he was appointed governor over Egypt in 368/H58-9 is frequently quoted as a model to be followed (cf. Waṣṣāfī, Tartīkh-i Waṣṣāfī, ed. Muhammad Mīhdi Iṣfahānī, lith. Bombay 1852-3, 440). This was to the effect that he should give greater attention to the development of the land than to the collection of kharāḍj, because the latter depended upon the former, and whoever demanded kharāḍj without developing the land, destroyed the country and the people. If the people complained of the heaviness of taxation, or of some natural calamity, the interruption of irrigation, misfortune, or that the land had become waterlogged or parched, their burden was to be lightened so that their affairs might recover (Nahdī al-balā‘gā, Beirut 1890-1, ii, 45. See further, A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and peasant in Persia, repr. Oxford 1969, xx ff.). Rāşīd al-Dīn Fadl Allāh, Ghāzān Khān’s waṣīr (d. 718/1318), recommends that men of wealth and those with high aspirations should be appointed over the collection of the taxes, because such persons, being themselves satisfied, would not act extortionately against the taxpayers, or at least would not be covetous in small things (Mukhtārāt-i Rāşīdī, ed. Muhammad Shāhī, Lahor 1952-5, 185), and Muhammad b. Hindūshāh Nahkībīwānī urges the need for consultation in the administration of taxes (Dastūr al-khātī, 181-2).

Land taxes and land tenure. In the early centuries the jurists attempted to fit the tax practices of the conquered territories into the framework of Islamic law (see also BAYT AL-MĀLI, II. HISTORY). In the theory, as worked out by them, there was a close connection between taxation and tenure. According to their expositions various factors were taken into account in the assessment of the land tax: the mode of conquest, which affected the tenure of the land, the geographical situation of the land, the manner of its irrigation, the crops grown, their yield, and price levels. In practice, however, local custom (which was itself also clearly influenced by most of these factors), was often the key (Khalid, 170), and, therefore, that there were wide variations from province to province and often from district to district.

In mediaeval times, although conditions were in many respects different from the early centuries, the influence of the ‘ulama‘ with the ruling classes and the population in general ensured that the legal theories would not be forgotten and made it possible to reactivate particular issues should circumstances so demand. Thus the pecuniary laws laid down by the jurists continued to have more than simply theoretical importance. The mode of conquest was, it is true, no longer of crucial importance, but the tenure of the land still affected the levy of kharāḍj. Land fell broadly into four categories: private property (milk), crown lands including the personal estates of the ruler which were not always clearly distinguished from town lands proper [see gāzīāt], and dead lands (mawsīr). In the case of private property, kharāḍj was regarded as a tax on the land or its produce. In the event of a concession being granted on private property, the kharāḍj was paid not to the state but to the concessionaire, who might or might not have been granted exemption from its payment to the state (see further below). Crown lands, the extent of which varied greatly at different times, strictly speaking did not pay kharāḍj, the whole produce belonging to the state. However, they were often conceded to individuals on temporary or life grants, in which case the holder, unless granted exemption, paid kharāḍj, which was regarded as a rent rather than a tax, and the rate of which often differed from that paid on neighbouring estates.

In the 19th century, experience showed that crown lands often tended to be left uncultivated and failed to provide the state with revenue (cf. British Parliamentary Papers 58 (1862) Persia. Report by Mr. Eastwick, Her Majesty’s Secretary of Legation, Camp near Tehran, 5 July 1861, p. 70). Accordingly they were sometimes transferred to individuals in the hope of encouraging the spread of cultivation. This was the case in the latter part of the reign of Nāṣīr al-Dīn Shāh, when, in view of the decay then prevailing in Madīṣa land, it was decided to sell them to individuals. In some cases special rates of tax were laid down (Hasan Khān Shāykh Dībābī Anṣārī, Tartīkh-i mīsāīr
Lands immobilised as wa'af for charitable purposes were frequently granted exemption from the payment of land tax and other dues. Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī (d. 672/1274), in an essay on finance written for his patron Hālāgū (or Abākā), states that kings considered it ill-omened to levy kharādī on awāf̄ and ordered their proceeds to be spent entirely on the purposes for which they had been constituted (Mādżīmaʿaʾ-ī rasāl al-tawḥīf-i Khwāṣja Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī, in Publications of the University of Tehran, 308 (1956), 34. This was first published by M. Minovi and V. Minorsky, Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī on finance, in BSOS, X(3) 1940-2). In fact, practice probably varied. Under the Ilkhanīs it seems that immunities were extended to wa'af̄ land by an extension of Mongol custom, which happened in this case to coincide with local custom.

Bāyādī is said to have reaffirmed on his accession in 694/1295 an old regulation (yāsā) of Cīnghz Khān, which exempted awāf̄ from taxation (Tārīkh-i Wazzāf, 824). Later rulers also granted immunities to wa'af̄ land. The Safawid shrine at Ardabil, for example, enjoyed exemptions and immunities from the 9th/15th century, if not before (cf. V. Minorsky, A sooyārghāl of Jahāngīr Qoyunlū, in BSOS, ix (1956-7), and London 1956/8, and London 1944-5, 104. See also H. Busse, Untersuchungen zur islamischen Kanzleiwesen, Cairo 1959, for various grants relating to wa'af̄ land). Curzon’s statement that all religious endowments were exempt from land tax under the Kādžārs (Persia and the Persian question, ii, 470) is rather too sweeping. Only those awāf̄ which had been granted exemption by a special decree were exempted, but it is probable that many awāf̄ came into this category.

A third category of land was formed by dead lands (mawd̄), which had no owner, and had fallen into disuse. In view of the close dependence of the state upon kharādī, the desirability of bringing such lands under cultivation is clear. The jurists laid down special regulations for their revival (cf. sections on ibdhat-i mawd̄ in fiqh literature). These provide for the acquisition of ownership of disused lands, and give reductions, which varied from district to district, in the amount of kharādī to which they were liable (see further Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, Tārīkh-i mubd̄jadi-i ghaḍar, ed. K. Jahn, GMS, London 1940, 333-4; cf. also 303 ff.).

The status of lands which had fallen into disuse or been abandoned (bāyāridī) but whose owners could not be deemed to have died without heirs (in which case the land became mawdī) was more shadowy. The main issue was whether such lands should pay kharādī or not. Hanafi jurists argued that since kharādī was levied according to the productivity of the land, it was due whether the owner cultivated the land or not, since by not cultivating it, the owner deprived the beneficiaries of kharādī of their revenue. Mālikīs, however, rejected this view. They held that the owner did not pay kharādī if the land was not cultivated. If, however, the reason for the land being uncultivated was that the owner lacked the means to cultivate it, the imām was entitled to lease the land to another person on a muṣūraʿ contract and to collect the tax from the owner’s share of the produce, to lease the land to a tenant and collect the kharādī from the rental, or to have the land cultivated at the expense of the public treasury and collect the tax from the owner’s share. Abū Hamīd held that if kharādī payers abandoned their lands, the imām might have them cultivated at the public expense or let them on a muḥāsā contract, the entire income from this belonging to the public treasury (see further N. P. Aghnides, Mohammedan theories of finance, Lahore 1961, 384-5).

The problem of abandoned lands was a perennial one. It is illustrated by the following incident related by Faḍl Allāh b. Rūzbihān Khūndī. He describes how Muhammad Shaybānī Khān, the Uzbeg ruler, asked the ‘ulamāʾ at his court to give a fatwa in 914/1509 on the status of certain lands in the neighbourhood of Samarkand. These lands had been abandoned by their owners for over thirty years. There was no one left in Samarkand to cultivate them on behalf of the owner. How to ensure that the country did not fall into ruin and that the land became liable to tax? They had become virtually dead lands. What, Muhammad Shaybānī asked, would be the position if someone revived them? Would ownership be established thereby (as was the case with dead lands)? One of the jurists present said that it would be difficult to give a decree annulling the ownership of those who had abandoned them, but if it was known that the owners had left the land, a decree could be given to make the cultivation of the land permissible (ibhāt-i zirāʿat). The Khān replied that this would not solve the problem which he had in mind. Kharādī land if cultivated paid kharādī. If its cultivation was abandoned, it was the duty of the governor to impose upon the owner a sum for its kharādī and to ask him why he had allowed the assets of the Muslims to be wasted by letting the land fall out of cultivation. Thus, if the land had an owner, he could be made subject to one of two rulings: either he would cultivate the land (and pay kharādī) or he would pay kharādī by estimation (bi takdir) on the land which had fallen out of cultivation. Two objects would be achieved: the land would be brought back into cultivation and it would be made liable to kharādī. By simply declaring the cultivation of the land permissible these objects would not be achieved, because in order for the cultivation of the land to be permissible, it was necessary for the right to demand rent to lapse; in other words if the owner made the land free for cultivation (mubdāh), his right to demand rent ceased, and the ruler could not make it incumbent upon him to cultivate the land or to pay kharādī. Muhammad Shaybānī Khān then explained that this object in putting the question was that the owners of the abandoned lands should be subjected to one of the two rulings mentioned above.

Finally, Faḍl Allāh b. Rūzbihān, who was also present, stated that if someone became the owner of a property by purchase, his ownership, being based on a contract, was not affected by lapse of time, even if he did not take effective possession of the property. It did not follow from the abandonment of land by reason of a journey that the cultivation of the land became free (muḥāsā). The people who had left their estates had clearly done so by force of necessity:
excessive injustice had made it impossible for them to live in their homeland, and the imposition of excessive dues by the dinām had prevented them from exercising effective ownership over their estates and so they had departed into different regions. It did not follow from the fact that they had left their estates that it was permissible for others to take possession of them (ibkhāt-i taṣarūf). Then, in order to show that lapse of time did not affect ownership he related how the Atabeg Abū Bakr Fārār Sa'd b. Zangi had been persuaded to restore to their owners estates which he had seized in Fārs (see Tārīkh-i Wazāfā, 165, for an account of this event), and advised the khan to seek conciliation with the owners of the estates in question, if they were known, so that they would return, and once they had returned, to treat them well, so that they would resume possession of their estates. In this way, the land would be cultivated, the kingdom prosperous, and the land liable to kharādī. If, however, the owners were not known, the ruler should take possession of the estates, cultivate them, reap their produce by virtue of the axiom "what is cultivated belongs to the cultivator even if he is an usurper" while purposing in his heart that he would give the owners, should they be found, the rent for their land from the public treasury. In this way also the land would be cultivated, while the rights of the owners would not be annulled or lost (Faḍl Allāh b. Rūzbībān Khūndji, Mīhmand-nāma-i Buḥārā, ed. Manūṣhīr Sutūdā, Tehran 1962, 295-9).

The state, however, clearly was not always bound by the letter of the law. Under the Ilghāns it would appear that taxes were frequently demanded from land which had fallen out of cultivation (cf. Tārīkh-i Wazāfā, 446, 631).

The rates of kharādī. The jurists were generally agreed in the early centuries that the smām could increase or decrease the rate of kharādī according to the ability of the land to pay and the taxable capacity of the land to pay and the taxable capacity of the payees. It was tacitly assumed that the temporal rulers had similar prerogatives. By the 7th/13th century a tradition seems to have evolved, perhaps deriving from the original theory of 'ushr, that the proper rate for land tax was one-tenth of the produce. Mention of this as the basic rate is found from time to time. There is also frequent reference in documents to a tax or due called 'wahr, but whether this was land tax levied at the rate of one-tenth of the produce or a special due is not clear. Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh in a letter to Ahmad Turka states that he had laid down that the people of Isfahān should pay as land tax one-tenth on their cultivated lands (apart from orchards which paid different proportions according to the kind of produce) and that he had sent officials to other provinces to make a similar assessment (Mukaddah-i Rashīdī, 374). In a letter to his son Shihāb al-Dīn, when governor of Shushtar and Ahwāz, it is again mentioned that kharādī should be taken at a rate of 10% and should be levied in kind (ibid., 721). There is nothing however in the Tārīkh-i muwābrāh-i Ghāsini to suggest that uniform rates were established over the whole country. In the late 18th century or early 19th century the rate is alleged to have been 10% (see below), and in the 19th century it was, in theory, one fifth of all agricultural produce, or its value in money. According to a report by Mr. R. F. Thomson, dated 1868, this was, as a general rule, somewhat exceeded and 25% could be taken to be the average assessment (excluding dues levied on cattle and flocks and duties exacted for provisions brought to market in the principal towns) (British Parliamentary Papers, 69 (1868), Persia). Report by Mr. Thomson, Her Majesty's Secretary of Legation, on the population, revenue, military force and trade of Persia, 250-3. Excerpts from this report are given in C. Issawi, The economic history of Iran 1200-1924, Chicago and London 1971. There was in practice at all times great variety in the rate levied in different districts and on different crops.

The law-books laid down the purposes upon which kharādī was to be expended and those who had a right to its proceeds. Control over these matters, as over the rate at which kharādī was levied, was similarly tacitly assumed to have passed to the temporal rulers. Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī states that kharādī was levied for the expenses of the kingdom (ibkhāt-i masāhīr-i fādišāhī, 31). So far as the temporal rulers expended the kharādī on the payment of the army (which, in theory, if not in practice, was for the defence of the lands of Islam) and on the officials concerned in its collection, on pensions to the religious classes and the needy, and on public and charitable works, they could be regarded as spending it on the interests of the Muslims (masāhīr-i musālimīn). Public opinion did not sanction the expenditure of reserves of kharādī on other purposes or the accumulation of reserves which, militated against long-term economic development.

Assessment and collection. Kharādī was assessed in three main ways, by masāhā, mukhāsama, and mukāšā. These methods, known in the early centuries, continued to be used down to modern times. Under the first the amount due was based on the measurement of the land. Under the second it depended upon the crop yield, while under the third the tax was compounded for a lump sum in cash or kind or both, and did not vary with the area sown or the amount of the crop. Assessment by masāhā did not, however, involve a comprehensive cadastral survey. Usually only the land sown was taken into account, which practice was sanctioned by the tradition "no kharādī on land in a bad (ruined) condition", and the tax demand was based on the average yield from good, bad, or fallow land. There was, however, a difference of opinion among the jurists on the matter of land not under cultivation. Where a part was fallow, some held that kharādī should be levied on the whole area but at half the normal rate. The issue turned on the question whether kharādī was a tax on the produce of the land or a rent for the land. If the latter, the holder of the land paid whether the land was cultivated or not, provided he was not prevented by force majeure from cultivating it. Gardens, vineyards, and date groves were assessed either according to the extent of the land sown or the number of trees on the land, the number of years it had been planted being taken into account. Irrigated crops paid a higher rate than unirrigated, and in the case of the former the rate varied with the method of irrigation. The quality of the land was also taken into account, and to meet the variety of physical conditions a number of tax schedules (waqāfī's, fīsh) were sometimes drawn up. The masāhā method of assessment was thus in fact concerned not so much with the extent of the land as with its produce. It differed from the mukhāsama system in that the tax demand did not vary in a good year or a bad year. In districts where the climate was capricious this was to the disadvantage of the taxpayer, unless he was able to accumulate reserves to tide him over a bad year. So far as the peasants were concerned, this was probably seldom the case. This may well have been
one of the reasons why assessment by masāḥa tended to be replaced by mukdāma.

This method was simpler in that it did not involve a calculation of the area under cultivation. It also had the merit of safeguarding the taxpayer in the event of partial or total crop failures—an important consideration in districts where these were of common occurrence. On the other hand, it was a disincentive to the extension and improvement of cultivation, since the heavier the crop the greater the tax. An added disadvantage was that the taxpayer could not remove the crop until the government's share had been taken, while budgeting was made difficult for the government since its revenue fluctuated and was not known until harvest time.

Valuation or ʿībra may have originated simply as an extension of masāḥa and mukdasama, the average annual value of the crop over a number of years, usually three, assessed by whatever method, being taken as the basis on which the tax was calculated. The term ʿībra is not met with after the early centuries and appears to have been replaced by hars, which, in the later centuries, seems usually to have meant not an average calculation made on the basis of three or more years, but an arbitrary valuation arrived at by the tax-collector, sometimes, but not always, after an inspecting growth or harvest time. Arbitrary valuation, in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, under the Ilkhans, and also in the 19th century, appears to have been common. The tax-collector, or his agent, would examine the crop in situ and estimate the tax due. Some were skilled in the task and made fair estimates, others did not. As the practice grew of assessing the provincial revenue at the centre and leaving its collection to the discretion of the provincial governor, who was then responsible for the remission of whatever sum remained after the deduction of provincial expenses, arbitrary valuation at the local level became increasingly common, whatever the assessment may have been according to the tax rolls drawn up at the centre (see further below).

The mukdāma method probably prevailed over other methods in the more remote districts and in tribal areas. With the extension of the škhāf [q.q.] from the 4th/10th century onwards, as more and more land became alienated from the direct control of the state, the mukdāma method became increasingly adopted. Under this system, the landlord, since he knew the area cultivated, agreed to a fixed price, which was to be obtained by taking the average annual produce of a good year, a bad year, and a medium year. This was the old tradition of ʿībra (though Nasir al-Din does not use the term). The amount in kind was then to be converted into cash at a medium rate, "neither high (dear) nor low (cheap)". He continues, "if the land is not cultivated every year or the garden does not bear fruit every year, the kharāḏi is taken at half rate [the variant "kharāḏi is not levied" reflects the conflicting views held by different schools of jurists, see above]. Every few years the lands and gardens are re-examined: if land in good condition (dhāḏān) has fallen into bad condition (kharāḏ), its kharāḏi is removed on the grounds of "no kharāḏi on (land) in a ruined condition", and if land in a ruined condition has been brought into cultivation (maʿnāʾ), it is to be treated in two ways. If it has been out of cultivation for thirty years, it is exempted from tax for three years and then for the following ten years pays half rate so that its prosperity may be firmly established and men be encouraged to develop it. If it has recently become ruined and been brought back into cultivation, this should be taken into account when fixing the kharāḏi; Similarly if land is converted into orchards or orchards are converted into ordinary agricultural land the tax demand should be according to the value of its product neither less nor more" (30-1).

In actual practice, however, in spite of what Nasir al-Din Tusi says, it is clear that assessment by masāḥa, muḥāṣama and valuation, together with muḥāḏaʿa, continued side by side under the Ilkhans and later rulers. Rashīd al-Din Faḍl Allāh alleges that valuation (hars) and muḥāṣama predominated in those provinces in which the tax was levied in cash and kind, and that Ghāzān Khān determined in 705/ 1304 to abolish these methods in certain categories of land (Rashīd al-Din Faḍl Allāh, Tārikh-i mubārak-i Ghāzānī, 267, 354). According to Wassāf, as a result of Ghāzān's reform of the kharāḏi the people were relieved from demands for extra payments when the crops were valued (taksir dar hars) and when the tax-collectors drew up the assessments and obtained the acknowledgment of the taxpayers, as well as from additional payments when the tax was demanded in advance (tafāwmuʿt-i takdāma), from excess payments extorted when the amount due for taxes assessed in kind was converted into cash (sawāʿid-i tafsīr) (see below), and from payment of the expenses and allowances of officials. They were also freed from the control and ascendency of the massaḥ and barrāz, whom he described as tyrants towards the peasants (Tārikh-i Wassāf, 386).

The various methods of assessment mentioned above were, to a greater or less extent, recognised by the jurists. Another method, based on custom, and probably in use in many districts from early times, was to take the ploughland (dhwfl, sawāḏ, škhāf) as the fiscal unit. This, in a sense, had something in common with masāḥa in that it was concerned with the area cultivated. The size of the ploughland, however, varied with the method of cultivation, the type of soil, the configuration of the land, and the pressure of the population on the land. It corresponded roughly to a single agricultural holding, and sometimes consisted of dispersed plots, and might be fragmented into smaller fractions such as halves or quarters. The amount of the tax and the dues levied on the ploughland varied. In the tax regime of the Āk Koryunlu ruler, Turan Hāsan, drawn up between the years 894/1470 and 883/1477, mention is made of dues levied on the ploughland (see W. Hinz, Das Steuer-
By whatever method the tax was normally assessed, it was paid partly in cash and partly in kind. If assessed by masahata (except in cases when the whole area, cultivated an uncultivated, was taken into consideration) or by mukadsama, both of which methods were closely concerned with the actual amount of the crop, the assessment was according to the solar year (also known as sa'i-i kharadji), which began at the vernal equinox. Mukadsama contracts, on the other hand, were usually according to the lunar year (see BAYT AL-MAL, II. HISTORY, and also Tārīkh-i Waṣṣāfī, 405). The general tendency was for the tax, when assessed by measurement, to be paid predominantly in cash. Under the mukadsama method, the tax on grain crops was usually paid in kind but on vegetables and summer crops it was converted into cash. The tax demand in a mukadsama contract frequently included some grain to be paid in kind. There was, however, great variation in practice in different districts and at different times. In districts which were not self-supporting in grain the tax, although assessed in cash and kind, was paid wholly in cash, the part assessed in kind being converted into cash at one of several prescribed rates of conversion. This was also sometimes the case in districts from which, owing to their remoteness, the removal of grain was impractical (cf. Sykes, op. cit., 3). Malcolm, writing in the early 19th century, states that according to the general rule taxes ought to be paid in cash and kind in equal proportions, but in practice the proportion varied. About the middle of the century the proportion of the total paid in kind was rather less than one-eighth but there were many local variations (see below). Some villages, where the inhabitants were poor, paid almost entirely in kind; but where the landowner was wealthy he preferred to pay in cash, thereby avoiding the interference of minor revenue officials (Malcolm, History of Persia, ii, 57). In 1844, Abbott noted that the revenue in Mazandaran was raised in money instead of money and produce as formerly, the difference being that what had formerly been collected in kind was priced and demanded in cash (F.O. 60: 108. Abbott, Journey along the shores of the Caspian, incl. in Abbott to Aberdeen, No. 8, Encampment near Tehran, 29 June 1844, also quoted in Isawi, op. cit., who refers the quotation, wrongly, to Gilan). From the point of view of the peasants, it was to their advantage to pay khardji in kind. If the tax was demanded in cash, having small reserves, or no reserves at all, they were often forced to sell their produce immediately after harvest when prices were at their lowest, in order to realise the cash to pay the tax. It was also in the government's interest to collect the tax partly in kind, because it could use the stocks of grain thus accumulated to provision its armed forces, hold grain against a rise in prices, thus providing itself with additional funds, or, perhaps more importantly, release the grain on to the market in times of shortage or famine thereby lessening the danger of bread riots and forestalling shortages artificially engineered for political purposes. Karim Kāhn Zand is alleged to have taken great care to replenish the government granaries regularly in order to ensure supplies of bread at low prices (cf. Muhammad Ḥāglich Rostam al-Ḥukamāʾ, Rostam al-

khāndān, ed. Muḥammad Muḥbīr, Tehran 1969, 421-2). In the early 19th century also, government granaries were well stocked, and those who had resided in Tehran as a result of the famine of 1247/1831-2 were fed for seven months from government stores until the new harvest came to hand (Muḥammad Taqī Ḵān al-Mulk Szībīr, Nāṣīḥa al-khaṣāṣ, ed. Dīhāngār Rām Mīkhāmī, Tehran 1958-9, i, 296; cf. also R. B. M. Bining, A journey of two years' travel in Persia, Ceylon, etc., 1857, ii, 476-7, who alleges that Fath-ʿAlī Shāh bought grain (and retailed it at ruinous prices). It was also customary for the government in the 19th century, and probably in earlier centuries also, to pay part of the salaries of its officials in kind.

So far as kharadji was assessed in cash, from the end of the 3rd/19th century, when an attempt was made to establish a unified system of accounting on the basis of the gold standard with a legal tariff for the exchange of the dirham (see BAYT AL-MAL, II. HISTORY), it was usually assessed in gold dinār or some "standard" coin. Actual payment, however, was made in silver coins. There were many different coins in circulation, sometimes of greatly debased value, and the rates of exchange for them against gold dinār or "standard" coins were subject to fluctuation. By manipulating the conversion rates to its own advantage, the government could raise or lower the amount of the tax without changing its nominal rate. In later centuries also the tax continued, for the most part, to be assessed in gold or a "standard" coin, and to be paid in some other coin (see further B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, Berlin 1968, 300 ff. for a discussion of Ilkhanid practice). In the 19th century there were still a number of coins in circulation of varying values in different parts of the country, which made for difficulty over the payment of taxes (see H. L. Rabin di Borgomale, Coins, medals and seals of the Shaḥs of Iran, 1500-1941, London 1945, 61 ff.; cf. also F.O. 60: 165 K. Abbott, Report on the commerce of the South of Persia, Trade report, Notes on the trade, manufacturers and productions of various cities and centres of Persia visited by Mr. Consul Abbott in 1849-50). Frequently the tax when assessed in kind was converted into cash by a procedure known as ṣafir. Ideally, as Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī stated, a medium price was taken, but in practice a number of rates were fixed arbitrarily and often bore little relation to prevailing prices. Raḥšād al-Dīn mentions the heavy burdens placed upon the peasants (rāḍyād wa muzmīn) by this system (Tārīkh-i mubāraḳ-i Ghāzānī, 267). It not only enabled the government, if it so wished, to raise or lower the amount of tax paid, it also provided an opportunity for the tax-collector or provincial governor to misappropriate sums of money which should rightfully have been paid into the central treasury. It also gave rise to innumerable wrangles between the central government on the one hand and the tax officials and governors on the other when their accounts were being cleared, a process which often ran for one tax year into the next. Waṣṣāfī cites numerous cases of officials who were forced to spend time and money over the clearing of their accounts during the reign of the Ilḵāns, and similar instances are frequently met with in later times. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Fūmnī mentions the case of Mirzā ʿAlāmīyān, who was for twelve years waṣār of Gīlānāt, Māzandarān, Gaskar and ʿĀstārā, and then waṣār of Ḵᵛāsīn and later waṣār of Ḵᵛārāzūn in the reign of Ṣalāḥ ad-Ībād (958-975/1552-1629). He was accused of not including in his
revenue accounts money which he was alleged to have taken from the taxpayers of Lāhīgān when converting the tax assessed in rice into cash (lāfāsūt-i tāšīr-i birāndī), and was finally made to pay this sum (Ṭārīḵ-i Gīlān, ed. Manūcbīr Sūtūda, Tehran 1970, 183 ff.).

Responsibility for the payment of taxes in general, including the land tax, was, in the early centuries, the collective responsibility of the taxpayers of a given district (see kābālā-l). They were required, as a body, to make good the tax from defaulters. This continued to be the case in practice, since so far as the tax was assessed on provinces and districts at the centre and partitioned locally among the villages and individual taxpayers, in effect those who remained had to make good the taxes of any who had left the district. Arrears were common. J. B. Fraser, writing in the early 19th century, states that there was a continual struggle between the governor of a province and his myrmidons on the one side, and villagers, dābfis (revenue collectors), and kadhkhudās on the other. Few villages paid without requisition. The giving and accepting of douceurs was common (Narrative of a journey into Khorasan in the years 1821 and 1822, London 1825, 221). The situation was probably not very different in earlier times.

If assessed in cash, or assessed in kind and converted to cash, the tax was often levied in two or more instalments. So far as it was paid in kind, the division of the crop was normally made at harvest time on the threshing floor. The responsibility for transporting the grain to government granaries was usually that of the landlord. If the land was worked by him under a crop-sharing agreement, the responsibility for the payment of kharādji was, according to the law-books, both Sunna and Shīʿī, the landlord's (cf. Abū Yūsuf, Kitāb al-kharādji, tr. E. Fagnan, Paris 1921, 137, Bahāʾ al-Dīn ʿAmīlī, Dīmons-i ʿAbbāsī, Bombay lith. 1884, 162). In practice, so far as the tax was levied on the threshing floor before the division of the crop between the landlord and the peasants, the tax liability was shared between the two parties. Ghāzān Khān laid down special regulations in 703/1304 for the payment of kharādji and the delivery of the amount owed on a periodic basis. During the winter crops. The dates when payment fell due in the garmār and the sarādīr respectively differed. The taxpayer was responsible for the transport of the tax quota to the government storehouses within a fixed period (Ṭārīḵ-i mubārak-i Ghāzānī, 264 ff.). There was, however, in the matter of the date when payment fell due and the number of instalments, a variety of practice. For example, in Kāšān, under the assessment made in 1233/1817-18 the tax due in kind in barley was collected from crown lands (khālidādāl-i dīwānī) towards the end of May (when the grain harvest had been reaped), and the tax due in cash was levied in three instalments, towards the end of June, September and January (ʿAbd al-Rahīm Dārābī, Tarīḵ-i Kāšān, ed. Irādī Afšār, Tehran 1956, 286-7). In Khorāsān at the beginning of the 19th century the revenue in cash was paid in three instalments, the first during the first month of the Persian solar year beginning on 21 March, the second four months later and the third towards the end of the tenth month. Revenue in kind and cash combined was paid in two instalments (Sykes, op. cit., 5).

Exortion by government officials over the collection of land taxes was common. Often the tax was demanded before the harvest was reaped, a practice of which Nisārān al-Mulk disapproved as leading to the ruin and dispersal of the peasants (Siyāsat-nāma, 18). In times of financial stringency and military campaigns, it was not only common to demand the taxes in advance but also to demand them several times over (cf. Tarīḵ-i Waṣṣāf, 346, 438, Tarīḵ-al-mubārak-i Ghāzānī, 267). The arbitrary exactions of government officials were, indeed, often more oppressive than the burden of taxation itself (see also below). The difficulties were, however, not all on one side. Governments and their officials were frequently extortionate, and the peasants feared that unless they countered poverty, they would be supposed to be rich and become a mark for extortion (cf. F.O. 60: 194. Sheil to Shah, n.d.). Perennial difficulties were experienced over tax collection. Arrears were common. Sometimes they were the result of a series of bad years or some natural disaster for which no remission had been granted, and sometimes the result of heavy demands made on the taxpayers; but they were also at times due to the recalcitrance of the taxpayers. There were doubtless village communities other than that of Simkān in Fārs whom Mīrzā Muḥammad Kālāntār's statement that they "were never in the habit of paying taxes" would have fitted (Rūznāma-i Mīrzā Muḥammad Kālāntār, ed. ʿAbbās Ilyābī, Tehran 1946, 20). Estates were not infrequently temporarily taken control of by the diwān until outstanding claims had been settled, while others were confiscated to the diwān. The kholīli land held by the Kāḏārs was acquired in this way (see further Landlord and Peasant, 147; see also Aghnīdes, op. cit., 389-90).

Remissions of taxation. Tradition demanded that remissions of kharādji should be granted in the event of natural disasters, such as flood, drought, and the destruction of crops by pests (see also Aghnīdes, op. cit., 389), and there is frequent mention in the chronicles of remissions and demands for remission of taxation. Waṣṣāf records that the kharādji had not been paid in Fārs in 703/1305-6 as a result of a dry year coupled with the extortion of officials. Accordingly Uḏījātū, who had succeeded in 703/1304, recalled Djamāl al-Dīn Ibārīm b. Muḥammad Shavākh al-Īslām to Shīrāz from Kīsh, whither he had retired after having been in charge of the financial administration of Fārs, to take control of affairs again. Djamāl al-Dīn gave orders for the sums outstanding for kharādji to be recorded but not to be demanded from the taxpayers, and for seed and advances to be given to the peasants (Ṭārīḵ-i Waṣṣāf, 507; cf. also 446). He died shortly afterwards, apparently in 706/1306 (ʿAbbād b. Zarkūb, Shīrāznāma, ed. Ismāʿīl Wāʿiz Ḏawākādī, 1971-2, 99, Tarīḵ-i Waṣṣāf, 446), and there is no record of the results achieved by these measures. Fath ʿAll Shāh gave remissions to the governors of Isfahān, Gīlān and Māzandarān in 1247/1831-2 on account of heavy loss of life from cholera and the severe winter of 1830-1, and a decline in silk production (Muḥammad Taḵlīsān al-Mulk Šīrīr, Nāṣīkh al-lawārḵārī, 1, 296). Despite the disastrous outbreak of silk-worm disease in Gīlān in 1864-5, the tax assessment of the province remained unchanged until 1868 when it was reduced by about 20%, though the relative decline in silk output and in the population's income had been greater (see further G. G. Silbermann, Persian constitutional revolution: the economic background, 1870-1906, unpublished Ph.D. thesis (London), 1974, 149 ff.).

Remissions were also sometimes granted as a reward for services already performed, to mark a military victory, the birth of a son, or to encourage future support. Shāhruk b. Tīmūr in a fath-nāma
issued after his defeat of Kārā Yūsuf (823/1420-1) announced the remission of one-third (du dang) of the taxes of the kingdom (māl wa mānādī-i mahrūsā) as a favour (suyūrgāh) for his subjects (ʿAbd al-Husayn Nawāʾī, Asnād wa muḥābātāt-i ʿārākh-i I Irān, Tehran 1962-3, 214). It is not clear whether this was intended to be a temporary remission or a permanent reduction. Śah ʿAbbās remitted the taxes (māl wa mānādī) of Iṣfahān for one year after his successful campaign in Khurāsān in 1007/1695 (Iskandar Mūnḫū, Ṭarīkh-i Qaṣīm wa mukdtabdt-i Ṭarīkh-i Iran, Tehran 1965, i, 587) and in 1025/1616 he is said to have remitted one month’s khandān-i diwānī (i.e. the instalment due in Ramadān) from the Shīʿīs in all provinces (ibid., ii, 895). Nādir ʿAbbās after his Indian campaign in 1151/1738-9 ordered the taxes to be remitted for three years (Mīrza Mīḥīl Aṣṭarābādī, Dānąćagāh-yi Nādirī, ed. ʿAbd Allāh Anwār, Tehran 1962-3, 334). He subsequently revoked this order (ibid., 422. Cf. also Diābīr Anṣārī, Ṭarīkh-i nisf-i ḡākān, 122).

**Charges on the land taxes.** In mediaeval Persia, as in earlier times, the main charge on the land tax and the revenues in general was the payment of the army and officials. In times of peace the tax regime tended to be milder than in times of war or when the numbers and influence of the military were increasing. Waṣṣāf’s account of Kirmān and Fārs, Kirmān in 647/1250-1 and early 7th/13th centuries illustrates how military adventures and defence affected the revenues. When the governor of Kirmān complained to the Salghurid ruler of Fārs, Saʿd b. Zangi, who had taken the province in 605/1208-9, that the revenues (ḥāṣādī) of Kirmān were not enough for the needs of the administration and the wages of the army (masālīk-i saflanat wa manādīk-ī iṣlāḥār), the latter issued a decree for an additional levy of one-tenth (furu*) of officials was in the late 6th/12th and early 7th/13th centuries.

Whereas the jurists had laid down that those who were responsible for drawing it up, half of the produce was for the administration and the military needs of the country on the other, and encouraged by ʿImād al-Dīn Mīrzā, the head of the diwān-i ināqāh, who pointed out that the ġarīnā permitted those in authority to levy sums from the rich for the defence of Islam, Saʿd b. Zangi increased the land tax and imposed a variety of new taxes upon the townspeople. Under this settlement, which was known as the Mīrathī settlement after Mīrā, Kadjars the costs of collection and administration were levied locally under the general head of tafṣawāt-i ʿamal over and above the basic tax (aṣl) and additional cesses (furu*). Under the French military adventurer appointed by the Persian government in 1907, states in a report dated 15 March 1909 that the tafṣawāt-i ʿamal was levied in the form of a percentage of the mālīyāt and varied from province to province and often exceeded the basic tax. When he was writing it was more or less fixed and where there was a surplus under this head it had to be remitted to Tehran. Under the Mongol amirs, the costs of collection and administration were levied locally under the general head of tafṣawāt-i ʿamal over and above the basic tax (aṣl) and additional cesses (furu*). Under the French military adventurer appointed by the Persian government in 1907, states in a report dated 15 March 1909 that the tafṣawāt-i ʿamal was levied in the form of a percentage of the mālīyāt and varied from province to province.

**Additional cesses.** Land taxes were not limited to the payment of the basic khandān. Numerous additional cesses (farāʾ, pl. ġarīnā, saḏār, pl. saẓārāt, sādīrīyyāt) for “occasional” purposes were added to the basic tax. Rūstam al-Hukamāʾī, writing at the end of the 18th or the beginning of the 19th century, states that the traditional rate for the basic tax was one-fifth of the produce from privately owned lands and one-third from land owned by the ruler (amādīk-i ṭāzdīkāhāt) and that in either case additional cesses (sādīrīyyāt) should not exceed one-fifth of the tax (Rūstam al-wābdīk, 172-3, 325). It is not clear whence he derived this theory. It was frequently transgressed if, indeed, it ever existed. The additional cesses in fact sometimes equalled or even exceeded the basic tax.

One of the most common of the additional cesses was the dīnār-i ‘aṣl or ‘aṣlār and under the Shiṣwālids, who collected the khandān, for whom they required special qualifications, should be paid out of the proceeds of khandān, sums for their pay were in practice commonly levied in addition as a proportion of the basic tax. They were subject to arbitrary increase or decrease, and varied from province to province, sometimes exceeding the basic tax. Naṣr al-Dīn Tūsī states that the additional cess (farāʾ) for the duties (mārīsūm) of officials had recently been raised and that a cess of 10% or 20% was levied on this account (as mālīyāt-yi dāh yāzīd dāvdīz dāvīsmīlāndu) (op. cit., 32). Under the Shiṣwālids the additional cess for the expenses of officials was known as khirmān-i hukkām. Iskandar Mūnḫū states that in ‘Īrāk (from the text it is not clear whether he means ‘Īrāk-i ‘Arab or ‘Īrāk-i ‘Aqṣām or both) an additional cess of five dinārs per one dinār had, in the course of time, been added to the basic tax for the perquisites of the tuṣūrgāh and dāvdīz (manāfīs-i tuṣūrgāhā wa dāvdīz) (Persiens im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert, Berlin 1966, 59-60), thus reducing it from 20% to 16%. Under the Kāḏjārs the costs of collection and administration were levied locally under the general head of tafṣawāt-i ʿamal over and above the basic tax (aṣl) and additional cesses (furu*). Under the French military adviser appointed by the Persian government in 1907, states in a report dated 15 March 1909 that the tafṣawāt-i ʿamal was levied in the form of a percentage of the mālīyāt and varied from province to province and often exceeded the basic tax. When he was writing it was more or less fixed and where there was a surplus under this head it had to be remitted to Tehran (Further correspondence respecting the affairs of Persia, Pt. xviii, April to June 1909, Report by M. Bizot on the financial situation in Persia, Tehran, dated 15 March 1909, incl. in No. 388, Sir George Barclay to Sir Edward Grey, Tehran, 8 April 1909). The surveyor (massūz), like the qāmā-i khandān, received his pay from the proceeds of the khandān, according to the theory of the jurists, but in the course of time duties for the surveyors also were levied in addition to the khandān. Ghānrā Khān, as stated above, attempted to do away with the need for the surveyor and the valuer, but his efforts were only temporarily, if at all, successful. In a document dated 904/1498-9 for a suyūrgāh, the grantee is given exemption from the payment of the due for measurement and valuation (rasm al-bāz wa masūz) (Landlord and peasant, 103).

According to the Šāfawī manual, the Dāṣūrīt, a small sum was levied as a due for the surveyor (massūz) of Iṣfahān (M. T. Dāndīshpāzhūhī, Dāṣūrīt al-mulūk-i Mīrzā Rașīdī wa taḥīrat al-mulūk-i Mīrzā Samīrī, in Rev. de la fac. Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV
Malcolm states that the sum derived from ṣādir had been calculated at two-fifths of the fixed revenue (i.e. double the rate mentioned by Rustam al-Ḥukmānī), and ought to have been levied according to definite rules, each person paying in the same proportion as he paid the basic tax. But the governors of provinces, he alleges, usually exercised an arbitrary discretion in collecting the ṣādir. It bore most heavily on “the proprietors of lands and citizens” (History of Persia, ii, 342-3). Once an additional cess was added for whatever purpose, the tendency was for it to become in due course part of the “fixed” tax (cf. Landlord and peasant, 144-5). Fraser relates that not long before his visit to Persia in 1821-2 various additional charges, which had been imposed to make good the deficiency of the revenue, had been compounded for a figure of 10% of the produce and added to the basic rate, which was also 10%, so that the regular government dues, when he was writing, were one-fifth of the produce. The government, he alleges, had kept ill-faith over the matter and ṣādirī were still levied in capricious and arbitrary forms (Narrative of a journey into Khorasan, 211). Thomson reported in 1868 that “It is impossible to discover what people really do pay in excess of the fixed assessment. Some pretence is made to the amount of tax equal to the legal assessments, and there does not appear to be any reason for supposing that this is an exaggeration” (Report on Persia, op. cit., 254-5. Cf. also Sykes, op. cit., 4 ff.).

The term ṣādirī covered not only additional cesses assessed in the same way as the basic tax (ṣāl-i māl), i.e. on the produce or ploughland, but also extraordinary or “occasional” requisitions made on the occasion of the progress of the ruler of a governor through the country, or to meet the expenses of a military expedition, or for some other purpose (cf. J. Morier, Journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor, to Constantinople in the years 1808 and 1809, London 1818, 237, and Malcolm, op. cit., ii, 342). Such reliefs also tended to become part of the fixed revenue.

Pasture taxes and taxes on flocks and herds. In addition to the additional cesses and “occasional” requisitions, there were many other taxes and duties which those who lived on the land were required to pay. Some of these were known in the early centuries; many more were added in Ilkhan times and continued to be levied thereafter. They included cattle and sheep taxes, pasture taxes, poll-taxes, dues for officials other than those specifically concerned with revenue collection, together with a great variety of other dues and services. Although they were not paid only by those living on the land, yet since the latter formed the main body of taxpayers, it was upon them that these levies bore most heavily.

Pasture taxes and taxes on flocks and herds (mardī, mawdshi, mawdsh), in contradistinction to the land tax, appear to have been paid mainly in cash. With the increase of the Mongol conquest of the 13th century a poll-tax (diżya), sanctioned by Islamic law and levied on dhimmīs, but like the diżya they implied an element of subjection. ‘Abd al-Razzāk records the levy of a hearth tax by Abū Sa‘īd in 839/1434-5 and 874/1469 (Mafā‘ī al-Sā‘ādayn, ed. Muhammad Shafī‘ī, Lahore, ii, 1087, 1410). In the 19th century a poll-tax of one kran was exacted from each man over 18 years of age. The inhabitants of towns did not pay this tax (Report by Mr. Thomson, op. cit., 255). In some villages, however, sarāna was exacted from the age of fourteen (Ṭārīḵ-i Kāḡān, 91).

Djuwaynī, describing the organisation of the Mongol horde, mentions certain contributions to which they were liable, including various dues (sauridād), sums for the maintenance of travellers (ikhrddjat), the furnishing of mounts (wādaḥ), and provisions (ulsāfī) (Ṭārīḵ-i Djuhāngūshā, ed. Muhammad Kāzwīnī, GMS, London/Leyden 1922, i, 22).

With the spread of the Mongol conquests, these contributions and many others were laid upon the conquered population (see also below). Rāshīd al-Dīn mentions various levies made for the provisions of Mongol officials and the establishments of the Mongol princes and princesses—sādān (provisions for travellers), sāfā, awfā, šewān, and tārīḵ, among others—which he alleges were abolished under
Ghazan’s reforms (Tāriḵ-i mubāraḵ-i Ghāzānī, 255).

Uldjātu, on his accession, announced his intention of codifying Ghazān’s policy and forbade the demand of irregular dues (Abū ‘l-Kāsim ‘Abd Allāh b. Muhammad al-Kāshāni, Tāriḵ-i Uldjātu, ed. M. Hambly, Tehran 1969, 96). In fact, however, similar levies continued to be made for the ruling classes, and large numbers of different dues and services were mentioned in documents granting tuyūls and swayyārgāhs in the 13th/14th century and later (see further Landlord and peasant, Land and H. Busse, Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiewesen. See also documents in T. M. Musevi, Orta ēr Āstābājan tariḵhind dair Fars ādānd yastīrmīnd snēdelār, Baku 1956, and idem, Bakl tariḵhind dair ēr ēr snēdelār, Baku 1967).

One of the most grievous levies was swayyārdāt (purveyance), claimed not only by the officials known as mihmandārs, who conducted foreign envosys through the countryside, but also by all great men or messengers travelling on behalf of the ruler. This first reached extortionate proportions under the Ikhāns (cf. Tāriḵ-i mubāraḵ-i Ghāzānī, 270 ff.), and continued to be demanded under later rulers. Clavijo described its levy in the time of Timūr (Embassy to Tamerlane, ed. G. le Strange, London 1933, 160). Abel Pinçon, writing ca. 1655, mentions the ill-treatment of peasants belonging to ambassadors, who were conducted through the country by soldiers furnished by the shah (Antony Sherley, His Persian adventure, ed. E. D. Ross, London 1933, 166). Under the Kadjars a similar system existed and provisions by way of swayyārdāt were extorted from the private stores of the villages. “The villager”, wrote Morier, “groans under the oppression, but in vain shrinks from it; every argument of its poverty is answered, if by nothing else, at least by the bastinado” (Journey through Persia, 37. Cf. also Fraser, Narrative of a journey into Khurasan, 88, 113, 115).

The abolition of swayyārdāt was announced in the official gazette on 21 February 1851 except for soldiers on the march (F.O. 60: 158. Shell to Palmerston, No. 29, Tehran, 21 February 1851), but there is no reason to think that this practice was completely eradicated. The abolition, however, was attended by violence and oppression. Mubāqāls were the chief offenders. Governors and other functionaries travelling to and from their posts were also a scourge to the country (F.O. 60: 194. Shell to Shah, n.d.).

The tax assessment and the levy of troops. The provision of troops, so far as this was connected with the grant of ḳẖādās and tuyūls, was closely connected with the assessment of the land tax. In 1851, under measures introduced by Mirzā Taḵī Amīr Niẓām, Nāṣir al-Dīn’s first minister, this connection became even closer. The basis of Mirzā Taḵī Khān’s reform was that a certain quota of soldiers or government servants (nauhar-i dwāla) should be provided under the group assessment (baṣīla) of each village, district or tribe, proportionate to the amount of its revenue assessment. The men served in theory for six months of the year and returned to their villages for the other six months. Their pay for this latter period was a charge on the village, as also was the small allowance paid to their families while they were away on service (Abū `l-Ḥāshām Mustawfi, Ṣarḥ-i sindāq-i mān, Tehran 1945-6, 1, 91-2). A decree issued in 1307/1889-90 laid down that one man per 180 male Muslims in each village was to be taken for military service and 150 ṭūmāns for every 180 non-Muslims, but this was probably never fully operative (see further Landlord and peasant, 168 ff.). According to the report on the Persian army dated 1900, quoted above, nominally for every 12-20 tūmān of the assessment one recruit was to be provided. Ṣayyids, sayyiḍ, ṣulāmā, the inhabitants of towns, and peasants on crown lands were exempted. In practice, however, recruitment was fixed in an arbitrary fashion. A village of 500 might furnish the same quota as one with only 50, while a village whose revenue might have declined might be required to provide the same number of men as when its revenue had been much greater (Report on the Persian army, op. cit., 97).

Assignments on the land taxes: ḳẖādās, swayyārgāhs and tuyūls. The jurists in the early centuries had sanctioned the practice of making assignments on the ḳẖādāj. Naṣr al-Dīn Ṭūṣ had, perhaps, such assignments in mind when he states that there were people whose ḳẖārāj had been remitted and others to whom a specific sum was allotted as a pension (ṣādār) or for other expenses and put against their ḳẖārāj. These privileges, he asserts, could be transmitted by sale and inheritance (op. cit., 31), though it is not clear what exactly he meant by “sale” in this connection. Al-ʿUmarī also states that he had been informed that pensions (ṣādār), whether in the form of money or villages, remained, like landed property (mīl wa ṣuwail), in the hands of the brothers of the last holder, who could dispose of them by sale or gift, or constitute them into wakf, as he pleased (Des mongolische Weltreich, ed. K. Lech, Wiesbaden 1968, Ar. text, 96).

The practice of assigning the fiscal rights of the state to the military as ḳẖādās [q.v., which became common from the 4th/10th century onwards, was, to some extent, an extension of the earlier assignments on ḳẖārāj. From about the 10th/14th century there was a change in terminology, and the term ḳẖādā was tended to be restricted to land grants made to soldiers (cf. the grants made by Ghāzān, Tāriḵ-i mubāraḵ-i Ghāzānī, 303 ff.), though it was also used from time to time in other senses. The beneficiaries had no authority over the peasants except to see that they cultivated their lands or their villages and to collect their rents (mīlām) from them if they were remiss. The local body (nawwār) or the holder, who might have declined was still required to provide the report on the Persian army dated 1900, quoted above, as one with only 50, while a village whose revenue might have declined might be required to provide the same number of men as when its revenue had been much greater (Report on the Persian army, op. cit., 97).

In the 9th/14th century the term swayyārgāh came to be used for other aspects of the institution formerly designated by the term ḳẖādās, and was itself replaced in the 9th/15th century by the term tuyūl so far as the institution designated earlier by the “provincial” ḳẖādā was concerned (see further I. P. Petrushevsky, K’istorii instituta soyurgala in Soveetskoe Vostokose- denie, vi (1949). The grants of swayyārgāhs by Timūr would appear to have been very much like the earlier “provincial” ḳẖādās. In post-Timūrid times, however, the term swayyārgāh for the most part designated a grant of immunity, often hereditary, from the payment of taxation, and frequently, though not by any means always, granted to members of the religious classes. If the grantee held land the grant might include not only immunity from the payment of taxation, but also the right to receive the taxes from the local population and sometimes to exercise rights of jurisdiction. Swayyārgāhs were also attached to institutions. Thus, Shāh Sulṭān Husayn (1205-3/
694-1722) constituted six hamlets (mazra'a) in Bara'an into a wafrf for the Sultani madrasa in Isfahan and granted their revenues (māl wa ḡāḥāt wa ḡāhrād) as a permanent suyūrgāl to the administration of the madrasa. No drafts for taxes or other sums (māl wa ḡāḥāt wa sā'ī ḡīḥāt) were to be made on those hamlets or their peasants on any account (‘Abd al-Husayn Sipinta, Tārīḵ-i awāfī-i Isfahan, Isfahan 1967, 225).

Tuyūls, on the other hand, were primarily temporary grants in return for services. They were often in practice, and sometimes in name, hereditary. In theory, however, they had to be re-granted on the accession of a new ruler. For example in Şafawid times, when the empire was divided into directly administered land known as ḡāṣa (see mülk) and indirectly administered land known as māmilāt, the taxes, including the land tax, were collected by the provincial governor or wuzūdīl and retained by him for provincial and other expenses. One of the crucial differences between ḡāṣa and māmilāt was that tuyūls were granted on the latter but not normally on the former. “Abd al-Fattāḥ Fūmīn quotes Mirzā ʿAlāmiyān as saying, “in ḡāṣa districts (dar uṣūl-i ḡāṣa) the existence of a tuyūl has no meaning” (Tārīḵ-i Gīlān, 232). This statement, however, does not apply throughout the Şafawid period. The tuyūl granted to Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Bāṭil (see below) was on ḡāṣa land.

Shaḥ ‘Abbas in 1049/1631 appointed Burḥān al-Dīn Ḥālīfā of the district of Dīzmar in succession to his father and allotted to him, as had been allotted to his father, 34 tāmānān 7938 Tābrīzī dinārs on account of taxes (māl wa ḡāḥāt wa ḡāhrād) of Dīzmar as his ṭuyūl and suyūrgāl from the date of the death of his father. The hadhandūs and peasants (raṣūyā) of Dīzmar were to recognise him as the holder of the suyūrgāl and their tuyūlādār and to pay to him their taxes year by year and to refer to him their affairs, apart from cases of murder (siwā-yi ṣāfiyyā-i ḡān). The Şūfs (i.e. the Kiziλbāḏi) of Dīzmar and Uṣūlīs were to serve him as their commander and some of his followers (7 bi ġār wa yāsāḵ) as they had served his father. The governors (hukkām), dārīqās, tuyūlādārs, and tax-collectors (ummālā) of ʿAḏharbāyjān in general and Dīzmar in particular were not to interfere in any way in his suyūrgāl or tuyūl or to make any drafts or allocations on account of expenses (ṭūrgāḏā or dūs), in particular the dues of the dārīqā, the waqīʿ, or the ḡālā, etc., which according to the decree of the late sultan (Tahmāsp) were not levied on the suyūrgāls of the Şūfs (Sarhang Bāyburdī, Tārīḵ-i Arābārān, Tehran 1962, 160).

In the case of most tuyūls and some suyūrgāls the grantee was required to perform certain services or to provide military forces. For example Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Bāṭil was ordered by ‘Abbas to provide 300 men from Bāf and Yazd to serve as Attendants in the Khāṣa administration and to accompany the royal train on military expeditions. He collected 300 ṭuqfālās from the aforementioned places and returned with them to the capital. Šāh ʿAbbās then ordered Bāf, Yazd, Sar Yazd, Fāhrādī (in the Yazd district), some of the districts of Kirmān, districts in the desert regions (māfāsā), Ḍandak-i Nāwḵūt and elsewhere to be his tuyūl, and he also appointed suyūrgāls for his children. Fakhr al-Dīn attained freedom of action and authority in those regions and spread justice among the people (Muḥammad Muḥiḍ, Dīmāsi-i Muḥṣīḍ, ed. ʿIrāqi ʿAjṣār, Tehran 1965, iii, 270). ‘Abbas later on established a tax on grain (māl wa ḡāḥāt wa ḡāhrād) to Amir Bāyānūr Sulṭān, the governor of Karadžā Dāgū, in 1113/1702 allotting to him the sum of 6 tāmānān 3,063 dinārs from the taxes (māl wa ḡāḥāt wa ḡāhrād) of the Dīzmar district. After his death this was to pass to his son on condition that he provided seven men for the shah’s service (bi ġār wa yāsāḵ-i ḡāh).

The headman and peasants of Dīzmar were to remit the (māl wa ḡāḥāt wa ḡāhrād) and government dues to the grantee (A suyūrgāl of Jahāngīr Aḡ-葯ymānī, 158-60). ‘Nādir ʿShāh similarly granted a tuyūl in 1156/1743 to Sulṭān Muḥammad Beg, the ḍarbūšt, on one of the villages of Burḵwār, which was his private property, so that it should be free of dayān drafts (dayānsādāt-i dāndānī) and he should expend its revenues on his livelihood and perform whatever was demanded by way of service (lāsudām-i ʿawkār wa ḡān-sipār) (B.M., Or. 4935, No. 27).

The assumption appears to have been made that the obligation to service was a permanent one and that the tuyūl would therefore also be permanent, and it was, in fact, frequently re-granted to the original holder’s sons and descendants. The following example illustrates this. Muḥammad Mirzā (later Muḥammad ʿShāh), when governor of ʿAḏharbāyjān, granted a tuyūl to Ṣajjādī Dājamān, holding in 1223/1807, allocating to him the taxes of Nūkūdūdī, in the district of Ahar, which was assessed at a lump sum of 15 ḵārāwds of rice, as his permanent tuyūl just as it had been granted by ‘Abbas Mirzā in former years to his late father, Ḥusayn Sulṭān, so that he should year by year collect the dayān taxes (muʿtaṣarādāt-i ḍarbūšt-i dāndānī) of that village, expend them on his expenses and perform what was demanded of him by way of service (bi lāsudām-i ʿawkār-ва ḡān-sipār) (Tārīḵ-i Arābārān, 260).

The degree to which a district on which or in which a tuyūl had been granted was removed from the control of the central government varied. In 1101/1691 Muḥammad ʿShāh’s envoy, ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Fūmīn quotes Mirzā ʿAlāmiyān as saying, “in ḡāṣa districts (dar uṣūl-i ḡāṣa) the existence of a tuyūl has no meaning” (Tārīḵ-i Gīlān, 232). This statement, however, does not apply throughout the Şafawid period. The tuyūl granted to an individual on his own land, the land and its taxes were removed from the control of the central or provincial government. For example, a farman dated 1252/1836 from Muḥammad ʿShāh granted to Hasan Khān Bāyburdī Karadžā Dāghī as a tuyūl the village of Razīn in the district of Ahar, which was his own estate, and gave him its taxes, in cash and kind, as pay, which he was to collect every year and spend on his living expenses. The farman commands Karahmān Mirzā, the governor of ʿAḏharbāyjān, to hand the village over to Hasan Khān as his tuyūl and to consider it immune from the entry of officials (Tārīḵ-i Arābārān, 264). Some years later in 1272/1856 Nāṣīr al-Dīn ʿShāh issued a farman to the commander-in-chief (sarār-i kull), ʿArż Khān, stating that the 184 tāmānān 7300 dinārs in cash and 47 ḵārāwds and 50 mans of grain (diṣn) as wages (mawāqūf wa mustarri) had been granted to Hasan Khān Bāyburdī Karadžā Dāghī on account of the taxes of Bohol and his other estates (māmilāt) and debated against the revenue of ʿAḏharbāyjān in the assessment (dayānsādāt-i dāndānī). Since Hasan Khān had
been appointed to serve in Fars, 'Aziz Khan was to order his tuyuls to be paid (wd gudhdr namuda) to him as before and to forbid anyone to interfere in them (Tārīkh-i Arābārān, 268).

The amount of land or its revenue alienated from the crown as tuyuls varied. Rawlinson, writing about 1838, states that it was calculated that about one-fifth of the whole land revenue of Persia was then alienated from the crown (Notes on a journey from Tabriz through Persian Kurdistan to the ruins of Takhhtī-Soleimān, in JRGS (1841), 5, n).

Apart from suyurghāls and tuyuls, grants known as hamasāla were also common. These were allocations on the revenue of specific villages or districts, according to which the taxpayers paid their taxes, up to the amount stipulated, to the holder of the hamasāla instead of to the government tax-collector. Since the holders were usually military men or government officials, they were not usually resident in the district on which their hamasāla was allotted. It was perhaps for this reason that the local people were sometimes required to certify their consent to the grant of pay (hamasāla) on the revenues of their village. A firmān from Shāh Šulṭān Husayn dated 1122/1710 states that Pīr Beg b. Kalb 'All Beg, the deputy (nābi) of Naṣīf Kūl Beg Yūzbāshī Bāyburdī, who claimed that his wages (mauskūlā) were paid by draft, part of which was paid by the people of Almān and Bohol (both near Ahar) out of their taxes (māl wa sīyāhā), had asked that these sums should be paid as his hamasāla in accordance with the certificate (ridānmāla) sealed by a group of the people of those villages. The firmān orders this to be done with the approval of the department (sarkār) of the kūrīs (Tārīkh-i Arābārān, 251; text also in Kāvīm Makāmī, Yīk wa wānī jāhīd sandād-i tārīkhī, Tehran 1969, 74-5).

Two earlier firmāns issued by Shāh Šulṭān Husayn in respect of Pīr Beg also concern the payment of his hamasāla. The first dated Shawwāl 1123/1702 states that the peasants (ra'āyā) of Usnūr in the district of Kandāvān of Karāhūrūd were to pay, according to the assessment of the register of the kūrīs, 6 tumāns annually on account of the annual grant of the kūrīs. The sum due to Pīr Beg from this was in arrears. His presence (on duty) having been testified to and confirmed by the kūrībāghī, his pay was to be made available. The second document, dated Muḥarram 1144/1720 orders the peasants (ra'āyā) of the districts mentioned on the back of the document to pay, according to the statement and assessment of the kūrī register, 1,466 dinārs in cash and 3 kharĀds and 50 manās in grain, according to their individual assessments, in respect of the annual wages (mauskūlā-i hamasāla) of Pīr Beg, this sum being included in the total sum of 36,000 tumāns odd (due to the kūrīs) (Kāvīm Makāmī, op. cit., 63-4).

Under the Ilḵāns, personal immunities, known as tarkhdn, were granted to Mongol princes and princesses, and also to members of the religious classes and scribes (cf. Djuwayni, i, 27-8 for the supposed origin of these grants). The historian Waṣṣāf claims to have held such an immunity, though it did not, in fact, protect him from the extortions of the tax-collectors (Tārīkh-i Waṣṣāf, 631). It is possible that the hereditary grants of immunity made to the religious classes and others as suyurghāls (see above) developed out of the tarkhdn.

The grants known as musāfī and musaylamā were also personal immunities. So far as the persons to whom they were granted held land, the immunity included, presumably, immunity from the payment of kharāḏj. Such grants are met with in the early centuries and continued to be made down to modern times.

So far as the tuyul was simply a device for the payment of salary the tendency was, according to Tavernier, for the dastarkhāna to allocate the sums due to an official on different places in small sums so that it was uneconomical for the recipient to collect them in person and tašāfīs would buy the drafts at a discount and collect them together making a great profit (Voyages en Perse, Geneva 1790, 243-50). Chardin, however, states that ‘Abbās II had reformed this practice (v, 422). Under the Kāḏārs such grants were usually made as block grants and the tuyulādār would, as Sheil wrote in 1854, “by some means not very intelligible” make himself the temporary owner of the land to the exclusion of the real proprietor. Almost everyone holding a certain position at court, from the prime minister downwards was, he states, a tuyulādār (F.O. 60: 194, Sheil to the Shah, n.d.).

Drafts on the revenue. An even more harmful practice than the alienation of the fiscal rights of the state in the form of tāhās and tuyuls was the practice of writing drafts on the revenue. This also arose because of the difficulties experienced in revenue collection and tended to reach high proportions in periods of financial stringency. It first became common under the Bāyids and more especially under the Ilḵāns (cf. Tārīkh-i mubārak-i Ghdzdānī, 244). The practice was highly detrimental to agricultural prosperity and to the wellbeing of the cultivators, who could never be certain that new demands for sums of money or supplies of grain and other crops would not be made upon them. Not infrequently the drafts made on the revenue exceeded the income. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAlī Falak ʿAḏ-ḏrī Tibrīzī in his handbook on financial administration, the Saʿādat-nāma, written during the reign of Gḥāzān Kḥān or Ulījāyūṭī, describes how drafts for salaries and other purposes were drawn on the revenue, and states that drafts in favour of the ruler, the princes, the princes, and the amirs had priority in that order on available funds (Mirkamal Nabipur, Die beiden persischen Leitfaden des Falak ʿAḏ-ḏrī Tibrīzī über das staatliche Rech- nungswesen im 14. Jahrhundert, Göttingen 1973, Persian text, 52b).

Gḥāzān Kḥān attempted to lessen the evils of the practice. He prohibited the indiscriminate writing of drafts by the officials of the central government and forbade its practice altogether by provincial officials. He appointed a bākī to be in charge of each province in the supreme diwān and made him responsible for writing drafts on that province, village by village, in accordance with the assessment (ḥānān). These measures were only partially successful. It was found that the village headmen continued to levy more than they ought from the taxpayers. The next step was to require them to send detailed lists of the liabilities of each taxpayer to the diwān so that the taxpayer would know what he was supposed to pay, and the headmen could not make demands on them. These names were not entered in the registers (ībād., 253 ff., and cf. Landlord and peasant, 82 ff.).

Under the Ṣafawīds and Kāḏārs it was also common practice to write drafts on the revenue for the salaries of officials, and for pensions and government debts. Under Muḥammad Shāh (1834-48) the issue of bārās or bills on the provincial treasuries in payment of his army, servants and other creditors exceeded tenfold the amount of the revenue. Their value was thus merely nominal, and none but a favoured few,
or those who bribed highly, actually received payment. Sheil, writing in 1846, states that scarcely any of the holders of drafts drawn on their respective provinces. The full amount was then afterwards charged in their accounts with the government although perhaps only a fifth or a tenth might have been really paid (P.O. 60: 125). Sheil to Palmerston, No. 177, Tehran, 20 November 1846. See also Lady Sheil, *Glimpses of life and manners in Persia*, London 1856, 386-7). This state of affairs was, in some respects reminiscent of that which prevailed under the Ilkhānids prior to Ghiyāth Khān (cf. *Tārīkh-i munbarak-i Ghāzīnī and Tārīkh-i Wāṣṣāf*).

Revenue farming. Another practice which closely affected the collection of kharāḍj was that of revenue farming. Partly because of the frequent shortage of funds and partly because of the perennial difficulties experienced over the collection of taxes governments frequently had recourse to this practice. The revenue farm (see damān), which might be for a single tax such as kharāḍj, or for all the taxes of a district or province, had some outward resemblance to the mufradta'a contract. In fact, however, it was something different. The latter in the early centuries was for the most part made with the local landowner or tribal leader, who became responsible for the payment of the taxes, apportioned them among the local peasants, collected them and paid them to the government. The taxfarmer, on the other hand, contracted to pay annually to the state, for a stipulated period, a certain sum of money for a specific tax, or all the taxes, of a district or province, which sum he recovered from the local farmers, and is given immunity from interference. He is forbidden to impose new dues or to take more than the customary amount from the taxpayers, while the diwān is enjoined not to make drafts in excess of what is laid down or to send tax-collectors to the province (*Die beiden persischen Leitfäden*, I. 56a. Cf. also Nafṣī's al-funūn for a specimen taslim-nāma, I. 312-13).

Expenses for the post (yām), sūlāf and ulāq were allowed against the sums due from the tax-farmers. The fact that the establishments of the Mongol princes, princesses and amirs and the ortāšaks (trading establishments attached to the court) also made frequent and unauthorised demands on the peasants for provisions, fodder, and animals complicated the system (cf. *Tārīkh-i munbarak-i Ghāzīnī and Tārīkh-i Wāṣṣāf*). In theory a trial balance could be struck at any moment, but the checking of the tax-farmers' accounts was often a lengthy business, as the numerous references to the prolonged investigation of their accounts show (see especially *Tārīkh-i Wāṣṣāf*).

Although money may often have changed hands at the time of the award of a contract, it appears to have been unusual for payments of the amount due from a farm to have been made in advance. Wāṣṣāf records that the Shaykh al-Islām Dīmāl al-Dīn Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad, who received a muhradta'a contract for the indāy and daīlay of Fārs for four years from 692/1292-3 for 1,000 tāmāns less 114 tāmāns expenses (kharāḍj) allowed him per annum, paid the money due for one year in advance together with various presents for the Ilkhān, the princesses, and amirs so that "no financial demands would be made on the poor peasants nor would the burden of the coming and going of iktā' be laid upon them" (*Tārīkh-i Wāṣṣāf*, 168). This was, to judge from Wāṣṣāf's account, probably an exceptional case.

In the early years of Ilkhān rule many of the outlying provinces were administered by the local Saldjuk rulers of Rūm, ʿHz al-Dīn Kay Kāhās and Rūkūn al-Dīn Kilīdī Asrlān and their successors, who acted as governors on behalf of the Ilkhānids, appear to have held their governments, nominally at least, on a muhradta'a tenure (cf. Muḥammad Musāmarat al-akhbār, ed. Osman Tura, Ankara 1944, 62). Kīrmand, after paying tribute for some years, was finally fully incorporated into the Ilkhān empire under Djalāl al-Dīn Suyūrgāmtuṣ, the Kuthluq Khiyānī, who succeeded to the government of Kīrmand in 681/1282. He farmed all the taxes of Kīrmand for 600,000 dinār-i sā-i rādīj. He was allowed as regular expenses (ikhtārādi jī-i muharīrāt) 390,000 dinārs. This sum was broken down as follows:

- 100,000 dinārs for his personal expenses as governor,
- 120,000 dinārs for the wages of the army, 10,000 dinārs for guards (qāba surūl), 10,000 dinārs, and the repair of fortresses, city walls, and the digging of diwānī handān, 30,000 dinārs for pensions (iṣırdārāt), 90,000 dinārs for provisions (ṣusūn), 10,000 dinārs for the post (yām), 10,000 dinārs for provisions (ḥawājī) and bahva (ord. = "wine"), 10,000 dinārs for the wages of the officials of the diwān (Nisīr al-Dīn Muḥṣīl, Simī al-ʿulā, ed. ʿAbbās Ibbāl, Tehran 1939-57).

Fārs had a varied fiscal history in the second half of the 7th/13th century. In 662/1263, on the death of the Musafarid Suldjukshāh, with the succession of Abīḥā Khāṭūn, the daughter of Saʿd b. Abū Bakr, who was married to Tāsh Mangū, Hūlāqū's son, it came under direct Mongol rule. The Mongols were unable to establish an effective administration, and some three years later, in 665/1266-7, after an abortive rising led by Sḥarāl al-Dīn Ibrāhīm, the kāk al-badīt of Fārs, a ḫūṭūk came to Shīrāz to collect the taxes. He was unable to accomplish his task and in 667/ 1268-9 Abākā sent Inkiyānī to Fārs as governor. He restored order and established an administration. The taxes were collected and the province prospered (*Tārīkh-i Wāṣṣāf*, 193). Intrigues led to his dismissal and he was succeeded by Sungūndjak Noyān in 670/1271. After investigating the accounts of the province, Sungūndjak concluded muhradta'a contracts for the districts of Fārs with the local leaders (askāb wa muhrad-i buḥāh) from the beginning of the kharāḍjī year 671/1272-3 on condition that each one should rule.
independently in his own district and meet whatever requisitions were made on the revenue of the district by the dishân (ibid., 195). Washâd states that although there were abundant surpluses under these contracts, yet owing to the numerous dues and requisitions made upon the revenues and the envy and strife prevailing among the local leaders, the revenue was not paid, the holders of drafts were unable to collect their money, the peasants were ruined, and the country lost its prosperity. Finally, in 676/1277-8 Şhâms al-Dîn Ahmad b. Malikî, a rich merchant with extensive trade connections with the East and the west, accepted a muhâsâlât contract for the whole of Fârs. Because of the failure of the local leaders (arbâb-i bulânî) to pay the sums due to him, all his reserves were rapidly dissipated in this venture (ibid., 197-8). In 678/1279-80 Sughundîakî was again sent to Fârs by Abâl-şâdîk to investigate the accounts and collect the revenue (ibid., 204). He abrogated the muhâsâlât contracts for the districts, demanded arrears and gave his ważir Khâdiya Nizâm al-Dîn charge of all the districts (bulânî). However, as a result of the intrigues of rival factions, in which some of the revenue farmers were also involved, Sughundîakî and Nizâm al-Dîn fell from favour.

Meanwhile Abâl-şâdîk died (680/1281) (ibid., 206-8). The next two years were a period of confusion. A Mongol vizier, Bulûhghân, was sent as a provincial revenue official (bâsâh) to Fârs, and during the next year accumulated much wealth. In or about 682/1283-4 Abîshâ, Tâsh Mangî’s wife, was appointed governor by Tegâdîr (ibid., 210-11). Partly, perhaps mainly, because of three years of drought and famine in which over 100,000 people were said to have died (ibid., 212, 217-18), little revenue reached the central government during her governorship. She was accordingly summoned to Tabrîz; she and her supporters after examination agreed to pay the arrears of taxation and various other sums. She died, however, almost immediately (685/1286-7) (ibid., 222). A yałîgh was then issued to the governors of Fârs, who had come to Tabrîz with Abîshâ, on their promising to pay 5,000,000 gold dinârs on account of arrears for several years, and they set out with a number of Mongol officials and amîrs for Fârs to collect the arrears. Although the governors, tax-collectors and wealthy people were mercilessly mulcted, it proved impossible to collect the full sum and the Ilhân was forced to reach a compromise with the governors of Fârs (ibid., 224-5).

Fârs may have been an extreme case. But it seems likely that the revenue farmers all over the empire committed abuses. Raşûld al-Dîn states that they extracted double the amount for which they contracted but paid nothing into the treasury (Târîkh-i mubârak-i Khânî, 258). Ghâzân Khan, who sought to bring the financial administration of the empire under stricter control, considerably decreased revenue farming. It nevertheless continued on a modified scale. Bâyât in Khûzistân, for example, was farmed to the local leaders for a fixed sum which was to be used for the salaries of amîrs of four hundred provided that they demanded their dues at harvest time (Mubâhâtâdî-RAshûldî, 179).

Under the Kâdîrs, revenue farming again became widespread. Abâbâ Mirzâ, when governor of Afgânîshân, is said to have made some progress in abolishing the practice and fixing the revenues of the province on a systematic scale and enforcing their collection (J. B. Fraser, Travels in Koordistan, London 1840, i, 8, and cf. Morier, Second journey through Persia, 240-1), but his reforms were limited and short-lived, and towards the end of the reign of Fâth ‘Alî Shâh and under his successors revenue farming was again common. It was of two kinds. The first resembled the early Islamic muhâsâlât contract, according to which powerful landowners farmed the duty of their estates to prevent the vexatious interference of the subordinate officials of the revenue (cf. Malcolm, ii, 338). The second, and more pernicious, was the system by which governors bid for their districts.

The tax administration: central government records. At the level of the central government, land revenue matters went through the department known as the dishân al-ṣâfâ’î, which was part of the supreme dishân (g.v.). Its elaborate procedure concerned with the assessment, collection and expenditure of the taxes was transmitted to posterity by the mustawfîs (g.v.). However, because of the widespread practice of farming the revenue, of the alienation of land from the control of the central government as ûlûqûs, iływûs, and suyûrgûs, and their expenditure (see below). The practical steps needed to keep the assessments up to date were seldom taken.

The two handbooks by ‘Âlâ-yi Tabrîzî, the Khânîn al-sa’âdat and the Sa’âdat-nâmeh, which have come down to us (see Mirkamal Nabipur, op. cit.), show that in spite of the introduction of new taxes, notably hâbatîr and tamâghâ (see below) by the Mongols, there was a marked continuity in accounting practice (cf. also Mâmûd-i Âmmû, Nafrîs al-funûn, whose description of the art of accountancy (šim-i ṣâfâ’î) is largely the same as ‘Âlâ-yi Tabrîzî’s exposition, though less detailed). There were some minor differences in vocabulary and dating, the Khânî solar year having come into operation under Ghâzân Khan (see further Târîkh-i Wâṣîfî, 404), and also certain modifications, made, according to ‘Âlâ-yi Tabrîzî, with a view to a simplification of the accounts for the benefit of the Mongols (f. 33b).

The tax assessments were entered in two registers. One, the daftar-i mâl, which was concerned with the “fixed” taxes of the villages, included land taxes. The other, daftar-i darbà, recorded dues and commercial transactions (mumîmdûd), and included tamâgha taxes, etc. (f. 62b; cf. also Nafrîs al-funûn, i, 324). ‘Âlâ-yi Tabrîzî’s description of the subsidiary registers (sârât-i mufri’d-i wîlâyâtî) throws considerable light on the sources of revenue, including land taxes, and their expenditure (see also below). Taking the case of the tûmen (province) of Kâshân as an example, he sets out the total revenue in cash from (i) “fixed” taxes from mumîmdûd (taxes on production other than agriculture), sheep and cattle taxes (al-ma’râfî), and land tax (al-ṣâwîr) according to the ancient assessment (fîl-kadîm), and (ii) tamâgha taxes, responsibility for which had been accepted by a certain mâlîkh, Nasîr al-Dîn, for a given year, as from the Naw Rûz. The revenues from “fixed” taxes are set out under taxes from (i) the town (al-balâd), these being levied on craftsmen (al-mu’tahârîs), who were sub-divided into those who paid 5 per cent tamâgha and those who did not (and presumably paid higher ad hoc rates),
KHARÂDJ

and dhimmls (Jews and Armenians), and (ii) the outlying districts (al-nawdi'iy), sub-divided under villages. Against this he sets out the sums to be deducted under various heads. These were (a) the expenses of the province (masâlih al-wilayya) as laid down by the supreme divân, namely allowances (al-rusûmid) for the bâzâb, the mulk and the scribe (bâdhab) and sums for the upkeep of the roads, listed under two districts, and (b) drafts made on the revenue by the court for the upkeep of the estates of two Mongol princesses (âshâ-i kubâdâhân), drafts (al-ikhtisâbiyya), or a Mongol princess for one year on specific villages, allocations for military personnel (al-âsâhîn) attacked to falconers (al-bâdhiyya), partly in cash and partly in kind, and partly as expenses (lazhâr), and for post-stations (al-yâm) and forage for them (al-sâsân) for six months. The revenue from tamghâ is similarly set out under (a) brokerage (dalldlkhâna), camel-markets (kharâq), slave-markets (nakkhâbiyya), cattle and sheep markets (sâk al-dawâbb) and slaughterhouses (al-sallâbiyya), and (b) districts, together with the expenses charged against their revenue for various Mongol officials and amirs (ff. 67a-68b). Cf. also Mahmûd-i Amuli, who divided the taxes entered in the defar-i mufrid wa dzâmis into male, bâdhab levied on craftsmen and on districts (bâdhab-i muhbarra), or bâdhab-i hâr mâhâyi, and tamghâ on transactions (tamghâ-i muhâba). See also Mahmûd-i Amuli, ed. Velami, St. Petersburg 1860-2, ii, 120. They are mentioned in the Tadhkira al-mulâkî in connection with the dues of the râhîb dzâmis of the rîhâkâdâna (l. 100b). Nevertheless, it is unlikely that Uzun Hasan's assessment was put into operation over the whole country, and it cannot, in any case, have operated efficiently during the fratricidal struggles between his son, Khâllî, who succeeded him, and Sultan Ya'qûb. A considerable part of the country was at that time alienated from the control of the central divân. Shîrâs was given to the Amîr Alwâd, the son of Khâllî, for his expenses (khurûf), the Shabânââ, on the other hand, was brought directly under the supreme divân (V. Minorsky, Persia in A.D. 1479-1490, an abridged translation of Fadîlûllâh b. Râbî'ûshân Khânji's Târîkh-i 'Amârâ-yi Aminî, London 1955, 47). Sultan Ya'qûb after his death (894/1489) Khâllî, who was apparently to collect additional revenue from many places which had never before been registered. But it is doubtful whether these records existed detailed records of the revenue of the tax districts of the empire and the charges made upon it. Accordingly on 4 Rabî I 894/5 February 1489 Kâdî 'Îsâ and Shâh Shâraf al-Dîn Mahmûd Daylamî, an inspector of the diwân, set out for 'Irâk and Fârs to revise the khârâdî in conformity with the sharîa and collect the land taxes. Their main activities appear to have been to resume suyârâhâls; their operations were cut short by the death of Ya'qûb in 896/1490 (Persia in A.D. 1479-1490, 93 ff.).

Under the Safawids there would appear to have existed detailed records of the revenue of the tax districts of the empire and the charges made upon it. These were probably based on earlier records, notably the assessment of Uzun Hasan mentioned above. Fadîl Isfahânî records under the years 953/1555 in the Afšâl al-tawdîrâhî that a new assessment (dastûr al-'umal) was made by the sadâr, Mir Zayn al-Dîn 5All, and that it was based on "the customs of good administration and care for the subjects, designed to achieve the embellishment of armies (kashânârî) and to contribute to the pomp of sovereignty, and founded upon good treatment of the subjects and soldiers (sulük bi ra'iyyât wa sipâhî), and concerned the levy of taxes (mâl wa gîhût wa suyâhâl), from every district and tribal region (wilâyât), even (capital) offences and the fining of criminals" (Minorsky, the Aq Qoyunlu and land reforms, in BSOAS, xxvii (1955), 449-62). His intention was apparently to collect additional revenue from legal taxes (absâb-i kifâyât) so that the various tamghâ taxes could be repealed. Accordingly on 19 Jumâdâ I 912/17 January 1505 (see further Divânî, ta'dîl in the province of Shiraz was given to Sadâr Shâh, the son of Shâh Shâraf, a son of the supreme divân, who was appointed to the province as laid down by the masâlih al-wilayya). It may be that Uzun Hasan's assessment was composed of the tax paid by the province of Shâh Shâraf as it was made by the sadâr, Mir Zayn al-Dîn 5All and that it was based on "the customs of good administration and care for the subjects, designed to achieve the embellishment of armies (kushânârî) and to contribute to the pomp of sovereignty, and founded upon good treatment of the subjects and soldiers (suluk bi ra'iyyat wa sipahi), and concerned the levy of taxes (mal wa gihati wa suyakhi) from every district and tribal region (wilayat), even (capital) offences and the fining of criminals" (Minorsky, the Aq Qoyunlu and land reforms, in BSOAS, xxvii (1955), 449-62). Detailed statements of the individual taxpayer's liabilities were in theory, if not always in practice, entered in the registers of the divan (see Dastur al-mulak and Tadhkira al-mulak). There is nothing, however, to show that the revenue records of the Safawids were regularly revised, any more than earlier records had been.

Nâdir Shâh in or about 1736 ordered an assessment of all landed properties in Fârs to be made. Their income and expenses were to be estimated, together...
with the dues of the peasants (bāzyārān). No difference was to be made between the khalisa land in possession of the supreme diwan, land held by sayyids, ulamā and notables, and private property made into waḥf for mosques or madrasas. The facts were to be recorded in the registers and a report submitted to Nādir so that the diwān taxes and dues might be justly fixed. He arranged for similar assessments to be carried out in all the provinces of Persia (Fasā‘, Fārs-nāma-i Nāşiri, lith. Tehran 1804-6, i, 181). The assessment for Fārs appears to have been submitted to Nādir in Kābul in 1738-9, whereupon he issued an order for the resumption of ṭuwyāl and awāḥf in Fārs (ibid., i, 183). Similar orders were given in respect of Iṣfahān, but Nādir was assassinated in 1740/1747 before the operation was completed (see further Landlord and peasants, 131-2; also Fasā‘, op. cit., i, 200-1). In 1739 and 1741 officials were sent to review the revenue assessments of Ālbarāy-dān. It is not clear whether their work was ever completed (Nādir Mīrzā, Tārikh wa diyāḥarīsā-yy dār al-salāman-ī Tabrīz, ed. Lišān al-Mulk Sīpīr, Tehran lith. 1905, 281 ff.). Rustam al-Ḥukamā al-Misri alleges that Nādir's registers were more accurate than any others, and that those of Karim Kāndān (1163-93/1750-79) were also accurate (Rustam al-Ḥukamā, 135). His figures appear to have remained in force, broadly speaking, until Mīrzā Taqī Kāndān, Nāṣir al-Dīn's sadr-i aʿzām, carried out a new assessment in 1851, many alterations in the value of the land having meanwhile taken place.

In the second half of Nāṣir al-Dīn's reign, between about 1878 and 1882, a number of reports were compiled on the villages, lands, and population of most of the provinces of Persia, presumably with a view to achieving greater efficiency in the assessment and collection of the revenue and the levy of troops. New assessments were made in various districts during his reign and under those of his successors (cf. Abū ʿAbd Allāh Mustawfi, Sharḥ-i ḥindagi-i man, Tehran 1945-6, ii, 651-2). Curzon, who visited Persia in 1889-90, however, records that for the most part the assessments were obsolete in date and character (Persia and the Persian question, 174). A land survey was planned to be carried out under the Ministry of Finance in 1889-90 proved abortive (see further Landlord and peasants, 168 ff.).

There were perennial difficulties over the actual collection of taxes, and what happened at the local level often had little relation to the assessment drawn up at the centre. Ghausān Kāndān, when he attempted to reform the tax system, found that the local authorities continued to exact more than they should. He sought to remedy this by demanding full returns from the provinces (see below). Although such steps under a strong government may have reduced abuses, the peasants and small landowners were for the most part unable to resist the demands of the tax-collectors, the provincial governors and the military. In the nineteenth century, although the central government continued to draw up the provincial assessments, the provincial governors, instead of collecting the taxes as authorised by the central government, followed a different procedure. Thomson describes this as follows: “In practice, a very complicated and irregular system of taxation is pursued, the main feature of which appears to be that it is designed solely with a view to take as little as possible from the wealthy and influential classes, and to get as much as possible from the hard-working peasant. The object, indeed of all Persian Governors and their subordinates, as well as of the landowners generally, is to avoid sim-
made a distinction between taxes levied on Mongols (who were nomads) and non-Mongols (who were sedentary), a dichotomy which was to some extent paralleled by the differences between taxes paid by Muslims and dhimmis in the Islamic system. The nomadic taxes were "occasional", whereas those levied on the sedentary population were "fixed" or "regular". The precise form of these two groups of taxes varied with the nature of Mongol rule and the roles of the nomads at different times and in different places (see further J. Masson Smith, *Mongol and nomadic taxation*, in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 1970, 46-83).

Under the Mongol system there were apparently three main taxes, kühb, kalán (kilán) and tankhá. The last named was a tax on commercial goods. What the precise difference was originally between the first two, kühb and kalán, is not entirely clear. According to Bartold kühb was originally levied mainly on nomads. As Quatremère has shown, it was also levied on the sedentary population, which, in turn, might have undergone modifications in their meanings. Bartold thinks that kühb was not a tax levied on the sedentary population, but in many of the passages in which the word occurs it could carry a different interpretation. With this the Mongol terms kühb and kalán, as used in the Islamic system, were assimilated, or had already been assimilated, to the terms used in the Islamic system. The passage in Djuwayní reads l'saldn, kühb, "in the sense of occasional" or "casual" and, until the collapse of the Mongol army, the post, expenses and fodder were "fixed" or "regular" taxation paid by non-Mongols (al-kubturiyya, al-mu'tamildt (i.e., fixed taxes) levied on the Mongol tribes (ulü-i muckgl) (Tärkh-i mubarak-i Ghasání, 304), by which he presumably meant a tax levied at so much per head on flocks and herds or an "occasional" tax on flocks and herds. Mün al-Din Natanzí referring to the administration of Kazaghan in Central Asia in the 8th/14th century, states that because of his justice no amir or vazír could take a single dínár from anyone under any pretext except by way of *küdr-i dísn* and kühb-i rasmí (Muníkhab al-tawrálth, 200). The former presumably meant a tax levied in kind, but it is not clear what taxes meant by what it is perhaps a poll-tax or a tax on flocks and herds. In documents issued by Ya'qub Beg and Alwánd dated 884/1479 and 904/1490 respectively granting certain immunities and exemptions to sayyids descended from 'Ali b. Músá al-Rídá, kühb does not seem to mean a floor tax. The relevant passage reads, "mawdshi, mard*i tankhá shall not be taken from them and their peasants (barsiqarán) shall not be ordered to perform forced labor (bihgbg) or to bear on hunting expeditions (shkdr) and kühb shall not be taken from them" (Untersuchungen, 159, 166).

So far as the Mongols became in the course of time agricultural proprietors and town-dwellers, they presumably became liable to the "regular" taxes levied on the sedentary population, which, in turn, were assimilated, or had already been assimilated, to the taxes to which the Persian population were traditionally subject. With this the Mongol terms underwent modifications in their meanings. Kühb lost its meaning of an "occasional" tax paid by Mongols. Kalán (a term not found in Djuwayní) also probably underwent modification. Bartold thinks that it was a tax levied on sown lands and on the peasantry in general. Caferoğlu accepts this view with some reserve. Masson Smith, following Bartold, thinks that kalán meant the pre-Mongol and essentially sedentary taxation of the conquered people and that it designated in the early Ilkhan period mál, "fixed" or "regular" taxation paid by non-Mongols (Mongol and nomadic taxation, 55). This may be so, but in many of the passages in which the word occurs it could carry a different interpretation. Al-'Umari, quoting al-Djuwayní on the Mongol army, states that the ruler took from them kühb, ulág, and badraka (Masálih al-abýr wa mamálk al-amár, 11). The passage in Djuwayní reads kühb wa *awúrídáti wa khádrájíti wa sádir wa wáríd wa tarí'b-i yárn wa ulág wa *slínl (i, 2). This suggests that al-'Umari understood kalán in the sense of occasional levies (*awúrídáti*), which meaning it could bear in many, if not most, of the passages in which it appears; (cf. also the passage in Seyf Harawí's Tärkh-namá-i Hardá, ed. Muh. Zobáyri al-Shákhrá, Calcutta 1943, 439; which states that Fakhr al-Dín, the Kurth malik of Harát, gave exemption to the people of Harát from
the khulāt and 'awdrīdāt-i divānī in 698/1298-9).

In Ghazān's yarlīgh on the grant of ikfa'dt to the Mongol army, although the term khulān could bear the interpretation of sedentary taxation levied on the conquered peoples, it could equally well mean occasional taxes ('awdrīdāt) and, this is, perhaps, more likely since the passage clearly refers to the Mongol army and not to the population in general. It reads, "It is known to everyone that formerly in the time of our good fathers the Mongol ulūs used to demand every kind of requisition (muflābād) and vexatious demand (muwāšāt), such as ḥabūr on flocks, the upkeep of the great post stations, the bearing of the heavy burdens of the law (yāsāk) and khulān, which in these days we have once and for all removed" (Ṭārīkh-i mubārak-i Ghāzānī, 304). On the other hand, the phrase which occurs later in the same document, mardum-i ārīh ki bi khulān dar āmāda va ḥaḍ kān (308) could be plausibly explained as "soldiers who have been brought into the assessment for sedentary taxes but [still] perform military service", though it need not necessarily bear this interpretation. If kāl means, as Minovi suggests, money paid by someone to the divān in lieu of performing military service as irregulars (ārīh), then the phrase could mean, 'soldiers who have been brought into the assessment for sedentary taxes and give money to the divān in lieu of service as irregular forces (cf. Badī' al-Zamān Frīzānī, Kulliyāt-i Šāms, Tehran 1966, pt. vii, 404-5), but this interpretation is not in keeping with the general tenor of the yarlīgh in question.

The term khulān occurs in the Mukdtabāt-i Rasḥīdī. In a letter from Rasḥīd al-Dīn to his son Shihāb al-Dīn, governor of Shuṣhtar, in which the tax lists for Kullīyāt are set out, there are separate headings for tamghā, khurādāt-i arbāb, māl wa ḥarādāt-i divānī, mawādīr, nīrā mawā'qapnī, nībārā, ārīh, and khulān. In a later letter, it seems probable that they continued to be based primarily on the land, though, as shown by 'Alā'i-ye Tabrīzī, there appear to have been an increase in poll-taxes and taxes on industry. When, however, these assessments were partitioned locally, it may be that this was sometimes done on the basis of a poll-tax.

Rasḥīd al-Dīn's account of the Ilkhanid administration prior to Ghazān Khān suggests that considerable variety prevailed in the fiscal administration. In assessing his account it must be remembered that his object was, in part at least, to show that the administration was in a state of disorder and that extortion had ruined the peasants. He states "before describing how the Lord of the World (Ghazān Khān) reformed conditions in 'Irāk-i 'Aḏjam, Āḏharbāyjān, and the provinces whose dwān taxes consisted of ḥabūr and tamghā, I will mention briefly what a state of confusion had prevailed prior to this. The situation was such that these provinces were given on a muḥāša'a contract to governors (kubūrī), each one being assessed at a fixed sum, "regular" expenses (ṭāḥādī-i muṣarrarī) being debited against it. The governor used to levy two ḥabūr from the subjects (ra'aṣiyāt) and in some places twenty or thirty ḥabūr. The governor's instructions were to allocate among the individual taxpayers the sum due on account of ḥabūr according to the revenue assessment (dājm) given to them [reading bunūhī sāḥibī for naṭīja sāḥibī]. When an ilī came to the province on account of some matter or to demand a tax or something that was needed, the governor, in order to give the individual taxpayers (kubūrī) and the illis would come and then-" (Ṭārīkh-i mubārak-i Ghāzānī, 243-4). Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell from the Persian text whether 'Irāk-i 'Aḏjam and Āḏharbāyjān were among the provinces whose divān taxes consisted of ḥabūr and tamghā or whether they fell into another category of provinces.

Hamd Allāh Mustawfī's account in the Nuzhāt al-kublāb also suggests that considerable variety prevailed. He states that the important province of Khūrāsān enjoyed a special status. This was because most of the ważirs and scribes of the supreme divān were Khūrāsānīs, and so they had constituted Khūrāsān, Kuhistān, Kumīs, Māzandarān and Tabaristān into a separate province (mamlakat), the accounts of which were kept apart from those of other provinces. Hamd Allāh alleges that they put 200,000 dinārs annually against the revenues for the expenses of the army of Khūrāsān, thus reducing the amount due to the central treasury. This situation continued until the reign of Abū Sa'id, when Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rasḥīd al-Dīn found out and stopped the practice. He had intended to draw up an account of the taxes of the province, deduct from the total the regular expenses of the province, sums for the šāfs of the soldiers and other local expenses, and to have the rest remitted to the treasury, but he died before he was able to implement this reform.
Ghāzānī which states that prior to Ghāzān's reforms 80% of the drafts on the revenue of Khurasan were unpaid (34).

In his account of the revenue of the different provinces and districts, Hamd Allāh makes a difference between the revenues of certain towns and their surrounding districts (wildyāt), the former being provided by the revenues of the towns and the latter by the tax on lands (khardī-i ḍiwan). Among the towns and districts described in this way, all of which were along the main trade routes, were Bahgādād, Kūfā, Wāṣīt, Hilla, Iṣfahān, Sūltāniyya, Kanvūn, Khūšāb, Khāgān, Hamadān, Yazd, Tabrīz, Ḍiğān, Aḥar, Shuṣhtar, Āwa, Sāwa, Zandjān, Maragha, and Şhrāz. The tax of the last five were farming. Writing of Fārs, Hamd Allāh states that the ḍiwan was in his time 2,571,200 currency dinārs (dinār-i rādīq) and that in the provinces (wildyāt) they were levied for the most part in kind (maḥbūl), but in the towns they were fixed as ṭamgīd (115). The inference to be drawn is that the taxes outside the provinces were mainly land taxes. Hamd Allāh makes no mention of ṭamgīd or other taxes in his description of the provinces of Kirmān, Khūrāsān, Māzandarān or Šabaristān. So far as the last three are concerned this may have been because of the special situation which prevailed in Khūrāsān. In ʿĪrāk-i ʿArab, what survived of the assessment of Ḥājdāḏūdī was known as ḫurārāḏī-i ṭārīk and was included, when Hamd Allāh was writing, among the sums due to the ḍiwan (muṭawāḏḏāḏīḵāt-i ḍiwan), which amounted in the Khand year 35 (A.D. 1335) to 300,000 currency dinārs. He points out that if the same amount of land had been under cultivation as in the time of ʿUmar double this amount would have been yielded (29). In Kūfā ḫurārāḏī was paid at the rate of one-third of winter and summer crops, the remaining two-thirds being equally divided between the tenant (reading tānī) and the cultivator (reading barisgar). The province (wildyāt), at the time he was writing, was assessed by the ḍiwan (? mubarrār bi ḍiwan ast, 31). Orchards (bāḏgīštān) in ʿĪrāk-i ʿArab paid ḫurārāḏī, either according to the old assessment of Ḥājdāḏūdī or according to a new assessment (ḵurārāḏī-i ḥāḏīk) (31).

It is somewhat little known that this "double" system of taxation bore heavily upon the people and also that it was the additional "Mongol" taxes which were felt to be especially onerous (cf. the poems of Ħārūn Bahā quoted above). Hamd Allāh Mustawfī alleges that most of the districts of ʿĪrāk-i ʿAdjam were ruined because of ṣabūḏūr and that the people had abandoned their homes, "so much so that in Kazwīn the Friday prayers were not performed" (Tahrīḵ-i gūzāda, 604). The tax officials brought up in pre-Mongol traditions, probably disapproved of the new taxes, just as the ʿulamāʾ had earlier disapproved of the muḥāṣṣ. They were unable to abolish them altogether. The most that they could do was to limit them, or sometimes to abrogate them temporarily.

In a letter to his son, Amir Maḥmūd, when the latter was governor (bāḵšīm) of Kirmān, Rashīd al-Dīn states that it had been reported to him that he (Amir Maḥmūd) had removed oppression against the people of Kirmān and had ruined them by imposing upon them additional cesses, ḍiwan dinārs (ṭaffuṭt wa ṭahālīq-i ḍiwan) and repeated royal drafts (ḥaṣālāt-i sūltānī) and by the levy of ṣubān, ṣabūḏūr, [money for] soldiers (ṭīrāḥ) and various expenses (ḫurārāḏī-i muṭaʃafarriḵā [Muḥālāt-i ḍiwan-i ḍiwan, 11]. He instructs him to remit for three years ṣabūḏūr, ṣabūḏūr, ṣuṭwald (occasional taxes) and the ḍiwan dinārs levied for Kirmān and the Great Urdū, so that prosperity might return to the deserted places and uncultivated lands, and agriculture be resumed. As for his own estates in Bām, seed and advances for the purchase of draught oxen and food were to be given to the peasants if they so desired (ibid., 12).

The reforms of Ghāzān Khan may have succeeded to some extent in ameliorating the condition of the peasants: certainly Rashīd al-Dīn alleges that prosperity returned during his reign. Hamd Allāh Mustawfī, on the other hand, while he gives due emphasis to Ghāzān’s reforms, shows that the change in agricultural conditions was not dramatic, though he alleges further improvement under Ṣadḫāyāt (Ṭahrīḵ-i gūzāda, 606).

Such figures as are given by Hamd Allāh Mustawfī and Waṣṣāf, incomplete though they are, suggest that the improvement was only marginal and that there was a striking fall in revenue compared to Ṣalṭānī prior times. Prior to the reign of Ghāzān, the ḍiwan received annually, according to Waṣṣāf, 18,000,000 dinārs, or according to Hamd Allāh Mustawfī 17,000,000. After Ghāzān’s reforms, the figure rose to 21,000,000 but fell in 1335-40 to 19,203,800. It is not clear whether these figures include the sums which were deducted for the expenses of local administration or not. Under the Ṣadḫāyāt ruler, Mālikšāh, ḍiwan revenue had amounted to 215,000,000 red gold dinārs, the equivalent of Hamd Allāh’s estimate of 500,000,000 current dinārs (see further Petrushevsky, who estimates the ḍiwan revenue for the pre-Mongol period on the basis of figures in the Nuzhāt al-bulūḥ to have been 100,580,000 currency dinārs, op. cit., 479 ff.). The figures for the two periods are not necessarily strictly comparable, because the extent of the land alienated from the control of the ḍiwan and of crown lands was not identical. The evidence, fragmentary though it is, would, nevertheless, seem to point to a marked decline in the revenue reaching the ḍiwan, though the decline was not equal in all provinces. If the revenue was still derived largely from land taxes, as would seem to have been the case, such a decline could be largely accounted for by first a decrease in the amount of land under cultivation consequent upon depopulation and the increase in the number of nomads, and secondly the removal of large areas of the country from the fiscal control of the agents of the central government.

Ṣaḥāwīds and Kāḏīārs. Under the Ṣaḥāwīds, there was a revival both of agriculture and trade, and it seems likely that the sums reaching the ḍiwan from ḫurārāḏī once more increased, but the proportion which they formed of the total may have fallen somewhat. Such figures as are available do not give a detailed breakdown (though an examination of Ottoman records for those provinces which from time to time came under Ottoman domination would doubtless throw further light), while the fluctuation in the extent of mamālīk and ḥāṭṭa land [see Ḵaša] together with the changing distribution of ṭūyūs, ṭuyūshūs, and ṭukbūf further obscures the situation. Minorsky, on the basis of the figures in the Taḏḵīrāt al-muṣlīm, puts the revenue towards the end of the Ṣaḥāwīd period at 800,000 ṭāmāns, excluding revenue directly collected by the ḥāṭṭa administration. He suggests that land taxes may have been responsible for 65% of the total. This may be an underestimate. He also analyzes the estimates of the revenue given by European travellers, which, he points out, were, in the absence of official statistics and the secrecy surrounding the question of state revenue, purely hypothetical. Chardin, who gives the
fullest account, puts forward, with some reserve, a total figure of 32,000,000 livres or 70,000 tumdns. This figure is not far short of that given in the Tādqīkār al-mulāhāt, but Chardin's figure includes 14,000,000 francs from demesnes, i.e. khāsā, and only 2,000,000 francs from provincial revenues (Tādqīkār al-mulāhāt, 173 ff.).

In the 18th century there was a period of recession. Rustam al-Hukamār puts the revenue, excluding pīghāsh, under Karim Khān (whose writ did not run in Khurasān) at 150,000 tumdns (Rustam al-tavāriż, 322). In the nineteenth, the general trend was again towards expansion, although the total area under the control of Persia had greatly diminished. In the absence of statistics, however, it is not possible to give detailed figures, though an examination of the records of the mustaafsī would, no doubt, yield further information. M. T. Gokbilgin, writing about 1815, states that the total revenue did not much exceed three million tumdns, of which the land taxes and revenue from crown lands probably amounted to two-thirds (History of Persia, ii, 336, 340).

At the end of the reign of Fath ʿAli Shāh (1797-1834), the revenue is reported to have amounted to 2,081,532 tumdns in cash and payments in kind worth 379,217 tumdns. The main constituents of the latter were 163,084 kharūdar (675 lbs each) of wheat, at 2 tumdns each, 12,850 kharūdar of rice, at 3 tumdns each, and 965 mams of silk, at 6 tumdns each. (Revenues of Persia ordered by the late Shah to be paid to the General credit of Government, India Office, LP and S/j, vol. 53, quoted by C. Issawi, The economic history of Iran, 301-2.)

By about 1868, despite the sharp fall in silk production in Gilān, the total revenue had increased by 313 crores of tumdns (or £6,544,000) and amounted to 4,361,660 tumdns (or £1,244,664) in money, most of which was from land tax, besides payments in kind in barley, wheat, rice, and silk valued at 350,840 tumdns (or £220,336) (Thomson, Report, op. cit., 250-1). The revenue of Khurasān, which towards the end of the reign of Fath ʿAli Shāh had been ca. 200,000 tumdns in money and 46,000 kharūdar in grain, was about the year 1876, although the population had decreased (because of the contraction of the frontiers), some 340,000 tumdns in money and 46,000 kharūdar in barley and wheat, 620 kharūdar in rice and 83 kharūdar in tobacco. The whole of this was absorbed in payments for military service, pensions, salaries and other local disbursements (F.O. 416/26, App. (A) in Hardinge to Grey, London, 23 December 1905, separate and confidential). Thus agriculture still retained its early 20th-century importance as the main economic activity of the country, and the state still depended, as it had in earlier times, upon land taxes for its current expenditure. Basically, the old patterns of land revenue assessment and collection, which had shown a striking continuity over the centuries, lived on and rulers still looked to the land—and this, in effect, meant to the peasants—to provide them with the material resources to support themselves and their governments. (A. K. S. Lambton)

III.—In Ottoman Turkey.

This term denoted in Ottoman usage both the land tax and the poll-tax on the state's non-Muslim subjects. In some documents the term khardi ru'usu refers to the djizya [q.v.] payers (M. T. Gökbilgin, XV-XVI. asrîlarda Edirne ve Paşa livası, Istanbul 1952, 158; the kānumāne of Kandiya dated 1081/1670, in Ö. L. Barkan, XV ve XVI asrîlarada Osmanlı imperatorluğuunda sirâz ekonomisinin hukuki ve mali esasları, i. Kanunu, Istanbul 1943, 351), whereas the word khardi was only used for the tax put on the land. In the early period, both the khardi and djizya were collected by the khardidin, an officials appointed to collect the khardi, so that the officials collecting the djizya were also called khardidin (Başbaşalian Arşiv Genel Müdürlüğü, Malye mudever defterler, no. 2775, p. 455). This state of affairs can also be seen in a khardid register showing the records of khardi and djizya between the years 954-6/1547-9 (Malye mudever defterler, no. 191).

The lands of the Ottoman Empire were, in financial theory, divided into three categories (1) ardiş-šabriyye; (2) ardiş-šabriyye; and (3) ardiş-
memleket, but in practice there was a great variety of application. Qəşur land was the land given to the Muslims at the time of the conquests in return for a tithe. Kharadji land was the land retained by the non-Muslims in return for a tithe or greater proportion levied on its product, the kharadji-mubâsama, plus an annual requirement in cash.

The so-called ard-i memleket (that is, state or mîrî land) was not the property of the subjects (re'îyâ) but cultivated by them on a temporary basis; they paid kharadji-i mubâsama instead of qəşur, according to the amount of produce obtained from the land, and kharadji-i mawazzaf instead of the fîst âkîf (Barkan, Kanunlar, 4, 66, 297-8, Kânûn-name-i Sultân Süleyman ve Ebu's-Su'âd Efendi'nin ma'rûfsi risâlât, in MTT, i (Istanbul 1331), 109).

The 1051/1640 tabâr缺陷 of the island of Crete, newly added to the Ottoman Empire in 1640/1641, is listed and perhaps the last register showing what the kharadji lands were and how this tax was applied. It was decided that one-fifth should be taken as kharadji-mubâsama from the produce of the lands retained by the non-Muslims. Those harvesting two crops a year would pay kharadji twice. The vineyards and orchards were surveyed and a dirham-i sharîh was taken annually from every 'âDIR of them. Kharadji-mubâsama was 'âDIST from the land, even if the owner did not sow it. Kharadji lands were the full property of their owners, and therefore they had right to sell them as they liked; when the owner of the land died, it was divided between his heirs. If the non-Muslim owner of kharadji land abandoned his land and fled, then his land was rented out and afterwards his name would be removed from the list; when the owner of the land died, it was divided between his heirs. If the non-Muslim owner of kharadji land abandoned his land and fled, then his land was rented out and its kharadji was taken from its produce (Barkan, Kanunlar, 351-2). The financial difficulties of the Christian re'îyâ in a newly-conquered land were taken into consideration. For example, in the island of Cyprus, immediately after its conquest in 980/1572, a register was made, and as a result of it, the non-Muslim subjects, taking into consideration their financial situation, were classified into three groups: the rich, people with average incomes (the middle class), and the people with lower incomes (Barkan, op. cit., 105)."
The heads of Christian villages, and their notables such as priests, were charged with the responsibility of collecting the kharāḏī, angaria and the other taxes (cf. Polonýs Simeon’s seyahat namesi (1608-1619), tr. H. D. Andreasyan, Istanbul 1964, 134).

The Christian dependent provinces like Ragusa or Dubrovnik, Moldavia and Transylvania were counted among the tributary rē’dyā in which they paid an agreed, fixed amount every year (the kharāḏī mahlā in gold (cf. N. H. Biegman, The Turco-Ragusan relationship, The Hague 1967, 132-3, 138, 140, 142 and C. Orhonlu, Osmanlı tarhine ait belgeler: Telhisler (1597-1607), Istanbul 1970, 35); but the situation of Ragusa, because it accepted the payment of kharāḏī as a result of a peace agreement and not after conquest, was somewhat different to that of Moldavia, Wallachia and Transylvania. The taxes taken from the peace agreements made after the victories of the Ottoman Empire in the west, at the times when it was powerful, were also described as kharāḏī, e.g. those paid at certain times by Austria and Venice (L. Fekete, Die Staatsschrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung, Budapest 1965, i, 481). In the 11th/12th century, when there was a dispute over the question of borders, the Ottomans claimed (basing their argument on the defters) that the villages and towns in dispute belonged to the empire because of the presence there of kharāḏī-paying non-Muslim subjects (Fekete, Türkische Schriften aus dem Archiv des Palatinus Nikolaus Esterhazy, 1660-1645, Budapest 1932, 65 ff., 82 ff.).

From the end of the 12th/13th century, the task of collecting kharāḏī in the largely non-Muslim regions passed into the hands of the non-Muslim local elite (priests, headmen, etc.). From this time, too, the word kharāḏī came to be linked with the word bāḏī in the phrase kharāḏī we bāḏī, which was current till the Tanzimat period (K. Schwarz, Osmanische Sultansterkunden des Sinai-Klosters in türkischer Sprache, Freiburg-in-Breisgau 1970, 149 (dated ni2/12), 162 (dated ni4/1780) 185 (dated ni2/1858). The officers charged with collecting the kharāḏī were everywhere called kharāḏī-emlīs, and at the beginning of the 19th century there was established an office of kharāḏī which looked after various problems involved in the tax and which later also took care of the gīz̄aya at the same time.

The Tanzimat decree of 1839 brought a new concept of citizenship into the society of the Ottoman state, the idea that both the Muslims and the Christians living in the Empire were to be treated as equal before the law. This involved the question of taxation, including the kharāḏī, for the abolition of which there was pressure from Western diplomats in Istanbul.

A decision on this was only taken after the 1856 reforms, when both kharāḏī and gīz̄aya were abolished, and instead, non-Muslim subjects were to pay a tax in lieu of military service (bedel-i ‘askeri) (cf. G. Muir Mackenzie and A. P. Irby, Travels in the Slavonic provinces of Turkey-in-Europe, London 1866, 13, 67); the tax is also mentioned under the names ‘askeri, kharāḏī, gīz̄iya, imādasiyye, nizamıyeye, bedel-i (cf. James Barker, Turkey, New York 1877, 384; for the bedel-i ‘askerîyeye, see Düsütür, Istanbul 1289, ii, 26-33, and see also Badal).


(Gencel ORHONLU)

IV.—IN THE INDIAN SUB-CONTINENT

In India, the term kharāḏī was less common in the administrative literature, being replaced by other expressions such as bāṣīl or muḥṣūl, meaning revenue or land-revenue. As in other Muslim lands, the kharāḏī in Muslim India also had two distinct forms, to which the names of muḥsāsam or muḥsāsam-i muwaṣa’a, the latter being less common in the largely non-Muslim regions, were given. The former is defined as an impost which depended on the actual produce of the land, and was leviable only when the land was cultivated; the latter depended on the return that the land was capable of yielding, and was due whether the land was tilled or not. It is the waṣīfa which is meant when the term kharāḏī is mentioned by the Muslim writers or historians of India, unless the muḥsāsam is specifically named.

The earliest record of the imposition of the kharāḏī in Muslim India relates to the reign of Sultan ‘Ala‘ al-Dīn Muhammad Ḥanīf al-Dīn (870/1466-1316), who fixed the standard of the revenue-demand at one-half of the produce, an arrangement which set the pattern for the agrarian system in the 7th/i3th and 8th/i4th centuries. A notable aspect of the implementation of the kharāḏī was a remarkable degree of harmony in the relation between the Sultan and the tribute-paying Hindu chiefs.

The system initiated by ‘Ala‘ al-Dīn was never completely put into effect and soon fell into desuetude; it was not till the time of Shēr Shāh that any effort was made to revive it. The changes which the Dīlū sultans endeavoured to introduce were afterwards perfected in the system which the Mughal administration under Akbar adopted concerning the imposition of the kharāḏī. Akbar first established a uniform standard of length which he termed gāz-i iūdā (from the Arab dīrā bi h) and having adopted the dīrā bi h, as the measure of surface area, he fixed it at 3,000 square gāz. The land was divided into four kinds on the basis of its potential fertility. Of these four kinds, only the category called Perowy, i.e. land kept out of cultivation for a short time to regain its strength, was in reality the kharāḏī-i
wa'af of the Islamic law which Akbar imposed, and the person immediately liable for the khardi was the husbandman, who was assured of all required assistance by the state. In terms of the principles of this kind of khardi, the cultivators who paid taxes direct to the state received proprietary rights from the conquerors in respect of the lands which they tilled. Akbar’s system of khardi revenue collection did not cover his entire dominion, for the outlying saba contained large tracts of land which were left unmeasured; hence, in such cases, the Emperor himself, in accordance with the rules of khardi-i mukasama, retained ownership of the land. The tenure and the position of the cultivators under Djahangir and Shahjahan was pretty much the same as was in vogue under Akbar’s policy of settlement. The ownership rights of the husbandman to the land of the khardi-i wa’af continued to prevail even throughout Awrangzib’s puritanical reign. Under Awrangzib, the religious jurists on whose fatwas or pronouncements the royal orders were issued, sought guidance not from the rules or orders of Shēr Shāh or Akbar, but from the standard Islamic law books or commentaries written at an earlier period in the Arab lands. Standard authorities such as Abu Ḥanifa and Abu Yūsuf were closely consulted when fatwas regarding the khardi were drafted, with the result that Islamic terms, ideas, and institutions, which were not in accordance with the facts of indigenous Indian life, were imported into the Muslim Indian system more vigorously.

In the midst of the chaotic political conditions following Awrangzib’s death in 1128/1717, when some strong-armed adventurers took over the reins of rulership as sabaars in outlying areas of the empire, the regular institution of the khardi fell into disruption. The exigencies and characters of the rulers in particular territories brought about various pressures on the land, so that in some localities the cultivator, who was normally left with two-thirds of the produce of the land after paying one-third as khardi, had to remain content with the bare minimum necessary for his and his family’s subsistence. This state of affairs continued to prevail in the country till the British rulers brought about a settlement of the land revenue in 1793-94. *(Abdus Suhain)*

**KHARAG** (usually shortened to Kharg; Kharak in Arabic), a coral island in the Persian Gulf off the coast of Persia at lat. 25° 16' N, long. 50° 19' E. Lying 55 km. northwest of Būshahr [q.v.], the island is 8 km. long from north to south and 4 km. broad. Much of it is covered by treeless hills with a maximum height of 75 m. Four km. to the north is the smaller island of Kharg (Arab. ‘Abū Ubaydah). Between the two islands and also west of Kharg are banks where pearls of exceptional value were sometimes found until commercial pearl-fishing withdrew away in the present century.

Whether Kharg is to be identified with one of the islands in the Persian Gulf mentioned in the Greek and Roman sources remains uncertain. An examination of burial caves and rock carvings has indicated that a Christian community existed on the island in the 3rd century A.D.

The early Muslim geographers list Kharg as belonging to the ša‘b of Asur (see [FIRUZA-ŠAB]). It is also described as lying opposite the town of Djanāb [q.v.]. According to Ibn Khurraḍādhbih, Kharg as a port of call on the route from al-ʿAlā to Umān and India was known for its cereals, grapes, and dates.

Yākūt, who visited Kharg more than once, saw the shrine pilgrims believed to be the tomb of Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya [q.v.], a belief Yākūt declares unhistorical. Yakut quotes ʿAbū Ubayda as saying that ʿAbū Ṣufra, the father of the renowned Umayyad general al-Muhallab [q.v.], was a native of Kharg who, for his military prowess, was adopted by the tribe of al-Azd. ʿAbu Ṣubayda’s statement is corroborated by verses of al-Ḥarām-i Yākūt, the lord of Bandar Rīg on the mainland 35 km. to the northeast. Building a fort on the northeastern side of the island, the Baron proceeded to develop a flourishing community, described in detail by the Englishman E. Ives and the German C. Niebuhr, who stayed there in 1171/1758 and 1178-79 respectively. Shortly after Niebuhr left, the Dutch were driven out by Mir Muḥammand of Bandar Rīg, who took up residence on the island. Karim Khān Zand [q.v.] then invested the island and forced Mir Muḥammand to flee to al-ʻAlā, where he met his end. Karim undertook to turn Kharg over to the French East India Company, but the suppression of the company prevented the arrangement from being consummated. Again during the reign of Fath-Allāh Shāh [q.v.], Persia was on the point of giving Kharg to the French but was thwarted by British pressure.

In 1247/1832 bubonic plague on the Persian coast impelled the British Political Residency in the Gulf to move temporarily from Būshahr to Kharg, and consideration was given to making Kharg its permanent site. When Persian arms advanced against Afghanistan, the British landed troops on Kharg in 1254/1838 and held it until 1250/1842, during part of which time the Residency was headquartered on the island. Lord Auckland, the Governor General of India, dreamed that “Kharg ... could become the Singapore of the Persian Gulf”. The initial Russian protest against the occupation of Kharg had failed to sway the British government, but prolonging the British presence there would have run the risk of giving Russia an excuse to march against Persia in the north, and in 1260/1844 the British coal depot was removed from the island.

Britain at the outset of its war with Persia in 1273/1856 again seized Kharg, whose Persian garrison had already been withdrawn. This time the grip on the island was kept for only a little more than a year. General Sir J. Outram, commander of the expeditionary force, advocated without success transferring the Political Residency from Būshahr to Kharg. For years thereafter the island’s importance derived in part from the skill of the pilots it provided for the upper Gulf and from its quarries for stone used in road building.

The growth of the oil industry has given Kharg a newly significant place on the map. The waters off the mainland coast of Persia (now Iran) are too shallow to accommodate large ships, while the island, lying 30 km. away from the coast, has waters deep enough
for this purpose. When Iran's production of oil for export mounted in the mid-20th century, Kharag was selected as the new terminal for shipping crude oil. Pipelines were laid to bring crude in from the producing fields as well as refined products from Abadan oil. Huge storage tanks were built on Kharag to hold millions of barrels of oil. Tankers were dispatched to carry the oil away berth at a jetty or a private pier. Kharag itself also lies within a recently-discovered area for the production of oil, with the Darius field stretching westwards from the island into the waters of the Persian Gulf. Moreover, the National Iranian Oil Company has constructed on Kharag one of its most elaborate petrochemical complexes. The few details which are reported concerning the external life of Kharakani point to a humble origin. He is said to have been a donkey-driver at the time when he was called to the mystic path (Samânî). As a youngster, he tended the cattle for his parents. But even in his later years he lived very close to the peasants of his home country. He seems to have travelled very little. There are no reports about his formal education, and he claimed to be an illiterate (ummi) who was ignorant about the correct pronunciation of even the most commonly used Arabic formulas (Anšârî, Tabâštî, 510). Some of his sayings show traces of a local dialect.

Kharakani described himself as a resident (mu'âmîn) of the small towns and villages where they were born. Another mystic of this type was Abû'âbab al-Kâsaš al-Ábã, a butcher turned into a mystic, who enjoyed a similar reputation as Kharakani. He is reported as having prophesied that his "little bazar" (bâsarâk) would, after his death, be taken over by Kharakani (Anšârî, Tabâštî, 308). There is no evidence, however, of a formal initiation in the form of the bestowal of a hâjdâ, which is a required prerequisite for membership in the mystic order of Kharakani and Kharakânî. The learned Sîfî skâyîs of the larger cities, in particular of Nîshâpûr, took a lively interest in these single-minded and uncompromising individuals, and they were seen as representatives of the mystic way. Whether or not the reports about the last two visits is questionable, the attention paid to Kharakani by the great Sûfis of his time is undoubtedly historical, and it fits very well into the pattern of Khurasanian mysticism in the beginning of the 9th and the 10th century. The learned Sûfî skâyîs of the larger cities, in particular of Nîshâpûr, took a lively interest in these single-minded and uncompromising individuals, and they were seen as representatives of the mystic way. Whether or not the reports about the last two visits is questionable, the attention paid to Kharakani by the great Sûfis of his time is undoubtedly historical, and it fits very well into the pattern of Khurasanian mysticism in the beginning of the 9th and the 10th century.
al-Karani [q.v.] in spite of the fact that they never actually met. The line of mystic tradition which runs through al-Bīṣṭāmī and Kharakānī was later in the same century attached to the classic silsilatul Sūfīm by Ābū ʿAṣīl al-Fārmādī (d. 472/1084). In addition to his regular affiliation to Abu Iʿlāṣīm al-Gūrhānī (d. 469/1076-7), al-Fārmādī chose also Kharakānī as his initiator, although it is hardly likely that both men ever met personally. In this way, Kharakānī has become a spiritual ancestor of the ṣūfīs of the Kharakānīyyūn out of which the Nakhshbandiyya order developed in the 8th/14th century. The interest of later generations in Kharakānī’s mysticism is also shown by the use of anecdotes about him in Sūfī epic poetry, notably in the works of ʿAṭṭār and of Mawlānā Ḍalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. Shāhīd al-Dīn Yāḥyā al-Suhrawārdī, the Shāykh al-Maḥṣūdī al-Dastānī (d. 417/1026), who is often attributed to Kharakānī have been preserved.

Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted in the article: Hudiwīrī, Kashfal-maḥṣūdī, Tayfūrīyya tradition in Bīṣṭām, Abu ʿAllāh Abū Ṣayyīkh Muhammad al-Dastānī (d. 417/1026), who is often fannā the self to which they really belong. Command created world, and the “brave ones” (khalfr) who remain attached to the created world, and the “brave ones” (dīwān-mardaḍ) who venture out to aspire for a return to the world of the Command (ṣālam al-ame) to which they really belong. The path of the latter goes through severe ascetic training and should end with the total extinction of the self (fana?) and the subsequent permanence in the will of God. The ascetic preparation has no value in itself. The attainment of the goal is entirely an act of Divine Grace. This idea is linguistically expressed by the use of passive verbal forms whenever there is a reference to the fulfillment of the mystic’s aim. At that stage, the mystic ceases to be the actor of his own deeds and the speaker of his own words. The highest gift granted to the adept is gnostic knowledg (marṣīyya) which is to be distinguished from the positive knowledge (ḥīm) of the theologians. When the former kind of knowledge has been attained to its full extent, it appears to be identical with the contents of the religious Laws. Kharakānī emphasizes that he would refuse to travel any path that would deviate from that of the Prophet. In spite of this adherence to Islamic orthodoxy, he dares to discourage other mystics to travel on to Mecca once they have “crossed the deserts of Kharakānī”, i.e. after they have visited him and have accepted his teaching. The way of Kharakānī is a path of sorrow (andaḥ) and anxiety (ḥabīb) which is contrasted to the joyfulness (gāhād) and relaxation (baṣīt) of mystics like Dāstānī and Abū Saʿīd. Humility and self-glorification are curiously mixed in the utterances of Kharakānī. He claims to be one of the radiating servants of God, and many of his sayings have the form of direct revelations from the Unseen. There are also some accounts of experiences in the higher world. One of his pupils recognizes him as the bīd of his age. The superior status of the shaykh enables him to act as a mediator for other people before the Divine Judge. On the other hand, Kharakānī takes great pains to conceal the graces bestowed on him. Neither his ascetic merits nor his miraculous powers, which in the case of Kharakānī consist in particular of the gift of foresight (fīrāsā), should mislead the true mystic into false pretensions. It is therefore to be regarded as a special favour of God to His friends that He helps them to conceal these graces from the eyes of the profane. (On the characteristics of Kharakānī’s mysticism, see also S. de Beaurecueil, Ansārī, 65-67.)

The sayings of Kharakānī have been collected by one of his followers in the Kitāb Nūr al-wulūm. Of this work, only an abstract seems to have survived in the so far unique manuscript British Museum Or. 249, dated 658/1259 (cf. Rieu, Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the British Museum, i, 3423; ed. by E. E. Bertel’s, in Iran, iii (1927), 155-224 = Izbrannoe trudy. Sufizm i suфизская литература, Moscow 1965, 201-55; the linguistic particularities of this text have been studied in the Introduction to Bertel’s edition as well as in M. Taqī-Bahārī, Sabkhasnātī, ii, Tehran n.d., 226-8 and G. Lazard, La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane, Paris 1963, 123-4 and passim). Considerably more of the contents of the original has been preserved in the long section on Kharakānī in the Supplement to Aṭṭār’s Tadhkhirat al-asīyā, ii, ed. Nicholson, Leiden-London 1907, 207-55. The Nūr al-wulūm has been divided into 20 chapters, the last of which contained hagiographic stories (manaḥ☆b) about the shaykh. Another chapter was devoted to the prayers (mundd☆d) of Kharakānī. A small separate collection of prayers is also known to exist (cf. H. Ritter, in Isl. xcv (1939), 63). The attribution of the edition of the Mundd☆d of Abū Yāzd al-Bīṣṭāmī to Kharakānī (cf. L. Massigön, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, Paris 1968, 274) needs to be verified. Two short risālas attributed to Kharakānī have recently come to light in Pakistan (cf. A. Munzawi, Fīhrīst-i nushkhāt-i khafī-i farsi, ii, Tehran 1349 sh., 1101 nos. 10165-10166). There are also a few quatrains attributed to him (see, e.g. Nadīm al-Dīn Dāya, Mirdād al-bādā, ed. Tehran 1377/f1377, 25, 28; Amin-i Aḥmad-i Rāzī, Haft Iḥlīm, ed. D. Pākalī, Tehran 1340 sh., iii, 335; Rūdī-hull Khān Hidāyat, Riyād al-arṣīfīn, Tehran 1305/1889-8, 28-9; idem, Maṣāḥ☆s al-fusahāb, ed. Tehran 1392/1878, i, 66, Ethé, Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the India Office Library, i, Oxford 1903, no. 1747, fol. 1b). A commentary to one of the sayings was written by Nadīm al-Dīn Dāya (cf. F. Meier, in Isl. xxiv (1937), 38 n.). One of the divine-inspired utterances (gāhīyya?) of Kharakānī has been studied by Kāsim Labīhān Bahkī. Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted in the article: Hudiwīrī, Kashf al-maḥṣūdī, KHARAKĀNĪ.
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Islam, Oxford 1971, 32, 52!, 92, 221; Akwdl wa
afywdl-i shaykh Abu'l-Ifasan Kharakdni, akwdl-i
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AL-KflARA&l, ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD
B. (Afi!) BISHR, BAHA* AL-DiN and SHAMS AL-DIN (and
also ABU MUHAMMAD CABD AL-DJABBAR B. CABD ALDJABBAR B. MUHAMMAD) AL-THABITI AL-HUSAYNI
AL-MARWAZ!, Persian mathematician, astronomer and
geographer, who also concerned himself with philosophical questions. He seems to have been a native
of Kharak (see Yakut, s.v.) near Marw, whence his
nisba (which Hadidji Khalifa, Kashf, Tehran 1947,
338, reads as al-Khiraki). He lived in Marw, whither
he had been summoned by the Khwarazm-Shah Kutb
al-DIn Muhammad (490-521/1097-1127) or by Atslz
(521-51/1127-56), and he also lived in Nlshapur. He
died at either Marw or Kharak in 533/1138-9.
Amongst his works, al-Risdla al-shdmila, on
arithmetic, and al-Risdla al-maghribiyya are lost,
but there are extant manuscripts of his works on
cosmography: (i) Muntahd 'l-idrdk fi takslm (or
takdsim] al-afldk, which included, according to
UadidjI Khalifa, 1852-3, three parts—(a) the structure of the spheres, the movements of the heavenly
bodies, etc. (b) the shape of the earth, with its devision into an inhabited zone and an uninhabited zone,
the differences in the ascendants (tdli<) and the
ascensions (matdli*), according to geographical
position (c) chronology; the conjunctions, especially
those of Saturn and Jupiter; and the periods of
revolution (adwdr). In this work there is a description
of the five seas borrowed from al-Djayham (301;
913-14), in which it is asserted that the Atlantic
communicates with the Indian Ocean, just as the
Black Sea communicates by means of the Don
(Jams) with the Baltic (ed. and tr. C. A. Nallino,
Albatenii Opus astronomicum, Milan 1903-7, i, 169-75).
(2) Kitdb al-Tabsirafi Him al-hay*a, a work basically
concerned with astronomy, and shorter than the
preceding work. According to HadjdjI Khalifa 338, i
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it was dedicated to the minister Abu '1-Husayn CA1I b.
Naslr al-DIn, and contained two parts concerning the
celestial spheres and the earth respectively. In it, the
author shows the positions of the apogees for the
beginning of the year 1444 of the Seleucid era (i
October 1132), and he brought the longitudes of
al-Battanl down to his own time (Nallino, op. cit.,
i, 240).
In these two works, al-Kharaki develops the
theory that the celestial bodies do not move along
imaginary circles, but are drawn along by material
spheres. The antecedents of this view can be found
in Ptolemy's Planetary hypotheses, and the same idea
was set forth by al-Khazin [q.v.] and by Ibn alHaytham [q.v.]. Kutb al-DIn al-Shlrazi (633-710/12361311) airs this view in his Nihdyat al-idrdk fl dirdyat
al-afldk, referring both to al-Kharaki and to Ibn alHaytham, and in Europe, it was known to Roger
Bacon (ca. 1214-92).
Bibliography: Brockelmann, I, 624, 81,863;
Suter, Mathematiker, 116, 161, 164; Sarton, Introduction, ii, 204-5, 750, 956, 1018; E. Wiedemann,
Zur Geschichte des Kompasses . . . , in Zeitschr.
Phys., xxiv (1924), 166-288; idem and K. Kohl,
Einleitung zu Werken von al-Charaql, in SPBMS
Erlg., Iviii-lix (1926-7), 203-18; Zirikli, Acldm, vi,
210.
(E. WIEDEMANN - [J. SAMS6])
KHARAN, a former native state of western
Balucistan, now incorporated in Pakistan. Geographically, it comprises a wide basin, that of the
Mashkel river in the west and the Baddo in the east,
between high ranges of mountains, the Ra3s Kuh
rising to 9,900 feet; the valley terrain includes an
extensive rigistdn or sand desert. The population is
largely Balu6, with some Brahms in the eastern part.
The early history of Kharan is very obscure. Local
tradition says that the Nawshirwam chiefs entered
Kharan in the 8th/i4th century. Over the ensuing
centuries, these chiefs gave a vague allegiance to
rulers in Persia, Kalat and Afghanistan at different
times; up till the period of Nadir Shah Afshar (midi8th century), Kharan seems generally to have been
considered as an extension of the Persian province
of Kirman. The energetic Naslr Khan of Kalat [see
KILAT] brought Kharan under his suzerainty, until
conflicts in the latter half of the igth century between Mir Khudadad Khan of Kalat and Azad Khan
of Kharan inclined the latter to the Afghan side.
In 1884, Sir Robert Sandeman, the pacifier of Balucistan, visited Kharan and arranged a settlement
between the rival rulers. Kharan continued to
acknowledge Kalat's general suzerainty, but now
received an annual subsidy from the Government of
India and referred disputes to the British Political
Agent in Quetta (see T. N. Thornton, Colonel Sir
Robert Sandeman: his life and work on our Indian
frontier, London 1895, 101, 180-2). It was around this
time also that the frontier on the west of Kharan and
the adjacent parts of Balucistan with Persia was
demarcated. Few travellers visited Kharan before
Sandeman's time; one of the few who did, H. Pottinger
(1810), alludes to the fine camels of Kharan and to the
fact that the local chief, Sardar cAbbas Khan
Nawshirwam, had recently declared himself independent of Mahmud b. Naslr Khan of Kalat (Travels in
Beloochistan and Sinde; accompanied by a geographical
and historical account of those countries, London 1816,
129-30).
Disputes and conflicts with Kalat in 1940 led to
an agreement whereby Kharan was recognized as a
separate native state under its own Nawab. The latter
immediately acceded to Pakistan in 1947. In 1952


KHARANA, a fortified building, usually referred to as Kasr Kharana. It is strategically located in the Transjordanian desert, 60 km. SE of 'Ammān in lat. 31° 42' N. and long. 36° 79' E., on the edge of a wadi at the meeting of several desert tracks. The land is stony, infertile and geologically basaltic (whence conceivably a connection of its name with Arabic harra [q.v.]), and there is no obvious water supply; 2 km. to the WSW is an Upper Palaeolithic-Mesolithic site, with an abundance of flint implements. The entrance to Kasr Kharana (see Plate xxix a) incorporates two stone blocks with part of a Greek inscription, suggesting that there was an earlier building nearby, of the late Roman or Byzantine period.

The building is approximately 35 m. square, and is two stories high; it is built of rough masonry with decorative brick inserts and plaster details. The outer wall has a round tower at each corner, and semi-circular towers at the centre of the N, E and W sides. The single entrance is on the S side, flanked with quarter-round projections, with a large window above and a row of decorative niches. The walls are pierced with loopholes of unusual design, the very opening resting on a single stone against which two bricks are set diagonally. Between the two rows of loopholes and an upper row of rectangular openings are horizontal bands of decorative brickwork inserted in the masonry, the bricks being placed diagonally to produce a herringbone pattern.

Inside, the covered entrance leads to a central courtyard, surrounded on all sides by basins of varying dimensions, on two floors; in fact, there was once a gallery, which has now disappeared (see Plate xxix b). Access to the gallery, and to the rooms on the upper level opening off it, was by means of two sloping ramps. The larger rooms on the upper floor are roofed by transverse vaults of stones set end to end, supported on triple engaged columns without bases or capitals, all plastered over. Two of these rooms have semi-domes at the far end, supported at the angles by squinch arches (see Plate xxx a). The rooms are plastered, with simple decorative mouldings, and a number of carved roundels with formal, symmetrical plant designs.

Important evidence for the date of Kasr Kharana was the discovery by B. Moritz in 1905-6 of a graffito inscription on the wall of one of the upper rooms (see Plate xxx b). This inscription in eleven lines, and another three-line inscription nearby, are amongst the earliest extant painted Arabic texts. The last three lines contain the statement, "'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar wrote [it] on Monday three [nights] remaining from Muḥarram of the year two and ninety" (tr. N. Abbott). This date corresponds to Monday, November 24th, 710 A.D. It has been conjectured that 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Umar (whose name is given thus at the beginning of the inscription) was a member of al-Walid's entourage, returning from a visit to Mecca in 710 A.D. While the inscription cannot be interpreted in any way as evidence for the Muslim origin of the building, it does provide a useful terminus ante quem. Most authors, and notably K. A. C. Creswell, have identified the building as Sāsānian, and have associated it with the Persian occupation of 614-28 A.D. Creswell, and others, have observed that many of the structural and decorative features, such as the use of elliptical arches, the squinches, the engaged columns supporting transverse arches, and the quarter-round entrance towers, find their parallels in Sāsānian and Mesopotamian architecture; Creswell has also pointed out that the obviously defensive nature of the structure sets it apart from the majority of the later Umayyad desert palaces, which were seldom fortified.
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a. General view, showing the main entrance with quarter-round towers (upper section restored)

b. The internal courtyard. Note the springing of arches and the traces of a gallery, now disappeared, on the first floor.
a. Upper floor room, with a semi-dome supported on squinch arches.

b. Squinch arch in upper room, with graffito inscription between the springing of the arch and the angle of the walls, dated 91/710.
The etymology of the name Khwarazm has evoked much speculation. In his article Khwarazm in the Muqaddimah, ed. Beirut 1374-6/1955-7, ii, 395-8, Yākūt offers a folk-etymology relating to two outstanding features of the province, the food gained for the Khwarazmians from the Amū Daryā and its channels, sc. the fish, and the trees and bushes which probably covered some part at least of the region in early times and supplied fuel for cooking; the translation of Ibn Faḍlān (tr. Arends, 1969, 805-36) remarks on the cheapness and easy availability of firewood there. Outside the realm of fancy, an obvious meaning for the name might well be "lowlands", if the -zam element of the Achaemenid name for Khwarazm, Huwārazmīs, links Middle and New Persian zamīn "land" and the first element in New Persian hādār "low, abject". Another suggestion has connected the first element with kharāhid "sun" and has explained it as "the land of the rising sun", reflecting Khwarazm's position on the northeastern periphery of the Iranian heartlands; and a further explanation has been that of "fruitful land", linking the first element with New Persian khurūrdan "to eat". Tolstov has even explained it as "the land of the people Khwrarī or Kharrī", connecting these with the Hurrians who founded the Mitanni kingdom in northeastern Mesopotamia and the Lake Van region in the middle of the second millennium B.C., presumably positing a migration of the proto-Hurrianic peoples westwards from Central Asia. Whether Khwarazm is to be identified with the Arzanem vače "Aryan range" of the Avesta, sc. with the homeland of the old Iranian sacred books, as was maintained by, e.g. Marquart, is unproven but the unlikely: W. B. Henning suggested a possibility that the Gāthās, the oldest part of the Avesta, were composed in northern Khurasan, the region of Marw and Harat, perhaps then part of the pre-Achaemenid kingdom of Khwarazm.

It certainly seems that in Achaemenid times Khwarazm was a flourishing land, and on the evidence of the Behistun and Persepolis inscriptions, was subject to some degree of Achaemenid control. Khwarazm or Huwārazmīs provided a "dark-blue stone" (?) turquoise for decorating the palace of Darius at Susa. Herodotus alludes to what he calls "the plain of the Akēs River", i.e. the Oxus, as part of the Achaemenid dominions, and mentions the presence of Chorasmian and Parthian troops in the army of Xerxes as a special division under Artabanus son of Pharnaces; he further says that these soldiers were equipped in the same fashion as the Bactrians, sc. with Median caps, bows and short spears. By the time of Alexander the Great, however, the Khwarazmians had somehow thrown off Persian control, and when Alexander was in Bactria in 328 B.C. he received a visit from the King of Chorassian, Pharasmanes, and his retinue of 1,500 cavalrymen. Apparently Pharasmanes claimed sovereignty over all the steppes westwards from Chorassia to Colchis on the Black Sea shores—by no means an impossible boast, given the long-standing political, commercial and cultural connections of Khwarazm with the Volga basin and South Russia.

Once the exiguous Greek sources become silent, we are dependent for literary evidence about the next centuries on the equally fragmentary information from the Khwarazmian Islamic scholar Birūnī (d. after 442/1050) [q.v.], a Khwarazmian patriot who was clearly conscious of the ancient glories of his home-land. In his Alīkhār al-bābīya, ed. Sachau, Leipzig 1875, 35-6, tr. idem, The chronology of ancient nations, London 1879, 42-2, he has a section on the ancient history and rulers of Khwarazm and on its era. He also wrote a special history of the province, the Kiāb al-Muṣāmara fi akhbār Khwarazm, cited by Yākūt (who visited Khwarazm personally in 616/1220-30, travelling from Marw in the depths of the harsh steppe winter) and utilised by Bayhaḵī in the closing section of his Mafhūm al-Musulūmīn, ed. Ghani and Fayyād, Tehran 1324/1945, 655-91, tr. Arends, Istoria Musulūmān (1030-1041) 8, Moscow 1969, 805-36; it is regrettable that no parts of this work on the pre-Islamavid history of Khwarazm have survived.

Until recent decades, we have had to depend largely on Birūnī for the history of the semi-legendary and pre-Islamic past of Khwarazm. He says that the land was first colonised 980 years before Alexander the Great, sc. before the Seleucid era, i.e. in 1292 B.C., when the hero of Iranian epic Siyavush came to Khwarazm, and his son Kay Khusrav was established on the throne 92 years later, in 1200 B.C. He starts giving names only with the Afrighid line of Khwarazm-Shāhs, having placed the ascension of Afrāgh in 616 of the Seleucid era, i.e. in 305 A.D.

The oldest Chinese name for Khwarazm, Yue-kiên, given in the annals of theEarlier Han (first and second centuries B.C.), suggests as the centre of Khwarazmian power Gurgāndj [q.v.], earlier form Urgāndj, on the left bank of the Amū Daryā in lower Khwarazm. However, Ptolemy mentions that this centre lay on the right bank of the river, corresponding to the position of the royal palace excavated by Tolstov at Toprak-kala and that of the later capital of the Afrighids, Kāb [q.v.] or al-Firādat-Pil, and this seems both historically and archaeologically more probable. The remarkable results of Soviet archaeological work have indeed vastly widened our knowledge of the pre-Islamic history of Khwarazm. Well over 1000 pre-Islamic and early-Islamic coins have been found, together with many inscriptions in the Khwarazmian language and script on vessels, documents, etc. (see on these, below). In general, these results show that Khwarazm, dates assigned to it, are not to be relied upon, for he was writing about matters which he could not verify. Thus V. A. Livshits has shown from dated Khwarazmian artefacts that Birūnī's era from the Siyavushid foundation of the kingdom and from the establishment of the Afrighids, were never in actual use; instead, there was an official era beginning in the opening years of the Christian era, and probably to be connected with the rise of the new, pre-Islamic line of Shāhs and the achievement of independence from Parthian control, a control which seems to be attested by the clear Arsacid influence in coin designs, etc. (The Khwarezmian calendar and the era of ancient Chorassian, in Acta antiqua academiae scientiarum hungaricae, xvi (1968), 433-46, and see Khwarazm-Shāhs).

We are wholly dependent on archaeology for any information at all on social and economic topics. Soviet research has provided much basic data, though these may be capable of various interpretations. It has shown the presence of extensive agricultural estates, with outlying field systems irrigated by networks of arāls or canals, and with central concentration points and fortified citadels, within which the peasants and their herds could take refuge. It is likely that, as at all times in its known pre-modern history, Khwarazm's borders were under pressure from the pastoralist nomads of the surrounding...
steppes, probably by peoples like the Massagetes and Sakas in early times, and certainly by Turkish tribes like the Oghuz, Khplek, Pechenegs, etc., in Islamic times. Birñun speaks in his Añhr, 236, tr. 224, of annual expeditions led by the Khãrazm-Shãhs against the Oghuz, so that there was an autumn festival in Khãrazm called faghbiiriya “that of the King’s expedition” (faghbur = Iranian baghbur). It seems certain that in the 4th/10th century a group of Oghuz, perhaps semi-sedentarised and practising some agriculture and fishing but still inclined by nature to plundering and rapine, were established near the mouth of the Sýr Daryá or Jaxartes only ten stages from Khãrazm, and their Yabghãu or leader spent his winters at their settlement of Yengi-kent (Díh-i naw, al-Qarya al-gjadída, modern Díl ankent-kala). The fortified nature of the Khãrazmian agricultural domains can thus be easily explained by this need for security against external raiders. It is less certain that these fortified enclosures were, as Soviet authorities have suggested, designed also for internal defence purposes, in the shape of peasant revolts against the “feudal” landowners of the province.

Tolstov adduces in support of his argument the events surrounding the Arab conquest of Khãrazm in 937/1251 by Kýtabya b. Muslim al-Báili, the lieutenant in Khurrazád of the Khãrazmian Shãh, b. Yusuf. There had been attempts by the Arabs in the early Umayyad period to extend their raids through Transoxania to Khãrazm, and historians like Balâdhûrî, Ñabari and Ibn al-al-Hír mention various raids, such as that led by Salâm b. Ziyâd in 61/681 against a town on the borders of Khãrazm (possibly Hazarasp) where the local Iranian princes of Soghdia had banded together to resist the Arabs. Kýtabya was able to intervene in internal Khãrazmian politics because he was summoned in from Marw by the Afrîghid Shãh, unable by himself to make headway in a civil war with his younger brother Khurrazád (“the sun-born one”), who had seized power. Tolstov interprets Khurrazád’s movement as one of social protest, of the Neo-Mazdakite type familiar in the disturbed countryside of Persia at this time, a rising of the urban and rural masses against the Khãrazm-Shãh and the landed aristocracy (what Ñabari, ii, 1237, calls “the dihkáns and marzbnáns”). He bases himself on Ñabari’s information that Khurrazád confiscated the slavegirls, fine horses, precious articles, etc. of those connected with the royal court; but the social implications of all this, if there were any, are not really explicit in the Arabic sources. See H. A. R. Gibb, The Arab conquests in Central Asia, London 1923, 42-3; Tolstov, Auf den Spuren der altkhozischen Kultur, Berlin 1953, 239-45; B. Spuler, Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 31.

At all events, the two Arab invasions of this year, entailing the killing by the Arabs of the Khãrazm-Shãh himself, brought for the province the first time into the Arab orbit, and the Arabs were able to exact the payment of tribute and the supplying of auxiliary troops. Much damage seems to have been wrought by the incoming Arabs. Birñun says that Kýtabya slaughtered all those who knew the old Khãrazmian script and who knew the old historical traditions. This is doubtless an exaggeration. The requirement of tribute lapsed, and Islam was certainly not implanted immediately. The Afrîghids themselves did not become Muslim till three generations or so later, perhaps in the caliphate of al-Ma’ümán. The Shãhs continued to join with the Soghdian rulers of Transoxania in common hostility to the Arabs, encouraging intervention by the Turks and Chinese; in 133/751 we hear from Chinese sources of an embassy from the Shãh Shâwus(n) (whose name is also known from coins) to the Imperial Court (Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, 145). The Khãrazmian language survived for several centuries to come, and so must some at least of the culture and lore of ancient Khãrazm, for it is hard to see the commanding figure of Birñun, a repository of so much knowledge, appearing in a cultural vacuum.

The persistence of the Khãrazmian language was, in fact, an outstanding manifestation of Khãrazmian ethnic and cultural vitality. Linguistically, this eastern Iranian language occupies a position midway between Soghdian on the east, known to us from a large number of Manichaean, Buddhist and other texts, and the rather less well-known Parthian on the west; an especially interesting feature of Khãrazmian is its conservative character in preserving many Avestan words (cf. the hypothesis, mentioned above, that the Gâshãs were composed in northern Khurrazân, then part of the pre-Achaemenid state of Chorasmia). It was a written language well before the Arab conquest, utilising, like Pahlavi, Parthian and Soghdian, an alphabet ultimately derived from the Aramaic one. This early stage of the language is known to us from the finds of Soviet archaeology, coin inscriptions, legends on pottery and silver vessels, documents on wood and leather, and many funerary inscriptions from ossuaries, but few of these texts have so far been satisfactorily published. It seems likely, however, that the Khãrazmian script emerged around the first century B.C. and was probably influenced by the practice of the Arsacid Parthian chancellery. Kýtabya’s invasions may have ended the old scribal tradition, but the language itself persisted, now written in the Arabic alphabet but with several characters modified to render the characteristic sounds of Khãrazmian, e.g. ẞ for the labiodental fricative v or ß, and ß for the affricate ts (as in Pashto) and probably for its voiced equivalent dz; these modified characters are to be found, for instance, in several manuscripts of Birñun’s works where Khãrazmian names and terms are cited. It may be that Birñun knew something of the old Khãrazmian script, but this is uncertain. Khãrazmian speech struck the Muslim geographers and travellers to the province as particularly qu?er and harsh; Ibn Fa’ðlan compares it to the chatter of the Oghuz, so that there was an autumn

The main sources for our rather exiguous knowledge of later Khãrazmian are the glosses in the Khãrazmian scholar Zamakhshârî’s Arabic dictionary the Muqaddimát al-adab, together with Khãrazmian sentences in a series of Arabic legal works adapted for use in Khãrazm, in particular, the Khwnat al-munya of Mu’âddar b. Mâdu’ar al-Zâhidî (d. 658/1260). Khãrazmian culture and speech felt the pressure of Turkish infiltration from northern Khãrazm southwards, leading to the disappearance of the original Iranian character of the province and its complete Turkisation today, but Khãrazmian speech probably lasted in upper Khãrazm, the region round Hazarasp, till the end of the 8th/14th century. See on the Khãrazmian language, W. B. Henning, in Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1. Abt., 4. Band, 1. Abschnitt, Iranistik, Leipzig-Cologne 1952, 25, 50-8, 82-4, 109-20, and D. N. MacKenzie,
In Cambridge history of Iran, iii, The Selucid, Parthian and Sassanid periods, ch. xxv(f); the Khwarazm which Hennig was working till his death remains unpublished, but a section of it has now been edited by MacKenzie, A fragment of the Khwarazmian dictionary... London 1971.

The religious pattern of early Islamic Khwarazm shows the gradual permeation of Islamic faith and learning, so that Khwarazm became, like Khurasan and Transoxiana, a bastion of Sunni orthodoxy and scholarship, attested by the large number of traditionalists, lawyers, theologians, etc. with the nisha “al-Khwarazm”. The great mathematician Muhammed b. Mūsā al-Khwarazmī (d. after 238/854) [q.v.] flourished at a time when the Khwarazmī-Shāhs were only just becoming Muslims themselves, and in the following century we have such outstanding figures as the poet and prose stylist Abū Bakr Muhammed b. al-‘Abbās al-Khwarazmī (d. 383/993) [q.v.], and the Sāmānīd secretary and official Abū ‘Abbāl Mūhammed b. Ahmad al-Khwarazmī [q.v.], author of the pioneer encyclopedia of the sciences, the Ma‘ālik al-ulūm. The Arabic literary and philological sciences flourished there, as is shown by the section on the judaica Khwarazm in Thālibī’s anthology, the Yadmat al-adhar, ed. Cairo, i, 194-255, and by the figure of Bīrūnī himself. Biruni himself was still to some extent dependent on the position of the Amīr Daryā and its frequently-changing channels; the citadel and its frequently-changing channels; the citadel and palace of the Aflatun Shāhs in Kāthā was gradually undermined by the river waters, and by the mid-4th/10th century the citadel and old city had been abandoned and a new city built to the east. As against the products of Khwarazm, the sources mention fruit (especially melons, which in the 3rd/9th century the Ma‘ānish and al-Wāghik were exported in leaden, snowpacked containers as far as Baghdad, and which Ibn Batūta also praises as ones of incomparable quality), dried fish, textiles, cheese, snow, bows, etc.; whilst imports from the steppes and forests included sheep, camels, furs, hides, honey, hardwoods, and above all, Turkish and Şakbāli slaves.

In the 4th/10th century Khwarazm was nominally under the suzerainty of the Sāmānīd Amirs of Bughdrā, but little is known of the internal history of the province during these last few decades of Aflatun rule. In 385/995 the Ma‘ānish of Gurgandj overthrew the ancient dynasty and themselves assumed the title of Khwarazmī-Shāhs, but in 408/1017 the province passed to the Ghaznavids; this control by Sultan Mahmūd meant the end of political power in Khwarazm exercised by local dynasties, just as the extinction of the Sāmānīs in Transoxiana meant the end of direct Iranian rule there. In the cases of both regions, the assumption of power by Turkish rulers and the breaking-down of the northeastern bulwark of the Iranian world against pressure from the steppes inaugurated an accelerating process of ethnic and linguistic turkisation; Khwarazm became wholly Turkish, and in Transoxiana, only the restricted district of Tajikistan survives of the formerly vast Iran extérieur. Khwarazm came into the Salgār orbit after the downfall of Ghaznavid power in Khurāshān,
and was ruled by Turkish slave governors on behalf of the Saljuq Sultans. In the last years of the 5th/10th century, the governor Anusha-Ghar a'la succeeded in founding an hereditary line in Khwarzm, whose members also took the title of Khwarz-sultans and who were, after the middle years of the 6th/12th century, virtually independent (for details of the history of these three centuries before the Mongol invasions, see Ulugh-Beg).

The extensive empire built up by this last line of Khwarz-sultans nevertheless crumbled before the Mongol onslaught, and the Shah Allah-Din Muhammad's capital of Urgenc (the former Gurgandj) fell to Caghatay and Ogedey in 618/1221 after a valiant defense. After this, the northern part of Khwarzm and the lower Syr Darya region came within the lands of the Golden Horde for 140 years, with only the southern part, including Khiva, coming to Caghatay and Ogedey in 618/1221 after a valiant defense. After the end of the Arabshahid line, there followed a century, virtually independent (for details of the Arabshahid line, see Shadiarat al-Atrakhiyya in the history of his land because none of his subjects was educated enough to undertake this task.

After the end of the Arabshahid line, there fol-
allowed various fāidānī khāns of Čingizid lineage but little competence or power, who were summoned from the steppes; the real holder of power in Khwāzī was generally the īnāq (i.e. senior member and military chief) of the Kongrat tribe, who simply sent these khāns back to the steppes when they proved inadequate for his purposes. It was in the 12th/13th century that relations between the Khānāte of Khwāzī and the expanding power of Russia began to assume some importance. Already, the Ural Cossacks had been attracted by the famed richness of Khwāžī and had raided New Urgenc. In 1717 Peter the Great, drawn by the possibility of opening up an overland trade to Bahār and India, and acting on a pretext that was to be much used in the process of the Russian reduction of Central Asia, viz. the release of Russian prisoners, sent a military expedition against Khwāzī under the Circassian adventurer Bekovī. The expedition failed, but in 1135/1740 the Persian conqueror or Nadīr Shāh Afšār conquered Bahār and Khwāzī temporarily; however, Nadīr’s nominee to the throne in Khwāzī, Tagīr, did not long survive the Shāh’s withdrawal.

From on now onwards, the Khwāzī Khānāte in general and the topography of the capital begin to be well-known from the accounts of Russian and western European travellers and explorers. The Khwāzī suffered badly from the raids from the south of the Yomut Türkmen of the Kara Kum desert, who almost completely destroyed the city shortly before 1184/1770; these Türkmen were however driven off and the city restored in that year by the Īnāq Mūhammad Amlīn. In 1225/1804 the Īnāq Itīzuč, grandson of Mūhammad Amlīn, assumed the title of Khān, and the remaining Khāns of Khwāzī were all from his line. Warfare with the Khāns of Bahār continued in the early 19th century, and in an expansionist phase under the Khān Mūhammad Rabī‘īn (1221–41/1806–26) and his son Allāh Kull (1241–55/1820–42), the Khwāzī Khānāte assumed its greatest extent, from the shores of the Aral Sea and the Sīr Dāyār mouth, to the south of Marw. But Russian expansionism now assumed serious proportions. The winter expedition of 1839–40 from Orenburg under General Perovski failed miserably, but soon afterwards, the Khān had to accede to a set of Russian demands, after vainly trying to open up relations with Great Britain. The Russians founded a fort named Kazarinsk at the mouth of the Sīr Dāyār in 1847, used subsequently as a base against the Khānāte of Khokand and Tashkent, but also constituting a threat to the flank of Khwāzī. The Khānāte was prosperous enough internally at this time, as is shown by the Sīfārāt-nāma-yi Khwārīzma, the account of the Persian envoy Rūdā Kull Khān, who visited Khwāzī in 1267/1851 to negotiate the freeing of Persians captured by the Türkmen in Māzāndarān and Khūrāsān and then sold in the slave markets of Khwāzī (French tr. by Ch. Schefer, Rellation de l’ambassade au Kharezm de Riza Qouly Khan, Paris 1878). It continued, however, to be harassed by Türkmen depredations, and was at odds with the Khānāte of Bahār. When in 1873 Russian forces from Orenburg, Krasnovodsk on the eastern shore of the Caspian, Perovski on the lower Sīr Dāyār and Tashkent, advanced simultaneously on Khwāzī, the Khān had to capitulate after some fighting. Sayyīd Mūhammad Rabī‘īn lost all his territories on the right bank of the Sīr Dāyār, and in his true successor Khānāte on the left bank, was to be under the protectorate of Russia, to consider himself as “the obedient servant of the Emperor of all the Russians”, and was to pay a heavy war indemnity. The Khāns of Khwāzī were never considered by the Tsarist government to be on the same level as those of Bahār. Internal dissensions within Khwāzī and attacks by the Türkmen still continued, but the last Khān, Sayyīd ‘Abd Allāh (1918–20) faced an invasion by Bolshevik troops and had to abdicate in February 1920 in favour of a nominally independent Khwāžī Shāh, People’s Soviet Republic. This lasted only till 1924, when the internal frontiers of Central Asia were redrawn by the USSR government on ethnic lines, so that the right-bank areas of the old Khwāzī Khānāte were incorporated in the Uzbek SSR and the left-bank ones in the Turkmen SSR.


(C. E. Bosworth)
mentioned at all by Biruni. However, there are one or two tentative confirmations of Blruni's names e.g. of the Artjamâk, Shâh in the time of the Prophet Muhammad, according to Biruni. At the time of Khatayba's two invasions of 937/932 (when the Arabs were invited in by the Shâh to aid him in a succession dispute, but ultimately turned on him and killed him), the then Shàh is named by Biruni as Askadjamûk son of Askadjavâr, the form of the latter's name being confirmed on a coin as Askatsvâr (in this particular case of an earlier coin of the same name). Askadjamûk's own son Shâwushfar[n] seems to appear on coins, and must in any case be identical with the ruler Shao-shien mentioned by the T'ang annals as sending an embassy to China in 133751 asking for assistance against the Arabs (Chavannes, *Documents sur les T'ou-kise (Turcs) occidentaux*, St. Petersburg 1903, 145). See for an analysis of these coins lemma V. A. Livshits, *The Khurasanian calendar and the era of ancient Chorasmia*, xvi (1968), 439-44.

The first Islamic name of Biruni is that one typical of the convert, 'Abd Allah b. Turkasbatha, whose reign should probably be placed in the early 3rd/9th century. However, even amongst the last Shàhs with Islamic names, Ibn al-Â'îb, viii, 310, mentions a Shàh with the second element included by Ibn Biruni as Abu Nasr b. Askâtâm, who rebelled against his nominal suzerain, the Sàmanid Amir of Bukhârâ, Nûb b. Naşr, in 332/943-4. It seems that the Sàmanids had extended their authority over Khârazm by the early 4th/1oth century. When Ibn Fa'dlân came from Baghâd in 909/921 accompanying the mission from the Caliph al-Mukâdîd to the King of the Volga Bulgârs, his party went firstly to Nâsir b. 'Abd Allah b. Askâtâm, who was the "Amir of Khârazm-Shàh, and apparently exercised power over Khârazmian territories, i.e. in Gurgândî in his time of the Ma'mûnids also adorned their capital with fine buildings, and a minaret now preserved in the ruins of Kunya Urgenc has an inscription describing how Ma'mûn II ordered its building in 401/1011 and supervised the laying of its foundations (see Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, 147 n. 2). The Ma'mûnids unfortunately came up against the expansionist policies of the Ghaznavid Sullivan Mumdûb b. Sebûtgitin, who aimed at turning the flanks of his enemies the Kârhânîds by securing possession of Khârazm. In 405/1014 Ma'mûd demanded that Ma'mûn II place the Sultan's name in the Muhaqqa of the Khârazmian territories, i.e. in effect recognise him as overlord of Khârazm. Mumdûb's sister Kâh-Kâldî was successfully wife of two of the Shàhs, and when Ma'mûn was assassinated in 407/1017 by a patriotic reaction against his submission to the Ghaznavid, Ma'mûd had a pretext for intervention, the avenging of his brother-in-law. Ma'mûd's army invaded Khârazm, defeated the local forces at Hazarasp, unleashed a reign of terror in Gurgândî against the regicides, and carried off large numbers of slaves to Ghazna. See for these events, Barthold, *Turkestan*, 275-9; Nâzîm, *The life and times of Sultan Mumdûb of Ghazna*, 56-60, 184-5; Sachau, in *SBWA*, xxiv (1873), 290-301.

Thus from 408/1017 onwards, Khârazm was incorporated in the immense Ghaznavid empire, and possession of it gave Ma'mûd the preponderance in Central Asia against the Karâkhânîds. It was difficult to control so distant a province as Khârazm directly from Ghazna, hence the "Amir of Khârazm" at the time of the 'Abbásid Revolution, 'Abd al-Malik b. Harhâma, mentioned in Narshâkhi, *Ta'rîkh-i Bûkhârâ*, tr. Frye, *The history of Buhûrâ*, 62. It is further strange that so peripatetic an observer as Ibn Fa'dlân, who first visited the Shàh Muhammad b. 'Arâk in his capital Kâth and then stayed over three months in Gurgândî waiting for the winter ice and snow to end, does not mention anything of the political situation in Gurgândî or the existence there of a rival governor. Yet towards the end of the 4th/1oth century, Gurgândî was certainly in the hands of the Ma'mûn family of amirs, for the *Bu'l-dîlâm* (392/982), tr. 122, describes the town as "formerly belonging to the Khârazm-Shàh", but now under the control of a separate pâdishâh or ruler, the Amir of Gurgândî.

This amir, Abu 'l-'Abbâb Ma'mûn b. Muhammad, in 385/995 overthrew the Afrighids of Kâth and killed the last Shàh, Abu 'Abdallah Muhammad b. Abmad, whose successor accordingly calls al-Shahid "the martyr". Abu 'l-'Abbâb Ma'mûn assumed the historic title and founded a brief-lived second line of Khârazm-Shàhs (385-408/995-1017), and the Ma'mûnids court of Gurgândî became a centre of learning and point of attraction for scholars and literary men from all over the eastern Islamic world. The Shàh Abu 'l-'Abbâb Ma'mûn II b. Ma'mûn (?) 399-407? (1009-17) and his Visier Abmad al-Suhaylî were surrounded by a brilliant concourse of figures like the philosophers Ibn Sinà and Abû Sahîl al-Mashhî, the mathematician Abû Nasr b. Askâtâm, who was the "Amir of Khârazm-Shàh", and the famous local man Abu 'l-Khâyir al-Hasan b. al-Khamirâ. The philologist Abû Ma'nûr 'Abd al-Malik al-Thâlibî moved to Khârazm from his home town of Nishâpûr, impelled by the unsettled conditions there consequent upon the fall of the Sàmanids, and became an intimate of the Shàh, to whom he dedicated various works, including a "Mirror for Princes", the *Kâtib Abad al-mulât al-âkhrâmshâh*, ed. and tr. by T. R. Topuçoğlu, unpublished Manchester Ph.D. thesis, 1975. The Ma'mûnids also adorned their capital with fine buildings, and a minaret now preserved in the ruins of Kunya Urgenc has an inscription describing how Ma'mûn II ordered its building in 401/1011 and supervised the laying of its foundations (see Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, 147 n. 2).
Altuntash and his two sons form the short third dynasty of Shahs (408-32/1017-41). Altuntash was the loyal servant of Mamun and his son Mas'ud, defending the frontiers of Khwarzam with the recruitment of auxiliary troops from the Klpek, Kudjet and Caghrat Turks, and he died in battle fighting for Mamun against the Karakhanid Altitgin in 423/1032. His son Harun succeeded as de facto ruler in Khwarzam, though Mas'ud conceded to him only the title of his representative in the lands of the Khitay al-dar. The interests of Altuntash's line were now clearly divergent from those of the Ghaznavids. Harun sought the alliance of the Saltjuk Turks and the Karakhanids, but Mas'ud procured his murder in 425/1034. His brother and successor Isma'il Khandan became the Sultan's bitter foe, and at this time when Mas'ud had his hands full coping with the Saltjuk incursions, was able to rule as an independent ruler. Isma'il was expelled from Khwarzam in 432/1041 by Mas'ud's ally, the Oguz Yabgu of Dian and the Saldiuk court. It was his son Arslan Arghun (551-67/1156-72) who had greater freedom of action after the death of Sandjar and the collapse of Saltjuk power in the east, in so far as relations with the Kara Khitay allowed, for the latter claimed suzerainty over the Karakhanids in Transoxania and over Khwarzam. However, provided that tribute was forwarded regularly to the Gür-Khan's ordu or military camp in Semireçeye, the Kara Khitay were little disposed to interfere in internal matters. The Khwarzam-Shahs especially coveted the Transoxanian possessions of the Karakhanids, and intervened with profit in the quarrels of the Khans of Samarkand and their turbulent Karluk tribal troops; hence in 533/1138 Il-Arslan invaded Transoxania on the latter's behalf.

The reign of Il-Arslan's son and successor 'Ali al-Din Tekish (565-66/1172-1200) brought the Shahs to new heights of their power, and Tekish was able to check the ambitions of the Ghurids (q.v.) in Khurásan and to bring about the final demise of the Great Saltjuk sultanate in western Persia. Tekish was placed on the throne with Kara Khitay help, but he soon rebelled against these last, and made an effort to ward off the Kara Khitay army which invaded Khwarzam by the traditional expedient of opening the dykes of Khwarzam and flooding the land lying in the invaders' path. Over the ensuing years, he was involved not only against the Kara Khitay again but also against his brother and rival for power Sultan Shah, who had established himself in northern Khurásan, and against the Ghurids. He secured his northern frontiers by conciliation of the Klpak and other Turkmen tribes along the lower Syr Darya, and the Khwarzamian armies which came to terrorise Persia and to earn an unenviable reputation for cruelty and barbarity there, included large numbers of steppe Turkmen, many of them still pagan.

Tekish first came westwards to Ray in 588/1192 and demanded that the Saltjuk and Iledegizid Atabegs of western Persia should place his name in the Khitay immediately after that of his father, Tekish. However, in the next year he mounted a further invasion, and in 590/1194 defeated Topghr il-Arslan, the last of the Great Saltjuk line, thus extinguishing this dynasty in Persia. Tekish was now able to occupy all Dibul as far west as Hamadan, so that his territories became coterminous with those of the resurgent 'Abbásid caliphs, and in 595/1199 the caliph al-Nasir deemed it prudent formally to invest Tekish with the sultanate of Træk (sc. 'Irak-i Adjami, western Persia), Khurásan and Turkistan; however, when Tekish died in the next year, the population of Dibul rose and massacred all whom they could find of the hated Khwarzamian occupying troops.

Tekish's son 'Ali al-Din Muhammad (595-617/1200-20) continued his father's anti-caliphal policy, but for many years he was preoccupied in the east by his own opponents, the Ghurids, the Kara Khitay, the Klpak of the northern steppes, and Uthman Khán, the last Karakhanid ruler in Samarkand. For long, he was careful not to break with the Kara Khitay, and welcomed their support in ejecting Muiz al-Din Muhammad Ghür from Khurásan in 601/1204. After the Ghürid sultan's death two years later, the Ghürid empire fell apart, and much of its territories fell briefly into the hands of the Khwarzam-Shahs. 'Ali al-Din could now dispense with Kara Khitay support, and when the latter became increasingly Sandjar's difficulties with the Karakhanids and the Oguz tribesmen of Khurásan; for details, see ATEIZ B. MUHAMMAD B. AN&ÖTITGIN.

Atsila's successors, beginning with Tadj al-Duny wa'll-Din Il-Arslan (551-57/1156-72) had greater freedom of action after the death of Sandjar and the collapse of Saltjuk power in the east, in so far as relations with the Kara Khitay allowed, for the latter claimed suzerainty over the Karakhanids in Transoxania and over Khwarzam. However, provided that tribute was forwarded regularly to the Gür-Khan's ordu or military camp in Semireçeye, the Kara Khitay were little disposed to interfere in internal matters. The Khwarzam-Shahs especially coveted the Transoxanian possessions of the Karakhanids, and intervened with profit in the quarrels of the Khans of Samarkand and their turbulent Karluk tribal troops; hence in 533/1138 Il-Arslan invaded Transoxania on the latter's behalf.
distracted from Transoxanian affairs by the revolt in Semirečye of the Mongol chief Küllüg, he was by 668/1272 able to kill Uthman Khân and succeed to the remainder of the Karâhânîd heritage in Transoxania. 'Alâ' al-Dîn was now assured of commanding prestige throughout the eastern Islamic world, though like his father, he continued to be satisfied with the circumscribed territorial designation of Khwârazm-Shâh and with that of Sultan. 'Alâ' al-Dîn knew from correspondence that the 'Abbasîd caliph had in the past incited the Ghurids against him; and he denounced al-Nâsr as unfit to rule and proclaimed an 'Alîd as anti-caliph. He began to march on Bagh-dâd, but in the winter of 617/1220-1, snowstorms of unusual severity halted his forces in Kurdistân and Luristân, and news of unrest among the Kîpîâks compelled him to return to the Khwârazmian frontiers. The menace of the advancing Mongols, successors to Küllüg in Semirečye and Karâshgaria, coincided with 'Alîd al-Dîn's closing years, and this new factor in Middle Eastern affairs was to occupy the attention of his son Djalâl al-Dîn (7) Minburnûrû (617-28/1220-31) and to lead to the downfall and complete disintegration of the extensive but transient empire of the Khwârazm-Shâhs. For these last events, see Cîrinî-şîrân and Djalâl al-Dîn Khwârazm-Shâh, and for the general history of this fourth dynasty of Shâhs, see Bosworth, in Cambridge history of Iran, v., see CîngîzKhân and Djalâl al-Dîn Khwârazm-Shâh.

The factor in Middle Eastern affairs was to occupy the Ala al-Dîn's closing years, and this new compelled him to return to the Khwârazmian frontiers. The menace of the advancing Mongols, successors to Küllüg in Semirečye and Karâshgaria, coincided with 'Alîd al-Dîn's closing years, and this new factor in Middle Eastern affairs was to occupy the attention of his son Djalâl al-Dîn (7) Minburnûrû (617-28/1220-31) and to lead to the downfall and complete disintegration of the extensive but transient empire of the Khwârazm-Shâhs. For these last events, see Cîrinî-şîrân and Djalâl al-Dîn Khwârazm-Shâh, and for the general history of this fourth dynasty of Shâhs, see Bosworth, in Cambridge history of Iran, v., The Saljuq and Mongol periods, ch. i.

The Mongol governors of Khwârazm do not seem to have employed the title of Khwârazm-Shâh, nor did the line of Sûfîd local rulers in the post-Il-Khânid period adopt it (see for these rulers, Khârazm). The title of Khan of Khwârfân is an introduction (madhâbî) to the elements of the sciences (auwâl al-sinâ'îd) which explains the key terms used by the various groups of scholars, artisans and government officials, in particular those terms which were left out of current lexica. Al-Khârazmî did not set out to write an essay on the aim and structure of the sciences, as al-Fârâbî (d. 339/950) had done in the Îshâ'î al-îhsân, or presented a Weltanschauung, as the Khwârn al-Safà were doing in their Epistles at about the same time. As a dictionary of basic technical terms drawn from many disciplines, and as a description of contemporary practices in the sciences and in the chanceries, the Mafâtîh is of considerable value for the study of Islamic culture. The book is divided into two roughly equal sections dealing respectively (i) the religious sciences (uluwm al-khârfâ) and the Arabic sciences associated with them, and (ii) the "foreign" sciences (uluwm al-âdâm). Each discourse is divided into sections (babs) and further into chapters (fâsîl). The subjects of the sections in the two discourses are the following: (i) 1. jurisprudence, 2. dialectical theology (kâtîm), 3. grammar, 4. the secretarial art (kâtâba), 5. poetry and prosody, 6. history; (ii) 1. philosophy, 2. logic, 3. medicine, 4. arithmetic, 5. geometry, astronomy and astrology, 7. music, 8. mechanical devices, 9. alchemy. Al-Khârazmî's book shows that to call the philosophical, natural and mathematical sciences "foreign" was not at that time a sign of rejection of these disciplines, but simply a statement of the fact that they had been developed by non-Arabs (âdâm). The book clearly implies the conception that to be considered educated, one had to be acquainted with both major branches of learning.

Bibliography: The standard critical edition of Mafâtîh al-uluwm is that of G. van Vloten, Leiden 1895, repr. 1968. There are other oriental prints. C. E. Bosworth describes six Istanbul manuscripts not used by van Vloten in Some new manuscripts of al-Khwârizmî's Mafâtîh al-uluwm, in JSS, ix (1964), 345-5, and comes to the conclusion that they do not add much to the elucidation of the text.

A useful general account is C. E. Bosworth,
A pioneer Arabic encyclopedia of the sciences: al-Khwārizmi's Keys of the Sciences, in Isis, lv (1963), 97-111. A number of E. Wiedemann's Beiträge zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften bei den Arabern deal with various parts of the Mašfāth. Originally published in Sitzungsberichte der Physikalisch-medicinischen Gesellschaft in Erlangen between 1906 and 1923, they are now conveniently reprinted in E. Wiedemann, Aufsätze zur Arabischen Wissenschaftsgeschichte, ed. M. ibn Tawlt al-fandji, index), he...
AL-KHWARAZMI (often written AL-KHWARIZMI), ABU OIA'FAR MUHAMMAD B. MUSA, mathematician, astronomer and geographer, who utilised the Arabic language. He lived in the first half of the 3rd/9th century (ca. 154-ca. 225/800-47), and should not be confused with two other important persons with the same nisba [q.vw.]. We know that in his youth, during the caliphate of al-Ma'mūn, he worked in the Bayt al-Ḥikma [q.v.] of Baghhdād, but we know very few other biographical details. However, his main works are well known to us, since many of them were translated into Latin in Spain and exerted a powerful influence on the development of mediaeval thought. If the attempts at dating put forward by C. J. Toomer (Dictionary of scientific biography, vii (1973), 338b) are correct, almost all these works were composed during the reign of al-Ma'mūn.

His Algebra, called al-Muḥaṣṣar fi ḥisāb al-dīrād wa 'l-mukābala [ed. with Eng. tr. F. Rosen, The algebra of ... , London 1831, repr. New York 1906; ed. A'li Musta'fā Musharrāfa and M. Mursi Ahmad, Cairo 1939] was translated partially by Robert of Chester as Liber algebra et almucabola [ed. with Eng. tr. L. Ch. Karpinski in Liber alghoarismi, ... , I973), 358b) is correct, almost all these works completely into disuse. The term ḥijāb may derive, according to Gandz, from Assyrian gabra; this etymology may be feasible, since, in the hundred or so mathematical tablets going back to the second millennium B.C., there appear algebraic problems parallel to those put forward by al-Khazari and which, according to Bruins (Computation in the old Babylonian period, in Acts of the XI111th International Congress on the History of Science, held in Moscow, 1971), show that the Assyrians knew the six model equations [see ḥišāb] used by the Muslim scholar. However, from the strictly historical point of view, there is the problem that the word is not attested in any intervening language, such as Greek, and it is difficult to hold that it could have survived solely in Aramaic till the time of al-Khazari. It is more likely that the word comes from medical terminology where ḥijāb has the idea of resetting a dislocated limb, just as today, in the dictionary of the Real Academia Española, algebra designates an algorithm and algebriasa is a synonym for a specialist in wounds and broken bones. On the various mathematical operations involved in algebra and on the typical equations used in it, see ḥišāb and also G. A. Saliba, in Centaurus, xvii (1972), 189-204.

Almost at the same time as the Algebra was being translated, John of Seville made known the Latin version of an adaption made either by himself or by some Muslim author of al-Khazari's Arithmetic, lost in the Arabic but which must have been called Kǔb ḥıšāb al-adad al-hindi or K. al-Dham' wa'l-tafrīk bi-ḥisāb al-Hind. John of Seville's work was called Liber alghoarismi de practica arismetica (ed. B. Boncompagni, ... , II, Rome 1857; K. Vogel, Mohammed ibn Musa AlKhwarismi's Algorismus, Aalen 1963; A.-P. Juschkewitsch, Über ein Werk des Abä 'Abbālāh Muḥammad ibn Mūsā ... zur Arithmetik der Indier, in Homage to G. Harig, 1964, 21-63, with an appendix containing a photographic reproduction of the Cambridge ms.). The connections among the various mediaeval works deriving from al-Khazari's one are not well established, but all of them have enough characteristic that they explain how to work with the numbers which we today call "Arabic" and which were known in the 3rd/9th century in the Iberian peninsula. Concerning these numbers, mediaeval scholars invented all sorts of etymologies and legends. Gaspar of Tejada asserted that "zero is not a sign, but an empty space" (cf. G. Menéndez Pidal, Los llamados numerales arabes en Occidente, in BRAH, cxlv/2 (1959), 179-208), an idea that one finds much earlier in the Mafātīḥ al-'uṣūm, ed. van Vloten, 58, ll. 1-4, in regard to ṣarkan, a line brought into a calculation to indicate "nothing", i.e. to keep the order, and whose value is expressed in Latin by nulla figura or in German by Null. On the other hand, this same sign appears in Abraham ben 'Ezra to separate the whole number from the fraction. Other popular etymologies of the time derive algorithm from the name of a hypothetical Algor, king or philosopher, or from the coupling of the Arabic article al- with Greek arithmos, when in reality these technical terms come from the name "al-Khazari", as Reinaud showed (Mémoire ... in Mem. Acad. Insct. et Belles- Lettres, xviii/2 (1849), 303-4.

The actual form of the numbers is unimportant for the operations described in the Liber alghoarismi, but the existence of operations carried out by means of nine or ten symbols implies a knowledge of the rules expounded by al-Khazari. In Spain, these were known by the 4th/10th century, proving the existence of a system of numeration by position. In regard to the form of the numbers used at that time, this is still debated. Destombes (Un astrolabe carolingien et l'origine de ses chiffres, in Annales de l'histoire intern. d'hist. des sciences, viii-lix (1962), 3-45) suggests that the monk Vigila of Albelda was present at the consecration of the monastery of Tipoll in 977 and that he knew the system of numeration by position, which he refers to in the appendix to Book iii of St. Isidore when he cites the skill of the Indians as able to create the nine figures described in the Esorcius ms. d. 12; the numbers are given from right to left and must therefore be incontrovertibly of Arabic origin, and their form derives, according to Destombes, from that of the Visigothic letters used in the second half of the 10th century as they appear on the Carolingian astrolabe. Given the fact that at this time of the appearance of this system of numeration by position, there must have existed various systems of representing the numbers, the need for tables of equivalents becomes evident, such as those of Alvaro of Oviedo. It also explains why in 1229 the Senate of Florence forbade their usage and imposed the practice of expressing numbers wholly in letters in order to avoid the possibility of a minor corruption in the form of the numbers or in the usage of different systems simultaneously, thus giving rise to errors.

The Liber alghoarismi and similar works all explain the operations of adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing; they show how decimal and
sexagesimal fractions should be used; and they use the so-called Egyptian fractions, sc. those with 1 as the denominator and from which one can obtain the others by means of addition (e.g. 1/3 + 1/15 = 2/5; 1/4 + 1/28 = 2/7). This type of fraction already appears in the Rhind papyrus and developed over the ancient and mediaeval periods, especially when the system of Kür'ānic inheritance rules gave rise to the 'ām al-farrā‘ (see FA‘RA‘). In 1488, it has been reproduced in Osiris, v (1938), 38, and its antecedents can be found in the similar Arabic tables of an earlier period and triangular in shape. A sexagesimal table of the type just mentioned was to be found in the work of Kūhiyār b. Lābbān (ca. 360-420/971-1032) called Kiṣāb fī usul kiṣāb al-Hind (facs. edn. M. Levey and M. Petrucci, Principles of Hindu reckoning; Madison 1965). E. S. Kennedy and W. R. Transue, A mediæval indian algorithm, in AMM, liii (1956), 80-3, but is unfortunately lost, and the oldest version preserved is that in the Latin version of the Astronomical tables of al-Khwārizmi translated by Adelard of Bath (1126). Tables of this type recall those of the cuneiform tablets.

Another of al-Khwārizmi's works which had a great influence in the birth of western science was his Zīgī al-Sindhind, which was translated into Latin by Adelard of Bath (ed. H. Suter, Die astronomischen Tafeln des Muhammed ibn Māṣūl al-Khārizmi, Copenhagen 1914; Eng. tr. and excellent study by O. Neugebauer, The astronomical tables of al-Khwārizmi, Copenhagen 1962). This work became the subject of a commentary by a certain Ibn al-Muthanna, lost in Arabic but preserved in Latin (ed. E. Millás Vendrell, Madrid-Barcelona 1963) and in Hebrew (ed. and tr. R. Goldstein, New Haven-London 1967), from which it appears that al-Khwārizmi's work had two recensions; Adelard used the minor one, corrected by Maslama al-Madjritl for the position of Cordova. Some complementary pieces of information on the transmission and the contents of the Tables can be found in El libro de los fundamentos de las tablas astronomicas of Abraham ben "Ezra (ed. and study by J. M. Millás, Madrid-Barcelona 1947) and in the monographs of J. J. Burckhardt, in Vierteljahrschrift der Naturforschenen Gesellschaft in Zürich, cvi (1961), 213-31, of E. S. Kennedy and M. Janjanian, in Contaurus, xi (1965), 73-8, of Kennedy and W. Ushakhs, in ibid., xiv (1969), 89-96, and of Neugebauer, in A. loccit's leg, studies in honour of S. H. Taqizadeh, 209-12.

In the Astronomical tables of al-Khwārizmi, in the translation that the first medieaval mathematical symbols appear, sc. three tides in a triangular arrangement followed by a number and placed above another indicate the sum of the first and second; if, on the other hand, there is a single dot, it indicates remainder. These notation systems as found in the West stem from the Arab world, and their connections with older systems, e.g. those of Diophantus, remain to be studied. An analysis of the Tables reveals their mixed character and the multiplicity of sources used. Thus the theory of the moon comes from an intermediate source which did not know the Almagest; the methods used for determining the true longitude of a planet stem from the Sūria Siddhānta and the Janda-Jādāyaka; the values of the movement come from Brahmagupta; and in the ms. of Corpus Christi College (which comes from Adelard's version) there is an allusion to the to-and-fro movement explained at length by Atarqu [see AL-ZARKĀJ], which stems equally from Indian sources. A similar origin can be recognised in the equation of the sun and in the primitive sine tables with R = 150 (Ibn al-Muhammād alludes to this value) replaced in Maslama's adaptation by others with a base = 60, a number of Hellenistic origin. On the other hand, the methods used to determine the direct and the retrograde movements of the planet stem, directly or not, from the manual Tables of Theo. Other elements stem from the Zīgī ma‘mūnī and the Zīgī al-ğāh. In the determination of the parallaxes, the repetitive algorithm from the Janda-Jādāyaka is used, and this presents a certain parallelism with the method used by Kepler to determine the eccentric anomaly.

Al-Khwārizmi's other works were not known in the mediaeval world. His geography or Kitāb Sūrat al-arq (ed. H. von Mißl, Leipzig 1926), has been the object of a detailed study by C. A. Nallino, al-Khwārizmi e il suo rifiutamento della Geografia di Tolomeo, in Raccolta di studi, v, Rome 1944, 456-57. It consists of lists of co-ordinates of the main towns and geographical features, which are sometimes, but not always, in harmony with those of Ptolemy. His source of inspiration might possibly have been the mappa mundi constructed for al-Ma’mūn by a team of geographers in which al-Khwārizmi himself would have been included. The K. Sūrat al-arq depends, even if indirectly, on the Geography of Ptolemy, some of whose errors he corrects, e.g. the excessive length of the Mediterranean.

His Istikhradī izārīkh al-Yahūd (ed. in al-Rasā‘il al-mutafa‘irihā fi’l-hay‘a, Hyderabad 1948) has been studied by E. S. Kennedy in Scripta mathematica, xxvii (1964), 44-9; internal evidence dates it to 208/823. This richly-documented work forms one of the oldest pointers which we possess concerning the Jewish calendar, and it necessitates the revising of many things previously written on the subject. Al-Khwārizmi was further the author of two works on the astrolabe (see J. Frank, Die Verwendung des Astrolabs nach al-Chwārizmi, in AGNM, iii (Erlangen 1922), of a historical chronicle, Kitāb al-Ta‘rīkh, and a book on sun-dials, Kitāb al-Rukhāma, both these latter lost. In regard to the first of the two, it may be surmised that it gave an astronomical explanation of history like that later given by Abū Ma‘shar, al-Nawbakhthī and the writer in al-Andalus Ibn al-Khayyāt (d. 447/1055).

Bibliography: In addition to works cited in the article, see Brockelmann, i, 216, S I, 381; Sezgin, GAS, v, 228-41; Sartor, Introduction, i, 563; Suter, 16; Nachr., 158-60; Fihrist, i, 274; Ibn al-Kīlī, 206, 266; Ibn Sā‘d, K. Tabābul al-amām, tr. Blachère, Paris 1933, 478; Hādīlī Khalfa, ii, 67-9, No. 10012. (J. VERNET)

KHARBGA, a type of the game of draughts
played in North Africa. Although the root kh.r.b.g. is known, yet the origins of this game are lost in the mists of time (squares marked out for it have been found at the tops of pyramids in Egypt). Kharbga, which is one of the four games brought into Ifrikiya by the Banū Hilāl, is played on a square board made up of holes marked out in the ground or in rock and has 49 component squares or “houses” (bit, dīr); the board can equally be traced out on a stone slab or on a sack covered over with sand. According to the number of holes along each side, the game is called by the following names, khamāṣiyah if there are 5, and sabāḥiyah if there are 7. The central square is called dīr al-wasī, and is remarkable by the fact that after the first move of the first piece it remains unoccupied all through the game; other squares of special note or with particular functions surround the central one and serve in the game as places of security.

The game is played by two people, and once the game is set up (mansūb), the players (khārbīg or kharbāg) are surrounded by an audience of interested people who follow the game and offer advice. After having placed on the board, two by two, the differently-coloured pieces called kalb (sing. kāb “dog”; this term is known in the Egyptian, Greek and Arab cultures, see Dozy, Supplément, s.v.) are placed on the board, two by two in the places chosen for this by the players. The course of the game depends on this; each player moves his pieces whilst endeavouring to foresee his opponent’s moves, and good players can plot the course of the opponent’s moves as far as eight future moves. The game consists of “eating up” the opponent’s “dogs” up to the last one by inserting them between two pieces and not going beyond them. In practice, the pieces can in principle be placed anywhere, and the players move them in turn. The substance and nature of the pieces varies according to the place where the game is played. They are black and white; the white ones are pebbles or snail shells, and the black ones are dried lumps of camel dung, peach stones blackened by the sun or even date stones. There are 24 of each colour for the games. The first stage is the placing of the pieces two-by-two in the places chosen for this by the players. The course of the game depends on this; each player moves his pieces whilst endeavouring to foresee his opponent’s moves, and good players can plot the course of the opponent’s moves as far as eight future moves. The game consists of “eating up” the opponent’s “dogs” up to the last one by inserting them between two pieces and not going beyond them. In practice, the pieces can in principle be placed anywhere, and the players move them in turn. Except, it seems, along diagonals.

Kharbga is played in the spring and out-of-doors, in a specified place between the tents and left vacant for this very purpose. Elderly men come and play the game in the afternoon until sunset. At the backs of shops, kharbga is played on sacks, and the shop-owner, who sets out four or five games of the pieces, serves drinks at the same time. Shepherds, whilst out on the job, play on sloping and uneven terrains from where they can keep an eye on their flocks. This social pastime is more popular in the north than in the south. Besides the water brought by the sayls of these valleys, al-Khardj contains four unusually deep spring-fed pools (“wāyn”), three clustered together in the northern part of the district and the fourth, Khafs Daghra, in the southern part. A channel called al-Sayb provides water for irrigation from ʿAyn Sambā in the north.

The two most important towns in the north are al-Salamiyya and al-Yamāma. The name al-Yamāma (q.v.), which in earlier times was applied to much of what is now called Najd, has become restricted geographically to this one town, though the older usage has been revived by giving the name to a hotel and other establishments in al-Riyadh. Farther south lie Naḍīm, al-Dilam, and Zumayka. The largest of all the towns is al-Dilam (or al-Daim; al-Daylam in a verse by ʿAntara)

The two most important towns in the north are al-Salamiyya and al-Yamāma. The name al-Yamāma (q.v.), which in earlier times was applied to much of what is now called Najd, has become restricted geographically to this one town, though the older usage has been revived by giving the name to a hotel and other establishments in al-Riyadh. Farther south lie Naḍīm, al-Dilam, and Zumayka. The largest of all the towns is al-Dilam (or al-Daim; al-Daylam in a verse by ʿAntara)

Many of the names given above occur in the literature of the Diāhilīyya and the early Islamic period. The dominant element in the population of al-Khardj then was the Banū Rays b. Thalāba, a branch of Bakr b. Wāḍi (q.v.). Today the settled people of the valley belong in the main to ʿĀl Ṣiyāḥ (said to be of Kaḥṭān), the Dawāsir, Banū Tamīl, and Banū Ḥālīd (q.v.). Bedouins are from Subay, the Suhāl, and ʿĀl Ṣamīr.

The district as such does not figure prominently in historical records until the 12th/13th century, in the middle years of which the men of al-Khardj stood forth among the principal opponents of the new movement of the Wahhābiyya (q.v.). In 1187/1773 ʿAlī Suʿūd of al-Dīrīyya (q.v.), the secular champion of the Wahhābiyya, captured the foremost enemy town, al-Riyadh, which held the ground between al-Dīrīyya and al-Khardj. Zayd b. Zāmil, the lord of al-Dilam, took up the gauntlet against the Wahhābiyya and paid a large sum in gold to the Ismāʿīlī chief of Naḍīm (q.v.) to join him and others in a campaign against ʿAlī Suʿūd which ended however in failure. In 1190/1776 ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Muhammad ʿAlī Suʿūd defeated Zayd and secured the submission of al-Dilam. The first ʿamīr sent to al-Khardj by ʿAlī Suʿūd was Sulaymān b. ʿUmayyān, who held office for sixteen years and whose family

remained associated with the district long thereafter. After Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt occupied al-Dilam in 1833 by the "Turks" from Egypt returned to Najid and took al-Dilam. When the "Turks" from Egypt withdrew, Turki b. 'Abd Allah Al Su'ud made al-Dilam the new Wakhābī capital and reincorporated al-Khardj in the state. The kādi of al-Khardj under Turki was the noted Ḥanbali divine, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Husayn, a grandson of the founder of the Wakhābīya.

The "Turks" from Egypt returned to Najid and took al-Dilam. Faysal, who had succeeded his father Turki as the Wakhābī Ilmām, based himself on al-Khardj, where Khurāshīd Pasha pursued and overcame him in 1854/1858 in a battle at al-Dilam and Zumayka and sent him a prisoner to Egypt, whence he eventually escaped to resume his rule in Najid. Faysal appointed a younger son of his, Su'ud, as amir of al-Khardj. On the death of Faysal in 1828/1865, Su'ud's challenge of the right of his older brother 'Abd Allah to the succession precipitated a long civil war that ensued Al Su'ud and opened the way for the ascendancy of Al Rashld of Haṣān. The forces of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah Al Rashld fought against Khargird and put them to death. The fortunes of Al Su'ud were revived by 'Abd al-Asīz, son of Faysal's youngest son 'Abd al-Rahmān. 'Abd al-Asīz recovered al-Khardj in 1320/1902 and then repulsed an attack against al-Dilam by 'Abd al-Asīz b. Muhammad Al Rashld. About ten years later the grandsons of Su'ud b. Faysal, still closely connected with al-Khardj, launched an abortive rebellion against their cousin 'Abd al-Asīz b. 'Abd al-Rahmān. In the end, 'Abd al-Asīz forgave them and took into his entourage their leader, known as Su'ud al-Kabīr ("the Elder"), to distinguish him from Su'ud b. 'Abd al-Asīz, who later became King Su'ud. Su'ud al-Kabīr was married to 'Abd al-Asīz's favourite sister, Nūra. As King of Saudi Arabia 'Abd al-Asīz was fond of visiting al-Khardj for diversion. He kept his stud of Arabian horses there, and a model farm run by Americans provided him with fresh produce.

Bibliography: See the bibliographies for al-Aflālī and al-Dawāsīr. (G. Rentz)

Khardj, Kharja, Khardj, Khardj, or Khardj, has been the name of at least two different places in north-eastern Persia but is at present only current for one of them.

1. Khardj in the sīrātāna of Turbat-i Haydariyya, or, more precisely, the dīkhāstān of Rūd-i miyān Khaf, is situated at about 6 km. to the southwest of the latter place. It is now a small settlement, the inhabitants of which live on the growing of cereals there, and a model farm run by Americans provided him with fresh produce.

2. Khardj in the district of Dīmā, which is mentioned in the biographies of three prominent mystic poets of the Timūrid period, is certainly not identical with the former place. Kāṣm-i Anwār [q.v.] died at Khardj of Dīmā in 837/1433-4 and was buried there in the garden of his estate. A mausoleum was erected at this spot to the order of Mīr 'Ali-Shir Nawālī [q.v.] in ca. 892/1487 (cf. Dawlatshāh, 348 ff.). In 817/1414 'Abd al-Rahmān Dīmā [q.v.] was born here and his nephew Hāttīl [q.v.] spent his life in the vicinity of the tomb of Kāṣm-i Anwār, where he found the inspiration for one of his maṯnawī-poems. At present, there no longer exists a place by the name of Khardj in the area of Dīmā. Several Persian travellers and scholars have since the last century identified its site with modern Langar which lies on the road from Meshhad to Turbat-i Shaykh-i Dīmā. As a common noun, langar of langarḵāna was used to denote an alms-house, as it was frequently attached to the tomb of a holy man. Sometimes it has developed into a place-name, and there are quite a few instances of this to be found in Khurāshīn. A similar development may very well have taken place in the case of Khardj. The shrine, which now exists at Langar and which contains no clues for its identification, has been ascribed to an unknown saint of the 12th/13th century by E. Diez on the basis of a popular tradition recorded by Khanykov.

Bibliography: In addition to the works referred to in the article,—1. C. E. Yate, Khorasan and Sistan, Edinburgh-London 1906, 129 f.; P. M. Sykes, A fifth journey to Persia, in Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, 28 (Nov.-Dec. 1906), 581; idem, in JRAS (1910), 714-81; E. Diez, Churassamische Baudenkmäler, i, Berlin 1918, 29, 71-6; idem, Persien. Islamische Baukunst in Churasan, Hagen 1923, passim; E. Herzfeld, in Isl., XI (1921), 185; idem, in ZDMG, lxxx (1926), 274 f.; idem, Archaeological history of Iran, London 1935, 98 and Pl. xvii; R. Byron, in Survey of Persian art, ii, 116-6 and passim; A. Godard, Khorasan, in Atār-i Iran, iv (1949); idem, L'art de l'Iran, Paris 1962, 333 ff.; Farhang-i dīḵwāristān Iran, ix, 1329 sh., 146; D. Hill and O. Grabar, Islamic architecture and its decoration A.D. 800-1900, Chicago 1964, Pl. i and figs. 58-90. 2. C. E. Yate, op. cit., 37; W. Barthold, Four studies on the history of Central Asia, tr. V. and T. Minorsky, iii, Leiden 1962, 46, and n. 4 (identifies the two Khargirds); E. Diez, Churassamische
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Baudenmäler, i, 25, 69-70, Pl. 37, 4 and Pl. 39, 1; 1074

(J. T. P. DE BRUJIN)

AL-KHĀRGŪSHI, Abū Sa'd (or Sa'd) 'Abd Allah Mūhammâd, a celebrated preacher (and therefore nicknamed al-Wârî) and ascetic, was born in the Khâرجush street of Nîshâpur: the arabised form of his name is al-Khârkûshî. He went to Baghdâd in the year 393/1002 on his way to perform the pilgrimage, and thereafter resided at Mecca for a while, returning to Nîshâpur to die there in 406/1015 or 407/1016. Three works are ascribed to him (Broekelmann, I, 218, S 1, 361). The first is a biography of Mūhammâd, or rather a classified collection of traditions relating to him, in 8 volumes, variously entitled Sharâf al-Nâbi (al-Mustafâ, al-nubuwâ) or Dalâ'il al-nubuwâ; a Persian translation of this, by Mâbûmâd b. Mūhammâd al-Rawandi, is extant (Storey, Persian literature, i, 175-6). The second is a treatise on onenomaracy entitled al-Bîghâr wa 'l-nidhâr, a pietistic compilation. The third, and most important work, is a systematic account of Şûfism in 70 chapters, Tahâdib al-asrâ'r, which has survived in a single manuscript (Berlin, No. 2819). This last work derives not directly from al-Khârkûshî himself, but from the recension of Abu Râ'îfân. It has been shown (cf. A. J. Arberry in Petermanns Mittheilungen, xxx (1884), 172 ff.; S. D. Goitein (ed.), Travels in Yemen: an account of Joseph Hâlay's journey to Najran in the year 1870, written in Sansâni Arabic by his guide Hayyim Habshush, Jerusalem 1941; J. Halévy, Voyage au Néjârân, in Bulletin de la Société de Géographie, Series 6, vi (1827), 36, 259, 582-4; A handbook of Arabia, i, Admiralty War Staff, Intelligence Division, London 1916; W. B. Harris, A journey through the Yemen, London 1893; H. Scott, In the High Yemen, London 1942.

(A. K. IRVINE)

KHÂRIDJÎA B. ZAYD B. THÂBIT [SEE FUKÂHÂ AL-MÂDÎNA AL-SÂRÂ], in Suppl.

KHÂRIDJITES (al-Khâwrîdîs, sing. Khâridî), the members of the earliest of the religious sects of Islam, whose importance lies particularly, from the point of view of the development of dogma, in the formulation of questions relative to the theory of the caliphate and to justification by faith or by works, while from the point of view of political history, the most important thought they played was disturbing by means of continual insurrections, which often ended in the temporary conquest of entire provinces, the peace of the eastern part of the Muslim empire during the two last years of the caliphate of 'Ali and during the Umayyad period, and involuntarily facilitating first Mu'âwiya's victory over 'Ali, then that of the 'Abbâsids over the Umayyads.

I. The origins of the Khâridî movement.

Opportunity for the schism was given by the proposal presented to 'Ali by Mu'âwiya during the battle of Siffin (Šafâr 37/July 657) [q.v.] to settle the differences arising out of the murder of Uhîmân, which had provoked the war, by referring it to two referees who would pronounce judgment "according to the Kur'ân". While the majority of 'Ali's army readily adopted this proposal, either because they were tired of war or because the "Kur'ân-readers" (bûrârâ) hoped there would emerge from this Kur'ânic judgment the justification of the furious campaign they had conducted against Uhîmân which had ended in the latter's assassination, one group of warriors, mainly of the tribe ofTamilm, vigorously protested against the setting up of a human tribunal above the divine word. Loudly protesting that "judgment belongs to God alone" (la hubuma itâ li-lâlâhî) they left the army, and withdrawing to the village ofHarârâ [q.v.], not far from Kûfa they elected as their chief an obscure soldier, 'Abd Allah b. Waḥhāb al-Râsîbî [q.v.]. These first dissenters took the name al-Ḫârâiyâ or al-Muâkkhîma (i.e. those who repeat the above phrase; cf. Râsîl, viii, 759, note 1), which is often applied by an extension of meaning to the later Khâwrîdîs also. This little group gradually increased on account of successive defections, especially when the arbitration ended in a verdict quite contrary to what the bûrârâ expected (probably in Ramâdân or Shawwâl 37/Feb.-March 658); on this occasion a large number of partisans of 'Ali, including a number of bûrârâ "went out" (Ḫârâ'â) secretly from Kûfa (to which the army had gone during the truce) to join the camp of the Waḥhâb, who in the meantime had gone to the Dîghâh country on the left bank of the Tigris, to a place who describes it and its many tributaries in some detail.


(A. K. IRVINE)

AL-KHAIRID (al-Khârîd), or Ghâyil al-Khârid, one of the principal watercourses of the Yemen. It originates about twenty km. north of Sanâ'â, near Hadâka'n in Arhab, and runs inland in a north-by-north-easterly direction, draining the eastern escarp of the highlands, towards the oasis of the Dîjâw, where it is joined by the Wâdî Mağhâb and veers to the south-east. After leaving the oasis, it unites with the Wâdî al-'Aţf and is lost in the sands of Ramlat Sab'atayn. According to popular belief, it reappears in the Hadrâmawt. Just east of Shîrâ, in Nîhm, where there are hot and mineral springs, it becomes a perennial river, one of the few in South Arabia, and is noted for supporting good-sized fish (Barbus arabicus), even in a dry summer. These provide a livelihood to the local inhabitants, who supply them to the Sanâ'â market. Otherwise little is known of this part of the wâdî because of the bad reputation of the inhabitants of Arhab, and the Sanâ'â-Dîjâw road avoids the region. It is, however, well cultivated by the inhabitants, the Dhû Husayn. In the Dîjâw itself an efficient agriculture is possible only by means of extensive irrigation schemes. This part of Wâdî al-Khârid is presum-
which commanded the exits of the roads from Fars and the bridge-head, at which in those days stood the little village of Baghda, which later was to become the capital of the empire. The rebel camp lay along the Nahrawan canal. It is to this episode of the exodus from Kufa that the Khawaridi owe their name ("those who went out"), more probably than to a general epithet expressing the idea that they had gone out of the community of the faithful as it was later interpreted, probably at quite an early period (cf. the name of the Jewish sect of the Pharisees, which Ed. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, II, 283,4, derived from the incident of their separation from the partisans of Judas Maccabeus in 163 B.C., quoting in support of his explanation the name of the Khawaridi). Another name given to those first Khawaridi (which has also been extended to their successors and seems to be the one which they gave themselves) is al-Shurdt (pl. of shurt), the "vendors" i.e. those who have sold their soul for the cause of God (this idea is found in several contemporary verses).

The extreme fanaticism of the Khawaridi at once manifested itself in a series of extremist proclamations and terrorist actions: they proclaimed the nullity of 'Ali's claim to the caliphate but equally condemned Uthman's conduct and disclaimed any intention of avenging his murder; they went farther and began to brand everyone infidel and outside the law who did not accept their point of view and disown 'Ali as well as Uthman. They then committed many murders, not even sparing women. Little by little the strength of the Khawaridi army grew by the accession of other fanatic and turbulent elements, included a number of non-Arabs, attracted by the principle of equality of races in the faith that the Khawaridi proclaimed. 'Ali, who had so far tried to avoid dealing with the rebels, in order to avoid a war in his rear so long as he had to face the army of Mu'awiya, after the rupture of the preliminaries of peace was obliged to take steps to avert the growing danger. He attacked the Khawaridi in their camp and inflicted a terrible defeat on them in which Ibn Wahab and the majority of his followers were slain (battle of al-Nahrawan, 9 Safar 38/17 July 658 [q.v.]). But the victory cost 'Ali dear. Not only was the rebellion far from suppressed and was prolonged in a series of local rising in 39 and 40, but 'Ali himself perished by the dagger of the Khawaridi 'Abd al-Rab'man b. Muljam al-Muradi (see IBN MULJAM), the husband of a woman whose family had lost most of its members at al-Nahrawan. The tradition that a conspiracy of Khawaridi had aimed at killing simultaneously 'Ali, Mu'awiya and the governor of Egypt, 'Amr b. al-'As, is certainly apocryphal.

It should be noted that the narratives of Arab historians on the origin of the Khawaridi movement are very confused and contradictory, and seem to have lost sight of the real connection between it and the arbitration; on the other hand the nature and date of the latter are quite uncertain. The reconstruction which is given above is that proposed by the writer of this article (see Bibl.) against the view of Wellhausen (followed by Lammens and Caetani), who thinks that the Khawaridi rebellion and the arbitration are independent of one another and even dates the battle of al-Nahrawan before the verdict of the arbiters.

II. The wars of the Khawaridi under the Umayyads.

The wise and energetic administration of Mu'awiya, succeeding the feeble and vacillating rule of 'Ali, prevented the agitation of the Khawaridi from breaking out, but it did not succeed in extinguishing it any more than it succeeded in suppressing the feelings and aspirations of the Shi'a. Our sources mention several risings that broke out in Kufa and Basra during the twenty years of Mu'awiya's reign (40-60/660-80), but they were promptly put down and only served to increase the roll of martyrs, the worship and avenging of whom became one of the features of the Khawaridi movement. It is at Basra in particular, under the governors Ziyad b. Abhi and his son 'Ubayd Allabh, that we find most risings and suppressions of risings. These insurrections, of which the most formidable was that of Mirdas b. Udayya al-Tumml Abi Bilal [q.v.], settled the tactics of the Khawaridi, whose raids henceforth took the form of guerilla warfare and owed their successes mainly to the rapidity — which soon became legendary — of their cavalry (the names of some of their horses are preserved in Arabic works on hippology). They mobilised unexpectedly, swept through the country, surprised undefended towns and then retired rapidly to escape the pursuit of the government troops. The centres of concentration of the Khawaridi were the marshy country of the Bakti and Basra (pi. of BARTA) and around Diokha, on the left bank of the Tigris, where their movement had originated, from which they could, if defeated, rapidly gain the mountainous lands of the Iranian plateaus.

It was only with the great civil war that broke out after the death of Yazid I, that in the midst of the general disorder the Khawaridi movement assumed serious dimensions and contributed more than anything else to render precarious the hold of the pretender 'Abd Allabh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.], on the territory that he had at first been able to subdue. After the fall of Ibn Zubayr, it was the Umayyad governors who had to wage a hard struggle with these indomitable rebels, enemies alike of victors and vanquished. It is at this time that we begin to distinguish among the Khawaridi half-political and half-theological subdivisions, the origin of which is not at all clear, for the tradition which makes them appear at the same time quite suddenly at Basra on the death of Yazid has probably altered the real succession of events. In any case, we henceforth find the Khawaridi breaking out throughout the eastern part of the empire (Syria was always free from them and Africa only knew them under the 'Abbasids) into serious rebellions, at the head of which they placed individuals who have given their names to the Asharit or as the case, to the Shafiyya and to the Sufiyya [q.v.]. Of all these movements the most dangerous to the unity of the Muslim Empire and the most terrible on account of its ferociously uncompromising character was without doubt that led by Nafi b. al-Azraq [q.v.], which gave the Khawaridi temporary control of Kirmân, Fars and other eastern provinces, constituted a permanent threat to the security of Basra and surrounding country, and which al-Muhaball b. Abi Su'ra at first, and later al-Hadi al-Di b. Yusuf only overcame (in 78/698 or 79/699) after long years of effort which ended in the defeat and death of the last and most remarkable of the Azraqi leaders, the valiant Kaftar b. al-Fudjâa [q.v.]. Less serious and less extensive and prolonged, but quite as stubborn as the Azraqi movement, was the insurrection which was called after Shabab b. Yazid al-Shaybâni (76-7697) after he did not begin it but was only its most distinguished leader; it began in the high Tigris country between Mardin and
Nisibin and its object was the conquest and devastation of Kufa. The partisans of Shabib, who advanced only in little bands of several hundred horsemen, but who often gathered round them large bands of malcontents, sowed terror throughout Irak, and having several times defeated al-Hadjidji’s troops were only destroyed by the help of an army of picked troops summoned from Syria. Shabib himself perished, drowned in the Dujayl, while trying to reach the mountains of Karman; his successors caused a certain amount of trouble to the governors of Yazid II and Higham but never again were a serious danger.

Arabia was another field of Khairih activity, where during the rule of Ibn al-Zubayr between the years 65/684-5 and 72/691-2 their leaders Abu Taliv, Nadja b. Amir and Abu Fudayk captured in succession Yamama, Hadramawt, Yanam and the town of al-Tau, and were only restrained by religious scruples from taking the holy cities. They were only destroyed after the intervention of al-Hadjidji, but they left the seeds of future movements, especially in the eastern part of the peninsula.

Owing mainly to the energy of al-Hadjidji, Khairijism seemed definitely quelled. Another factor contributed considerably to its failure, namely the fanaticism and intolerance of the rebels, whose religious disputes ended in splitting their ranks and sometimes resulted in the removal of their ablest leaders on the charge of having on some occasion failed to observe the absolute irreconcilableness of their principles. Another cause of weakness may be recognised in the eternal feud between the Arab element and that of the Mansili which brought fatal consequences along with it, especially among the ranks after the death of Kasari b. al-Fudayl. But under the last Umayyads, in the midst of the irreparable collapse of the central government, the Khawaridi again raised their heads, and resumed their exploits, this time not in little bands but in large bodies. While the two most serious risings of this period, those of al-Daibak b. Kai al-Shaybani (q.v.) in the Dihman and of Irak and that of Abd Allah b. Yabyaa, surnamed Taiib al-Hash, and of Abu Hamza [see al-Mugitar b. ‘Awp] in Arabia (in the course of which Medina itself was occupied), ended in defeat, it is nevertheless true that the anarchy which they provoked destroyed the eastern rampart of Umayyad power and enabled the ‘Abbasid insurrection to penetrate more easily to the heart of the empire.

Under the ‘Abbasid caliphs, the Khairij movement may be said to be practically extinct in Irak and adjoining regions. Except for a few local risings, promptly suppressed, Khairijism no longer presented any serious danger and only survived as a religious sect, without, however, any remarkable vitality or wide dissemination. In Eastern Arabia, on the other hand, in North Africa and later on the eastern coast of Africa, one of the principal branches of the Khawaridi, that of the Ihadiyya, played an important part in politics, and even after this role was ended it continued to be of importance from the religious point of view. It survives in our day with its dogmas, its rites and its special laws.

III. The political and religious theories of the Khawaridi

The Khawaridi, who, as we have seen, never had any tendency of military and political action, did not have either a uniform body of doctrines. Their teachings seem to us like the particular views of a number of independent sub-sects (the heresiographers number not less than a score including principal and subsidiary together), some of which represent theological schools as well as political movements of a collectivist character, while others confine themselves to expressing differences of individual opinions among the theorists of the sect. One article is common to all: it is that which treats of the question of the caliphate, a question which has been the starting point of all the religious divisions in Islam. On this question, the Khawaridi are opposed equally to the legitimism of the Shii and the quietism of the Murjii. On the one hand they assert what Wellhausen aptly calls their “non-conformity” i.e. the obligation on believers to proclaim illegitimate and ipso facto deposed the imam who has gone off the right path (this is how they justify their abandonment of ‘Ali after his acceptance of the arbitration); on the other hand they declare every believer who is morally and religiously irreproachable to be capable of being raised by the vote of the community to the supreme dignity of the imamate, “even if he were a black slave”. The result is that each of their leaders has been recognised by them as amir al-mu’minin, although none of them had, among other things, the qualification of Kwaraji birth. Consequently it is the other caliphs besides their own that they recognise as legitimate, who was Bakr and ‘Umar (the latter is particularly venerated by them); ‘Uthman only during the first six years of his reign; and ‘Ali till the battle of Siffin.

Another capital article of Khairiji heterodoxy is the absolute rejection of the doctrine of justification by faith without works. They push their moral strictness to the point of refusing the title of believer to anyone who has committed a mortal sin and regarding him as a murid (apostate); and their extreme wing, represented by the Azrakis, says that he who has become an infidel in this way can never re-enter the faith and should be killed for his apostasy along with his wives and children. Of course all non-Khairiji Muslims are regarded as apostates. Here we have the principle of isririyd (religious murder) which we find applied from the beginning of the Khawaridi movement, even before it had been formulated in theory, and which found its completest application during the war of the Azraks. This ferocious principle forms a strange but not illogical contrast with the spirit of tolerance shown by the Khawaridi to non-Muslims and which in some of their schools goes so far as to recognise as equal to Muslims in every way those Jews or Christians who will pronounce the shahida with the modification: “Muhammad is the Apostle of God to the Arabs and not to us.” The tendency to the levelling of the Arabs and the Mansili (which was already a result of their attitude to the problem of the imamate) was pushed so far by one of the theorists of Khairiji doctrine, Yazid b. Abl Anisa (founder of the Yastiyya), that he says that God will reveal a new Kur’an to a prophet among the Persians and that he will found a new religion for them, divine in the same sense as Judaism, Christianity and Islam, which will be no other than that of the Sabil mentioned in the Kur’an.

The same Puritanism which characterises Khairijism in its conception of the state and of faith is found in its ethical principles: it demands purity of conscience as an indispensable complement to bodily purity for the validity of acts of worship; and one of their sects goes so far as to remove Sura XII from the Kur’an (Sura Yelp) because its contents...
are worldly and frivolous and make it unworthy to be the Word of God. If, on the other hand, they do not allow-stoning, this is due simply to the fact that they do not recognize the authenticity of the famous verses added by 'Umar to the primitive text of the Kur'an (cf. Nödeke-Schwally, Gesch. d. Qur'ans, i, 488-54).

Outside of general principles and a few particular cases, the law and dogmatics of the Kharawïdî are not known to us in their totality except for the Ibadiyya, whose survival to the present day has preserved in its integrity their religious tradition. The Ibadiyya represent (as do the Shi'îyya on the other side) a comparatively moderate school and their present views, in dogma as well as law, have been to some degree influenced by other Muslim schools. Attention has recently been drawn (by C. A. Nallino, in RSO, vii, 455-60) to the very close connection between the dogmatics of the Ibadiyya and of the Mu'tazila. It may also be supposed that it was the latter which, in certain points at least, received a stimulus from Kharidjism. What seems beyond doubt is that, as Wellhausen points out, Kharidjism played a very important part in the development of Muslim theology, either directly or by the impetus which it gave to reflection on the problems of the faith.

Although Kharidjism seems to us an essentially popular movement in its origins, we must be careful not to think of it as devoid of intellectualism. On the contrary, the very radicalism of its theories must have exercised an attraction on many cultivated minds, much as similar doctrines have done in other times and countries. It is particularly at the time of the early 'Abbasids, under the influence of and at the same time in opposition to the refined and sceptical culture of the period, that we find many scholars and men of letters who were thought to cherish Kharidjî views, without this preventing their frequent high society and enjoying the favour of the court. The best known of these Kharawïdî is the famous philologist Abû 'Ubayda Ma'mar b. al-Mughâna (q.v.), regarding whose fanaticism, in conversation at least, a rather piquant anecdote is recorded by Ibn Khallikan (i, 107 of the 1310 edition; the poetic quotation should be corrected from the Amili of the Murtaḍâ, iii, 88-9).

Poetry and eloquence were also cultivated among the Kharawïdî, which is explained by the fact that the majority of their leaders, especially in the early days, belonged to the Bedouin element in the military camps of Kufa and Başra. Collections were compiled of the khabab pronounced by the Kharidjî leaders, and what survives of them, besides giving an excellent idea of their views, gives us a fairly high opinion of their oratorical talent. We also possess numerous fragments of their poetry (which had also been collected in particular hadithi), especially of those of 'I'mrân b. Hīṭtân (q.v.) (who is at the same time considered one of the founders of the Kharidjî fiqh). A long list of Kharidjî orators, poets and jurists was prepared by Diḥḥî (see Ch. Pellat, Diḥḥî and les Kharidjîtes, in Folia Orientalia, xii (1970), 195-209).

The wars of the Kharidjî had been recorded from the beginning of Arabic historiography in several works which have not come down to us in their entirety; we know, however, the substance of the more important among them, the authors of which were Abû Mîkhnafl, Abû 'Ubayda and al-Madâ'inî from the extracts which have been preserved in the historical sources given below.


Kharîta (or Kharîta), "map" in modern Arabic, derived from French "carte", (see I. I. Krachkovsky, Istoria Arabshaya geografisckaya literatura (Moscow-Leningrad 1957), with Arabic tr.
Cartography had been practised in the Middle East since ancient times, but with the advent of Islam it received a new impetus due to the political and administrative requirements of the expanding Islamic world. Thus in the 2nd/8th century a map of al-Daylam was prepared for al-Hadджаджи b. Yûsuf (d. 95/714); then a map of the Swamps of Bašra is said to have existed during the reign of the Abbasid caliph al-Manṣûr (235/849-57). (Krachkovsky, op. cit., i, 59, 206; cf. Shawkat, op. cit., 2, 3). Whatever the quality of such maps, the Arabs' direct knowledge of the region gathered during their early campaigns, coupled with indigenous methods of drawing maps, probably enabled them to draw these.

It is not, however, until the early decades of the 3rd/9th century that we come across the first detailed world maps drawn in Arabic. This became possible through the introduction to the Islamic world of the Greek, Indian and Iranian astronomical and geographical works in the 8th and the early 9th centuries. It was during this period until the 17th century, cartography was practised as a science and passed through several stages of development. Muslim astronomers and geographers drew world maps and regional maps, as well as sea-charts, following various traditions until their mediaeval techniques of cartography were replaced by the modern ones. The first world map, the original form of which is not extant, was constructed by the scholars of Baghdad who worked in the Bayt al-Hikma "House of Science," there under the patronage of the caliph al-Ma'mûn (198-218/813-33). This map was named after the caliph as al-Sûrat al-Ma'mûniyya. According to al-Masûdî (d. 345/956), who had seen this map directly, it depicted "the universe with spheres, the stars, land and the seas, inhabited and barren (regions of the world), settlements of peoples, cities, etc." It was, he says, more exquisite than the world maps of Claudius Ptolemy, Marinus and others, (al-Masûdî, Tanbih, 33; cf. al-Masûdî, Murûdî, i, 183-205. According to al-Zuhri (lived ca. 532/1137), al-Fazârî had made a copy of the map, and al-Zuhri's own work, the Kitâb al-djârâfîyya, was based on this copy of the Sûrat al-Ma'mûniyya, ed. Muhammad Hadji-Sadok, Damascus 1968, 306; cf. Krachkovsky, op. cit., 867, 270). As the arrangement of the geographical material in the Arabic world's work follows the ancient Iranian system (see Djuhrâfîyya), it is possible that al-Sûrat al-Ma'mûniyya represented a synthesis between the Iranian system and the Ptolemaic system according to which the inhabited world was divided into seven climates parallel to the equator and divided according to the length of the day. It is evident, therefore, that while much of the data of the map was derived from Ptolemy's Geography, a substantial amount of it and its arrangement must have come from non-Greek sources.

It was during this period that Muhammad b. Mûsâ al-Khârazmî (d. after 232/849 [q.v.]) wrote his geographical work entitled Kitâb Sûrat al-ârd. Though essentially based on Ptolemy's Geography, the work gives in a tabulated form the co-ordinates of places (cities, mountains, rivers, etc.) arranged according to the Ptolemaic climates. There is little doubt that the work must have been originally accompanied by regional maps of each of the climates or by a single world map, but none of these seem to have survived. The four maps produced in the printed edition of the work seem to be later recensions of the original maps depicting djustrat al-djâwarî, a map of the seas, guls, etc., of the Nile and the Sea of Azov drawn by the author. (For the maps, see Kitâb Sûrat al-ârd, ed. H. von Milik, Leipzig 1926, Tafl I (djustrat al-djâwarî); Tafl II (shapes of the seas, guls, etc.); Tafl III (Map of the Nile); and Tafl IV (Map of the Sea of Azov). Shawkat reasons that since al-Khârazmî wrote a brief work, he did not draw a complete map of the world but confined himself to drawing the four maps as an illustration, see op. cit., 7-8). Al-Khârazmî's maps have now been fully reconstructed by S. Raxia Jafrî on the basis of the data given in his Sûrat al-ârd (A critical revision and interpretation of Kitâb Sûrat al-ârd by Muham- mad b. Mûsâ al-Khârazmî, thesis, Aligarh Muslim University, unpublished). A comparison of these maps with those of the extant maps of Ptolemy (see E. L. Stevenson, Geography of Claudius Ptolemy, New York 1932; cf. the map of Afrika by al-Khwârazmî as interpreted by the Indian Ocean, Kanal, Monumenta Cartographica Africnae et Aegypti, iii (Époque Arabe), Fasc. I, 1930, 525), shows their close resemblance to each other, just as the maps reproduced in al-Khârazmî's work resemble those of Ptolemy.

Thâbit b. Kûra (d. 288/901 [q.v.]), who was credited with an excellent translation of Ptolemy's Geography into Arabic, also drew a world map called Šifât al-dinûn (Krachkovsky, i, 206), but it has not survived.

The maps enumerated above followed what may be called the Greco-Muslim tradition in cartography, yet they differed from the maps of Ptolemy in several aspects. First, they did not follow the Ptolemaic technique of conical projection. The cartographers drew their maps with latitudes and longitudes as straight lines as though they were on a plane surface without any regard to the spherical shape of the earth. Al-Bûrûnî (d. after 442/1050 [q.v.]), criticising Marinus for some assumptions in his map of the earth, and also al-Battânî (d. 317/929 [q.v.]) for his determination of the direction of the bibîa, says that "They treated the meridian circles as parallel straight lines and the parallels of latitudes as straight lines. Thus they have fallen into this outrageous error," (al-Bûrûnî, The determination of the co-ordinates of positions for the correction of distances between cities, tr. of Kitâb Taqâdîd nihâyât al-amâkin li-taâlîr masâqâfî al-masâkin, by Djâmî Allî, Beirut 1966). Similarly, al-Zuhri was critical of the scientists who had constructed al-Sûrat al-Ma'mûniyya, for, he says, while the earth was in fact spherical in shape, they drew the map of the earth on a plane, a method followed in the construction of the astrolabe (op. cit., 304). Again, while in the Ptolemaic maps the inhabited world is divided into seven climates (subdivided into 21 parallels north of the equator and 4 parallels south of it), in the Greco-Muslim maps only the broader division of the climates is followed, while the subdivision into the parallels is neglected. Thirdly, differences in the physical features as depicted on the Ptolemaic and the Greco-Muslim maps can also be noticed. For instance, in the Ptolemaic maps the Indian Ocean is shown as a lake, while on the Greco-Muslim maps it...
is shown as having water communication with the Pacific (the "Encircling Ocean") in the south-east. Again, Ceylon in the Greco-Muslim maps is much smaller in size than that shown in the Ptolemaic maps. These and similar dissimilarities were partly due to the more intimate knowledge of Asia and Africa enjoyed by the Muslim geographers and cartographers. Moreover, the Muslim astronomers of the later period had revised the astronomical tables of the Greeks as well as those of the early Muslim astronomers in the light of their own observations, which must have helped the cartographers to draw more accurate maps (for details, see Shawkat, 11. 5).

During the 4th/10th century Abū 'Hasan Ibn Yūnus (d. 390/1000 [q.v.]), along with al-Hasan b. Ahmad al-Muhallabi, prepared a world map for the Fāṭimid caliph al-'Azīz (365/869-96). It was drawn on a Tustar silk cloth and woven in gold and different colours in silk. On it were shown the climes, mountains, rivers, cities, seas and the different routes, and Mecca and Medina were prominently depicted on it. It cost 22,000 dinārīs. Except for some differences in the south-eastern coast of Arabia and the northern coast of Africa, it conformed to the map of al-Khārīja or Khārīta (ibid., 12-13).

Also in this century, Abū Zayd Ahmad b. Sahl al-Balkhī (d. 322/934 [q.v.]) initiated a new tradition in cartography. Practically it exercised a deep influence on later cartographers and became the most popular style of cartography in the Islamic world. Al-Balkhī wrote a geography of the Islamic world entitled Ṣawwar al-akhlīm, in which he described each of the various provinces, calling it an iklim. Though brief, the work was a description of the maps produced by the author with his boundaries, main cities and towns, rivers, mountains and the main roads connecting the cities. He also drew maps of the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean and the Caspian and a world map in which Mecca occupied the central position. Neither the geographical treatise nor the maps of al-Balkhī have survived independently. However, his maps were copied and probably improved by al-Iṣṭakhri (ca. 340/951 [q.v.]) and his treatise incorporated in the latter's work. Al-Iṣṭakhri drew 21 provincial maps (including one of the world) which are found attached to his Kitāb Masālik al-mamālik. (For the maps, see al-Masālik wa 'l-mamālik, ed. Muḥammad Dālibī 'Abd al-Ḥālīm, Cairo 1961; see also ibid., 195-205, for a discussion of the maps by the editor; see also coloured maps in a Persian translation of Al-Iṣṭakhri's work entitled Masālik wa mamālik, ed. Ḥassān Bādī, Tehran 1960; 1961). Another geographer who followed the cartographical tradition of al-Balkhī was Ibn Hawkal (ca. 367/977 [q.v.]). One of the outstanding geographers of the time, Ibn Hawkal produced an excellent work on the geography of the Islamic world, his Kitāb Suraṭ al-arḍ. Though essentially based on the Balkhī-Iṣṭakhri tradition, the work includes the rich personal experiences and observations of the author. For his work, Ibn Hawkal drew 22 maps, including a world map. In his opinion, some of the maps of al-Iṣṭakhri were excellent, whereas others were confused and full of defects. Hence, on al-Iṣṭakhri's own request, he revised some of the former's maps (Ibn Ḥawkal, Kitāb Suraṭ al-arḍ, ed. J. H. Kramers, Leiden 1939, ii, 329-30). A glance at the maps of Ibn Hawkal shows that they are superior to those of al-Iṣṭakhri. A third follower of this school was al-Mukaddasi (ca. 375/985 [q.v.]), who was perhaps the most original of the geographers of mediaeval Islam. In his Kitāb Ábbās al-lākālīm fi mā'rifat al-akhlīm he gave a systematic account of the geography and the cultural aspects of each of the provinces of the Islamic world. Having rearranged the provinces, he drew the maps of 12 of them (for al-Mukaddasi's maps, see Kamāl, iii, fasc. 1, 672-7), and claimed to have drawn a more accurate map of the sea round Arabia in the light of his own experiences and the information derived from experiences of sailors whom he had met (al-Mukaddasi, ed. M. J. de Goeje, BGA, iii, Leiden 1877, 10-1). It seems therefore, that the cartographers of the Balkhī school continuously laboured to improve the maps of their predecessors.

This new tradition of cartography differed fundamentally both in approach and content from the Greco-Muslim tradition, and could be described as reflecting the Islamic political point of view of the time. As against the Greco-Muslim maps in which 'Irāq was usually placed in the central clime (i.e. the fourth), in the world maps belonging to the Balkhī school, Mecca occupied the central position. Another interesting feature of these round world maps is that south is placed at the top and north at the bottom, for which religious reasons are assigned (Shawkat, 21, n. 3, is of the view that the geographers put south at the top of their maps because of reverence for the cities of Mecca and Medina in Arabia, beyond which there was no land). Again, land is surrounded by the "encircling Ocean" and reaching nearest to each other at the Isthmus of Suez, thus conforming to the Kūr'ānic concept of terra incognita as an extension of the African continent. Then, the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean are depicted as two "gulfs" coming out of the "Encircling Ocean" and reaching nearest to each other at the Isthmus of Suez, thus conforming to the Kūr'ānic concept of the two gulfs meeting at al-Bāzār (q.v.) ("the barrier", XXV, 55/53). Thus the Indian Ocean, though connected with the Pacific in the south-east, has no water communication with the Atlantic. The separate sea maps are usually geometrical in shape, and resemble a bird or some other figure, which are again based on ideas of Muslim traditionists. In these world maps, arbitrary boundaries of the provinces (iklims) of the Islamic world, as well those of the non-Islamic regions, are drawn so as to convey an overall picture of the political and the ethnographic divisions of the world. It is above all, in their provincial (iklim) maps that these cartographers display their originality. In each of these maps, the boundaries, cities and towns, rivers, mountains and roads are shown with great dexterity. Obviously, the main purpose of the author was to highlight the Islamic world. These maps, therefore, may be taken as a distinctive achievement on the part of the cartographers of the Balkhī school and an improvement on the mathematical division of the climes of the Greco-Muslim maps.

K. Miller attributed some maps which have traces of the Balkhī school in them to the famous Sāmānid wazīr Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. Naṣr al-Ḥāyānī, the author of the lost work called Kitāb al-Masālik wa 'l-mamālik (written 372/982) (Mappae arabicae, Stuttgart 1931, Islam Atlas, Band v, Tafel 66-70, 72v and 73r). It is unlikely, however, that these maps were drawn by him, for in his work he followed the Ptolemaic arrangement of the seven climes.

One of the earliest Persian geographical works produced in this century was the anonymous Ḥudūd al-ʿilām (compiled in 372/982-3). According to V. Minorsky, the author "worked on the basis of some previous maps", probably a modified form of Abū
Dja'far al-Khazin's maps, upon which he seems to have made some improvements. However, the map upon which the anonymous author worked has not survived. (Minorsky based his view on Barthold's suggestion that al-Balkhi's book on geography may have actually been an explanation of Abū Dja'far traditional terra incognita is replaced by sea which covers most of the southern quarter, the Indian Ocean is connected with the Atlantic, and Africa acquires a small size (for al-Biruni's map of the sea, see Fig. 1). Al-Biruni's theory was adopted by many a later geographer and cartographer. (For example, see Abu

![Map of the seas by al-Biruni](image)

Fig. 1. Map of the seas by al-Biruni as contained in his Kitāb al-Tafhim li-awnā'il al-tamālim (written in 420/1029), British Museum, MS. Or. 8349, f. 58.

al-Khazin's maps, see Hudūd al-Sālam, tr. 18, n. 5; for Minorsky's view, see ibid., p. xv). It might have belonged to the tradition of the Balkhi school.

It was, however, left to al-Biruni to introduce new concepts in physical geography which resulted in innovations in the world maps hitherto drawn by the Muslim cartographers. He was the first to propound the theory that the Indian Ocean must have a connection with the Atlantic through certain channels south of the Mountains of the Moon, the traditional sources of the Nile. He argued that just as al-Bahr al-Kabīr (the Indian Ocean) penetrated into the northern continent (Asia) on the east and entered it in many places, creating many islands there, similarly, the continent, to keep up the balance jutted out into al-Bahr al-Dirāndah (the Southern Sea) in the west. He continues that in this region, the sea had entered the mountains [of the Moon] and the valleys, with a continuous ebb and flow, and was stormy, causing shipwrecks and preventing sailing, but in spite of this it was still connected with the Uṣayyāni (the Atlantic) through these narrow passages. He then says that towards the south and beyond these mountains, signs of the connection of these two seas have been discovered, even though no-one has personal experience of their connection. Thus al-Biruni conceived of the inhabited continent as being surrounded by the "Encircling Ocean" (al-Kānūn al-Mas'udī, Hyderabad 1955, ii, 538); and in his map of the seas, the

During the 5th/11th centuries, Māhmūd al-Kāshgārī [q.v.] drew a rather unusual world map with a linguistic basis, giving prominence to the Turkish-speaking regions and placing Kāshgār at the centre of the world, with other regions receding to the periphery. (For his map, see Kamāl, iii, fasc. II, 741; cf. Miller, op. cit., Arabishe Welt- und Länderkarten, Band v, Weltkarten, 142-8.)

While the Balkhi school was gaining popularity with the cartographers in the east, in Europe some of the most outstanding maps in the Greco-Muslim tradition were still being produced. In Sicily, the well-known geographer al-Sharīf al-Idrīsī (d. 560/1166 [q.v.]), who lived at the court of Roger II, produced a series of world and sectional maps at the orders of the king. Taking the Ptolemaic maps as the basis, he constructed a large silver map. He then draw a world map and by dividing each of the seven climates into ten longitudinal sections, he drew a separate and detailed map of each of these sections. Into these he incor-
porated the geographical information collected from Arabic as well as Norman sources. The maps form a part of his monumental geographical work Kitāb Nuzhat al-mughālī fi 'ṣīhrār al-dārāk, and except for the silver map, all have fortunately survived the vicissitudes of time. (For his maps, see Miller, Band i, Heft 2, Heft 3; and Band vi). Al-Idrīsī's maps represent the best example of Arabo-Norman cooperation in cartography.

An interesting world map belonging to the middle of the 6th/12th century exists in an anonymous work entitled Mabkhāṣār Ibn Hawkal, in which the shape of the inhabited world is drawn elliptically rather than round. The Indian and the Atlantic Oceans are separated by a narrow isthmus of land near the sources of the Nile, which is connected with the terra incognita and which is partly visible (of the three mss. of this, two carry the title Kitāb Hayat al-aqīl al-ard wa-makhāriṣa fi 'l-sūl wa 'l-sārat al-mašruṭ bi-diğawāfīyya, Kamāl, iii, fasc. II, 804-17. Kamāl reproduced all the maps belonging to the various mss. of this work. One of these (B.N. No. 2214), according to Kramer, is an abridgement of Ibn Hawkal's ms. Top Kapu Saray No. 3346, which was copied in 479/1086 with supplementary annotations relating to the period of the epiposition, i.e. 534-80/1139-94, see Ibn Hawkal, ed. Kramer, pp. v-vii. Among the various maps belonging to the manuscript of this work, there is a map of the Nile reproduced by Kamār in his edition, i, 149, but it differs in detail from the map of the Nile by al-%ārāmī (see above).

To this century also belong the six maps of Ahmad al-Tūsī, one of the earliest Muslim cosmographers and author of the Persian work Kitāb ʿAḍāqib al-mabkhasa (written ca. 576/1180); these were probably drawn in the Bābghī tradition, and are the maps of the Caspian (Bābgh Kāzwm), the Mediterranean, al-Dībāl, al-Sind and the Persian Gulf (Krachkovsky, 325).

During the 7th/13th century, a number of world maps were produced, some of which belonged to the Greco-Muslim tradition and others to that of the Balkhī school. A peculiar world map belonging to the former tradition and dated 646/1248 is found in a fragment of a Persian geographical treatise. By this map, the Indian Ocean passes south of the Mountains of the Moon and then turning northwards joins the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, thus surrounding what appears to be the continent of Africa. However, the terra incognita is also shown covering part of the southern quarter of the earth and then extending northwards around Africa where it joins Spain (see Kamāl, iii [1935], fasc. V, 966; the volume containing the Persian geographical treatise (Leiden ms. Ar. 1899) also contains an astronomical treatise by Ahmad al-Sīdīzī copied in 646/1248). The author seemed to have been influenced by al-Bīrūnī, but at the same time persisted in retaining the terrai incognita on the map, and it was this which led him to connect it with the European mainland. To the Greco-Muslim tradition also belonged the Syriac world map of Bar Hebraeus ( Ibn al-Idrīsī, A.D. 1226-86 [959-], Miller, i, 9; v, 169; cf. Krachkovsky, 371-4).

The elliptical world maps attributed by Miller to Ibn Saʿīd al-Maghribī (d. 673/1274 or 685/1286), see Miller, Band v, Tafel 71, and i, 21-2, are more likely to be the work of the anonymous author of the Mubkhasa Ibn Hawkal. Ibn Saʿīd's world map, on the other hand, follows the Greco-Muslim tradition, but the terra incognita is replaced by sea in the southern quarter of the earth and the Indian Ocean is connected with the Atlantic south of Africa, whose southern part is fork-shaped. However, the author seemed to have been confused with regard to the outlines of the continents and the islands. (For the world map of Ibn Saʿīd, see L. Bagrow and R. A. Skelton, History of cartography, London 1964, Pt. xxvi).

The maps drawn by the cosmographers of the 7th-13th and 8th-14th centuries present some special and interesting features. For instance, the world map of Zakariyya b. Muḥammad al-Kazwīnī (d. 685/1285) follows the tradition of the Balkhī school, but the “Encircling Ocean” is shown as being surrounded by the legendary ʿān al-bayāt (“the Fountain of Life”) flows into the terra incognita. (Miller, Band v, Tafel 80 (2. Kazwini Gotha). However, his map of the sea is based on that of al-Bīrūnī and the climatic world map is in the Greco-Muslim tradition (ibid., Weltkarten, 129-32). The world map of Sirāḏī al-Dīn Abī Hāfs ʿUmar, called Ibn al-Wardi (q.v.) (d. 861/1457 or 850/1446), is similar to that of al-Kazwīnī, following the Balkhī tradition of cartography and depicting the legendary ʿān al-bayāt surrounding the “Encircling Ocean” and the ʿān al-bayāt (ibid., Band v, Tafel 75-9; Weltkarten, 134-8). On the other hand, al-Dīmāshiṭī (d. 727/1327 [q.v.], drew diagrams, distinctive in their nature, of the relative distribution of various races in the inhabited parts of the world (ibid., Band v, Weltkarten, 130-41).

By this time, new trends seemed to be appearing in Islamic cartography. Of great interest are some maps in which the Muslim cartographers used a grid of horizontal and vertical lines representing latitudes and longitudes, which form small squares within which place names are shown to indicate their geographical positions. Whether this new experiment in Islamic cartography was due to any influence of Chinese cartography, in which the rectangular grid was used as a scale to indicate distances, or whether it was indigenous to Muslim cartographers, is not certain. We have some examples of Mongol maps of this design produced in China during this period; for instance, the Mongol map of A.D. 1329 which formed part of the History of the Yuan Shih used the rectangular grid. Krachkovsky believed that this map may have been drawn on a representative of the Iranian-Arab school of cartography and that the place names given on the map were possibly in the Mongolian language initially, and the map later translated into Chinese (Krachkovsky, 398-9). However, since the Islamic maps of this category differ fundamentally from their Chinese prototypes, in that the former use the horizontal and the vertical lines to represent the latitudes and the longitudes, while the latter use them to form squares to indicate distances, it is not unlikely that the concept of using a grid was originally borrowed from the Chinese by the Muslim cartographers, considering the fact that Mongol rule at this point covered much of the region between Iran and China.

A notable example of this class of maps is the world map of ʿAbd Allāh al-Mustawfī (d. 750/1349 [q.v.]), in which the inhabited world is divided into 9 parallel divisions beginning from the equator and going northwards. Thus, the squares formed are approximately of $10° \times 10°$, each degree being equal to 56 2/3 Arabian miles (according to al-Maʿmūn’s astronomers). Place names are then arbitrarily written within each of the squares, and so are the names of the seven climates around the circum-
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ference of the inhabited world. The map shows traces of al-Biruni's concept of sea covering the southern quarter of the earth, and southern Africa is fork-shaped, as in some of the maps discussed above. In his detailed map of Central Asia, Iran, etc. called by Miller "Irān-karte", al-Mustawfi used a rectangular grid in which each of the squares represents $x^2 \times y^2$ and the names of the main cities and towns are given in each of the squares. The map covers longitudes from 64° to 111° from west to east and latitudes from 10° to 45° north of the equator (the Muslim astronomers generally calculated their longitudes beginning from the Canary Islands (0°) to China (180°)). Again, according to al-Mustawfi, his map spreads between the 1st and the 6th clime north of the equator, but these are arbitrarily mentioned and seem to have no relation with the actual astronomical divisions of the climes as worked out by the astronomers. With an arbitrary division of the parallels of latitudes and with no regard for the sphericity of the earth in drawing the longitudes, it was hardly to be expected that the places would find correct geographical positions as known to the Muslim astronomers (Miller, Band v, Tafel 83-6; Band v, Weltkarten, 178-82).

Another example of this category of maps is the world map of Hāfiz-i Ābrū (d. 833/1430 [q.v.]). While the three regional maps accompanying his work on geography are drawn after the tradition of the Balkhi school, his world map belongs to the category under discussion and resembles in many respects that of al-Mustawfi. The world map is superimposed on a grid of squares of $x^2 \times y^2$ with vertical lines representing the longitudes and horizontal lines representing the latitudes. The longitudes begin at 0° (passing through the west coast of Africa) and then go eastwards up to 180° which crosses a place called "Kankanūz" (Kang-diz), a legendary town which, according to the Persians, was built by Kay Kā'ūs or Dījam in the most remote east, behind the sea, Minorsky, Hudud al-Siām, 189).

Muslim astronomers also drew maps of cities and towns and the direction of the kibla [q.v., 2. Astronomical aspects], of which quite a few examples are extant, see Miller, Band v, 149-54 for the kibla maps.

In the 10th/16th century, the members of the al-Sharafi al-Sifaksi family of Tunisia distinguished themselves by drawing several maps between 958/1551 and 1559 (preserved in Marciana, Venice) has now been proved by V. L. Ménage to be of European origin (Taeschner, 2; Ménage, The map of Hājjī Ahmed and its makers, in BSOAS, xxii (1958), 297-314; cf. Krachkovsky, 457-8; G. Kish, The suppressed Turkish map of 1556, Ann Arbor 1957).

It may be pointed out here that the world map hitherto attributed to Hājjīl Ahmad of Tunis and dated 967/1559 (Band v, Weltkarte, 111-12; Band v, Weltkarten, Tafel 72, 82, "Kankanūz" (Kang-diz), was a legendary town which, according to the Persians, was built by Kay Kā'ūs or Dījam in the most remote east, behind the sea, Minorsky, Hudud al-Siām, 189).

According to Miller, was an attempt to combine the Catalanon sea map with that of al-Idrisi to produce a new Arabic sea map. Another member of the family, Muhammad b. All al-Sharafi, produced a world map in 1009/1601, the eastern half of which was based on al-Idrisi and the western half (Mediterranean and the Atlantic coast) and the Black Sea on Catalanon portolanos (Krachkovsky, 455-7; cf. Miller, Band v, Weltkarten, 175-7).

**Turkish maps and sea-charts.**

During this century, Turkish cartographers made some very significant contributions to Islamic cartography. In fact, they may be said to have formed a bridge between mediaeval Islamic and modern cartography. Among the most prominent examples are the maps of Plri Re'is [q.v.] (d. 962/1554). He drew a world map, completed in 959/1553, only the western part of which has been preserved. This portion depicts the Iberian peninsula, north-west Africa, the Atlantic Ocean and the coasts of the islands of America. Drawn on a gazelle hide, it includes coloured pictures and notes about the countries, peoples, animals and plants. It was presented to Sultan Selim in 923/1517.

A portolano chart, the map has a mathematical basis, and Plri Re'is used some twenty maps in constructing it, four of which were by Portuguese explorers, including the lost map of Christopher Columbus recording the discoveries made by him during his third voyage (A.D. 1498). In 1512-18, Plri Re'is drew a second map showing the northern part of the Atlantic Ocean and the newly-discovered regions of North and Central America. Sevim Tekeli points out that a comparison of the two maps shows that Plri Re'is followed the new discoveries very closely. His sailing manual for the Mediterranean, the Bahriyye, included numerous maps of the Italian portolanos and probably based on them, each representing the portion of the Mediterranean coast treated in the respective chapter (see Dīghīfrā'yah, vi. The Ottoman geographers (Taeschner); cf. Sevim Tekeli, Plri Rais, in Dictionary of Scientific Biography, New York 1974, x, 616-9).

We may finally mention the maps of Kâthib Celebi [q.v. (1017-67/1609-57), drawn by him in the first manuscript of his Dīghīfrā'yah; these were mainly based on modern European cartography (Taeschner, 2; cf. Abdülhak Adnan Adivar, La science chez les Turcs ottomans, Paris 1939, 107-8). Also, a manuscript of the Near and Middle East was printed by İbrahim Müteferrika, dated 1139/1728-79 or 1141/1728-9 (Taeschner, loc. cit.).

**Arab Sea-charts of the Indian Ocean.**

Although there are no direct references to the existence of Arab sea-charts in the works of the Arab navigators, Ibn Mājdīd [q.v.] (d. after 905/1500) and Sulaymān al-Mahri (first half of the 10th/16th century) (see G. R. Tibbetts, The navigational theory of the Arabs in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in Agrupamento de estudos de cartografia antiga, xxxvi (Colima 1969), 19), one does find references to Arab sea-charts of a type in the Portuguese and other sources. At an earlier date, according to Marco Polo,
the “Arabs had good charts” (Tibbetts, Arab Navigation in the Indian Ocean before the coming of the Portuguese, London 1971, 4; cf. A. Teixeira da Mota which Ibn Mājid had shown to Vasco da Gama during his meeting with the latter in East Africa. The chart, according to João de Barros, depicted the entire coast of India and had the meridians and the parallels drawn on it in the Moorish (i.e. Arab) way but had no rhumbs of the winds indicated on it. The squares formed by these lines were very small, hence the coast traced between the two rhumbs of north-south and east-west was very exact. In the opinion of Teixeira da Mota, the parallels may have represented the altitudes of the stars and were probably traced in the scale 1/4 by 1/4 of an isba', conforming to the altitudes given in the works of Ibn Mājid and Sulaymān al-Mahrī, and the meridians could have been lines of equal distance, east-west, at an interval of perhaps 24 hours or 8 zāms (1 zam being equal to 3 farṣaḥs) (op. cit., 61-5, 69-72; on the value of 1 zam (= 3 farṣaḥs), see ibid., 57, n. 9). Teixeira da Mota further points out that according to Le Livro de Marinharia d'André Pires (ca. 1550), 5 isba's of the Moorish maps were to be taken as being equal to 8 parts which was 8° (i.e. 1 isba' represented 1° 36', whereas the correct value is 1° 37' (ibid., 74-5).

The second example is that of the nautical map possessed by a skilled navigator of Mogadishu met by Sir Thomas Roe. Drawn on a parchment, this map was lined and graduated in an orderly fashion. But Teixeira da Mota believes that the map may have actually belonged to the European type, for the pilot spoke Portuguese and the Portuguese had since long established themselves in East Africa and maintained close relationships with the local navigators (ibid., 72-3).

From the above example, it may be concluded that the Muslim navigators of the Indian Ocean did evolve an indigenous technique of drawing sea-charts with graduated lines in which the parallels represented the altitudes of the stars in isba's and “the meridians”, the fixed distances. According to Tibbetts, the Arab navigators of the Indian Ocean had followed a system of measuring the massāfīt or distances (The navigational theory of the Arabs in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries), 16). These could have been represented by the vertical lines on the charts.

Finally, it may be said that Islamic cartography, despite its technical drawbacks, as pointed out by scientists like al-Bīrūnī, did serve the purpose of the conqueror, the traveller and the scholar alike throughout the Middle Ages. The mistakes initially made persisted, even though in certain aspects like regional maps there were signs of progress. Its influence in the Islamic world lasted until the 17th century, when it seems to have been replaced by modern cartography.
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early in the 3rd/9th century, he joined al-Nihājī, Abū ʿUbayd al-Bursī, Saʿīl al-Saʿātī, Bishr al-Haffī, Dhu’l-Muḥṣīn al-Munṣūr, Muḥammad b. Maʾṣūr al-Tūsī and other Sūfī shaykhīs. He travelled extensively from an early age, though only few details about his itineraries are known from his own statements. His final departure from Bağhdād may be connected with the wave of persecution of the Sūfīs instigated by the Ḥanbalī Ḥūlām al-Haffī during the co-regency of al-Muwaffak (257/872-873), for he is reported to have been accused of infidelity by a group of ʿulāma' for some daring expressions in his Kitāb al-ṣira. According to his own testimony, he visited al-Ramla, Jerusalem, and Sāyyā and lived in Mecca for eleven years, regularly visiting Medina in order to perform the pilgrimage from there. He was expelled from Mecca by the governor because of his teaching. During the last part of his life, and perhaps during an earlier period, he lived in Egypt. From there he travelled to al-Baṣrā in order to meet the Sūfī Abū Hātim al-ʿAṭār, and he also visited Raywān. According to the best attested report, he died in 286/899.

Like his contemporary al-Djinayd (q.v.), al-Kharrāz strove to combine a doctrine of ecstatic mysticism with orthodox support of the religious law. He affirmed that any еxtatic (bābak) doctrine that contradicts the apparent meaning (ẓāhir) of the law is false. Upholding the superiority of the prophets over the saints (aṣḥāb al-ṣāliḥ), he argued that every prophet is a saint before becoming a prophet. He addressed a letter to a group of Sūfīs in Damascus, refuting their heretical view that they could see God with their hearts as the inhabitants of Paradise will see Him with their eyes. In a book on proper conduct in the vicinity of the sacred places (adab al-salāt), he described the significance of its rites for the Sūfī. Al-Kharrāz is credited by al-Sulami and others with having been the first one to speak about the states of annihilation (fānā) and subsistence (bābak) (q.v.). This is not literally correct, for these concepts had been used by earlier Sūfīs and were commonplace among his contemporaries. They appear, however, as fundamental in his doctrine and designate the highest stages of the mystic “beyond which no mortal mind can reach”. He defined fānā as “annihilation of the consciousness of manhood” and bābak as “subsistence in the contemplation of Godhead”. At the highest stage, so he stated in his Kitāb al-ṣira, the mystic loses his (human) attributes and attains the attributes of God, a doctrine disputed by al-Djinayd and expressly condemned as heretical by al-Sarrādī.

Fig. 2. The world map of Ptolemy translated into Arabic, as contained in the MS. Istanbul, Aya Sofya, No. 2160 (which bears the seal of Bayezid II, 886-918/1481-1512).
Fig. 3. Map of the world by Hāfiz-i Abru as contained in his untitled work on geography (written between 817/1414-5 and 823/1420), British Museum, MS. Or. 1577, ff. 7b-8a.
Fig. 4. Map of the world as contained in al-İşāḥrī’s Kitāb al-Manāḥī (written towards the middle of the 4th/10th century), Leiden University Library, Cod. Or. 3101, pp. 4-5.
**KHARRUBA** (see **MAKVIL**).

**KHARSHI** (Persian *khāršī* "hard substance from China"), also *ḥādīd *šīnī* "Chinese iron" (J. Ruska, *Tabula Smaragdina*, Heidelberg 1926, 70, tr. 75), to which corresponds the Persian *shān *šīnī* (*Āṣīr-i ḉabra*, tr. H. Blochmann, i, 40) is not zinc, as often assumed, but a highly-storied alloy, the constituents of which have not been established with certainty. According to the physical qualities attributed to it, *khārshī* would best correspond with hard lead, i.e. an alloy consisting of a mixture of lead, antimony and small quantities of copper, iron and tin. Next to gold, silver, iron, copper, lead, and tin, *khārshī* is mentioned as the seventh "metallic substance" (*khār *zār, *m*fāštī *al-*ūlām, ed. van Vloten, 252; Dījbīr, *K. al-Khwāds al-hobr*, see M. Ullmann, *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam*, Leiden-Cologne 1972, 143; Dimāḏiḡ, *Nūḡbāt al-dahr*, ed. Mehren, 1866, Arab. text 48, tr. 52) and called "mercury" (*fǎrīb*) by the alchemists. In his *K. al-Sirr al-rabbānī* fi *ṭīm al-mīḍān*, an alchemical treatise on the theory of the proportions to be mixed, Iznaḏī deals with this metal in a separate section (M. Ullmann, op. cit., 243). Rāzī compares it with the "Chinese mirrors" (*al-mardīyāt al-%intiya*) and Dījbīr with lead (both following al-Bīrūnī, who in his *K. al-Dimāḏiḡ*, Hydrobabad 1955, 261 f., deals with *khārshī* in a special chapter). This "strange substance" (*dawḥar gharib*) was "all but unknown" to the Arabs: this is probably the meaning of *shābī bi 'l-maʿāḏm* (*Kh *zārām, loc. cit.); van Vloten's interpretation "colourless" is less likely, since occasionally the yellow colour of *khārshī* is mentioned.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the article, see E. Wiedemann, *Aufsätze zur arabischen Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, ed. W. Fischer, Hildesheim-New York 1970, i, 49 f., 106, 697, 703 f., 707, 833, iii, 599. (A. Dietrich)

**KHARTABIRT** (see **KHARTPERT**).

**KHARTPERT**, a stronghold of eastern Armenia situated on a rock (Armenian, *pert*) 350 m./1,150 ft. above the plain of Khaz'it (g.v.), to be identified with the *Hīn-Za[Y]t of the Aramaic texts (and already in Ammianus Marcellinus, *castellum Ziala*, whence, through a confusion, the Arabic *Hīn *Ziyād, a term in use till the 16th century). The corrupted form Khartpert is found in colloquial Armenian (whence already in the Byzantine author Cedrenos, ii, 419) and in modern Turkish. The Latin and French authors at the time of the Crusades use forms like Quart-Pierre, Al-Dimāḏiḡ, ed. Mehren, 190, thought that Khartpert was the name of the fortress and *Hīn *Ziyād that of the settlement as a whole, but this appears to be a personal interpretation.

Khartpert was situated on the Arab-Byzantine borders, which were frequently crossed and re-crossed by armies from both sides. It is mentioned by Ibn Khurraḍādbihī, but is nevertheless not apparently cited in the Islamic historical sources before 567/977-8, when the Ḥamdānīd Abī Taghlib took refuge there with a brother-in-law, a Byzantine vassal. In the 6th/12th century, after the Turkish invasions, it fell temporarily to a Turkmen called Dījbūk, and soon afterwards to the Artuksids, amongst whom was the celebrated Balak, who imprisoned then Jocelyn of Edessa and Baldwin II of Jerusalem. When Diyār Bahr was partitioned between rival branches of this dynasty, Khartpert fell within that centred on Hīsn Kayfa, and then under a subordinate branch of these last Artuksids in 581/1185. The town played a big part at the time of the Ayyūbīd al-Malik al-Kāmil's expedition of 631/1234 against the Rūm Saldūk Kaykābd, who annexed it directly. It passed subsequently into the hands of all the powers who transiently held power over the region during the Mongol period, and in the 9th/15th century the Banū Erene, the Duḡḥādīr, the Āf Koyunlu (g.v.), and finally, after an interval of Safawī control, into the grip of the Ottomans in 921/1515. The Ottoman governors established themselves at the foot of the rock at Mezere, now named Maʿmūrat al-ʿAzdī (a name later extended to all the province, along both banks of the Euphrates). In the 9th/15th century Khartpert had been visited by Joseph Barbaro (*Viaggi*, ed. Venice 1545, 49-9) and it was described in the 12th/17th one by Ewlyā Celebi.

The population, partly Armenian until the massacres of the present century, had nevertheless been largely Turkicised and Kurdicised over the preceding centuries. According to the register from 936/1530 published by Ī. L. Barkan, its revenue at that time was about 250,000 a[hçe]. The town possessed an old mosque and a more recent one built by ʿUzūn Ḥasan, a madrasa and 50 (?) schools. Amongst the industries mentioned were saddles or "Chinese mirrors" (*al-mardīyāt al-%intiya*) and Dījbīr with lead (both following al-Bīrūnī, who in his *K. al-Dimāḏiḡ*, Hydrobabad 1955, 261 f., deals with *khārshī* in a special chapter). This "strange substance" (*dawḥar gharib*) was "all but unknown" to the Arabs: this is probably the meaning of *shābī bi 'l-maʿāḏm* (*Kh *zārām, loc. cit.); van Vloten's interpretation "colourless" is less likely, since occasionally the yellow colour of *khārshī* is mentioned.

**Bibliography:** This is given essentially in the arts. of *EI* (Besim Darkot), and *H. W. Darkot, H. W. (s.v. Khurpat).* It is named in most of the Arabic geographers from Ibn Khurraḍādbihī and Ibn Serapion onwards (information summed up in Le Strange, *Lands*, 116-7), till the time of Ewlyā Celebi, ed. 1314/1896-7, iii, 216-17, and the 19th century travellers, Moltke, Brant, Hommaire de Hell, Saudredzkī, Taylor, Tozer, Lynch and Lehmann Haupt (summed up in Kitter, *Erkundungen*), and finally Cuiinet (cf. Darkot in *IA*). The most important Muslim and other mediaeval historians include Ibn al-ʿAqlī; Ibn al-Azraq al-Fārīkī, *Ṭaʿrikh Mayyāḏfārīn*, Marwānīd period ed. B. A. L. Awad, 1959, Artuksid one resumed by Cl. Cahen in *Le Dīyar Bahr au temps des premiers Artuksides*, in *JA* (1955); the historians of the campaign of 631/1234, especially Ibn Wāṣil and Ibn Bībī; those of Jocelyn and Baldwin's captivity (Foucher of Chartres, Matthew of Edessa); and Michael the Syrian and Bar Hebraeus. The inscription of 561/1166 (REA, No. 3271) has now been more satisfactorily published by Sauvaget in his *Quatre décrets séleucides*, Damascus 1947; another unedited inscription has been brought to light. For archeology, see especially A. Gabriel, *Voyages*, 257-8. There is an Artuksid coin given in *I. and C. Artuk, İslambol ... sikkeler katalogu*, i, 396. (Cl. Cahen)

**BANŌ KHRUS** (Persian *bhūkhud*) or **BAŠ KHRUS** (Turkish *Bey Khris*), a tribe which has played an important role in the history of the *Ibadīyā* (g.v.) in *Umān*. Descendants of Yaḥmād, a branch of al-Azd (g.v.), members of the tribe migrated to *Umān* in pre-Islamic times and established themselves in a valley which came to bear their name. Wāṭl Bani Khrūs runs down from the heights of the western mountain range of al-Ḥadjar to join Wāṭl al-Đar before debouching on the plain of al-Bāṭina and then
into the Gulf of ʿUmān. On the right bank not far below the juncture of the two valleys is the famous ʿ Ibāḍī stronghold of al-Rūstāk [q.v.].

Yahyā ibn Ishaq provided most of the ʿ Ibāḍī Imāms of ʿUmān before the advent of the Yaʿrubī dynasty in the 12th/13th century, and of these a goodly share were ʿKharūṣīs. The first ʿKharūṣī to be elected to the high office appears to have been al-Wārīṭ b. Kaʿb (179/922-938), during whose tenure of power the centre of the ʿ Ibāḍīyya is believed to have moved from al-Basra to ʿUmān. Ḥādī ibn Ishaq al-ʿKharūṣī became the head of the community. Upon his assassination in 1338/1920, the succession went to Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, a grandson of Saʿīd b. ʿKhaṭfīn, who reigned until his death in 1373/1954. For the careers of these later ʿKharūṣīs, see ʿUmān.


ʿAl-ʿIḥāṣāsī, Abū ʿ-Ẓafīr ʿAṣīm b. al-Ḥāṣib ʿAṣīm b. ʿAṣīm al-ʿIḥāṣāsī, a Moroccan saint, member of the ʿIḥāṣāsī order [q.v.]. Originally from Andalusia, he owed his ethnic name to the town of al-ʿIḥāṣa, which was situated on the al-Kāfī mountain on the Mediterranean coast. He was born at Fez in ca. 1002/1593-4, where he studied and had, in particular, Abī Ḥamīd b. ʿAbd Allāh Maʿn al-Andalusī as his pupil. Al-ʿKādirī [q.v.] devoted a work called al-Zāhir al-bāṣīm to his maṣāḥīḥ. He died at Fez on 19 Ramadan 1083/8 January 1673 and was buried in the mausoleum of al-Ashyakh. (M. Lakhādār)
buy in full, without any authorisation for re-exportation. Thus in the time of the Crusades there was a kind of “war of wood” with the Latin East which was sustained by conciliar decrees as clear-cut in intention as they were useless in practice. As early as the 10th century the Byzantine emperor John I Tzimisces had forbidden the sale of timber to the Muslims of the Maghrib, but they managed to buy already-constructed ships at Amalфи or to re-use valuable parts of unseaworthy vessels. It has been said that the decline in Muslim shipping at the end of the Middle Ages resulted from the scarcity of wood. This idea cannot be accepted in its entirety, since the Byzantines, who had a wealth of wood, still allowed the Italians to achieve mastery of the sea, but this scarcity undoubtedly played a part.

Bibliography: For topics on which the information is both scattered and tenuous, it is impossible to provide a proper bibliography. The essential facts on the production of wood and naval arsenals can be found in the articles by Maurice Lombard (reproduced in a posthumous collection, *Espaces et réseaux au haut Moyen Âge*, Paris and The Hague 1972), Arsenaux et bois de marine dans la Méditerranée musulmane (VIIe-Xle s.), in *Le Navire et l’économie maritime* ... Second colloquium on Maritime History, Paris 1958, 53-106 and Le bois dans la Méditerranée musulmane, in *Annales ESC* (1959), 234-54, with good bibliographies up to these dates. For trade, see the histories of Levantine trade and the Crusades, and Cl. Cahen, *Douanes et commerce dans les ports méditerranéens de l’Égypte Médiévale*, in *JESH* (1965), and the few references cited in this article. (Cl. CAHEN*)

**AL-KHASHABĀT**: pl. of Arabic *khashaba* “wooden beam”, the name given to wooden pillars which in mediaval times were driven into the seabed at the place where the *Ṣaḥāb* al-ʿArab empties into the Persian Gulf. These beaches were placed at six miles’ distance from ʿAbbadān, and were meant to guide sailors in danger of being drawn into a dangerous whirlpool and also on occasion to signal the approach of pirates. Al-Maʾṣūdī, *Musnad*, i, 250, 330-1 = §§ 2-3, mentions al-Khāṣāzī, *Mafatih*, 124, states that lamps were lit on their upper parts. Nāṣir-i Khusrav, *Safar-nāma*, ed. Schefer, text 90, tr. 246, gives a more exact description. They consisted of four teak columns set obliquely in their upper parts. Nasir-i Khusraw, *Shark Kasidat Ibn ‘Abdun*, and is said to have taken his name from these. Moreover, al-Khashabiyya was another name for the Kaysānīyya [q.v.] and then was applied to the adherents of the doctrines which were current among the latter, like that of the return (raḍ’a [q.v.] and that of metempsychosis (*tānāsakh* [q.v.]). The poetical representative of these doctrines, Kūlaḡyir, is called a Khashābi and is said to have been gained for the *Khashabiyā* by the poet Khāndif al-ʿAsadī (ʿAbd Allāh, viii, 33-4, xl, 47, where Khandif is to be read instead of Khandak).

According to Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Khāṣāzī (Mafāṭīḥ al-ʿItīm, ed. van Vloten, 29), the name al-Khashabiyya was used for a group of the Zaydiyya [q.v.] known as Ṣurkhābiyya after a certain Ṣurkhāb al-ʿAtarī, of whom nothing seems to be known; it might be possible to think of the Ṣurkhāb who played a part in Tabaristan in the time of Hasan b. Ṣayd [q.v.]. (cf. Ibn Isfandiyar, *Ensl. tr. E. G. Browne, Leiden-London 1905, Index*). It must be left undecided whether they were called Khashabiyā after their weapons or perhaps on account of Kaysānī doctrines which asserted themselves among them. The same statement occurs in Abu ʿl-Maʿallī, *Bayān al-adāyn*, in *Christianitas przesone*, ed. Ch. Schefer, i, Paris 1833, 157, where Ṣurkhā is to be read instead of Ṣ-thāl.

**According to a statement given on the authority of al-Layth (apparently Ibn al-Muzaffar), al-Khashabā**...
biyya was also the name of a section of the Djahmiyya [q.v.], which maintained that Allah does not speak and that the Qur'an is created (LA and TA, s.v.). Bibliography (in addition to the works cited in the article): Samâ'î, Anisâh, Leiden:London 1912, I, 199b; Tabarî, Gloss., s.v. khasb and kfr; BGA, iv, Gloss., 278; H. D. van Gelder, Mojarat de voscalese profete, diss. Leiden 1888, 71-3; Wellhausen, Die religiöspolitischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam (Abb. G.W.G., philhist. Kl., N.F., No. 3, Berlin 1901), 80; H. Banning, Muhammad ibn al-İbnâ'fija, diss. Erlangen 1909, 46-7; Friedländer, The heterodoxes der Scribes according to Ibn Hasm, in JASOS, xxix, 93-5.

(C. van Arendonk*)

KHAŞİ (A), pl. khyyăın “castrated man, eunuch”.

I.—In the Central Islamic lands.

From the 4th/10th century especially, several euphemisms were applied to eunuchs, who were numerous in the palaces and frequently invested with important functions: notably kâddîm (coll. khadham, pl. kuddādīm, maw'alla, shaykh, usādīh (see M. Canard, 'Akhur ar-Raddī, ..., i, 210-1, note), later on jawāshî (which, according to al-Makrizī, Hist. des Sultans Mamlouks, tr. Quatremère, t/2 (1849), 132, comes from the Turkish jâbâsîh = Osmanlı tapançî “servant” and also designating in the administrative language of Egypt a military position in the bodyguard, all in the Arabic-speaking world; in Turkish, kâddîm/hadîm, khâdîja/khâda/koca and âçha, in Persian khâdâja and âqâhâja (q.v.v.), were employed. Placed before or after the name of the person concerned, these terms are not generally ambiguous, but employed on their own, in the sing. or the pl., most of them can cause confusion, particularly the first, kâddîm (q.v.), equally frequent in the ancient texts to designate normal slaves, and even free servants; it is the same, in Muslim Spain and other parts, with fa'tâ, ghumâm (q.v.v.), and one never knows exactly what an author intends by these words when the real state of the person cited is not known from other sources. On the other hand, eunuchs were often named Yâkût, Kâfür, 'Anbar, etc. (see in al-Kalâşandî, 39th v., 45, the honorific titles corresponding to these names), but even these epithets are not sufficient to identify them as such. Khaşî, by contrast, is never equivocal, and the same can be said of makhkîs (passive participle particularly frequent in the passages of al-Mutanabbî about Kâfür (q.v.)); these terms, as well as kâddîm, are opposed to fašt “stallion”, and there is a characteristic example in the distinction between the two famous homonyms, Mu'âsh al-Fâbi and Mu'nis al-Khâdîm (q.v.v.).

Even so, the use of the preceding terms and of the word khaşî itself allows an uncertainty to continue, for it does not permit the distinction to be made between the two fundamental categories of eunuchs: in Arabic, khaşî designates, properly speaking, the man or animal who has undergone the ablation of the testicles (called among other things khyyā, khyyây, the operation being called khaṣî), whereas the correct equivalent deprived of all his sexual organs, is a madâţîb (pl. madâţib); this latter word, which rhymes with maslāb “castrated by evulsion” (al-Mas'ūdī, Murūjû, viii, 149 = § 3290), while distinguished from it, rarely appeared in the texts, as is the case with the verb dâshâ and the verbal noun dâzâb; one encounters at times one or the other in the account of a mutilation inflicted on a slave by his master or even on a free man by a flouted husband who takes vengeance on his rival. With regard to this, one of the most frightful stories is that of a Sind slave surprised by his master in the company of his wife and punished by the latter in the following manner: dâshâ dakhara-khâ; taking the sons of his tormentor as hostages, he forced their father to mutilate himself (dâshâ naša'-khâ) with a knife, after which he threw the children from the top of the house (al-Mas'ūdī, vi, 264-5 = 2472; al-İbâhî, Mustârâf, Cairo n.d., ii, 203).

Similar acts of cruelty enter into the arsenal of folkloric themes, and the Thousand and One Nights, where the person of the eunuch plays a characteristic role (notably 3rd, 7th, 27th, 107th, 237th, 719th nights; see N. Elissâdet, Thèmes et motifs des Mille et une Nuits, Damascus 1949, index), offer several examples of the mutilation of a man by a mistress (113th night) or a jealous husband (33rd night), or to punish the seducer of a young girl (59th night); even a schoolmaster is seen depriving himself of his virility (403rd night), and a slave who refuses to be freed, is castrated and sold at a very high price (275th night). Independently of more or less legendary traditions, the case is cited of 'Aתחילa b. Sahî, emasculated by a king of Yemen (al-Djabiz, Hayawān, i, 120-1), which could however be the result of an accidental castration; perhaps the epithet of al-Fâbi is to be added to the name of 'A�향âma b. 'Abâda (q.v.). The famous story is also reported of the letter of 'Alâhâm (Hayawān, i, 121-2) or of Sulaymân (al-Alâhî, ed. Beirut, iv, 275) or of al-Wâlid (ibid., iv, 278) b. 'Abd al-Mâlik ordering the governor of Medina or Mecca to take a census of akhsî the effeminate men of the two holy towns; having read khaşî, the official had two (or nine of them) castrated, notably the singer al-Dalâlî (al-Alâhî, iv, 273 ff.) by one named Badarâkus/Badarâkus, who was a circumciser; this last detail does not figure in al-Djabiz and, despite the traditions which tend to make it an historical fact, the whole account is, by all appearances, nothing other than a pleasing anecdote, forged to provide evidence of the inconveniences of the Arabic script, but later exploited by anti-Umayyad authors. Some cases of accidental castration were also related, and it seems that some doctors practised from early on such an operation, when the state of an illness made it necessary (Hayawān, i, 121-3). At all events, the vocabulary used rarely permits the specification of the exact nature of the emasculation undertaken, and in a famous passage (Aƙâsin al-tâkâsîm, 242; ed.-tr. Pellat, Descr. de l'Ocident mus. au IVe siècle, Algiers 1950, 57-9 (where “inciser”, p. 57, should be replaced by “trancher”); Germ., Engl., Span. tr. in A. Mes, Renaissance, and on the tranal. of this work, ch. xx1), al-Mukaddasî uses the collective khadam and the verb khaşî in the part of his description which applies to complete eunuchs, i.e. to the madâţîb. To judge by this text, two methods were used for the emasculation of eunuchs that the author has been able to encounter: simultaneous ablation of the testicles (misra'd) and the penis or incision of the scrotal sheath (safan) and evulsion of the testicles first of all, then cutting of the male member; after this operation a rod of lead was placed in the urethra and replaced after each urination, until the healing was complete, in order to prevent the tissues from joining. However, this horrible mutilation was not general, and it is probable that the majority of eunuchs were not actually madâţîb, but khyyāy properly so-called, who had undergone a khaşî consisting, for the operator (khaşî), of incising and at the same time cauterizing the scrotum by means of a red-hot blade
of iron and removing (sall, salb or imtildkh) the testicles. This emasculation is also called mals or main, since it is especially associated with rams. As for wasid, another form of castration, it consisted of binding the cord supporting the testicles and making them gush out, when they underwent a crushing (radd) and atrophied naturally; twisting of the cord (‘ab) was also known. Al-Ḍābiḫī (Hayawanī, i, 130-1) gives us to understand that the first of these processes was applied to men and speaks immediately afterwards of animals, but it is highly likely that, never having had the opportunity to see the operation practised on a human being, he generalised, although the word wasid, probably deprived of its technical meaning, is also used for a man (see below).

In fact, if curious investigators were able easily to interrogate stock-breeders and obtain exact information on the castration of animals, they were less well informed on emasculation of men, and, as far as we know, al-Muḥaddasī alone reports at first hand the information supplied by eunuchs whom he says he had questioned. Speaking of the Byzantine origin who fell into the hands of the Muslims at the time when the latter made incursions into the territory of Byzantium, this author states that he had come across children whose parents had had them castrated in order to consecrate them to the service of the Church; he also demonstrates that the religious origin of emasculation was not unknown. In fact, the Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.) had clearly prohibited eunuchs from the priesthood, but they could be choristers and even priests in the Oriental Church. eunuchs from the priesthood, but they could be

...while on one may estimate that the majority of white eunuchs, besides being less and less numerous as the centuries progressed, originated from Spain in the Middle Ages, there is a scarcity of information for a much later period, and it is not known exactly where the operations were performed. The authors who were found further afield in the harems and courts of the sovereigns of Iran and Turkey.

Concerning the blacks, their origin is sufficiently well-known, for it is evidently identical to that of the slaves [see 'abd], on which, moreover, there is some precise information. Al-Muḥaddasī distinguishes three kinds: the first, which is, he says without any other specification, the best, was exported to Egypt; the second, that of the Berbers, was sent to Aden; the third “resembles” the Abyssinians. Al-ʾIṣṭakhri, 40, remains equally vague in saying that the eunuchs sold in the Muslim lands are neither Nubians, nor Zandji, nor Ethiopians, nor Bedja, but belong to a still blacker race; al-ʾMāḍīṣī (Budā, iv, Ar. text 69, tr. 65) speaks of the Zaghl (?) and Zagwā; al-ʾIdrīsī (tr. Dozy-de Goeje, 3; partial edn. Peires, Algiers 1957, 4; ed. Naples-Rome, 1, 1970, 19) cites Takrur (q.v.), as a region from which the Moorish merchants imported gold ore and wadīd. (It is a fact that the Takrurīs, besides the Rūm, Indians and Ḥabashi, belonged to one of the four races which supplied the Mamlūk sultanate with eunuchs, see D. Ayalon, Names, titles and "misbas" of the Mamlūks, in Israel Oriental Studies, v
(1975), 220.) For his part, Ibn Battuta (iv, 447; partial tr. H. A. R. Gibb, London 1957, 330) says that they came from Bornu, via Zawila [p.], to the Mediterranean world. But that given that emasculation was practised secretly, it is difficult to know the centres where it was carried out in the Middle Ages. According to the Hudud al-Islam, 165, the Sudán is, without doubt, the land from which the majority of eunuchs came; in a lively passage, the author adds that the Egyptian merchants stole children there—on the latter must certainly have sustained conversations (cf. al-Mascudi, Murudi, viii, 148-9 = § 3290) on the behaviour of the latter having expressed the wish to mutilate himself, the Prophet is said to have recommended fasting for young men who were unable to get married, adding that fasting was a khamis. All this evidence confirms the tendency of certain pious Muslims to deprive themselves of the pleasures of the flesh and, thus, they had the habits of the Prophet against the weakening of the community that would have resulted from it. In any case, there is no text forbidding the possession of eunuchs, and it has been noted that Muḥammad received them and accepted one who was offered him by the Muṣawiqis [q.v.] at the same time as Mary the Copt (Hayawdn, i, 163). Neither can the Kur‘an serve to enunciate a rigorous prohibition. The verses 118/119 of Sūra IV certainly read: “Let God curse (the demon) who said: ‘... I will ordain them to modify the creation of God’, but it is open to divergent interpretations: for Anas b. Mālik, Ibn ‘Abbās, ‘Ikrīma, it is definitely khamis (of animals rather than of men) that is visualised, whereas for Sa`īd b. Diūbayr and Muğāhīd, it is a matter simply of “the religion of God” (in Hayawdn, i, 179). Besides, it is not that al-Masḥūd (Murādī, viii, 179) does not obvious that the operation was carried out, for a sum of 40 to 60 piastres, by two Coptic monks, under the protection of the government, to whom an annual tax was paid. Contrary to what other authors have said (notably E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., ii, 125; E. W. Bovill, Golden trade, 244: 10% of survivors; H. von Maltzan, Wallfahrer nach Mekka, Leipzig 1865, i, 48-9), the Swiss traveller claims that the children (from 8 to 12 years) who died were a very small number. These young eunuchs were valued at 1,000 piastres at Asyūt, whilst they had been bought for 300 piastres. The annual figure (150) that Burckhardt gives corresponds to that of Frank; he adds that two years previously Muḥammad b. ‘Āli had had 200 young slaves from Dārāfīr castrated to offer them to the Ottoman Sultan. Until recent times, slaves from Muslim states situated further to the north raided Central Africa; women slaves and eunuchs passed clandestinely via Djibouti to people the harem of the Ḥiğlās (L. Massignon, Annuaire du monde musulman, 4th edn, Paris 1955, 357, 385).

A priori, these practices hardly appear legal. Before Islam, although some isolated cases of castration were reported (see above) and although the Arabs of the period without doubt possessed some eunuchs (it is sometimes thought that a reference to them appears in the Kur‘ān, xxiv 31, where it is said that women can show their finery to their male servants who have no carnal desire, al-ib‘īn ghayr ail l-‘irba), they cannot have had them produced regularly on their territory, so that the question of knowing whether emasculation of men was permitted was not put clearly to the first Muslims. With regard to this, the hadith is not very explicit, and we must once more place a certain amount of confidence in al-Dhābī, who reports a reply of Muḥammad to ‘Uṯmān b. Māz‘ūn: the latter having expressed the desire to mutilate himself, the Prophet is said to have replied to him that it was fasting (ṣawm) that had replaced castration (khāmis; var. wāidiq) in Islam (Hayawdn, i, 128-9); in the collections of āhadith, it is said simply that Ibn Māz‘ūn wanted to devote himself to celibacy (la‘ība), Ibn Ḥajar Ḥamadānī (ed.-tr. Bercker, 329) it was the same with capus (Hayawdn, i, 131). In addition, a special reasoning to justify it was to compare khāmis improperly with the mark of the red-hot iron practised on flocks and herds (ibid., i, 166).

If, in the final reckoning, the castration of domestic animals was always tolerated, and the legality of the possession of eunuchs does not seem to have given rise to serious discussions, considerations on the behaviour of the latter must certainly have sustained conversations (cf. al-Masḥūd, Murādī, viii, 128-9 =
§ 3288-90); but al-Djabiz is probably the first author to have recorded his observations on their characteristics and the transformations that they undergo physically, morally and intellectually (Hayawdn, i, 106 ff.; in a more condensed form in Mušaḥḥarat al-dijawari wa'l-ghilman, ed. Pellat, Beirut 1957, 52-5; ed. Hārūn, Cairo 1965, ii, 123-5; cf. al-Bayhaḵī, al-Maḥāsin wa'l-maṣawī, ed. Schwally, Giessen 1902, 509-12; al-Thaʿlabī, al-Latāfi wa'l-qarārif, Cairo 1915, 124). He remarks truly that if emasculation takes place before puberty—which is the most frequent case—the beard and body hair do not grow, but the hair of the head, eyebrows and lashes remain and never fall, exactly as with women, who do not experience baldness (i, 108, 114; cf. al-Tawḥīdī, Imād, i, 160-1). Eunuchs have soft skin, a florid complexion, but they become lined and thin very quickly with advancing age, which does not prevent them from enjoying a great longevity, for they do not use their strength to copulate (i, 137). Their voice, having changed after the operation, is recognisable (i, 113) by everyone (which allows kāḥiyās to include them easily in their imitations; al-Masūdī, viii, 156, 164 = §§ 3300, 3302). They have long feet, knotted fingers in their old age, long limb bones, and by contrast with castrated animals, thick (which is an error, for they are thin), their muscular tonicity is poor, and their flesh is flaccid; their walk is ungainly (Hayawdn, i, 116) due to the weakness of their nerves. Because of the fatidness of their sweat, they give off a peculiar odour, contrasting on this point with the animals who, after castration, smell no longer bad (i, 106; al-Masūdī, viii, 149 = § 3290, asserts on the contrary that their armpits do not give off a fetid odour); finally, urinary incontinence is their lot (Hayawdn, i, 138). If the operation takes place in adulthood, the pilary system disappears, with the exception of the pubic hair (i, 113), and strength diminishes (i, 115).

The character of eunuchs is comparable with that of women and children (i, 135-6); like them, they particularly like playing with birds. Finding in food and drink (they appreciate wine especially; i, 158) a kind of compensation for the deprivation of other pleasures, they have a tendency to excess, with which, with their continence (vii, 223), explains their obesity (i, 111). They are avaricious, indiscreet, as quick to lose their temper as to show their joy or to weep (i, 135), inclined to gossip and slander. They despise the common people and accept only the powerful and the rich as masters (i, 136, 159). They like domestic work, but are ill-adapted to arduous trades (i, 117); on the other hand, they endure long horse rides better than the Turks and Khārāḏīs (i, 136) and are excellent at archery; especially devoted to that are white eunuchs who deploy their warlike qualities against the Byzantine to avenge themselves for the mutilation that the latter have made them undergo; they dedicate themselves to harbouring an illegitimate child and avaricious, and to include them easily in their imitations; al-Masūdī, viii, 148 = § 3289) and that the Ottomans preferred as harem attendants negroes who had been completely castrated and who were physically ugly. Besides, al-Muḥaddasī records that, according to Abū Ḥanīfa, eunuchs could marry (and take concubines, adds al-Djabiz, i, 123, 166); however, it must in practice have been very rare (see e.g. Ibn al-ʿAḫḫīr, ix, 39, with regard to a eunuch of ʿAqīd al-Dawla who has as wife an Abyssinian slave), but Burckhardt (Travels in Arabia, London 1829, 158-9) asserts that "Extraordinary as it may appear, the grown-up eunuchs [of the Kaʿba] are all married to black slaves." The patience of the children that their wives brought into the world was naturally attributed to them: this curious assertion is explained by the automatic application of the principle according to which se pater est quem justae nuptiae demonstrant and also by the fact that a khaṣ is not always maʿmūn al-liḥrāb; in fact, during the operation, the child might experience such fear that one of his testicles would rise up into his body and escape mutilation (cf. Hayawdn, i, 129, where this statement is followed by the remark that a maḏbūb, in these conditions, preserves a testicle and remains neither a man nor a woman nor even an eunuch); if it is the left (for it is popularly held that this is the procreative one; Hayawdn, i, 123), the half-eunuch secretes sperm
and can engender children; if it is the right one only, the beard grows, but the case has been known of a man deprived of his left testicle who had a child whom he could not repudiate because he looked exactly like him (i, 123-4).

Generally, eunuchs lived with their master, whether he was a private individual or a ruler, and did not mingle much with the populace, especially as they were easily recognisable and as the humber people did not refrain from hurling gibes at them (al-Tabari, iii, 274; al-Mas'udi, viii, 318; cf. i, 339). In the palaces of the caliphs, in Cordoba as in the East, they were always numerous, despite the high price that was asked for them; by way of example, Leo Africanus (tr. Épaulard, 139, 209) states that in Morocco a slave girl was worth 15 dinārs, a man, 20 and a eunuch, 40; in general, it is double the price of an ordinary slave that is mentioned by the sources. The historians charge al-Āmin (al-Tabari, iii, 950 ff.; cf. Abū Nuwās, Diwān, 288: rhyme and wādī) with having bought many more eunuchs than his predecessors and with having had them constantly in attendance at his side, associating them even in the affairs of state. His successors largely imitated his example, and the figures supplied, although to be treated with caution, remain very high; in the time of al-Muktafi (289-95/902-9), there were in the palace 10,000 ādām, 10,000 blacks and whites (Subkibā), and the king of Gao owned a eunuch as early as the end of the 4th/10th century (Bardjawan [q.v.]). Without doubt, the most famous and successful in the reign of the Fatimid al-Muktadir (295-320/908-32) sheltered 11,000, comprising 7,000 blacks and 4,000 whites (Hilal al-Sabi', Russūm dār al-khilāfa, ed. M. 'Awāwīd, Baghdad, 1964, 8). It is remarkable that al-Kalāqashandīfī (v, 92) also mentions the figure of 10,000 for the court of Dihlī, but precise details of this kind are rare and are clearly exaggerated. However, the organisation of the corps of eunuchs is well-known, particularly under the Fatimids (see below). In the Islamicised lands of West Africa, the custom of surrounding oneself with Turkish slaves and eunuchs bought in Cairo also spread (Ibn Faḍl Allāh Ḫūzayfī, Somāl, iii, 485). It would be easy to multiply the examples.

In Persia, a notable case cited is that of Manucihr Subfī, who, in 564/1169, hatched a plot against Saladin (Ibn Abī'l-Sādī, 208) and a eunuch, ii, 123) reports that some rich eunuchs bought estates in the marches (see 'awāsim, tawukhr) recruited fighting men and made attacks on the Byzantines to revenge themselves (see above) for their very serious injuries. It may not be by chance that several governors of Tarsūs [q.v.], notably Bīghr, mawla of Ibn Abī'l-Sādī, were white eunuchs who launched expeditions against the Rūm (see Vasiliiev-Canard, Byzance et les Arabes, ii, 3, Brussels 1968, 130) and that Ḫamal, commanding the naval forces in the Mediterranean, was also one (ibid., index).

In a general way, the eunuchs were authorised to circulate freely in the harems and served as intermediaries between their master and his wives and concubines. This freedom of movement permitted a number of them to become accomplices of the women who hatched plots (see for example M. Taibī, Mīrut al-aghlābī, index) and to participate in the political life of the state. Although Hilāl al-Sābi', (Russūm, ii) says only that some [white] eunuchs used to surround the throne of the Caliph, brushing away the flies, while others, armed with cross-bows, killed the birds of ill-omen or those that were too noisy, it is certain that not all were assigned domestic functions, and history provides us with examples of the political and military rôle that a number of them, as in Greece, Rome or Byzantium, succeeded in playing throughout the centuries.

As early as the 3rd/9th century, al-Ḍībāi (Ḥayawān, i, 125) reports that some rich eunuchs bought estates in the marches (see 'awāsim, tawukhr) recruited fighting men and made attacks on the Byzantines to revenge themselves (see above) for their very serious injuries. It may not be by chance that several governors of Tarsūs [q.v.], notably Bīghr, mawla of Ibn Abī'l-Sādī, were white eunuchs who launched expeditions against the Rūm (see Vasiliiev-Canard, Byzance et les Arabes, ii, 3, Brussels 1968, 130) and that Ḫamal, commanding the naval forces in the Mediterranean, was also one (ibid., index). In the same way, in 307/919 the admirals commanding the Fātimid and Byzantine fleets respectively were both eunuchs (al-Kindī, Judges, 276). At this period, moreover, there were numerous generals who were ḥāyīyān (for example Mas'ūdī, Muflīh al-Muḳṭadīrī, etc.; see Vasiliiev-Canard, ii, 1, index); similarly, some of them were leaders of the Huḍjāriyya [q.v.]. Without doubt, the most famous and successful in his enterprises was Kāfir [q.v.], who died in 357/968 after he had been master of Egypt and Syria; it will be noted that he was black. Under the first Fātimids, Ustādī Jawhar [q.v.] who was a Slav eunuch, played a role so important that he merited a special biography. A little later, Bardjawan [q.v.] who was also white, was the tutor of the caliph al-Ḥākim; having assumed the functions of regent of the Fātimid Empire, he was killed by another eunuch, Raḍīn, on the orders of the caliph. The organization of a body of a thousand eunuchs (al-Kalāqashandīfī) Subfī, iii, 485) under this dynasty may still be noted because In the 6th/12th century a number were to be found in charge of various forces, directing rival states and governing important towns (see, for example, N. Elissēeff, Nūr al-Dīn, ii, 327, 340, 385, 484, 557, 657); in the reign of the Fātimid al-ʿĀdīd, the black eunuchs exercised a considerable influence (B. Lewis, op. laud., 71-2) it was his muṭʿāmin al-aghlāfa, Jawhar, who, in 564/1169, hatched a plot against Saladin (Ibn Abī-Abīrī, ix, 103). Eunuchs were still found among the troops of the latter (Imād al-Dīn, al-Fāṭḥ al-bussī, 324; tr. H. Massé, 287) who took Karakūsh completely into his confidence (Bahār al-Dīn [q.v.]). It would be easy to multiply the examples.

In Persia, a notable case cited is that of ʿAwāsim, Khān Muḥammad al-Dawla, sometime governor of Isfāhān during the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh; he had been taken prisoner in Fāṭḥ al-ʿĀdīd's [q.v.] campaign against Russia and castrated. On his death, his property was claimed by the Persian crown on the grounds of his having been a slave, though this was disputed (Great Britain, Public Record Office, F.O. 60/29. Murray to Clarendon, No. 69, Baghdad, 8 August 1856). ʿĀdīl Shāh, the nephew of Nāṣir Shāh, into whose hands he had fallen.
It goes without saying that such accession to the throne, which was exceptional, is in contradiction to the law of Islam which demands the physical integrity of the ruler. A. Mez (ch. xx) mentions that a eunuch functioned as a ḥāḍī at Damietta, but it is certain that the ḥāṣyān, from the sole fact of their mutilation, were normally excluded from the magistrature [see khaṭ]. However, Niẓām al-Mulk (Ṣiyāṣat-nāma, ed. Schefer, Paris 1891-3, 41) considers that it is preferable to transfer the functions of muḥtārīn on a eunuch and it will be noted that, under the Ottomans, the control of the ṭawfīk of the Holy Cities and most of the mosques was assured up to the 16th century by the ṭapīt aghāst [q.v.], in the 17th century by the latter and the ṭiṣlār aghāst, respectively the Chief White Eunuch and the Chief Black Eunuch, in the 18th century by the ṭapīt aghāst alone, after the weakening of the power of the whites (see below).

It should be noted that, in different courts of Muslim rulers, the eunuchs were organised in a body at an early date. According to the account of the Byzantine embassy received by al-Muqtadi at Bağhdād on Monday 24 Muḥarram 305/17 July 917 (see Vasiliev-Canard, ii/1, 238 ff.), the Ḥujjariyya and eunuchs of the Caliph were to be seen positioned between the latter and the soldiers; some of them accompanied ambassadors during all their visits. At the court of the Fāṭimids (see al-Balkhashandi, ʿṢubh, iii, 480-t), the eunuchs (mawṭaḍd) were used immediately after the amīr. The officials in private service were eunuchs, of whom those of greatest dignity wore a turban passing under the chin and were therefore called muḥānnaḫ. “The most exalted rank among the muḥānnaḵs eunuchs was held by the one who had the charge of wrapping a special crown round the head of the Caliph for ceremonial occasions. Next [came] the ṣāḥib al-maḍjīd or master of the audience hall; the ṣāḥib al-risāla, or master of correspondence; the ṣāḥib al-buṣūr, the intendant of the palaces; the ṣāḥib bāyṭ al-māl, or director of the Treasury; the master of the registry (ṣāḥib al-dafṣar) who directed the general offices (dawān); the bearer of the inkwell (kāmil al-dawūd); the superintendent of the Caliph’s kinsmen (ṣamm al-aḍābūr); the head of the household (ṣāḥib al-mawṭaḍd). Important household offices held by non-eunuchs included the deanship of the women’s apartments in the royal palace began to play an important role in political affairs. Chardin placed the number of eunuchs at court at ca. 3,000, and says that these were mainly white persons coming above all from the Malabar coast (Voyages, Amsterdam 1711, 283-5). But under ʿShāh ʿAbbās (985-1038/1578-1629) it became common practice to enslave and castrate Georgian and other captives taken in war and to use them as palace servants, especially in the royal ḥaram. According to the Taḫkiṣir al-mulāḳā, he was the first šah to introduce white eunuchs into the palace alongside the black eunuchs (i, 312 ff.). He also initiated the practice of immuring the royal princes in the ḥaram. This practice unfitted them for rule and in due course enabled the palace eunuchs to dominate affairs of state. On the death of ʿShāh ʿAbbās II in 1077/1667, the palace eunuchs contrived the succession of ʿShāh Sulaymān and seized control of the state. On the latter’s death in 1105/1694, with the connivance of Maryam Begum, ʿShāh Sulaymān’s aunt, they placed ʿShāh Sulṭān Hūsayn on the throne. He left the management of affairs of state entirely to them. They succeeded in extending their influence over military as well as civil affairs, the only check on their power being the faction which prevailed in their own ranks and the rivalry of the religious party under Muhammad Bākīr Maḏjīlī. The irresponsible character of their government and the faction to which it gave rise was one of the main causes of the decline of the Ṣafawī dynasty. The ḥaram of ʿShāh Sulṭān Hūsayn, and with it the number of eunuchs, reached enormous proportions and swallowed up a large part of the revenue.

After the fall of the Ṣafawīs, the eunuchs never again achieved political influence on a large scale.

In 1887 it was reported that there were only thirty-eight eunuchs in the royal ḥaram (l’Tīmād al-Salṭāna, Rūznāma-i Ḵẖāṣīr-i l’Tīmād al-Salṭāna, ed. Iraj Afghār, Tehran 1966, 644).


(A. K. S. LAMBOTON)

III.—In Turkey.

It is believed that there were eunuchs in the palaces of the Seljūqs of Rûm or Anatolia, and in those of the beyliks of the Čandarlıgulları [see MANDARLI] in Kastamonu in the 8th/14th century (see Fuad Kırpülli,Bitsans müesseseberinin Osmanlı müesseseberine tesiri hakkında mühahalar, in Türk Hukuk ve İtkisî Tarh, Mucemmus, 1 [İstanbul 1931], 208-11). Their first appearance in the Ottoman state was in the first half of the 9th/15th century, and these eunuchs...
were of two kinds: white (ak agha) and negro (karâ agha). According to tradition it was Murad II (824-55/ 1421-51) who first employed the khâdim aghas (white chief eunuchs) in the palace; during his reign the ak khâdim aghas (white chief eunuchs) in the harem occupied the offices of kapî aghastı (chief white eunuch in the Imperial Palace), khâmîsanıdâ-bâšî (the title of the fourth officer of the white eunuchs) and sârî aghastı and khâdim bâšî (chief clerk of the imperial pantry); above them all was the Dâr al-sa’âda aghastı (chief eunuch of the palace) (Tayyâr-zâde ‘Ali, Ta’rîh-i Endûrân, Istanbul 1929, i, 34). Later, some eunuchs of particular ability were employed outside the palace. The mention of some well-known government officials bearing the title of khâdim or jawâshî in the first half of the 9th/15th century may indicate an earlier date for the employment of white chief eunuchs in the palace. For instance, the appointment on several occasions of Şehâb-ı Din Paşa (Kula Şâhîn, d. 853/1454) during the reign of Murât II to the office of beylerbeyi of Rumelia means that his early life and upbringing should be placed in the reign of Celebi Mehemmed (805-24/1403-21). (Neşri, Dîhat- namû, ed. Taeschner, Leipzig 1951, i, 170, 181, 230; M. Tayyib Gökblîgîn, XV ve XVI inci asrîlarda Edirne ve Paşaeli livast, Istanbul 1952, 255-7). The use of negroes, that is black eunuchs, in the palace started during the reign of Selim I (855-86/1451-81) and from the beginning of the 10th/16th century we find negro eunuchs employed in the Ottoman palace. The head of the eunuchs in charge of the Bab al-Harîm (the office of the chief white eunuchs) in the palace because of their maleficent influence there. However, among the white eunuchs there were some who rose to the office ofKhâdim Mefrmed Pasha (1031-2/1622-3) in the reign of Murât III; Khâdim Hasan Pasha (948-51/1541-4) in the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent (M. Tayyib Gökblîgîn, XV ve XVI inci asrîlarda Edirne ve Paşaeli livast, Istanbul 1952, 255-7). The number of existing eunuchs should not be brought into Rumelia under any circumstances. But he was killed in the battle of Peterwardein, and the possibility of enforcing this decision was then lost in 1129/1717 (Râshîd, Ta’rîh, Istanbul 1282, iv, 175-6; Derwîsh ‘Abd Allah, Risâle-i Tabârdanîyaye, Köprüli Küttâphânesi, ii, 433, ft. 66a-b). The process of abolishing slavery and the negro slave trade in the Ottoman Empire started during the reign of Mahmûd II, and in Dümâdâ II 1273/February 1857 a firman was issued prohibiting slavery and the slave trade in the Ottoman lands (Dustûr, Istanbul 1299, 1st series, v, 368, 396, etc.). After this, slavery and the use of eunuchs gradually disappeared, their use persisting longest in the harems of the palace.


(CENGÎZ ORHONLU)
AL-KHAŞİB — KHASS
AL-KHAŞİB, name given to AHMAD B. 'UBAYD AL-‘AZZAM B. AHMAD B. AL-KHAŞİB, vizier of al-Muktaḍir and al-Kāhir, who was probably the grandson of al-Muntaṣir’s vizier Ahmad b. al-Khaşib [see AL-DIYARAKR]. He was originally secretary to the caliph’s mother, and then suddenly was made vizier after the fall of al-Khākānī, but only filled this office for a few months (Rāmāḍān 313/Dhu ‘l-Kāda 314/Nov. 925-Jan. 927). Faced with the hostility of the military leaders, and treating administrative affairs in a very perfunctory way, he immediately ran into serious difficulties which he was unable to surmount. He re-appears in 318/930 as a financial official in the Persian provinces, and then as one of the caliph’s counsellors who brought about the fall of the vizier al-Husayn b. al-Kāsim. He became vizier for the second time under al-Kāhir, from Dhu ‘l-Kāda 321/Oct. 933 till Di‘āmādā 322/April 934, but was unable to prevent the intrigues of the former vizier Ibn Mūkla [q.v.] nor to put down the discontents of the palace guards, who ended up by imprisoning the caliph.

Under al-Rādi, al-Khaṣib still held important functions in the central administration, but was exiled for some time to ‘Umnān by the vizier Ibn Mūkla, upon whom he was later able to take vengeance. He helped ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Iṣā during his short vīzīrat (324/936) and died in Baghāsh in Shawwāl 328/August 940.


AL-ḴĀṢĪR [see SALM AL-ḴĀṢĪR].

Ḵāṣī [š] (A.) and its fem. ḫāṣṣa “personal, private, pertaining to the state or ruler”. In Ottoman administrative and society, ḫāṣī and ḫāṣṣa were generally used interchangeably, with pl. ḫāṣṣašāh and ḫāṣṣas, see on these various forms, Meninski, ii, 530-1. It appears in Turkish literature for “a person close to the ruler”, “something personal to the ruler”, in the 7th/13th century, see Mecûdūd Mansuroğlu, Sultan veled-in (1226-1322) türkçe manzumeleri, Istanbul 1938, vv. 26, 48-9, 53-4, 143-5, 149. The word, used for describing the palace services of a ruler, widely appears in the Ghaznawid state (Ta*rikh-i Bâyḫâbî, ed. Ghamî and Fayyâd, Tehran 1342/1964, 235, 253, 271 and passim), and then was used in the Great Saljūq state in regard to the Sultan’s personal revenue. From the existing registers, three types of ḫāṣṣa can be distinguished, and sometimes ḫāṣṣa-i indicu, sometimes ḫāṣṣa-i indicu [q.v.] (see Z. Velidi Togan, Ummi türk tarihine giriş, Istanbul 1946, 278-9). The words ḫāṣṣa and ḫāṣṣa were used synonymously during the first period of the Ottoman empire. Then ḫāṣṣa came to be used for the services and matters concerning the ruler and his palace (ḫāṣṣa bostiţânlâ, ḫāṣṣa dostiţânlâ, ḫāṣṣa doghatiţânlâ etc.), while ḫāṣṣa-i sancak the sandjaf, ḫāṣṣa-i hekime the ūlā hekim, ḫāṣṣa-i kânsî, and ḫāṣṣa-i kânsi, meaning the imperial lands (see O. L. Barkan, Osmanlı imparatorluğunda sârit ekonomisin hukûk ve mali esasları, 1. Kanunlar, Istanbul 1943, index).

The ḫāṣṣa lands followed a course similar to that of the timār system. From the existing timār defters, it appears that the ḫāṣṣa lands stretch back to the reign of Bayezid I (791-805/1389-1403) (Başbakanlık arşiv Genel Mühürdârlâ, tapu defterleri, 1/1, Misir, 331, 332) and beyond. The term ḫāṣṣa, pl. ḫāṣṣas, in the Ottoman timār system was used for the more extensive timārs. There were only timārs during the first period of the Ottoman state (for the 804/1402 and 807/1405 timār entries, see Sûbeyle Unver, Yıldırım Bayezid’in oğlu İsa’nın bir emri, in Belleten, xii (1944), 335, 337), but at the beginning of the 9th/15th century the term ḫāṣṣa was also used for some personal timārs: in 821/1418, 822/1419, and 590/1192, (H. İnalci, Hicri 835 tarihli sure-i defter-i sancak-i Ar-avdan, Ankara 1954, 33-55). Hence at this time the timār included the ḫāṣṣa; the timārs of begs which were called ḫāṣṣa and sezämet were also alike called “great timārs”. The ḫānsı-nâmes show how the ḫāṣṣa was used. In the ḫānsı-nâm of Mehmed Fâthîb, it is indicated that the most productive lands in the provinces were to be included in the ḫāṣṣa of the Sultan, and that the defterdârs or treasurers had the authority to confiscate the lands of a person, if they discovered that he had had productive land, and give him less productive land as a ḫāṣṣa. The viziers, it was stipulated, were to have ḫāṣṣa lands with an income of 1,200,000 akbës, the beglerbegs those with an income of 1,000,000, the defterdârs those with an income of 600,000 as long as they remained in office; for this see Fâthî känsı-nâm-nâme-i 2/1, 75. Because the ḫāṣṣa lands, rather than the eyâletes, constituted the basis of the administrative system, the ḫāṣṣa lands assigned to a sandjâk beg were made more numerous during the 9th/15th century (for the ḫāṣṣa of the sandjâk beg of Üskûp, see Hicri 835 tarihli sure-i defter-i mücmeli-i vilâyet-i Yeled ve Incebn ve Hudeside ve Semîca ve Res ve Üskûp ve Kalhâmdân ve tevâhî, ed. H. Şahanâvî, Israîl-i 1330, 7). After the organisation of a sandjâk, the villages and ḫāṣṣa lands there could be terminated as ḫāṣṣa land with the permission of the sandjâk beg, if it was thought to be necessary, or some of the timār land could be made into ḫāṣṣa (M. Teyib Gökbilgin, XV. ve XVI. asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa livast, Istanbul 1955, 74; Hicri 835 tarihli sure-i defter-i sancak-i Aravand, pp. xxiii, xxiv, xxvii, 12, 39, 101). ḫāṣṣa lands were the administrative units with the highest ḫāṣṣa income in 934/1527-8, the sandjâk beg of Semendere (622,000 akbës) had the highest income among the sandjâk begs; in contrast to this, the sandjâk beg of Vojnâk (52,000) and that of Khrâqisî or Khrâqisîen (81,000) had the lowest ḫāṣṣa incomes (for the other provinces, and the ḫāṣṣa lands of beglerbegs and the pashas, see A. D. Barkan, 1577-1952 yil Yayınları, 25-7; for the ḫāṣṣa lands of the Grand Vizier, the Kabbe-alti viziers and retired viziers in 1070/1660, see Hezarfen Çelebi, Telhîşî ‘l-beyân fi kawdmn-i al-i Öğümân, 43b, 46a, 47a ff., and cf. Kâmil Kepeci tasnîfî, Haslar kalemî defterî, no. 3069).

The ḫāṣṣa lands were administered on the basis of the registers made up annually, and according to the sources were divided into three: (1) ḫāṣṣa-i...
The **khâṣṣ** lands of Viziers, Amirs, beglerbegs and other high officials of the imperial Chancery or Devlet; and the **khâṣṣ** lands called paşamlık which were appropriated to the needs of the Sultan's wives.

Any surpluses from all these at the end of each financial year were added to the **khâṣṣ-i humâyûn** treasury. The **khâṣṣ** lands given to the Sultan's wives were awarded for life, and could not be transferred to anyone else. The holders of **paşamlık** **khâṣṣ** died or had no further need for it, then it would be transferred to the Sultan's wives. In the 10th/16th century onwards, the number of viziers, beglerbegs, and other high officials of the imperial Chancery or Devlet significantly increased, but the **khâṣṣ** lands allotted to them became insufficient and inadequate, and henceforth there was the need to,**khâṣṣ** lands called kâmil **khâṣṣ** (Kâmil Kepeci Tasnîfi, no. 3065). From the 10th/16th century onwards, the number of viziers, beglerbegs increased, but the **khâṣṣ** lands allotted to them became insufficient and inadequate, and henceforth there was the need to

The **khâṣṣ** lands of high officials and administrators formed an important part of the revenues of every province; for example, they constituted 48% of the general revenue of Rumelia, 26% of Anatolia, Karaman, Dulkadiye and Rum (Sivas), 31% of Dîyarbekir, 48% of Aleppo and Damascus, and 86% of Egypt. Out of all the Ottoman provinces, they formed 277,244,782 akçe, 31% of the total revenue; the other **khâṣṣ** lands and timârs comprised 206,186,394 akçe, 37% of the total revenue (Barkan, Topkapı 1393-94 (fi. 1738-39) maâlî yazma ait bir bülte ornek, in İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, xvi (Istanbul 1955), 277).

According to the calculations made from the 1071/1660-1 budget, about three-quarters (1 billion, 800 million) of the total revenue of the state (2 billion, 400 million) went to the officials in charge of **khâṣṣ**, timâr or mahl lands; the revenue from **khâṣṣ** lands was not always sent to the capital, but could be spent on the spot (Barkan, Osmanlı büççlerine ait notlar, in İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, xvii (1960), 190).

The value and extent of **khâṣṣ** lands would vary according to the productivity of the provinces and sandjak. Although the most productive lands were already included in the **khâṣṣ** estates at the beginning of the 10th/16th century, their boundaries and the revenue accruing from them tended to increase by a considerable amount (the shares of state and of the officials supervising the shares of state and of the officials supervising the shares of state and of the officials managing the lands eventually decreased in the empire (Barkan, Topkapı 1393-94 (fi. 1738-39) maâlî yazma ait bir bülte ornek, in İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, xvi (Istanbul 1955), 277).

The **khâṣṣ** lands were exempted from all taxes and from the entry of officials. The revenues of the **khâṣṣ** lands were managed by a **sandjak** who was under their command the **sandjak** of Mardin, see Nejat Göyunc, XVI. yüzyılda Mardin sancağı, Istanbul 1969, 142-7). From the agricultural produce of arable fields, vineyards, orchards, etc., there were, also, revenues from the dişya, sheep tax, yayla tax, başlık tax, firewood and hay tax, bride tax, başlık又有 irregular taxes, fânûl tax, pasture tax, tapu tax, ởi tax, taxes on the produce of nomads and revenues from some of the mukâfâ-as in the towns, all of which constituted the income of the **khâṣṣ** lands. In the cities, such items as taxes on the başkâne (slaughter-houses), kirisân-kâne (cutgut factory), the ihsâd tax, bozakânâne, rents from shops, etc., formed part of the revenues of the **khâṣṣ**; however, agricultural products constituted the greatest part of the **khâṣṣ** revenues.

According to the comparisons made between the years 1550 and 1650-70, there was a 50% decline in the revenues from agricultural products, hence the revenues of the **khâṣṣ** lands were topped up by other means. Accordingly, some of the timârs and seârânets, and even the **khâṣṣ** lands of viziers, beglerbegs and sandjak begs, were added to the **khâṣṣ-i humâyûn** lands (see Kâmil Kepeci tasnîfi, haslar kalemi, no. 3065). When a vizier or a beglerbeg retired, some of his **khâṣṣ** was added to the **khâṣṣ-i humâyûn**, but some was left to him as a retirement **khâṣṣ** (Kâmil Kepeci Tasnîfi, no. 3065). From the 10th/16th century onwards, the number of viziers and beglerbegs increased, but the **khâṣṣ** lands allotted to them became insufficient and inadequate, and henceforth there was the need to
However, the taxes on the reßâyâ living and working on the khasil lands were collected by emîns, who had nothing to do with the voyvodas (Malâyeden müdevver defterler, no. 7534, pp. 1047, 1220). Beside the voyvodas, there were also some other officials, including the khasil hâbis or clerks, appointed by a decree (Malâyeden müdevver defterler, no. 7534, p. 567). These officials were in charge of managing the imperial khasil lands, with authority to pursue runaway cultivators and safeguard the interests of the imperial treasury in the khasil lands. They also had such duties as ensuring the transference to the treasury of heirest estates and abandoned properties, the inheritors of which had disappeared and had not returned within 6 months (Kânûn-nâme-i sultânî ber mûlâciba ûrûf'i Oltâmâni, ed. H. Iналîkî and R. Anhegger, Ankara 1956, 70-1).

In earlier times permission was not given for the khasil lands to be farmed out on sûltâm (see) [H. Iналîkî, Arvandîn ûlûs, 123-5], but this was not adhered to in later applications (Halît Ongan, op. cit., 8, 43, 85; cf. Arazi Kanunûndemê ve Evsunud Efendînîn arayiî mûéalîk fetvalarî, in MîT, 1/z (Istanbul 1313), 324). Although the principle of not giving out khasil lands thus still existed at the beginning of the 11th/17th century, the actual practice had become established (M. Çagatay Uluçay, op. cit., 231). In 1826-7 the register of the khasil lands, amounting to 23,507,943 ahtên, were given out as sûltâm for the sum of 26,272,485 mûrîd (see Kâmîl Kepçî tanwîfî, haslar kalemî, no. 3060).

During the composition of the register, the children on the khasil lands were not registered as such (khasilîdî ex defter), but were assumed to be registered through the registration of their fathers. Natural calamities such as drought and epidemics affected the khasil lands, leading to the emigration of reßâyâ from their villages and farms to other places (Baş-bakanîk arşiv genel müderrîslû, Malâyeden müdevver defterler, no. 7534, pp. 560, 1661).

Gradually, the khasil lands belonging to the ranks of viziers, beglerbegs, and sandjak begs, were abolished and were added to the mûrl mukdta'ât lands, and payment in cash was made in lieu of these lands, leading to the emigration of reßâyâ from their villages and farms to other places (Baş-bakanîk arşiv genel müderrîslû, Malâyeden müdevver defterler, no. 7534, pp. 560, 1661).

In 1833 this office was abolished, its memory survived in the names of certain places; for example, one of the names of the Eyyub kâdîî in Istanbul was Khâsî-î reßû or Khâsil Kadâş; the name Khâsî-köy as the name of villages in Rumelia and Anatólia shows their former status (see Türkiye'de meskun yerler kilavuzu, Ankara 1944, i), the most famous ones having this name being the town of Khâşkoy (Haskova) in Bulgaria and the town of Khâsî, founded in 1865, in the Hatay province of Turkey.
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Gradually, the khasil lands belonging to the ranks of viziers, beglerbegs, and sandjak begs, were abolished and were added to the mûrl mukdta'ât lands, and payment in cash was made in lieu of these lands, leading to the emigration of reßâyâ from their villages and farms to other places (Baş-bakanîk arşiv genel müderrîslû, Malâyeden müdevver defterler, no. 7534, pp. 560, 1661).

In 1833 this office was abolished, its memory survived in the names of certain places; for example, one of the names of the Eyyub kâdîî in Istanbul was Khâsî-î reßû or Khâsil Kadâş; the name Khâsî-köy as the name of villages in Rumelia and Anatólia shows their former status (see Türkiye'de meskun yerler kilavuzu, Ankara 1944, i), the most famous ones having this name being the town of Khâşkoy (Haskova) in Bulgaria and the town of Khâsî, founded in 1865, in the Hatay province of Turkey.

The terms Khâsî-î humdûûn and Khâsî-î pâdüshâhî gradually disappeared after the Tanâtâmî, as explained above, but continued to be used for the services related to the Imperial Palace and to the Sultan, e.g. the khâsî treasury, khâsî avvâllarî or infantry, khâsî bostandîlarî, khâsî suvdrîlarî or cavalry, khâsî-î khâbed, khâsî ordusu or imperial guard regiments, khâsî-î muessizîleri, khâsî-î 'aske.serialize, khâsî-î taburlarî or battalions, khâsî-î kâhür, treasury for the imperial stables, khâsî-î oda or khâsî-î baghete, mathâkh-î khâsî or imperial kitchen (for the other terms, see Uzurçarşîlî, Osmanî devletînin saray teksîldî, Ankara 1945, index).

KHAŞ — KHASSA


(CENGİZ ORHONLU)

KHASS, KHAŞSA in Persia [see KHAŞA].

KHASS BEG or ARLANK BEG b. BALANGIRI (d. 547 or 548/1153), Türkmen amir under the Great Seljuqs of Iraq and western Persia. The name Khaş Beg seems to have been bestowed on him because of his favoured position under Sultan Mas'ud b. Muḥammad (529-47/1134-52); it is used in similar contexts in the works of Diālā al-Dīn Rūmī and in the Kitāb Dede Körküt. During the latter years of Mas'ud's reign, Khass Beg secured an ascendency in the state, disposing of such rivals as Togha Yüreq's amīrs and the Great and Little Chambars or Büyük ve Kutuk Odalar. The name Khass Beg seems to have been bestowed on him because of his favoured position under Sultan Mas'ud b. Muḥammad (529-47/1134-52); it is used in similar contexts in the works of Diālā al-Dīn Rūmī and in the Kitāb Dede Körküt. During the latter years of Mas'ud's reign, Khass Beg secured an ascendency in the state, disposing of such rivals as Togha Yüreq's amīrs and the Great and Little Chambars or Büyük ve Kutuk Odalar.

KHASS ODA, the "Privy Chamber" of the Ottoman palace organisation and the most important of the four departments comprising the Enderun or Inside Service (the others being, in decreasing order of importance, the Treasury or Khaşiye [q.v.], the Privy Larder or Kūlā-ı Khass and the Great and Little Chambers or Büyük ve Külük Odalar. The Khass Oda as we know it was created by Mehmed the Conqueror, who in his Kānān-nāme mentions by title its four chief officers and its staff of 32 pages or 12 Oghlans [q.v.], who became known as the Khass Oda gülmənd or Khass Odalar. Selim I increased their number to what became the classic one of 40, and entrusted to them the duty of guarding the Prophet's mantle [see MUKAĐIRAT]; in the 12th/13th century, according to d'Ossun, they still numbered 40.

The principal ones of these 40 pages waited on the Sultan personally in the Māh-bayn apartments [q.v.] of the palace, becoming thereby known as the Mārāf, their duties included helping him to dress, shaving him, etc. The chief page was the Ṣilbhdär or Sword-Bearer, but the supervision of the Khass Oda was the responsibility of the White Eunuchs, the particular one in charge being known as the Khass Oda Bağlı. In Mehmed's Kānān-nāme, one of his duties was as Şāhık-i 'Arj or presenter of petitions to the Sultan. By the 18th century, however, the Khass Oda Bağlı's duties were, according to d'Ossun, restricted to certain ceremonial duties as Master of Ceremonies of the Inside Service (Enderun Teşrifikātı).


KHASSA, plur. khawāns, also ḥāşiyā, plur. ḥāshiyāyāt, "sympathetic quality" is a recurring theme in magic and occult sciences indicating the unaccountable, esoteric forces in animates and inanimate Nature. The conception that everywhere in Nature such forces are active or can be activated, developed during the Hellenistic period. It was believed that all objects were in relation to each other through sympathies and antipathies, as is evident in the mysterious forces of the magnet—and that diseases could be caused and cured, good and ill fortune be brought about as a result of the relations of these tensions. Unlike peripatetic philosophy, this way of thinking renounces a rational explanation of phenomena. It was voiced in the Ḩawās of Bolos of Mendes (ca. 200 B.C.), the Arvogisofos of Xenocrates (see M. Ullmann, Das Steinbuch des Xenocrates von Ephesos, in Medizinhistorisches Journal, von Ephesos, 1968, 49-64; idem, Neues zum Steinbuch des Xenocrates, in ibid., viii (1973), 59-76), the Cyranides and other hermetic treatises, in the Book of Animals of Timaeus of Gaza and in the books of agriculture. These views also entered into medical and pharmacological literature (see Galen, viii, 421; xi, 823; xii, 192 Kühn; Dioscorides, passim) and gained a theoretical foundation in the Neo-platonic doctrine of the graded structure of the world.

The translation of the above-mentioned Greek works carried the doctrine of the occult qualities of Nature to the Arabs, among whom it found an extraordinarily fertile soil and called forth an extensive literature. Muḥammad b. Zakariyya al-Rāzī, "Djabir b. Hayyān", Ibn al-Djazzār, Abū 'l-Ḥalām b. Zuhūr, "Alī b. Ayyamīr al-Djilā'ī and others wrote books with the title Ḥawās al-taṣāwī or the like. Furthermore, there is hardly any Islamic work on the natural sciences in which the Ḥawās are not treated at greater or shorter length. The "Books of stones" by Aristotle and Tīfāš, the "Books of animals", by Ibn Abī l-Hāwāfīr and Dāmīrī, the "Books of plants" by Ibn Wāḥshiyya, the "Books of poisons" by Ibn al-Bīfīkī and Ibn al-Mūbārak, the encyclopaedias of Kāzwīnī and Nuwayrī and the manual of medicine by "Alī b. Rubban al-'Tabarī, are all full of information on the most remarkable effects of "sympathy".

KHASSA, plur. khawāns, also ḥāşiyā, plur. ḥāshiyāyāt, "sympathetic quality" is a recurring theme in magic and occult sciences indicating the unaccountable, esoteric forces in animates and inanimate Nature. The conception that everywhere in Nature such forces are active or can be activated, developed during the Hellenistic period. It was believed that all objects were in relation to each other through sympathies and antipathies, as is evident in the mysterious forces of the magnet—and that diseases could be caused and cured, good and ill fortune be brought about as a result of the relations of these tensions. Unlike peripatetic philosophy, this way of thinking renounces a rational explanation of phenomena. It was voiced in the Ḩawās of Bolos of Mendes (ca. 200 B.C.), the Arvogisofos of Xenocrates (see M. Ullmann, Das Steinbuch des Xenocrates von Ephesos, in Medizinhistorisches Journal, von Ephesos, 1968, 49-64; idem, Neues zum Steinbuch des Xenocrates, in ibid., viii (1973), 59-76), the Cyranides and other hermetic treatises, in the Book of Animals of Timaeus of Gaza and in the books of agriculture. These views also entered into medical and pharmacological literature (see Galen, viii, 421; xi, 823; xii, 192 Kühn; Dioscorides, passim) and gained a theoretical foundation in the Neo-platonic doctrine of the graded structure of the world.

The translation of the above-mentioned Greek works carried the doctrine of the occult qualities of Nature to the Arabs, among whom it found an extraordinary fertile soil and called forth an extensive literature. Muḥammad b. Zakariyya al-Rāzī, "Djabir b. Hayyān", Ibn al-Djazzār, Abū 'l-Ḥalām b. Zuhūr, "Alī b. Ayyamīr al-Djilā'ī and others wrote books with the title Ḥawās al-taṣāwī (or the like). Furthermore, there is hardly any Islamic work on the natural sciences in which the Ḥawās are not treated at greater or shorter length. The "Books of stones" by Aristotle and Tīfāš, the "Books of animals", by Ibn Abī l-Hāwāfīr and Dāmīrī, the "Books of plants" by Ibn Wāḥshiyya, the "Books of poisons" by Ibn al-Bīfīkī and Ibn al-Mūbārak, the encyclopaedias of Kāzwīnī and Nuwayrī and the manual of medicine by "Alī b. Rubban al-'Tabarī, are all full of information on the most remarkable effects of "sympathy".
Finally, abstract entities were also believed to possess mysterious forces: al-Buni, al-Djill, al-Nadrum and others wrote about the ḵẖ̱āṣṣa of letters and numbers, of the names of Allāh and of the verses of the Kurʾān.

Bibliography: P. Kraus, Jābir b. Ḥayyān, i (MIE 45), Cairo 1942, 61-95; H. Ritter and M. Plessner, Picatrix, London 1962, passim; M. Ullmann, Die Natur und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam (HO, Erg. Bd. VI/z), Leiden 1972, 393-416, see iv s.v. ḵẖ̱āṣṣa, vii, 27; D. Sourdel, Vizirat, 338). One is tempted to render ḵẖ̱̱s̱a or ḵẖ̱awdss by "court" or "courtiers", which are terms

Although Sasanid society had possessed four estates divided into several classes (cf. A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhagen 1944, 97 ff.), it is not impossible that Persia (and possibly Greece; cf. al-Fārābī, K. al-ṧrāf, 133-4) exercised an influence on the division adopted by the Muslims (cf. al-Thaqlībī, Histoire des rois de Perse, 469, 608, 730; Ibn Nubāta, Sarh al-拉萨̱n, Cairo 1903, 44-5; ed. 1964, 67), but the aristocratic spirit of the Arabs is enough to account for this dichotomy. All the same, one of the earliest authors to speak about the ḵẖ̱āṣṣa and ṣ̱m̱m̱, Ibn al-Muḳaffaʿ, who in various of his writings uses the terms in the general sense mentioned above, but gives to them a different timbre in one passage of al-ʿAdāb al-ṣāḥīb (ed. Kūr ʿAll, in Raʾāfīl, ṣ̱ḏr al-Ṭābiʿī, 1946, 13) where the attitude which one should adopt according to whether one is in the presence of a member of the ḵẖ̱āṣṣa, understood as comprising people of merit and quality, or of the ṣ̱m̱m̱, a thousand times more numerous; in practice, this author divides mankind, in relation to himself, into two categories, and in this passage alludes to a personal ḵẖ̱āṣṣa made up of friends having outstanding moral qualities. If the same conception is transferred to the level

of the rulers, one finds already the idea of a ḵẖ̱āṣṣa confined to their intimates and confidants. The historians often mention the persons who were closest (ḵẖ̱āṣṣa) to the caliphs and sultans. Thus Ḥabība b. Dhuʿayb al-Khuzayfī in relation to ʿAbd al-Malik (see al-Dījahshīyār, Ṣawāwī, 34); Yazīd b. al-Muhallab had a specially favoured position (ḵẖ̱āṣṣa) at Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik's side, who allowed his protégé to sit next to him on his throne (ibid., 50); Sālim al-Suḍūrī was part of Ṣaman b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's ḵẖ̱āṣṣa (Murādī, op. cit., 410 = § 2717; al-Masʿūdī goes as far as saying that Muṣʿīya had his ḵẖ̱āṣṣa, without however naming anyone specifically. Under the ʿAbbasids, Ṣaḥābī b. ʿAll, al-ʿAbbās b. Muhammad and ʿAbd al-Malik b. Humayd were the ḵẖ̱awdss of al-Manṣūr (al-Dījahshīyār, 37, 97), ʿAbd ʿAbbād Thābit b. Yabīyā was the ḵẖ̱āṣṣ of al-Maʿmūn (Murādī, vii, 3, 35 = § 2695, 2723) and Ibn al-Zayyāt was one of the ḵẖ̱awdss of al-Muʿtaṣim (Ibn al-Tiṣkāqī, Ṣāḥbānī, 233). Many other examples could be cited of these persons, officials or courtiers, who enjoyed the sovereign's special favour. Naturally, there were amongst all these, a certain number of parasites (cf. al-Khāṭīb al-Baghdādī, K. al-Taʿīfī, Damascus 1927, 99). In another sphere, the word ḵẖ̱āṣṣ was applied to "royal" institutions and estates. Under the ʿAbbasids and Fāṭimids, landed estate belonged to the non-Arabs and especially to members of their families were called diyaʿ al-ḵẖ̱āṣṣa. Similarly, the productions of the jīrās manufactories were sometimes called ḵẖ̱āṣṣ (cf. Serjeant, Materials for a history of Islamic textiles, Beirut 1972, 138). The bayt al-māl al-ḵẖ̱āṣṣ was created at a later period by the ʿAbbasid caliphs in order to distinguish the privy treasury from the public one supplied by state revenues; a department called the ṣīrān al-muʾtaṣib al-ḵẖ̱āṣṣ was set up during the reign of al-Mutawakkil to take charge of the royal household expenses.

Various viziers, high officials and rebel chiefs who occupy an important place in Islamic history also had their ḵẖ̱āṣṣa (cf. Ibn al-ʿAṭār, Ṣawāwī, Beirut n.d., i, 412; Ibn al-Diwālī, Munaṣṣabāt x, 143; Ibn al-Fuwāṭi, Muʿjam al-adab al-ṣūfī muʿjam al-ʿulām, Bagh-dād 1967, iv, 756; al-Azdī, Thābit Ṣawāwī, op. cit., 67; Ibn Abī Ḥadīdī, Sharh Nakhlī al-balāgah, Beirut 1963, iii, 17; etc.). The ḵẖ̱āṣṣa described so far had a personal character and only merited being called thus in relationship to the person who had chosen it; whatever its unofficial role may have been, it had no legal status. However, one part at least of the ruler's entourage made up a wider ḵẖ̱āṣṣa, which was itself able to intervene, or had the right to intervene, in affairs of state, e.g. to share in the designation of an heir presumptive or the installation of a new caliph, without taking into account the fact that certain of its members had precisely-defined functions. It is unfortunately difficult to discern its exact composition, since the sources give hardly any details in this regard. The oath of allegiance called bayʿat al-ḵẖ̱āṣṣ was given to the caliph, before the bayʿat al-ʿʿaμmā, by a group of which we do not know the criteria for its membership. Nor can we enumerate those persons who were privileged to pass through the ṣīrān al-ḵẖ̱āṣṣ into the palace at Bagh-dād or at Sāmarrā, who were allowed into the maṣāfīls or dār al-ḵẖ̱āṣṣ (dīwān-i ḵẖ̱āṣṣ amongst the Mughals of India), or who could be cited before the tribunal of maṣālīm al-ḵẖ̱āṣṣ set up for them (cf. al-Ṣāhībī, Ṣawāwī, 20, 22, 27; D. Sourdel, Vizirat, 338). One is tempted to render ḵẖ̱āṣṣa or ḵẖ̱awdss by "court" or "courtiers", which are terms
vague enough as a blanket designation for what is hard to pinpoint precisely in reality; but one may nevertheless try and define further that lot of khâssa.

It is quite probable that the khâssa in the east was not substantially different, at least in early times, from that described by É. Lévi-Provençal: "The khâssa at Cordova [was] originally composed above all of aristocrats of Arab stock, and more particularly, of relations more or less distant from the prince in power". In official ceremonies "these Ahî Kurayshy were in first place; they were followed by groups of high officials in the central administration" and by the legal and civil magistrates included within the khâssa, "whether they were members of the Arab nobility or slave officials", as well as by "the holders of more or less honorific posts, which their riches, old-established or recently-acquired, had allowed them to purchase for money, in order to acquire in this fashion a place in the most privileged social class" (Hist. Esp. musulmane, iii, 188 ff).

For its being placed in an eastern context, this institution ought probably to be given some altered touches (cf. A. Mez, Renaissance, ch. x) and to be rounded out by various pieces of information derived particularly from the descriptions of official ceremonies (e.g. see M. Canard, Le ceremonial fâtimide et le ceremonial byzantin. Essais de comparaison, in Byzantion, viii, 1951), and by lists of notabilities and officials (e.g. see al-Kalkashandî, Sahnî, iii, 480-8, tr. B. Lewis, in Islam from the Prophet Muhammad to the capture of Constantinople, New York 1974, i, 201-8), but prudence is still necessary.

Lévi-Provençal's last remark provides an easy transition allowing us to pass from the khâssa of the state to that of the nation, for without thinking in any way of the venality of appointments, Ibn al-Fakîh, Buldân, ii, tr. Massé, t, proposed precisely to take it, following here al-Faṣîl b. Yâbiya, as the rich and cultivated people, at the side of the rulers and their ministers, with the rest of humanity making up a completely uninteresting 'âmma. If the categories of the rulers and their ministers are only to be expected, the other two are remarkable because this writer includes in the khâssa a higher class ('îyâs) which has been raised to a higher level through riches, and "people of middling status whose education has made them assimilated to the previous class", i.e. the bourgeoisie, which is largely made up of merchants who have grown rich (and these were often scholars also) and the intellectual elite. The idea of a bourgeoisie is very recent, and al-Marsafî himself still places the middle class amongst the khâssa, but one would like to know more about the aghtdm set up in al-Andalus and probably responsible for retreating out crimes committed by this intermediate class (cf. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. musulmane, iii, 156-7). As for the intellectual elite, it would require an unusual amount of modesty for authors to place themselves in the 'âmma when they talk of the two great social classes. In practice, the secretaries of the administration tend to apply the term khâssa to the ruler's entourage, of which they were a part, whilst literary men and the authors of religious works apply it to an ill-defined élite which corresponds to the educated people mentioned by Ibn al-Fakîh. It would probably be unfair to base oneself on the criterion adopted by the philologists who wrote works on the lbn al-'âmma [q.v.], because all the people utilising this medium of expression, not in classical Arabic at all but in dialect, 'umîyya, were part of the 'âmma, including gross and untutored rulers. This linguistic criterion cannot then be upheld, especially as authors recognise that the khârsa generally use a language which is different, and in any case, more correct than that of the 'âdwa, even if they may at times commit the faults which, for instance, al-Harîrî has brought out in his Durrat al-khârsa fi awdân al-khârsa.

If writers do not seem to have composed much else on the khâssa and were content to address themselves to it as did Sîbî Ibn al-Djawzî with his Ta'ânîsh wa-l-'âmma, the 'âmma is a theme of Arabic literature which was first treated from a critical point of view. Thus al-Dhâhîbî has left a Risâla fi tawâdî al-'âdwa, and Abu l-`Anbas al-Saymari was the author of the Masûrî l-sawwâd wa-akhtâr al-sifâ wa-l-'âdwa, etc. (cf. C. E. Bosworth, The medieval Islamic underworld, i. The Banâ Sâsûn in Arabic society and literature, Leiden 1976, 30 ff.).

The title given to his opuscule by Abu l-`Anbas [q.v. in Suppl.] shows revealing a mentality current at that time which tended to make no differentiation between the various elements making up the 'âmma and which tended to assimilate this last to the mass of population which was, in greater or lesser degree, turbulent. Hence the terms awdâ, awdân, awdâm, etc. were applied to the 'âmma, all of these being pejorative expressions inspired by an aristocratic vision which an Abu l-`Anbas who has been assimilated into the last to express. Whether the khâssa in its proper sense was—justifiably—the recipient of only praises for its moral and intellectual qualities and for the adaî [q.v.] of which it had a monopoly (cf. for example, Abu Hayyan al-Tawhîlî, Imâmî, iii, 61, 151-2), all possible sins were fathered on to the 'âmma. It was ignorant, without any morality, unrespecting of religious obligations, and let itself be easily manipulated by the khâssa, whose play-thing it was (but the two classes then needed each other). It was conformist for some, but easily won over to heterodox teachings for others, and it was the 'âmma which made up the hordes of extremist sects, all the more so because it was incapable of distinguishing the true from the false, hence acted without due reflection and easily rallied to mischief-makers. It does not seem necessary to dwell any further upon this unattractive picture which writers sketch out, but this general picture which writers sketch out, but this general picture...
AL-KHASA WA 'I/AMMA — KHATA

i, 143; Sourdel, Le vizirat, i, 338, ii, 592; R. Levy, 
The social structure of Islam, Cambridge 1969, 395; 
Lane, Lexicon, 746-7, 7150; (M. A. J. Bres)

**KHASSARIYYA** (under the Mamlûks). These 
were the sultan’s bodyguard and select retinue. Most 
of them usually belonged to the corps of the reigning 
sultan’s freedmen (mughtarawat, aglabî, djiûlân). Most 
of the commanders (amîrs) rose from the khâssakiyya.
They were considered to be the most prestigious body 
within the Mamlûk military aristocracy, and were 
those closest to the sultan. Frequent reference is made 
to their being sent on special missions inside and 
outside the Mamlûk sultanate, their being appointed 
governors of some of the Syrian provinces, and their 
being dispatched to arrest and imprison rebellious 
amirs and governors. There were amongst them, 
box-holders (dawdûrîyya), cup-bearers (sugâtî), 
treasurers (khâssindarîyya), masters of the robe (dirâmî-
ryya), armour bearers (sîlâhârdârîyya) and shoe-
bearers (hashmahandarîyya). The rest of the khâssâ-
kiyya held no offices and were inferior in status to 
the office holders.

The numbers of the khâssakiyya varied considerably. 
The minimum number was 40 and the maximum was 
1,200. The increase of the number of the khâssakiyya 
was a clear symptom of the decline of the military 
aristocracy in the later years of the Mamlûk sultanate, 
but their tasks to curtail chief process met with only 
partial and temporary success.

**Bibliography:** D. Ayalon, Studies on the structure 
of the Mamlûk army, in BSOS, xv (1953), 
213-16, and the bibliography on p. 213, n. 7; Ismaîl 
Hakkî Uzuncârshî, Osmanlı devleti teşkilâtında me-

**KHASEK,** Turkish form of Persian khâssagi 
from Aрабî khês, “private, special, confidential”, 
applied to persons in the personal service of 
medieval Turco-Islamic rulers (see further 
khâssakiyya).

The term was used in the Ottoman palace service 
from the 10th/16th to the 13th/19th centuries and 
in military organisation. The first of these usages was 
as applied to the Sultan’s concubines who were known by 
the title of khâssaki. Their number varied between 
4 and 7 (Mabûnî had 6, and the Last Year III had 7), and 
these were the special favourites of the sultan, above 
all other concubines, and honoured by the title of 
badûn with their own private apartments and attend-
ants. Those bearing a child to the sultan were called 
khâssâkh sultan. Thus Kholdûn Sultan (q.v.), one of the 
Süleyman the Magnificent’s badûns, Kholdûjî 
Turkân Sultan, one of the seven khâssaks of Sultan 
Îbrahim, Gûnlûh Emetullâh Sultan, one of the 
baddûns of Mehmed IV, were all therefore called by 
the honorific title of Khâssâkh Sûlûn (for this last 
lady, see Topkapî Sarayi Mû Ârjî, N.D. 2081, 
33/10). When a sultan died, some of the khâssâks who 
were childless or whose children had died might be 
given in marriage to one of the ministers or high 
officials. (For documentation on the Khâssâkh Sûlûns 
in the period 936-1223/1530-1809 see Topkapî Sarayi 
Mû Ârjî, Unpublished Catalogue, N.E. 6/245.)

The 4th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 18th, 20th century 
corporations or corps of the Janissary corps were called 
khâssâkh oraturdays. Each one of the khâssâks or corpora-
tions was headed by an agha, 
the most senior of these aghas bearing the title of 
Bash Khâssâkh “Chief Khâssâk”; these khâssâks, 
according to tradition, were introduced during the reign 
of Mehmed the Conqueror. Just as it was customary 
for the sultan’s attendants, together with the 
greyhounds, to accompany him on his hunting 
expeditions, so there were four senior aghas of the 
khâssâks who walked, two on the sultan’s right and 
two on his left, when he went to the mosque; 
in these aghas of the four companies were dispersed. 
Located the title of kûnbûrî khâssâki. The most senior of 
them, when promoted, became the Turnâdji bahlî (baud-
nin-i sîlehdîrîyân, Sûleymaniye, Esat Efendi Kütü-
phanesi, no. 2068, ff. 85, 86 etc.). The number of the 
four khâssâki companies amounted to 1,018 in 1032/ 
1623 and 1,120 in 1074/1664 (Uzuncârshî, Osmanlı 
devleti teşkilâtında kapalîleri okulâ, Ankara 1943, 
i, 205). These refer to the abolition of the Janissary corps in 1241/1826.

There were also the bostânîî khâssâks, numbering 
500 in the 12th/18th century, who formed a group 
within the larger organisation of the Bostânîîs which 
were looking after the palace gardens and orchards 
as well as undertaking certain other palace services. 
These khâssâks were chosen from among the 
bostânîîs, and 60 of them acted as escorts for the 
ruler round the imperial boat, with a khâssâkh agha 
in charge of the boat. The bostânîî khâssâks also 
acted as diplomatic couriers (Topkapî Sarayi Mû Ârjî, 
N.D. 2939, Mehmed ‘Aţâ, Ta’rîkh-i Enderûn, 
Istanbul 1292, i, 293 ff.). One should also mention 
the bostânîî khâssâks (also called wezîr hârabulaibi), 
who performed the duty of carrying correspondence 
between the sultan and the Grand Vizier, and others 
who held such offices as hâmîn bahlî (the palm 
burner), hâlch emînî (collector of dues on fish brought 
to market in Istanbul), gharîb emînî or emînî-i hâmî 
(collectors of dues on wine). The bostânîî khâssâks 
were abolished in 1244/1829 (Uzuncârshî, Osmanlı 
devletin saray teşkilâtî, Ankara 1945, 474).

**Bibliography:** Apart from the sources men-
tioned in the text, see M. Ç. Şahabettin Tekindag, 
Berkhur devinde Mêmîî sultanîyân, İstanbul 1961, 
33, 192, P. Rycaut, The Persian State of the Ottoman 
Empire, London 1668, 40-1; Theodore Spandonouy 
Cantacassin, Petit Traité de l’Origine des Turcô, 
Paris 1896, 321-2; J. von Hammer, Staatsverfassung 
und Staatsverwaltung des Osmanischen Reichs, repr. 
1963, ii, 69, 107, 196, 204; Hüdîr Ilyás, Leçîî-i 
Enderûn, İstanbul 1276, passim; d’Ohsson, Tableau 
général de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1824, vii; Gibb 
and Bowen, Islamic Society in the Ottoman 
Empire, London 1957-7, iv, 302-3, 351-6; Çağatay 
Uluçay, Harem, Ankara 1971, 44; Topkapî Sarayi Mû Ârjî, 
N.D. 5695; Mehmed Zeki Pakalân, Osmanlı tarih 
deyimleri ve terimleri sâslîgî, İstanbul 1946, i, 752- 
4; Ismail Hakkî Uzuncârshî, art. Haseki in İA, 
A. D. Alderson, The structure of the Ottoman dyn-
asty, Oxford 1956, 88, 106. (Canakoz Orhonlu)

**KHÂTA** (A), a mistake, which is made in 
thought, speech or action (a fault which one has is 
called ‘ayb), the opposite of wassîb, what is correct, 
hence in the field of knowledge, error; in that of 
action, omission, failure, all this, of course, un-
intentional. From the last meaning develops that of 
wrong which one commits, transgression; whether 
this is to be regarded as unintentional or— 
as in khâta’i and khâ ‘i—deliberate (sc. a sin) is a 
disputed point with the lexicographers. Khâta’i 
and khâ ‘i (the latter is found only in the Kâmî, 
so that it is hardly classical) are synonymous (or phonetic 
variants?). Khâta’i is sometimes regarded as an 
infinite of khâ ta’i used as a substantive (which it 
initially was and still is), sometimes as a substantive 
from akhîla’i (which it has become through linguistic 
usage), and sometimes as belonging to both. The 
lexicographers have the most diverse opinions 
regarding the more accurate definition of the meaning
of these two verbs, within the sphere of ideas above outlined. Khafa* and khaffi are exceedingly rare ... more frequently only the verbal forms khati*a and ahkija*a are used as synonyms.

The use of khaja* as a technical term is in keeping with the general use of the word; the principles used in it are as follows:

1. Error in logic (opposite of sawdb), synonymous with badiji, the "invalid" (opposite of bahk); the former pair of concepts ought to be used in questions of ijtihadd [q.v.] and the latter in questions of fiqih [q.v.] (this may be the result of the corresponding use of the word in the Kur'an, so that Islam and the other religions are contrasted with one another in bahk and badiji, opposite views in the furû of the fikh [see riik], as sawdb and khaja*; but there is only one verb for each, asabha and abkha*, which points to the artificiality of this distinction, and in reality the rule is often not observed; in other branches of learning also khaja* and badiji are used promiscuously, as indeed are sawdb and bahk also. The works which deal with the usul al-fikh [see yuful] discuss the question whether the mudhija* [q.v.] mudihak can err. In the orthodox view, however (as in the polemics regarding the mudhijah fi 'l-shar'iyydt), the other meanings of khaja* come into consideration, so that it is doubtless correctly explained that by "being right" is not meant agreement with the actual facts, but that the mudhijah has duly fulfilled the task imposed on him and therefore cannot be punished (while according to the orthodox consensus, every non-Muslim is doomed to the pains of hell eternally), and that to that attitude his ijtihadd leads him is what is right for him by Allah's decree itself. This ambiguity in terminology must have contributed to the ambiguity in tradition. That, taken purely logically, several differing views could be right at the same time, has never been asserted. The mudhijah in the wrong is not punished for his error and is not considered as being in a religious error (dali*), but is regarded as excused and is rewarded; this is of interest here, in so far as it is illegal. It may be more accurately defined as an act contrary to law, in which the intention of committing an illegal act is lacking, while the action itself may be deliberate; any negligence is left quite out of the question in the juridical appreciation. The Mu'tazills asserted that one of the Mu'tazila* could not be punished by Allah for it, for punishment is only conceivable for a deliberate illegal act. Orthodoxy on the contrary teaches that, while khaja* is not a sin (ishlm), any negligence, however, is something deliberate, and the khaja*, as its result, is liable to be punished (it was regarded as belonging to the 'asurid muhtasaba, happenings only indirectly intended, in themselves not deliberate, for which man can equally be made responsible); but Allah in his mercy will overlook the punishment in the next world. The khaja* is thus considered as an ameliorating, often even exonerating, circumstance in the infliction of punishment in this world (shubha [q.v.]); it cannot be punished by hadd [q.v.]. But not all of Allah's rights are waived: anyone who, contrary to the prohibition, kills an animal in the haram [q.v.], the sacred territory of Mecca, whether with 'amd (deliberately) or from khaja* (unintentionally), has in the opinion of all four usul madhhabs, to make the prescribed atonement. Dawâd al-Zâhirî alone in this case considers khaja* as an excuse. This is doubtless connected with what is ultimately a pre-Islamic idea, that Allah has an especial right of ownership to the haram, its plants and animals (cf. Gaudefoy-Demobymes, Le Pêlerinage à la Mekke, 7, 11); it follows that an unintentional infraction of this right of property is to be atoned for like an intentional one (the substance of this is also found in the following difference of opinion): Mâlik and Ahmad
KHATAK — KHATAM

b. Hanbal do not require a special compensation if
the animal has an owner—who, of course, must be
compensated—i.e. does not belong to Allah; Abū Ḥanīfah and al-Shāfi‘ī demand it in every case, so that
they extend their area of application). In KHATAM there
also is a full liability for any injury done to another.
Here ḥisāṣ [q.v.] is a special case; it is application is
excluded when KHATAM is present; and instead, the
diyā [q.v.] is to be paid and the ḫaffārā [q.v.] to be
performed. For further details, see the article KHAT.
Section i, 5, 6, where the variations of KHATAM in
the meaning of an unintentional act are given. From them
it will be seen that this terminological use of the
word is based on the two meanings “error” (in the case of
KHATAM fi ‘l-ḥisāṣ) and “failure,” “accident” (in the case of KHATAM fi ‘l-ḥisāṣ) and is no more uniform
than the use dealt with under i.

Bibliography: The statements of the diction-
naries are collected in Lane, Arabic-English lexicon, i/2, 761; on its use as a technical term, see Dictionnaire des technical terms used in the sciences of the Musulmans, i, 401-2; Dorschcháni, Definitiones, ed. G. Flügel, 104; for further details the works on wsd and the ḥish-books are indis-
ensible. See also kātāt. (J. SCHACHT)

KHATÁ [see ismā‘īl, šāhīn].

KHATAK, a Pashto tribe living in the Kohät and Pashtunwál district of the North-West Frontier region of former British India, now Pakistan, estimated at about 200,000 individuals; for their gene-
ology, see the table in AFGHÁN. They are Ḥanafí Sunní Muslims, and their original home area has been
the Shāhwal valley in Waziristán. In the early 8th/14th century they were driven by other Pashtún tribes to the southern portion of the Téri mountains of Kohät, where they now live as neighbors of the Bangash tribe. They speak the so-called
“soft” dialect of Pashto [see AFGHÁN, ii. The Pashto language], but a section of this tribe, the Akora
Khataks, live in Nowshera Taksül of the Pashtunwál District, and have adopted the “hard” dialect.
The Khataks are the only major Pashtún tribe which is divided into the two main Pashto dialects.

Although not mentioned in the Bābur-náma, the Khataks appear in 10th/16th century documents. Malik Ako (or Akūrāy) led his clan of Khataks to the land they occupy to this day west of the confluence of the Kabul and Indus Rivers. He was granted the land from the Indus to Nowshera (1386) by the Mughal Emperor Akbar, and given the right to levy ferry tolls at the Attock crossing [see ATRAK], in return for keeping open this part of the road to Kabul, then a province of the Mughal Empire. This stretch formed part of the famous Grand Trunk Road from Hindu-
stán to Khurṣhān. Control of the Attock crossing brought the Khataks into conflict with the neighbor-
ing Yúsufzay tribe living north of the Kabul River, who had, at this time, been resisting Mughal encroach-
ments into their areas. The Khataks took advantage of Akbar’s attempted suppression of the Yusufzays to occupy part of their lands. Later, the Khatak Yúsufzays were caught up in the struggle for
succession between Auranzib and his competing brothers (1068/1658). The Khataks were then hard hit by the abolition of the Indus ferry tolls. During most of the second half of the 11th/17th century the Khatak and some other tribes were in constant rebel-
lión against Auranzib, a resistance in which Khush-
ös Khán [q.v.] was the guiding force. He secured the assistance of the Afrídíd (led by Malik Davyā Kghan and Aymál Kghan), but failed with the Yusufzays because of the historic Khatak-Yúsufzay feud. There

was no major resistance by the Khataks against the Mughals after Auranzib. In 1824 the Khataks, in
confederation with the Yusufzays, formed a tribal army under Akbar Shāh, Sayyid of the Pîr Bâbâ family, and gallantly resisted the advance of the Sikh Mahārājā, Randjît Singh. In 1828, Khatak tribesmen joined the forces of Sayyid Aḥmad of Barell (sup-
ported by the family of the Pîr Bâbâ Sayyids), who defeated the Sikhs. The British found the Khataks
most of the second half of the nth/i7th century the succession between Aurangzib and his competing

tribes, plays a great part in festivities and folklore.


(RAVAN FARHADI)

KHATÁM, KHÁTIM (a.) (P. muhr), seal, sign-
et, signet-ring, the impression (also khatam) as well as the actual seal-matrix; it is applied not only
to seals proper, engraved in incuse characters with retrograde inscriptions, but also to very common
seal-like objects with regular inscriptions of a pious or auspicious character; for the latter, which are
amulets and further readily distinguished from seals by the absence of a personal name, see TILSAM; indeed anything with an inscription stamped upon it may be called khatam. Here we are only concerned
with seals in the strict sense of the word. The word khatam is said by Nöldeke, Mandatliche Grammatik,
112 to be of Aramaic origin, and in this he is followed by Fraenkel, Aram. Freuds., 252, who also recog-
nises a loan word in bārakas, seal-clay.

The part played by the signet-ring in the east cannot be better illustrated than by the following
quotation from Lane (Modern Egyptians, 1860, 31).

Describing the dress of a Muslim Egyptian he says:

“The little finger of the right hand (it is allow-
able to wear it on a finger of the left hand) is worn a

seal-ring (khatam), which is generally of silver, with a
carnelian, or other stone, upon which is engraved the
wearer’s name; the name is usually accompanied by other words ex-

pressive of the person’s trust in God, etc. The Prophet

disapproved of gold; therefore few Muslims wear gold
rings: but the women have various ornaments (rings,
bracelets, etc.) of that precious metal. The seal-ring

is used for signing letters and other writings and its

impression is considered more valid than the sign-


A little ink is dabbed upon it with one of the fingers, and it is pressed upon the paper; the person who uses it having first touched his tongue with another finger, and moistened the place in the paper which is to be stamped. Almost every person who can afford it has a seal-ring, even though he be a servant. The use of seals dates from remote antiquity in the east, and they have never been supplantated by the spread of a knowledge of the art of writing and the use of the signature. It has happened in the west also.

In the east, the seal takes the place of the signature and it is the former that gives validity to a document even if the latter is also used. The seal is also much used as a guarantee that property will be kept intact and thus takes the place of locks and keys. Goods are simply roped up in a packet and the knots sealed with the owner's seal, a plan which to Chardin, for example, appeared more reliable than the western system, owing to the practical impossibility of counterfeiting a seal. It is also used to stamp property as a mark of ownership (e.g. books and bindings) and in this way corresponds to a coat of arms in the west.

The possession of another person's seal is evidence that the latter has delegated his authority. There is abundant evidence of these usages in the east from very early times. Pharaoh, for example (Gen. xlii, 42), gave to Joseph his signet-ring, as the Sultan of Turkey did to his grand vizier. Jezabel (I Kings, xxii, 8) forges a letter in Ahab's name and seals it with his seal to give it validity. The books of Esther and Daniel give similar examples of the power of the Persian king's seal. Herodotus (i, 195) tells us that every Babylonian carried a seal and the abundance of seals, usually cylindrical in form, that have survived from ancient times in Mesopotamia, illustrates this statement. Seals of authority, such as the Sultan of Turkey did to his grand vizier, are still used in numbers, whether made for mounting in rings or pierced for suspension. In South Arabia also the pre-Islamic civilisation has left numerous specimens of its signets.

No seals of the pre-Muslim Arabs are known. The earliest Arab seals come from Egypt with papyri and belong to the period soon after the conquest. Whether we can accept or not the story, men in Mecca could write in the time of Muhammad, we must suppose that seals were in common use in this important commercial centre as in other parts of the east. Tradition, in any case, has a certain amount to tell about the Prophet's khatam. Al-Buhairi, Sahih, Bälak 131-13/1894-6, vii, libas, 48, says that the Prophet wished to write to the Byzantines. He was told they would not read his letter unless it had a seal, so he adopted one of silver with the inscription Muhammad rasûl Allâh. According to al-Mas'udî, he adopted this ring in Muharam of the year 7/May-June 628. The Prophet is also said to have originally worn a khatam of gold, but gave it up when he forbade the wearing of gold rings and silk and brocade (Buǧârî, loc. cit.). Women did not observe the prohibition of gold rings and ʿAbâsha for example wore them (ibid.). The Prophet wore his signet on his right hand and used to take it off when he went to the private (al-Tirmîdhi Sahih, Bälak 1242/1826-7, i, libas, 324). Opinions differ as to the proper hand and finger for the ring, and there is no established rule. Later stories illustrate the Prophet's disapproval of metals other than silver for signet-rings. He is reported to have said that a brass ring savoured of idolatry, that an iron one was emblematic of souls condemned to eternal fire, while words could not express his horror of a gold ring; meeting the wearer of one, he cast upon him a terrible frown and turned away as if he had encountered a dog or an infidel. The Prophet's seal was handed on and used by his successors, who had however also their own seals, until Uqba b. Mas'ud lost it in a well at Aris, or in Zumzam, or according to others in the Tigris near Mawsil. The Prophet's interdiction has been generally observed, and it is exceedingly rare to find signet-rings of the more precious metals or mounted with the more valuable precious stones, upon which there was no embargo.

The earliest known seal of a Muslim is that of ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, conqueror and governor of Egypt whose signet was a bull (Râfer, Fuhrer, No. 556). Whether this is due to local influence, or whether the representation of an animal was not unusual with the pre-Muslim Arabs, is impossible to say. Other Arab seals bearing animals are known of this period, but the rigorous avoidance of images of living things was soon applied to seals also, for we soon find seals in Egypt of the Muslim type, although as late as 8/707, we find the governor Kurra b. Shârik using a wolf (Râfer, Fuhrer, No. 593). The seals of Abû Hâ'im b. Yâbirî (No. 572) and of the head of the Treasury Rashîd b. Khâlid "who trusts in God" (No. 577) are already of the style that became stereotyped. A notable seal from Egypt is that of the tax-collector Nâjid b. Muslim which bears his name in Greek and Arabic (No. 578). Bilâd al-Sham signets of authority, such as the Sultan of Turkey did to his grand vizier, are still found in Syria and Asia Minor in the 4th/10th century (cf. Schlumberger, op. cit., and Halil Edhem, op. cit.). Here also under Byzantine influence we find double sided impressions of seals in lead (bullae); of these the most notable is that of the Kâkûyûd ʿÂla' al-Dawla of 430/1038-9 with a horseman on the obverse (Halil Edhem, No. 30). Another remarkable seal from the same region is that of the Hamûdî Muhammad b. Sa'd al-Dawla Abu l-Mâ'allî Shârif with obverse a bust of St. Theodore and his name in Greek characters (op. cit., No. 31).

The materials of these early impressions are the same as in later times, a special kind of clay (karkas), or lead, appended by cords to the documents as in the mediaeval west also. When the seal is stamped on the documents itself, it is done with a special thick kind of ink and the impression is received by the impression; red wax is also used when the climate permits it. As in mediaeval Europe, there are instances recorded in the east of bullae of the precious metals, silver and even gold for very special occasions (Reinaud, op. cit., i, p. 112).

Charles White (op. cit.) deals very fully with the use of seals among the Turks and the guild of engravers in Istanbul. The latter have, he says, a special quarter in the bazaar called after them kâkâkir čarşî. The members of the guild are Muslims (in contrast to the dealers in stones, who are usually Jews) of fair education conversant with Arabic, Persian and Turkish. A few can decipher the Kûfic character. Their training is a long one. Apprentices after a good education take lessons from the best calligraphers of the day and then serve seven years with a master-engraver. When their indentures have expired, they become journeymen (kâfî), until they can acquire a business of their own and be admitted into the guild as master-members (usta), the number of whom is limited to fifty. Their shops are regularly searched by the police lest they be tempted to put their skill to illegal uses, such as the engraving of false coin-dies. Such great care is taken to ensure the genuineness of a seal that the trade are forbidden to engrave two seals exactly the same for the same person. When a seal is lost the owner has some trifling alteration made in the new one, such as a change in
an ornament or the date, so that the forgery can be detected if his first seal should fall into evil hands.

The Istanbul engravers date the origin of their art in the time of the caliph 'Uthmān and say the first engraver was a certain Muḥammad al-Ḥidżāżī who engraved seals for 'Uthmān and ʿAlī bearing their names with the additional epithet ʿabd Allāh; the rings were of silver and the stones were bloodstones.

White's account of the seals of the sultan and dignitaries of the Ottoman empire follows d'Ohsson. The sultan has three seals of different sizes, all of emerald set in gold with the same inscription, the tughrā (v.v.) and a religious legend. The first is a small seal always carried by the sultan and handed to his secretary as required. The second is somewhat larger and is entrusted to the grand treasurer of the harem, who uses it for all matters relating to the harem—the Mughal Emperor Akbar similarly had a special seal for all documents relating to the harem. The third imperial Ottoman seal is the seal of state confided to the grand vizier of the day, who is supposed to keep it in his bosom day and night. The head of each department of state has also his own seal for matters relating to his office.

Persons of distinction do not usually wear signet-rings on their fingers. Great dignitaries have a confidential seal bearer (muhrād) who carries the signet in a small bag in his breast pocket and produces it when required inked for the stamp or clean if wax is used. People of humble rank carry their seal in the breast pocket or suspended round the neck. The impression of the signet stands for a signature, although for documents of importance the latter is also necessary. In the case of the sultan, the seal used and the presence or absence of the signature vary with the importance of the document, as does the format of the latter.

Chardin's account of the seals used by the Șâh of Persia is similar. There are three seal-keepers (muhrād-bâış) but they only affix the seals, which are kept in a box in the palace sealed with the king's own seal. Friday is the usual day for sealing documents; the muhrād prepares the seal and the paper and makes the impression on a sign from the Shah, who does not usually do it himself. There are three great seals, used for military, civil and foreign affairs, and two small seals used for the palace accounts etc. The same inscription is in the centre of the three large seals, banda Shâh wîlâyatal Sulaymân ast 1080 (A.H.); the small seals have dîn in place of wîlâyat. One of the large seals has a quadrat round it and another has the names of the 12 Shî'î Imâms. At the king's death his name is erased and that of his successor engraved on it. Of the general use of seals, Chardin observes that it would not be easy to steal one, as they are worn around the neck and only taken off in the bath; they are also worn on rings. It is rarer to find a seal counterfeited than a signature in Europe. The seal engravers used a drill and a small wheel with emery.

Abū 'l-Faoll in the Āyn-i Akbarī devotes a special chapter to the Emperor's seals, which are used in the three branches of the government—"indeed every man requires them in his transactions". (Here we may note that English officials in India in the 18th and 19th centuries found it necessary to have a seal with their names in Persian characters).

At the beginning of his reign, Akbar had a circular seal bearing his name and those of his ancestors back to Tīmūr in the nasta‘īlī characters; later he had a simpler one with his name only in the nasta‘īlī character. The former was at first used for letters to foreign kings and the latter (known as wuzūk) for home affairs but the distinction was not maintained. A second seal used for juridical business was lozenge-shaped (mīhrābī) and bore an appropriate verse in praise of justness, round his majesty's name. For other business a small square seal with the legend Allāh Akbar, djalā djalāluhu was used and the harem, as already stated, had its own special seal.

The great figures of Muslim tradition had of course their seals. That of Sulaymân b. Dâwūd is particularly famous and plays an important part in many of the stories of his miraculous exploits. It was held in particular awe by the dīvān. Dīmāshqī, the Solon of Persia, according to Sa'dī, was the first person to wear his signet on the left hand. In Firdawṣī's story of Shāpūr II's escape from captivity in Rûm, he reveals his return by sending an impression of his signet to the grand mōbed.

Coming to more historical periods, we have a record of the seal inscriptions of all the early caliphs (e.g. in Mas'ūdī, Kitāb al-Tanbīh, under each caliph; collected by Hammer-Purgstall and von Murr); specimens of the seal inscriptions of several early Caliphs still exist; (cf. Halîl Edhem, op. cit.) Tīmūr's seal bore his special mark, three small circles arranged in a triangle, and the motto rasti rusti, and an impression still exists in the Bibl. Nationale (de Sacy, op. cit.). Johnville mentions a ring of "mout fin or" bearing his signet which was among the presents sent to St. Louis by the Shâykh al-Djibâl. Specimens of the seals of sultans of Turkey and other high Turkish dignitaries are given by Hammer-Purgstall (op. cit.). Of these, the most remarkable is the original seal of Sultan Muṣṭafā II of 1106/1694-5 found on the battle field of Zenta (1697) where its bearer, the Grand Vizier Elmas Meḥmed Paşa, was killed. A special medal was struck by the Austrians to commemorate this trophy. The tughrâ is a feature of the imperial Turkish seals; it is said to be an imitation of the impression of the hand, because Orkhan's sign-manual was the impress of his hand in red ink. Tīmūr is also said to have used this primitive signature, but we know that he was not illiterate. The tughrâ is also traced back to the Prophet himself.

Muslims have followed the example of the Prophet in having simple inscriptions on their seals. Sometimes the name alone is used, sometimes it is accompanied by a brief pious inscription, often indicative of humility; if the owner has the name of a person mentioned in the Kur'ān, the reference is frequently worked into the seal inscription. The name is given in a simple form and titles are as a rule avoided, in keeping with the general modesty of the signet; for examples of legends, see Reinaud and Hammer-Purgstall; in later times in Persia and India seals became much more elaborate and the seal of a minor official of the Mughal court of the end of the 18th century often has several lines of bombastic inscription and forms a striking contrast to the seal, for example, of the great Sinān Paşa, five times Grand Vizier of Turkey, with its modest inscription "O God Thou art full of mercy, pardon poor Sinān, son of ʿAbbās".

The commonest materials for rings are silver or copper; and if a stone is mounted in it with the seal, it is one of the less valuable stones, cornelian, garnet, jacinth, agate, coral; the turquoise is not uncommon and one often sees them carved as amulets with inscription inlaid with gold. When not worn on a ring, the seal is mounted on a handle and carried in a bag; sometimes the stone itself is pierced for suspension and worn round the neck. The shapes of Arab seals
vary; oval is naturally the commonest, but they are also square, hexagonal or octagonal; a round shape is not common except for the largest sizes.

The art of the seal engraver was at its best, like that of calligraphy, in the 16th and 17th centuries. Its decline in the 18th was followed by the practical extinction of the art in the 19th. The names of few celebrated engravers have been preserved. Altm at the court of Timur was reckoned a master of his art. Abu 'l-Fadl gives the names of four masters of the craft at Akbar's court, each of whom was a specialist in a particular branch.


(J. ALLAM)

The seal from which every ruler in the Islamic lands utilised in order to authenticate documents signed in his name, had a design peculiar to each ruler, and was the symbol of his power. Hence when a caliph proved to be in a physical state unfitting him to govern, his seal was taken from him. Moreover, it was his seal which the caliph entrusted first of all to his confidants, i.e. usually to his successive viziers. Nevertheless, it seems that the caliph always retained a personal seal, quite distinct from the official seal which he used to authenticate his letters.

In the central administration of the 'Abbāsid period, there was an organisation of state specially charged with the task of gathering together the documents, letters and inventire patents prepared by the chancery or Divān al-Rasā'il and then ready to receive the caliphal seal. This was the Divān al-Khātam, which played on these occasions a crucial rôle, since it had to be certain in advance that the documents prepared for sealing were in conformity with the caliph's and vizier's instructions on the one hand, and in conformity with the administrative rules then in force on the other hand. In the first decades of the 'Abbāsid caliphate, there were at times bitter contests for control of the Divān al-Khātam. In practice, the vizier, at a time when his duties and sphere of competence were not clearly defined, could not exercise his powers properly unless he controlled this office; hence it happened that its head might, out of animosity towards the vizier, hold back deliberately the execution of orders and in this way bring all the administrative machine to a standstill. It was at a later period, from the opening of the 3rd/9th century, the custom to give the vizier direct control over the office of the seal, and the chroniclers note generally, in this connection, that the viziers received "the seal and the vizierate". If this detail no longer appears at the end of the century, it is because by that time the vizier's control over the whole administration of offices making up the caliphal administration was firmly recognised, and the office of the seal could no longer function except under his direct orders.

Bibliography: D. Sourdel, Le vizirat 'Abbāsida, Damascus 1959-60, index. (D. SOURDEL)

In the Maghrib, at the present time, Khatam (dialectical, khāt'am) denotes not only seal-rings, but any kind of ring worn on the finger. The seal itself, whether mounted on a ring or on a stem, is called fāba. Its impress, stamped with thick black or violet ink, served until a recent time for the authentication of official documents, whether emanating from the baniṣṣā of the Sharifian Mahāzīn or from the tribal hāids. For judicial acts, the fāba is rarely used; the complicated flourishes of the signatures of the audials (ṣudāl) and the kadīs take its place. The impresses of the sīrāfis and the Great Arab and Persian houses have been preserved. They are usually circular in shape, but sometimes oval. Reproductions of them can be seen in Nehil, Lettres chérifennes, Paris 1916, and in H. de Castries, Sources indiètes de l'histoire de Maroc, Paris 1905 ff. In general, the sultans used two seals, a large one and a smaller one, and the vizier of ḍājū slightly was left with the responsibility of affixing it. The same procedure doubtless obtained in Muslim Spain; the historians of the Umayyad caliphs and mulūk al-faḍla'ī often give, after a physical sketch of the ruler and a list of his honorific titles, the legend inscribed on his seal (see Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., iii, 13). Khatam, an Arab tribe (the name is tripotite, although in several European editions of Arabic texts we find it wrongly vocalised as a dipotite). They inhabited the desert region from the deserts of the Arabian peninsula, the mountainous territory between al-Tāf and Nadjrân along the caravan route from Yemen to Mecca. Historiographical theory on the migrations of the tribes, which is bound up with their genealogical systematisation, makes them settle, at the time of the separation of the sons of Ma'add, in the mountains of al-Sarēt [q.v.], from which the Azd are said to have driven them at the time of the migration of the South Arabian tribes after the burning of the dam of Ma'āch, to the lands they occupied in historical times (al-Bakrī, Muqālam, ed. Wüstenfeld, 28, 38, 41-2 = Wüstenfeld, Die Wohnsitze u. Wanderungen d. ar. Stämme, in Abh. G. W. Götz, xiv, 39, 53, 58 = Muqadāsīyyah, ed. Lyall, 113-14, following Ibn al-Kalbī; Yādūr, Muqālam, i, 464, ii, 526-7; Wüstenfeld, Register s. d. genealog. Tabellen, 130-1). According to this theory, the Khatāmī (like the Jadīla [q.v.] who figure everywhere as their brethren) were part of the tribes of 'Adnān, their descent being Khāṭāmī b. Annārā b. Nizār (Ibn Hishām, Sīra, ed. Wüstenfeld, 49-50; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'ārif, ed. Wüstenfeld, 50; al-Makdisi, Badī', iv, 110-11, who all attribute this view to "the genealogists of Mudur"). But another theory (Ibn al-Kalbī-Caskei, Gānhart an-nasab, Leiden 1966, table 221) connects them with a branch of the Sāhamī according to the genealogy: Aftāl, surnamed Khatāmī b. Annār b. Irāš b. 'Amr b. al-Ghwāth (the latter is also the father of the Azdī tribes) or more
KHAṬİ'AM — KHAṬİ'AM

Simply, Khaṭ'ām b. 'Amr b. al-Ghawth (see also Ibn Durayd, Ḥaṭib, ed. Wüstefeld, 302; Ibn Kūtabya, 50; Ibn Ḥishām, 50; Aḥzānī; xv, 152; Wüstefeld, Geneal. Tabellen, 9; Hamdānī, Ḩudur al-'Arab, ed. Müller, 116, gives the isolated genealogy: Khaṭ'ām b. Rabī'ā b. Āmir (?) and Ibn Kūtabya, 50, makes Anmār the son of Sāba', cf. Reiske, Pirmiae lineae, 133; Masūdī, ii, 148 = 998, replaces Iraš by Ṭabba', however contradictory statements seem to indicate that, like so many other tribes, the Khaṭ'ām do not represent an ethnic unit but rather a confederation of clans of different origins. This seems also to be deducible from the etymology of their name, which connects it with the verb takḥāt to smoulder oneself with blood on the occasion of a pact of alliance (on this custom, cf. J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, 21; 25; 26 and the bibl. cited there). Other etymologies which make Khaṭ'ām the name of a mountain or of a camel are not worthy of consideration (Ibn Durayd, 302, 304; Harmāsā, ed. Freytag, 72, 375; L. A., xv, 56). In any case we always find the Khaṭ'ām associated with tribes of the south, either in alliances made on the occasion of expeditions (e.g. al-Aḥzānī, ix, 17; xii, 47-8; xviii, 35-6) or during the ridda (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1985-6), or latterly in the groupings of the tribes stationed in the military camps of Bṣāma and Kūfa (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1985-6); but in ii, 1382, we find them also grouped with the Kinnā, Kays ʿAyān, Muzayyina and even Kūraysh, all tribes of the north, under the general denomination of ʿAhl al-ʿĀliya. It seems that at this time (101/720) the territorial principle had prevailed over the ethnic one). Their principal clans were the Shahrān, Nāḥiṣa and ʿĀklūb, the latter, according to the South Arabian genealogy, was of another origin (Aḥzānī, Rabī'ā b. Nizar, 53), but Ibn al-Kalbī (Caskel, table 224) makes him nevertheless descend from Khaṭ'ām.

We have no authentic information on the Khaṭ'ām for the remote period in the history of the Arabian peninsula (the identification proposed by Blau, ZDMG, xxii, 658; xxiii, 561, n. 6 with the ʿĀṣrāfratī dār ‘Uṣur, of Usur and his descendants, is quite untenable). From the 6th century we find them inhabiting, along with other tribes of diverse origins, the districts of Bṣāma, Turāba, Ḥurash and Tabāla; this last was the centre of the cult of the God Dhu 'l-Khalaṣa (on him see Wellhausen, Annali, xii, 47, 129; xv, 56). In any case we always find different ʿAmāl women were married to Kurašī, Daws, Bahilā etc., worshipped (Yākūṭ, i, 791; ii, 465; 723; iv, 62, 567 [= ʿAḥzānī, xi, 152], 578, where there are numerous references to the neighbours of the Khaṭ'ām and to the assignation of the part of the territory of Bṣāma at the end of the 1st century A.H. to some members of the Umayyad and Ḥaḍīmi families; Hamdānī, 135-6; Ibn al-Kalbī, Kūfāl al-ʿĀṣmām, ed. and tr. Atallah, 29-30).

Among the numerous guerilla wars in which the Khaṭ'ām were involved (cf. ʿAḥzānī, vii, 119; xii, 47, 51-2; xiv, 25; xviii, 35-6; Nakārī, ed. Bevan, 46; Yākūṭ, ii, 735; iv, 56; Hamdānī, 170, the best known is that of Fāy al-Riḥ in which their chief Anas b. Mudrik (or Mudrika), allied to the greater part of the Maḥūdhī, defeated the Banū ʿĀmir b. Ṣaṣā'a commanded by ʿĀmir b. al-Tufayl [q.v., who lost an eye in the battle (Nakārī, 468-72; Ibn al-ʿAḫrī, i, 474; Ṣaḥāḥ, ed. 1293, iii, 102-3; Dīnār al-ʿĀmir, ed. Līly, Intro., 62-3, nos. x, xi (Mufakhdātī, n. cvii), xii, xiii, xxv, xxvii, Suppl., nos. i, 19). Anas b. Mudrik, famous also as a poet, was the hero of an other enterprise of the Khaṭ'ām, sc. that against the Banū Dīshām (Aḥzānī, ix, 17) and that in which he killed the famous poet-brigand Sulayk b. Sulakā (Ḥamāsā, 415-16; Aḥzānī, xviii, 123-8; Ibn Kūtabya, Ṣirr, ed. de Goeje, 217). The biographical notes on Anas, who lived for several years after the introduction of Islam, have been collected by Levi della Vida in Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, x, 499-500 (year 40 A.H., § 547).

The position of the lands of the Khaṭ'ām enabled them to play a part in the Abyssinian expedition against Mecca. They tried to oppose Abraḥa's advance, but beaten by him, they were forced to guide the enemy's army as far as al-Ṭāhif (see the sources collected in Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Pers. u. Araber, 206-17). The spread of Islam at first left them indifferent (no heed need be paid to the story in al-Ṭabarī, i, 1079-80, of the Khaṭ'ām asinna of Tabāla, Ṣaṣīm bint Murr, who saw a divine light on the face of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, the future father of the Prophet. The only interesting feature of the story is the epithet "Judaising", Mutawwawida, conferred on the ʿāṣma). Their first relations with Muḥammad were certainly hostile (Wājidī, tr. Welhausen, 387; al-Ṭabarī, i, 1730-1), but they ultimately sent him an embassy and recognised him, and accepted a letter from him which declared all the blood-feuds previous to Islam abolished (Ibn Saʿd, i, 34, 78; Annali dell' Islam, i, 330, year 10 A.H., § 28, cf. also § 23, 326-7).

On the death of the Prophet, only a section of them rebelled (Annali, ii, 573-4, 581, 585, year 11 A.H., § 87-8, 98, 104). The destruction of the sanctuary of Dhū 'l-Khalaṣa by ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥarīr al-Bagdālī must have broken their resistance, along with that of other tribes who were grouped round this turbulent centre (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1985-6). During the wars of conquest we find them in the army of Syria (Ibn ʿAsikīr, in Annali, iii, 588, year 15 A.H., § 664, cf. also al-Ṭabarī, i, 3287, 3408), as well as in those of ʿIrāq (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2188), and as we have seen, they formed part of the tribes quartered at Baṣra (Pellat, Mīṣīlī, index) and Kūfā.

Several Khaṭ'āmī women were married to Kurašī. One of them played rather an important part in the early history of Islam, Ṣama bint Umays [q.v., in Suppl.]. Her sister Salmā was the wife of Hamzā b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib (Annali, loc. cit., § 285, Ibn Saʿd, vii, 209); a daughter of Anas b. Mūdrik, Ṣama, was the wife of Khālid b. al-Walīd (Ibn Ḥādīr, Isbāba, Cairo, ed., vii, 6, no. 39; Annali, i, year 37 A.H., § 412, x, 499).

The Khaṭ'āmī poets were few in number; the most notable is Ibn al-Dumayna [q.v.]. Bibliography: Given in the article.

G. LEVI DELLA VIDA

KHAṬṬA (pl. ḥaṭṭā and ḥaṭṭātā), moral lapse, sin, a synonym of ḏāن (pl. ḏānātā). The root ḥātā is means "to fail, stumble" (in Hebrew, Prov. xix, 2), "make a mistake" (e.g., one says ḥaṭṭātā of an archer whose arrow misses the target); [see KHAṬṬA].

The form ḥaṭṭāt appears five times in the Kurān, and the root ḥātā is frequently found there. It combines within itself the three meanings of "error" (ḥaṭṭātā, e.g., XVII, 33), "culpable lapse" (ḥaṭṭātā, e.g., XVII, 31; cf. ḥaṭṭātā, XCVI, 16), and "sin" (ḥaṭṭātā, ii, 81, 112, VII, 161; XXVI, 82; LXXI, 25). However, "sin" is more often conveyed by ḏānātā, ḏānātā; a sāyyā is an evil action, and an ṣāmā is a very grave sin, a crime against God.

We likewise find sometimes ḥaṭṭātā, but more often ḏānātā, and occasionally ṣāmā or sāyyā, in works on ʿim al-ḥalām, fiqh and tasawwuf. It would be tedious
to study each of these terms separately; sufficient to say that in endeavouring to pin down the idea and the theological aspect of sin in Islam, reference should be made above all to the article **khafa** rather than to that on **khalfa**.

I. Kur'anic references. On one hand, sin brings down divine anger and punishment (for **khalfa**, see II, 81; IV, 112; LXXI, 53); but on the other hand, it nevertheless remains within the operative sphere of the divine mercy. Thus Abraham says, “It is He whom I ardently desire to forgive me my sins (**khafi**-dil) on the Day of Judgment” (XXVI, 82; cf. VII, 161). God, through His apostles and prophets, summons mankind to Himself in order to pardon their sins (XIV, 10; XLVI, 31; LXXI, 4). If a man avoids grave sin (**tashm**) and depraved actions, he will receive pardon from his Lord (LIII, 32). God gives absolution from sin (**dhanb**) and accepts repentance (XL, 3), and He forgives sins (**dhuwab**) completely (XXXIX, 53).

God is the All-Pardoning One whose power to pardon is endless, **al-khafar al-khafi**,** two of the "Most beautiful names" upon which pious Muslims like to meditate (see al-**asma**-al-**husna**). However, one sin is unpardonable, sc. the rejection and the disowning of God and His Oneness (IV, 48, 137; XLVII, 34). Impious persons, guilty of **kufar** and **shirk**, will only receive pardon if they repent (VIII, 38). Those who have perpetrated an evil action (**sayyia**) and remain “encompassed” within their sin (**khalfa**) will bring down on themselves the torments of everlasting hell-fire (II, 81).

Thus there are three types of sins mentioned in the text of the **Kur'an**: (1) minor sins, not affecting one’s faith, which can be submitted to the divine mercy (LIII, 32); (2) grave sins (**kaba’ir**,** al-tashm**, according to XLII, 37) and “depraved actions” which God may pardon immediately or may punish for a specific period, according to His mysterious will (cf. II, 284; III, 129); and (3) **kufar** and **shirk**, attacks on the Divine Oneness, which cannot be wiped out except through repentance (**taubah**) and which, failing this last, remain under the threat of eternal hell-fire: “those guilty of **kufar** will be rounded up in Gehenna” (VIII, 36).

II. The traditions. There are numerous traditions which stress the idea of sinfulness and the fate reserved for the sinner, out of which two main themes emerge:

(1) Faith and sinfulness. There is a certain amount of self-contradiction here. (a) Some traditions stress salvation through faith. The divine pardon is assured, provided that there is not rejection of faith in the One God. Thus the Prophet related that **Djibril** appeared before him and comforted him by this assurance: “Every member of your community who dies professing the Oneness of God will enter paradise”. The Prophet repeated, “Even if such a person is guilty of adultery and theft?” **Djibril** replied, “Even if he is guilty of adultery and theft” (Muslim, **Imam**, 113). Certain traditions (ibid., 201-8) go so far as to affirm that God “does not take into account” sins of simple intention, seeing that the thoughts involved are not expressed in words not realised in deeds. The delicate conscience of the believer who discovers in himself “evil thoughts” which he is “too scrupulous to express”, is praised as an act of faith (ibid., 209).
(b) However, according to another chain of traditions, “grave sins” are considered as an attack against faith itself: “The Messenger of God said that whoever is guilty of fornication is not a believer, any more than he who steals or drinks wine” (ibid., 100, cf. 101-5, and al-Bukhari, **Huda** i, 6, 20, etc.). (c) In any case, the Prophet’s intercession at the Last Judgment for the sins of his community is emphasised in many traditions (see **sharika**).

(2) What are the “grave sins”? The Kur’an mentions clearly and on several occasions the **kaba’ir** or “grave sins”, grave sinfulness (**tashm**) and “depraved actions” (**fahsh**), and gives various examples of each class, but without setting up a precise table. One tradition, which has been seen as a version of the “seven capital sins” of Christian morality, enumerates them thus: “The Messenger of God said, Avoid the seven deadly sins (**mabiha**). When he was asked what these were, he replied, ‘Associating others with God (**shirk**); sorcery; unlawful homicide (except when there is a legal reason); despoiling an orphan of his property; flight from a battle being waged against the enemy; and taking advantage of the weakness and credulity of virtuous women (**muja**-nati)” (Muslim, **Imam**, 144; al-Bukhari, **Wa**ayda, bbd 23). The tendency towards a laxity which tends to blur the distinction between grave and lesser sins is condemned: “Anas related: Indeed, you commit sins which are only a single hair’s weight according to your own view, but in Muhammad’s time we used to consider them as grave sins” (al-Bukhari, Risha, bbd 32).

III. Tafsir and ‘ilm al-kalâm. Discussions and elaborations went on through the course of the ages, emphasising such-and-such Kur’anic verse or such-and-such tradition, according to the tendencies of the different schools of thought.

(1) The definition of grave sins and lesser ones (**kaba’ir** and **shugba’ir**). This distinction, which appears already in both the **Kur’an** (e.g., LIII, 32) and traditions, has been developed at great length by the various schools. The exact definition of **kaba’ir** remained variable. It can be said that the generally-accepted idea of moral lapse or sin was one of disobedience (**ma’siya**) to the prescriptions of the divine law, to the point that **ma’siya** often becomes a synonym for **khafi’** or **dhanb**. It was then readily explained that it was the hardening of the heart and persistence in evil-doing which constituted the seriousness of the sin, expressed by Ibn ‘Abbâs as “Everything forbidden by God, once persisted in, becomes a grave sin”. Moreover, it is related from ‘Umar and Ibn ‘Abbâs (text cited by al-Nawawi) that “No sin is a grave one, if one asks pardon for it; but no sin is a venial one if the sinner persists in it”. In other words, persistence in minor sins makes them become grave ones.

Is there, then, only a difference of degree between great and small sins? Mu’tazil tradition, as represented by the **khadi** Abd al-Djabbar, states that a man whose acts of disobedience (**ma’siyad**) on the whole outweigh his acts of obedience (**fa’siya**) is guilty of “grave sin”, whereas, on the other hand, a man whose acts of obedience outweigh his acts of disobedience is only guilty of “lesser sin” (**shur** al-**sia** al-khamsa), ed. ‘Abd al-Kartm (Ithmân, Cairo 1934/1956, 789). For the Ash’a’ rif al-Djuwayni (Ishbâd, ed. Luciani, Paris 1938, 331), every sin is necessarily grave, in relation to the divine Majesty. Sin is a failure of duty towards God, and every failure of duty towards God is necessarily grave. However, there are sins of greater or lesser degrees of gravity. The two views expressed here are certainly completely divergent, but it seems that one might posit a simple difference of degree amongst the “acts of disobedience”.

The leading members of the various schools nevertheless attempted to lay down different kinds of sins.
(a) For the Khāridjīs and Mu'tazīlīs, the "actions of the limbs" form an integral part of faith [see IMAN, 1170-1, §§ 1, 3]. Consequently, grave sins which are destructive of faith are deliberate acts of disobedience against the Kur'ānic injunctions, above all, against the 'bāddāt "pillars of Islam", and against those prescriptions whose non-performance is punishable by the ḥudūd. (b) The usual Sunnī trend of thought seeks to establish a list of sins which are, as such, grave, but even here, there is some variation. The Shāfi'ī jurist Taqī 'l-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī puts forward this tautology: "Every sin which has grown so grave that one can call it a grave sin is in fact a grave sin" (cf. al-Bāḍjurī, Ḥāṣiyya 'alā ... Dia'marat al-tawḥīd, ed. Cairo 1352/1934, 114). As for lists of kābā'ir, these vary amongst writers; al-Bāḍjurī's popular manual gives two different enumerations, and asserts the validity of both (ibid., 102, 104). These lists refer almost invariably to the kābā'ir about the mābākbā'ir mentioned above, and to Kur'ān, VI, 157, and they freely admit that the number seven is not a limiting one. One may state that the following are unanimously considered as "grave sins": apostasy from the faith, kufr and shirk, insults to the Prophet, fornication and adultery, sins against nature, murder, stolen liquors, theft on a serious scale, and flight in battle. [38]

Al-Nawawī relies on Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Salām in his commentary (ii, 170) in order to set forth this criterion: if there is any doubt about the gravity or lightness of any sin which has been committed, it should be compared with the "seven capital sins" of the ḥudūd. If it proves to be less serious than the least grave of those, it belongs to the saghdār. In the opposite case, to the kabdār. According to the consensus of Sunnis, and contrary to the Khāridjīs and Mu'tazīlīs, tauba for grave sins is not necessary for salvation. If the sinner repents, and if God accepts his repentance, the sin is "wiped out"; it requires neither reaparation nor penitence, for it no longer exists. For, as al-Diwdānī remarks, "God extends His pardon for grave sins to several other sins mentioned in it. The prudent believer should therefore eschew all sin, lest he suddenly finds that he has committed one of the gravest possible ones.

(a) Sinning and repentance. The idea of repentance (tauba) is common to the varying schools. For example, we find it expressed in identical terms in 'Abd al-Diwbār (Sharḥ al-wṣūl, 791), just as in al-Idījā'i al-Dīgīrī (Sharḥ al-mawṣūlī, ed. Cairo 1325/1907, viii, 314). This formulation is "regret for an act of disobedience against God in itself, combined with the firm intention of avoiding it in the future": Cf. also in the Tafsīr al-Dīgīrī, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 74, the two definitions of tauba and sincere tawbah. If, although an act of repentance is shared, the degree of the necessity to repent is formulated differently by the various schools.

(a) The Khāridjīs and Mu'tazīlīs, relying on Kur'ān, II, 81, condemn to hell-fire everyone who remains "encircled" by his own sin, and for those who have committed grave sins, only repentance accepted by God can avoid eternal hell-fire. When a moderate Mu'tazīli like al-Zanāghāshī comments on the words "He pardons whomsoever He wills" (Kur'ān, III, 129), he explains, "... in tauba, for God is only inclined to extend His pardon to those who repent"; and he strongly opposes the interpretation attributed to Ibn 'Abbās—"God extends His pardon for grave sins to whomsoever seems good to Him, and punishes whomsoever seems good to Him in regard to venial sins". According to the Mu'tazīla, it is not that the tauba is efficacious in itself, but because of his justice, God is bound to accept it when it is sincere. The Mu'tazīla of Baghdād explain in general that He remits the punishment on the grounds of repentance (cf. 'Abd al-Diwbār, op. cit., 75).

(b) The Asbā'ī school, on the contrary, insists on absolute freedom of action by the Almighty. Only one wanted to establish an equivalence with Christian terminology, one would have to say that, according to the dominant Sunnī trend of thought, only these lastnamed sins really merit being called "mortal sins" (though the ideas at work here do not really correspond).

A comparison with the "capital sins" certainly fits the kābā'ir better, and every "capital sin" is not in itself (in Christianity) a "mortal sin". In Sunnī Islam, God, in His mercy, can therefore either pardon every "grave sin" apart from kufr and shirk, or else, in His justice, punish it by a period in hell-fire. It is for these sins that the Prophet's intercession can be invoked. Must the believer repent of them? Certainly, if he wishes to remain faithful to the divine prescriptions and regain complete purity of heart and intentions (ikhhās). The rules concerning tauba [q.v.] are very numerous. In regard to perfecting the purity of a man's faith, it is necessarily required. Furthermore, if tauba for grave sins is strongly urged, these last can nevertheless be "wiped out" by istighfrā' and/or istisfār. Other authors define these last as sins connected by the Qur'ān with hell-fire, but even here, there is some variation. "Every sin which has grown so grave that one can call it a grave sin is in fact a grave sin" (ibid., v, 455), just as in al-Idījā'i al-Dīgīrī, on Kur'ān, II, 82), and on the contrary, insists on absolute freedom of action by the Almighty. Only one wanted to establish an equivalence with Christian terminology, one would have to say that, according to the dominant Sunnī trend of thought, only these lastnamed sins really merit being called "mortal sins" (though the ideas at work here do not really correspond).

All this concerns judgments made on the perfection of the believer's status. But one must point out that according to the consensus of Sunnis, and contrary to the Khāridjīs and Mu'tazīlīs, tauba for grave sins is not necessary for salvation. If the sinner repents, and if God accepts his repentance, the sin is "wiped out"; it requires neither reaparation nor penitence, for it no longer exists. For, as al-Dīgīrī remarks, if God's pardon "were to come into effect after the sinner's repentance, it would no longer be an act of pardon" (Sharḥ al-mawṣūlī, viii, 311). It is when "grave sins" are wiped out neither by tauba nor istīkhār that God can, if He wills, show Himself as Pardoner. To sum up: on one hand, divine punishment of grave sins which have not been repented of is not necessarily obligatory (cf. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Dīgīrī, Mafītih al-ghayb, ed. Kur'ān, II, 82), and on the other hand, if the punishment does not come into effect, it can only be temporary. Consequently, "it is untrue that tauba is necessary for the pardoning of sins, with the exception of shirk" (ibid., v, 455), and one finds the same teaching in other Sunnī sources. According to al-Baydāwī on Kur'ān, II, 81, the "encircled" by sin of those threatened with (eternal) hell-fire refers only to those impious per-
sons guilty of hujf or shirk. Those believers who have committed grave sins do not come under the verdict of this verse.

On all these points, the Hanafi-Maturidi trend of thought is very close to the Ašh'arī attitude, with one difference, however (cf. L. Gardet, *Dieu et la destinde de l'homme*, Paris 1967, 304 and ref.). For the Ašh'arīs, everything is submitted to the inscrutable Divine Will which may, just as it pleases, pardon straightforwardly or punish straightforwardly in any period of time the believer who is guilty of prevarication; and there are no reservations here. It is therefore possible that for a certain period of time, there will be sinning believers in hell-fire, but it is not certain. For the Hanafi-Maturidi theologians, God's promises must always come into effect, and God has threatened punishment for grave sins, even when committed by a believer. Hence it is "obligatory that certain individuals out of those who have committed grave sins will be punished" (Maturidi thesis adopted by the Ašh'arī al-Lakānī, *Dinawarat al-taubīd*, verse 177). It is uncertain whether such a prevaricating believer will be condemned to spend some time in hell-fire, but it is certain that some sinning believers will spend some time there.

IV. Tawlawf—A few examples. We find in the works on mysticism a spiritual life and on mysticism ascendant classifications and analyses of the various kinds of moral sins. In Şī'ism the most frequently-employed term is *dhanb*, *duwmāb*, rather than *khatīb* (e.g. al-Kalābādhī, *Kut al-kulūb*, ed. Arberry, Cairo 1934, 64). One may cite as an example al-Ghazālī, who in his *Ihyā‘* *ilm al-dīn* (iv, treatise on *taubah*, ed. Cairo 1352/1933, 2-53), takes over the analyses in Abu Tālib al-Makki's *Kūl al-bulāb* and endeavours to classify these sins according to their nature and to lay down a precise list of *khabīr*:

1. The classification of sins (*dhanb*). According to Abu Tālib al-Makki and al-Ghazālī, these are of four kinds (a) the "lordly" (rabibbiyya) ones, such as pride, scorn, boastfulness, arrogance, love of praise, love of life, ambition and despicable behaviour; (b) the "satanic" (ghafrīyya) ones, such as envy and deceitfulness; (c) the "bestial" (shayfīyya) ones, such as greed, covetousness, anger and concupiscence; and (d) those attributable to "wild beasts" (sabūtīyya), such as furious anger, lust for battle and murder.

2. The enumeration of the "grave sins". Al-Ghazālī firmly maintains the distinction between grave and lesser sins (*Ihyā‘*, ibid., 28 ff.). The list of grave sins which he puts forward is not governed by the number seven for the sūrūh in the *Kāfīb*. He proposes lists varying between four and eleven, and cites al-Makki's view that there are seventeen. In this last case, they may be grouped as follows: four come from the heart, sc. the sin of shirk, persistence in evil-doing, lack of confident belief in God's Mercy and lack of any fear of His power to punish; four come from the tongue, sc. bearing false witness, misusing an upright man (muhkam), perjury and sorcery; three stem from the belly, sc. drinking wine and intoxicants, despising orphans of their wealth and practising usury; two are connected with the genitalia, sc. fornication and homosexuality; two with the hands, sc. murder and theft; one with the feet, sc. flight from the battle field; and finally, one is connected with the whole body, sc. disobeying one's parents.

In regard to moral sin, certain extremist Sūfī traditions oscillate between two attitudes which are opposed in principle, but which are at the same time often apparently mixed together in fact. An attitude of laxity carried to excess, with which one might accuse those called the *Ibāšīya*, asserts that anyone who attains to union with God no longer has to worry about the fear of sinning, nor about the prescriptions, injunctions and prohibitions of the law. Opposed to this is the rigorism of a special variety of the *Mālid-ma'īya*, which is characterised by a deeply-rooted care to shun the praise and admiration of men; in order to achieve this, such a person will make no attempt to avoid actions which seem to be scandalous, but will indeed instigate them. In the first case (the attitude of laxity), we have the abandonment of all asceticism, and in the second ("rigorism"), we have ascetic behaviour which goes to the point of being perfectly content with disdain and disapproval, shunning what are undoubtedly sins, but embarking on acts which look like sins in the eyes of men.

However, the dominating fact in the counsels and adjurations of the Sūfī masters is the necessity of avoiding any kind of voluntary sin, and this goes to the point of a refined scrupulousness of heart (*wurad*). Man, the *sāhīf*, is fallible and a sinner before God, hence he must take account of this feebleness and his small stature as a created being, in relationship to the greatness of the Almighty. Self-control, awareness of one's spiritual condition (*muṣāwa*), is necessary. From the time of al-Muhāsibī onwards, examination of one's conscience (muḥkama) is rigorously prescribed, and al-Ghazālī insists upon it (*op. cit.*, 336-61, esp. 346; cf. Asin Palacios, *La espiritualidad de Alghazal*, iii, Madrid-Grenada 1940, 80-103). Al-Ghazālī goes on to say that the heart is like a mirror which is pitted and spoilt by rust, and which must therefore be cleaned and polished, so that the superior world can be reflected in it.

Bibliography: given in the article.
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**KHAṬĪB** (Av.), plur. *khulub*, was, among the ancient Arabs, the name for the spokesman of the tribe. The *khāṭīb* is therefore often mentioned along with the *shā'ir*, the poet (Ibn Hishām, *Sira*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 934, 938; Yākūt, *Buldān*, iv, 484), and, like the *khā'id* and the *sayyī'id*, was one of the leaders of the tribe. The character and significance of his office is clearly explained by Dībāzī, *Kīb al-Baydāwī wa l-tabylin*, Cairo 1332, i. The distinction between *khāṭīb* and *shā'ir* is not absolutely definite, but essentially is that the *shā'ir* uses the poetic form while the *khāṭīb* expresses himself in prose, often, however, also in *sadī* (*q.v.* cf. Dībāzī, *op. cit.*, i, 159); his speech is introduced with *amman ba'du* (al-Hariri, ed. de Sacy, 1822, 42). According to Dībāzī, there were only a few *khulub* who were also *shā'ird* (i, 27). In the *Dīgbilīyya* al-Ghazālī says the *khāṭīb* is said to have been more highly esteemed than the *khāṭīb*, but when the numbers of poets gradually increased and the latter's art declined and they became beggars, the *khāṭīb* obtained more prestige (i, 136; iii, 227). The *khāṭīb* is also associated with the story-teller, the *kāfīb* (*q.v.*), and with the *ašbāb al-ashāb wa l-'āthār* (Dībāzī, i, 167-8 and passim); the office was sometimes hereditary in the same family. The *khulub* did not form a gland or caste; they were the men who had the ability to speak to men. They appear not only at the head of a *waṣīd* to negotiate as representatives of their tribe, as we know from the *Sira* (cf. Goldzimer, *Abhandl. zur arab. Philol.*, i, 20), but, like the poets, they were also the leaders in the war of wits with the enemies (*muṣāba*). The *khāṭīb* had to be able to extol the glorious deeds and the noble qualities of his tribe and to narrate them in perfect language and to be able likewise to expose the weaknesses of his opponents. He had therefore to be *fāṣīb* and know how to employ *ba'da* (*q.v.*)
in this way to overcome his opponents (cf. The Mufad-
dallyat, ed. Lyall, xci, 4; ed. Wright, xcv, 20; Ibn Bihm, ed. Thod-
kanakis, S.B. A. Wem, xlv (1902), 95; Kâmil, ed. Wight, 20). Lampoons give the following characteristics of a poor khatib: his pronunciation is bad, he turns to and fro, stammers, coughs, strokes his beard and twists his fingers, a sign of cowardice (Hamâma, ed. Freytag, 650, verse 5; Kâmil, 20). It is in keeping with the character of the ancient Arab khatib that he is included among the fighters, ains and nobles (al-
Kutâm, op. cit.; Dâjîb, i, 134, 172), indeed, khatib itself is used as a name for a brave warrior (Dâjîb, i, 125). When the khatib makes a public appearance his insignia are lance, staff or bow (al-makhdîsî, just as a man taking an oath carries tokens of masculine honour; he often strikes the earth with it (cf. al-
Kutâm, xvi, 6; al-Khidîlî, 27, 45; Dâjîb, i, 197-8, iii, 3 ff., 61-2).

In the earliest days of Islam the khatib retained much of his old character. “The prophet came forward as a khatib” after the conquest of Mecca (Ibn Hašham, ed. Wüstendfeld, 823) and spoke publicly with ceremony and authority. But the khatib now became solely an address to the Muslims, not a part of the war against the enemy and muṣâhârâ was no longer part of the activities of the Muslim khatib. But it is quite in keeping with the nature of early Islam and with that of the Arab khatib that the ruler himself was spokesman and that he not only made edifying speeches from the minbar as khatib but also issued orders, made decisions and pronounced his views on political questions and particularly questions of general interest. This was the case under the first four caliphs and the Umayyads (cf. Dâjîb, i, 190), and the governors appointed by them also acted as khatâb (e.g. al-Yaμâlî, ed. Houtsma, ii, 318; Dâjîb, i, 170). The local governors, appointed by the latter were also entrusted with the control of the minbar and of the salât (al-Tabari, ii, 920). Diatribes against and commands on the enemy were part of their minbar speeches, e.g. the curses on ‘Affi and occasionally on ‘Alâ and al-
Zubayr (Dâjîb, i, 165). Khatib was therefore still synonymous with “leader”; a poet of the Khawaridi holds in his right hand during the khutba, his insignia are lance, staff or bow (Djahiz, iii, 135). An inheritance from the ancient Arab spokesman is the staff or lance which the Muslim khatib holds in his right hand during the khutba, a custom which provoked the scorn of the Persians (Dâjîb, iii, 135). But the close connection between the khutba and divine service gave the Muslim khatib a specifically religious character. After the alteration of the wars of the first generations, this element became more predominant and in the time of the ‘Ab-
bâsids, as early as Hârûn rašîd, the caliph left it to the khatib to deliver the sermon at the service while he himself was simply a listener (Dâjîb, i, 161). But in theory, the leaders of divine service in the great mosques are representatives of the caliph (cf. Ibn Khâlidun, Mukhadimmâ, Cairo 1322, 173).

The Egyptian Fatimid still occasionally preached the khutba behind a veil, namely three times in the month of Ramadan and at the great festivals (Ibn al-
Taḥhrîri, ed. Juynboll, ii, 486-2; ed. Popper, 337 ff.; al-Makrîzî, Khatib, Cairo 1334, ii, 322, 327, 329). On this occasion his highest dignitaries stood on the steps of the minbar (op. cit., 327, 329), while on the other hand the râ'is of a district often stood on the minbar if the khatib was preaching, a custom which testifies to the original high rank of the kha-
tib, but was later condemned by strict authorities on morals (Ibn al-
Hâjî, Khatib al-Madhdhal, Cairo 1320, ii, 74). Special khutâb were everywhere appointed. There were three of them in Cairo under the earlier Fâtimid period for the ‘Amr, Ibn Tûlûn and al-
Azhâr mosques; cf. al-Makrîzî, Khatibî, ii, 348; as a rule it seems to have been the honorary office of a khatib; cf. op. cit., 224. On the ‘Id al-
’Aṣâr, a special khatib pronounced the khutba on a minbar with nine steps in the sanctuary of Ħusayn in Cairo, while the chief khatib conducted the salât; the khâbit conducted the on this occasion was given a silk robe and 30 or 50 dinars (al-Makrîzî, Khatibî, ii, 224-5). On other occasions the khatib received a robe of honour (op. cit., ii, 387). The khatib usually was also the conductor (imâm) of the Friday salât at which he preached and, according to Abû Hanîfâ and a tradition of Mâlik, he must actually do so unless there were special reasons for a deviation from the rule. The daily salâts are as a rule conducted by other imâms (al-Mawardî, Al-
Akhâm al-sulâÔtayya, ed. Enger, 181). According to al-
Shâfî’î and Mâlik, the Friday worship with khutba can only be held in one mosque in each town, if the size of the town does not make it impossible, while Abû Hanîfâ has no such rule. The khutba was therefore delivered, for example, in Cairo after the end of the Fâtimid period in the mosque of al-
Hâkim only, because Saladin appointed a Shâfî’î chief khatib. This state of affairs was altered by Baybars when he appointed a Hanâfî chief khatib (al-Makrîzî, Khatibî, iv, 53). Abû Hanîfâ on the other hand allows the worship in which a khatib takes part only in a large town (misr), in which the ruler of his deputy is present in person. The other schools are less rigorous on the point. But the imâm-khatib of the Friday service is, according to the other schools also, in theory the representative of “the highest imâm”. Several imâms can be chosen, if necessary with their exact functions defined. According to al-
Mawardî, 172, the Sultan appoints the imâms of the larger mosques, in keeping, with the theory of their representative character. But, according to al-Kâshâshâdî (Subh al-
A‘âdîb, Cairo, iv, 39), each mosque under the Mamlûks had its own khutab while the Sultan only concerned himself with the larger mosques. The office of khatib of the most important mosques was as long as it was according to Ibn ‘Abd al-
Zâhir, the Shâfî’î chief khatib was khatib of the great mosque in the citadel of Cairo (cf. P. Ravaisse, Zoubdat kachf el-mamdlik, 1894, 92) and it was regarded as a special distinction, anxiously coveted, when Saladin after the conquest of Jerusalem chose the khatib Muhâr al-Dîn Abu ‘l-
Ma‘âlî as the first khatib in the Aqṣa mosque (Shîhâb al-Dîn, Kitâb al-Ra‘ādatayn fi akhbar al-
Baybars, Cairo 1288, ii, 108 ff.). The document confirming his appointment under the Mamlûks is further evidence of the khatib’s dignity (cf. al-Kâshâshâdî, op. cit., ii, 222-5; al-
Umarî, Khatib al-Târif bi ‘l-
muṣâhârâh al-
gharîf, Cairo 1312, 126-7). He is the natural authority to whom new converts announce their conversion to Islam (Ibn al-
Hâjî, Khatib al-
Maddhal, 76), the people touch his robe il‘l-
tabarrakh, etc. (al-
Shârâ‘î, Khatib al-Missâb, i, 106). According to al-
Mawardî, 185, the khatib ought preferably to wear black clothes, according to al-
Ghazâlî, white, while the first mentioned would be bida‘a (Ihya’i, Cairo 1322, 131 ff.). His insignia are al-
šâ‘înâ, the “two things of wood” i.e. the minbar and the staff or wooden sword which he has to hold in his hand during the sermon, according to the fihb books also. According to the law of 1911 applied to al-
Azhâr, art. 59, every one who has passed through the second of the three divisions of the institute can become a
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khafib. While in al-Azhar itself only one khatib is appointed (al-Zayyati, Ta'rikh al-Azhar, Cairo 1320, 209), there were in 1909 in the mosque of the Prophet in Medina 46, in Mecca 122 khafib, besides their deputies. They enjoy certain benefactions and the office is on the whole hereditary (al-Batanuni, al-Riha fi al-Hadisayia, Cairo 1329, 101, 242).

Beside the official khatib, the wa'fs exercised the function of an edifying preacher, when he pleased (cf. A. Mez, Die Renaissance des Islam, 1922, 318 ff.).


J. PEDERSEN

AL-KHATIB AL-BAGHDADI, ABU BAKR AHMAD B. 'ALI B. THABIT B. AHMAD B. MAHDI AL-SHAFII, known as AL-KHATIB AL-BAGHDADI, was born on 24th Dhu’l-Qaddûl 392/1005 May 1002 (Ta’rikh Baghhd, xi, 266) in Hanîkovan, a village in the neighbourhood of the Nahâr al-Malik below Baghhd (Saâdi, Wâfi, vii, 191; see M. Streck, Die alle Landschaft Babyloniens, Leiden 1900, i, 27). According to Ibn al-Nadîdjûr (see Y. al-Shâh, al-Ishsh al-Baghdadi, Damascus 1364/1945, 17) he was born in Ghuzyayya, a hamlet about half-way between Kîfva and Mecca. The son of the preacher (khafib [q.v.]) of Darâgînân, a large village on the west bank of the Tigris below Baghhd, he began his studies very early with his father and other sha'yâkhî (Ta’rikh Baghhd, xiv, 75-6; iv, 393; i, 351-2). Proceeding from the Kur’ân he occupied himself primarily with hadîth, a science which remained all his life the centre of his interest, even when he extended his learned studies to other branches of science, above all to fiqh, and also after he had become famous as preacher far beyond the walls of Baghhd. At the age of twenty, in the year in which he lost his father (ibid., xi, 359), he set out for Basra in search of hadîth, on which occasions he seems to have stayed also in Kîfva. Three years later, in 413/1024 (Yâkût, Uddâbî, i, 246), he set out on a second journey which brought him to the north and east as far as Nîshâpûr. On the way, either on the outward or the return journey, he collected further hadîth material in Rayy and Isfahân, whither his teacher from Baghhd al-Barkanî (Ta’rikh Baghhd, iv, 372-6) had given him a letter of introduction to Abû Nu’aym [q.v.] (preserved in Ibn ‘Asâkir, al-Ta’rikh al-kabîr, Damascus 1329/1922, i, 400; Yâkût, Uddâbî, i, 258 f.; cf. al-Dhahabi, Hujût, iii, 276; 3093), as well as in Hamadân and Dinawar. How long he remained en route is not known in detail; according to his own testimony (Ta’rikh Baghhd, iv, 374) he was back in Baghhd in 429/1038. In the following years his preaching secured him great fame and he became an authority in hadîth because of his profound erudition in this field. One of his biographers (al-Dhahabi, Hujût, iii, 317; 3141) says that preachers and teachers of tradition usually had to submit the traditions they had collected to his expert opinion before quoting them in their sermons and lectures. On the other hand, al-Khâtib seems to have suffered from the hostility of the Hanbalis, who were numerous and powerful in Baghhd at this period. After having been at first a Hanball himself like his father, his preference for the Shafi’i school—probably definite after a journey to Nîshâpûr (Ta’rikh Baghhd, iii, 197)—and his theological opinions, which were quite uncompromising in their Ash’arism, attracted to him the hatred of I mam Ahmad b. Hanbal’s pupils who were enemies of all bold theological speculation. In spite of the Hanball opposition and thanks to the protection of Caliph al-Kâ’îm and the vizier Ibn al-Muslima [q.v.], he succeeded in opening a course of lectures on hadîth in the al-Mansûr mosque (Yâkût, Uddâbî, i, 246 f.). Retaining a bitter resentment at the enmity shown to him, al-Khâtib seems never to have lost an opportunity in his lectures and writings of making malicious insinuations against Ahmad b. Hanbal and the Hanbalis and even of attacking them openly (cf. al-Ishsh, op. cit., 210-17). On that account, later generations accused him of ta’âsib (legal and theological bias) (Ibn al-Diwâzî, al-Miṣâ, a hamlet about 254 f.; al-Ishsh, op. cit., 92-119). His teaching activities brought him occasionally also to other Syrian towns like Sûr (Tyre), known to him from earlier journeys (R. Sellheim, Arabische Handelsmaterialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte, Wiesbaden 1974, i, 69-73, no. 20). A personal mishap enragcd suddenly the Shi’i circles in Damascus against him. Arrested by order of the Fâtimid governor, he had a narrow escape from execution only through the intercession of a distinguished Shi’i personality and by a precipitous flight to Sûr. Returning to Baghhd via Tarâbulus (Tripoli) and Aleppo after the Saldjûks had restored order there, al-Khâtib, the “Hâfiz of the east”, died in Baghhd on Monday 7 Dhu ’l-Hijjah 463/5 September 1071 (Ibn ‘Asâkir, op. cit., i, 401), in the same year as Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr [q.v.], the “Hâfiz of the west”. In the presence of a great crowd he was buried beside the tomb of the venerated Bishr al-Hâfî [q.v.].

Al-Khâtib’s fame is in general based on his biographical encyclopaedia of more than 7800 scholars and other personalities, among whom were also included women, connected with the cultural and political life of Baghhd. He seems to have corrected and completed it right up to the year he died (cf., e.g. Ta’rikh Baghhd, iii, 308, 336). It is known under the title Ta’rikh Baghhd and there is a printed edition in 14 volumes: Cairo, 1349/1931 (repr. Beirut 1969). Praiseworthy as al-Khâtib’s monumental work indeed is, it should not be overlooked that he intended to
produce with his biographical work a reference book for traditionists, through which chains of transmitters (imāda), relations between teachers and pupils, questions on the reliability of a hadith-scholar etc. can be ascertained, checked and established. The arrangement and contents of the biographies, set down in a not strictly alphabetical order, show also that a traditionist rather than a biographer has been at work. A look at the rest of al-Khātīb's extensive scientific production makes it clear that his works on hadith have made him the great critical systematiser of hadith methodology. In addition to Brockelmann, I, 401 and S I, 563 f., there are mentioned: al-Kifāya fi ma'rūf ʿuṣūl al-riwāya, on the ideal rāwī (transmitter) (printed Hyderabad 1357/1938, Cairo 1972; cf. al-Albānī, Fihrist makhfīdāt . . ., 268, no. 947; Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 185 f.); al-Dīdāmī l-ʾākhīs l-arāwī wa-dādāl al-ʾāmīs (al-Albānī, op. cit., 267, no. 938); Takhdī al-ʾāmīn, with the central question whether it is forbidden or permitted to determine traditions in writing (ed. by Y. al-ʿIṣbāḥ, Damascus 1949; on this see A. Ates, in Ilāhiyyat Fakūlles Fergisī [Ankara], i (1952), 91-103; ʿA. al-ʿAzzāwī, in MIMA, xviii (1953), 302-5; M. Weisweiler, in Oriens, viii (1954), 193-4; al-Sharāf ʿashūb al-ḥadīth, a work on the prominent signification of the traditionists (ed. by M. S. Ḥattūḥū, Ankara 1972; cf. al-ʿAzmī, op. cit., 268, no. 127; al-ʿIṣbāḥ, op. cit., 212, 219); al-Sābī wa ʾl-lābīsī, a biographical dictionary of traditionists (only in the Chester Beatty ms. 3508, dating from the 7th/13th century); al-Muʿtaṣimīs fī takmilat al-Muʿtaṣimīs wa ʾl-muḥāshellīs, on the correct spelling and pronunciation of resembling denominative verbs from ṣabīl, ḥaqqīt, ṣahāba, min nuwādir al-tashīf wa-dādāl al-ḡāfī, with a French translation by G. Salmon, L'Introduzione toponomastica a l'Historia di Bagdād, Paris 1971; O. Spies, in Isl. xvi (1970), 224 (= Brockelmann, I, 401, 61 f.); other manuscripts, e.g. Chester Beatty 4702, 4818; M. N. al-ʾAlbānī, Fihrist makhfīdāt dāl al-mawṣūla al-šāhīrīyya al-munawwīsāmīn makhfīdāt al-ḥadīths, Damascus 1390/1970, 266, no. 936, cf. 269, no. 935; al-Muḥāshellīs, abstracs and continuations see Brockelmann, i, 401, S I, 563 and G. Makdisi, Ibn ʾAqīl, Damascus 1963, 32 ff.; al-Khātīb's introductory chapter on toponomy (Ta’rīḫ Bagdād, i, 4-101) was published with a French translation by G. Salmon, L'Introduction toponomastique à l'Histoire de Bagdad, Paris 1904; the ḥaḍīths were compiled by Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Ḥammarī al-Maghribī, Muḥāṣṣa l-ṭarīqī tiḥādīth Ta’rīḫ Bagdād, Cairo, 1958; for further literature see Brockelmann, op. cit.; Munir ud-Din Ahmed, Muslim education and the scholars' social status up to the 8th century Muslim era in the light of Ta’rīḫ Bagdād, Ph.D. thesis, Hamburg 1968. (b) In addition to the works mentioned in the article: K. al-Qādī, al-ʿĀlam, Cairo 1954, i, 166; U. R. al-Qādī, Muḥāṣṣa l-ṭarīqī al-muṭalaʿīfīn, Damascus 1376/1957, ii, 3 f. (with the most detailed compilation of sources on al-Khātīb); M. A. Muḥarrar, Rihāyat al-ʿādāb, 2nd ed., Tabriz 1347/1969, ii, 144 f.; A. Bendine, L'I firada del Cehekh A'bud el-Qādir al-Fasā, in Actes du XIVe Congr. Intern. des Orient., Paris 1908, 344 ff., no. 144; F. Rosenblatt, A History of Muslim historiography, 2, Leiden 1968, index; F. Ṣezgin, GAS, Leiden 1967, i, index.

KHĀTĪB DIMĀSHK [see al-ʿAṣSIM].

KHAMT [see KHĀTAM].

KHATMA, KHITMA (a.), pl. khītām, the technical name for the recitation of the whole of the Qurʾān from beginning to end, the verbal noun from khyātama, denominative verb from khyāt, the complete recitation of the Qurʾān is, especially if it is done within a short time, a meritorious achievement, e.g. in eight nights, as Ubayy b. Ka'b is said to have done ( Ibn Sa'd, iii/2, 61; cf. on Ibn Ṣa'd, ibid., iii/2, 53). It is related of Sulaymān al-ʾAṣmāʾī
that he accomplished the khatma at times according to Ibn Mas'ūd. For a dead man, the reciters were asked to recite the Surah al-Khatamāt (i.e. in the 1001 Nights in the story of the merchant Ayyūb and his son). In Egypt the khatma was used as an entertainment for guests. In modern Mecca the so-called thikāt, now called ṭamīrīd at al-khatamāt, was asked to recite the reading of Ibn Mas'ūd. In South Arabia a khdām is presented to one who has recited the Kūrān. It is presented to one who has recited the sacred text of the Kūrān, subsequently down the sacred text of the Kūrān, subsequently is presented to one who has recited the sacred text of the Kūrān, subsequently.

The Arabic writing used, according to tradition, even as early as the lifetime of Muḥammad, for setting down the sacred text of the Kurān, subsequently underwent a diffusion corresponding to the expansion of the Islamic faith and to the development of the Islamic civilisation in which it came to full fruition. A script of alphabetic and phonological type, belonging to the vast family of Semitic scripts, it showed in this capacity the characteristics of a consonantal script, with vocalisation signs added in the form of accents, and thus belongs to the category of scripts of which "the orthography always comprises an element of interpretation by the reader, an ideographic element" (M. Cohen). Its conditions of use and development were therefore determined by its association with the language with which it was required to express, in terms of social facts to which we shall have to return, for the Arabic language became very quickly a major academic and literary language, while experiencing here and there diversifications of articulation and pronunciation which belonged to the sphere of colloquial usage and were consequently ignored at the level of orthography. This very individual script was also applied to other languages where the conditions thereby created do not prevail. On the other hand, in the evolution of Arabic script, the shapes of the letters themselves underwent changes in appearance which were not only linked to the rare attempts at orthographic adaption imposed by the cultural milieu, but were also determined by other influences, technical, aesthetic and psychological, within Arabo-Islamic society during its evolution in the course of the centuries, not the least of these influences being the assimilation of graphic writing to an art-form.

It would be impossible here to make a proper study of either the nature or the evolution of Arabic writing in its many different manifestations, while taking into account the principal studies dealing the subject, without some preliminary and indispensable remarks, regarding both its scope and its propagation. These remarks can only be brief and inconclusive, because the perspective has been insufficiently pursued to this day: it appears in fact more to the curiosity of the historian and the sociologist than to that of the specialists who have hitherto interested themselves in decipherment or in stylistic analysis of Arabic writings. It nevertheless opens up directions of research which can only prove to be fruitful, inviting us to consider, behind the simple observation of palaeographic facts, the meaning and the value of the evidence carried by the documents themselves. Here we encounter some of the questions of a general order which have been posed by the linguist Marcel Cohen when he has reflected on the conditions of birth, expansion and transference of different types of script, and has been obliged to envisage them in the terms of the axioms affirming that "the use of the script is a function of its utility in a given society" (see La grande invention de l'écriture et son évolution, Paris 1956, passim).

The first point to be underlined in this sense is, without doubt, the incomparable prestige which has constantly been enjoyed, in the world of Islam, by an Arabic script borne, it could be said, by the expansion-movement of the religion with which it had been associated from the beginning. As the instrument of materialisation and transmission of a message identified with the Divine Word, this script permitted, among the members of the first Muslim community, the precise conservation of the letter of the revelation and, thus facilitating its study as well as its memorisation, obtained a sort of "sacred character". The reality of this "consecration" as confirmed by the textual Arabic sources; the data regarding this subject, found in the Kūrān itself and the hadīth, also in personal opinions of various authors, deserve a more extensive and systematic exploration than has been undertaken hitherto (see, for example, the attempt made by F. Rosenthal, Significances des scrits arabes. Sauf la véritable écriture, in Ars Orientalis, iv (1961), 15-23; cf. idem, Abū Haiyān al-Tawhidi, on ponmansī, in Ars Islamica, xiii-xiv (1948), 1-30).

At the same time, the Arabic alphabet benefited in its diffusion outside Arabia, from the rapid propagation of Arabic as a liturgical and cultural language of the Arabo-Islamic empire, itself constituted shortly after the conquest to which Muhammad had given the first impulse and which followed almost immediately upon his death. The various usages, profane as well as religious, for which the Arabic script was henceforward adopted, conferred upon it a considerable expansion in its territorial scope: not only did it take the place of local scripts previously employed, in the same way that Arabic was to some extent substituted for the autochthonous languages temporarily reduced to an inferior role; but it was also offered to all Muslims, by means of the teaching of the Kūrān, first written and read in Arabic, as the means of graphic representation of various non-Arab languages, those which continued to be employed or which were gradually revived, in various provinces of this rapidly-fragmented empire, or even those which were introduced, in differing circumstances, by new ethnic elements, but which all encountered, in the course of the centuries, a preferential treatment linked to the development of states and of national feelings. Thus the Arabic script became the script of Iranian languages (such as Persian and Pashto or Afghān) or Turkish languages (such as the Qırımān Turkish of the Ottoman Empire and other Turkish dialects then current in Adharbaydjan, in the Caucasus, in Turkestan and as far away as China) languages of the Indian (the Urdu variety of Hindustani) and Malayan peninsulas (the ancient script of Malay, as well as languages belonging to Madagascar and the Comoro islands), languages of North Africa (Berber), of mediaeval Spain (literature of the al ja'ma [q.v.]), of Slavonic Europe (the Croat language, for example), and of Black Africa (languages of the Bantu family, such as Swahili, or Sudanese languages, such as Hausa, Peul and Kanouri from the Chad region). At the same time, it was the object of other episodic usages (for more precise details and essential bibliography, see M. Cohen, Grande invention, 184-6, and doc. 199-11).
It would thus not only appear difficult to distinguish formally from the Arabic script the various scripts of the Islamic domain which borrowed its alphabet, but it is even more difficult to draw with precision, over the course of the centuries, the contours of the geographical area marked by its usage. The historical mutations of the Muslim world, losing some of its provinces, making gains in other directions and attaining its actual limits by the device of proselytism and peaceful conversion, provoked constant modifications in the parallel developments of a language, a religion and a script, whose contour-lines did not necessarily coincide. There were of course some absolute regressions on the part of Islam and of Arabic speaking (the reconquests of Spain and of Sicily, for example), resulting in a similar abandonment of Arabic graphisms, except in the case of ornamental inscriptions; but there were also cases where the spoken Arabic language declined, ceasing to cope adequately with the administrative or literary requirements, but the Arabic script survived, linked to the maintenance of the academic Arabic languages in circles still Islamised. Also, there were cases of Islamic gains, at once territorial and demographic, especially notable in South-East Asia and Black Africa, which resulted in an expansion of Arabic graphisms surpassing that of the language to which it corresponded with that of the Muslim faith itself; on the other hand, areas Islamised in ancient times, where Arabic retained its prestige as a religious language, have seen in modern times a decline in the use of the Arabic script, as decisions have been taken favouring the phonetic notation of, for example, Turkish, Malay, Malagasy or African languages into the Latin, and sometimes the Cyrillic alphabet.

The consequences of these various phenomena of replacement, or on the contrary, of adoption, of the Arabic script cannot be evaluated quantitatively in a precise manner, any more than can the effects of the recent tendency to an increased utilisation of this script, in the Arab countries, for the practical reasons of the proliferation of documentary material and especially of the progress of education and the spread of literacy, familiarising the vast masses of the population with the alphabet.

This progress at least seems clear-cut, and the crystallisation of sentiments linked to a new consciousness of Arabism and of its cultural patrimony even today reinforces the vogue and the universality of a script which has never ceased to transcend, as a mode of symbolic expression, the frontiers of the Arabic-speaking world. We know in fact to what extent its characters, privileged symbols of a true politico-religious unity, were able, by emotional as well as practical means, to impress upon the minds of Muslims of every race and every country that recognised them, from the classical period of Islam onwards, their superior and incontestable artistic worth. In that period, in fact, when the triumphant society which had adopted the Arabic characters used them for utilitarian ends (arches, historical inscriptions, coinage, that of all kinds derived purposes (copies of the Qur'ān, pious inscriptions, religious texts), the script was tending through its use in these media towards a high degree of aesthetic and decorative accomplishment in accordance with certain rules of formal beauty, as well as with the exigencies of literal meaning. The practice of writing Arabic was from that time onward an art, as well as a science, reserved for initiates. All the same, the experts in calligraphy were judged worthy, and this has remained the general rule in every Muslim society, to attain to the double distinction of artist and respected sage, acceding sometimes to the rank of masters of the "science of letters" (see hurof), itself a branch of the divinatory science of ḍiyār (q.v.) and an instrument of a talismanic art linked to certain aspects of mystical speculation.

This exceptional situation regarding the Arabic script over the centuries, in a particularly vast world where the "thing written" was at once admired and preserved, is insufficient alone to explain the abundance and the variety of documents on which today all knowledge of the forms belonging to this script, and their history, must rely. Developments of another order must also be invoked, among them one factor which in its way considerably influenced the development of Arabic civilisation, viz. the widespread manufacture of paper in the lands of Islam from the 9th/10th century onward (see kaghd). The expansion of this industry, which was not without effect in the sphere of economic exchanges and the transmission of sciences, facilitated the manifestations of the art of writing in providing the most convenient medium, with the smoothness of its surface and its lightness, a medium that was durable and not too costly. Sheets of paper of various formats, which could be carried, rolled up, folded and sealed, thus supplied the indispensable material for innumerable letters and archives, the latter sometimes enriched with artistic and illuminated signatures, which came to supersede the rare and costly specimens previously represented by pieces of tanned skin or parchment (see dild) as well as by papyri (see kirtas). Their use permitted hand-written books, preserving in Arabic the texts of literary or academic works so that they proliferated at such a rate that the profession of copyist-cum-book-seller became, in the mediaeval Islamic cities, a profitable occupation in the context of the growth in popularity of "reading-rooms" and of private libraries (see mizana). It was not only intellectual life that gained a fortunate boost; but from that time on, the educated Muslim became a indefatigable writer, recording the oral tradition of his masters through the medium of the written word, never hesitating to comment upon or summarise, pen in hand, his own works as well as those of his predecessors, from whom he gladly reproduced extracts and quotations.

In the same line are the effects of another technical invention, which came much later to the Islamic world, that of printing with movable characters. From its expansion in the Near East in the second half of the 19th century—four centuries after its invention and diffusion in western Europe (although impressions on blocks of wood had made their appearance in the 'Abbāsid period, in the 4th/10th century for the reproduction of prayers in Arabic and of talismanic formulas; cf. M. Cohen, Grande invention pl. 53)—dates a new transformation in the conditions of usage of Arabic writing, which have recently been further aided by the advent of typing and other industrial processes. The phenomenon, interesting to consider in itself, could have resulted in a radical normalisation of Arabic writing, an undertaking which is still recommended in some quarters today in the form of various projects for the improvement or even the replacement of the traditional alphabet. In fact, it resulted only in the hardening of some types of usage, halting, in favour of the most widespread cursive, that is the "oriental" cursive, the evolution of signs which have preserved to this day in printed texts the features of a hand-written script.
We must return to the various functions supplied by Arabic writing in the mediaeval world in order to understand the abundance of stylistic varieties which corresponded, in spite of its constant orthography, to successive or concomitant stages of its development in the course of the centuries.

The writing practised by government scribes in their compilation of archives or their official documents could not be the same as that of calligraphers working to satisfy the taste for luxury of some patron, nor that of pious people copying the texts of the Kurān, nor that of scholars making rough drafts or taking down speeches and discussions as dictation, nor that of merchants writing private letters and statements of account, nor that of makers of amulets and magical diagrams, for example. The greater or lesser degree of legibility required in each case—which it was a case of documents intended to be widely read or appreciated solely from an artistic angle, or designs of limited, technical and sometimes even esoteric usage—intervened to modify the types of letters used; thus certain types of script reserved for certain uses are differentiated, scripts of diplomacy or of business accounts, for example, but also artistic scripts illustrated by inscriptions on objects of common usage, such as the illegible anthropomorphic script on letter seals, or precious objects of inlaid metal, are disguised as the gesticulations of small figures (see on this subject, D.S. Rice, The Wade Cup in the Cleveland Museum of Art, Paris 1954, 22-33), or on the contrary, the rigid and simple “kūfī” or “astronomical” scripts used particularly for the figures and other markings born by astrolabes (see for example, M. Destombes, Les chiffres coufiques des inscriptions astronomiques arabes, in Physisc, ii (1960), 197-210).

Other types may have been given shape by the influence of the many different regional milieux and national temperaments which coexisted in the world of Islam and whose heritages it is difficult to define with certainty. Even if our remarks on this subject may be connected with reflections concerning other families of scripts (see the collective work devoted to L'écriture et la psychologie des chiffres coufiques des instruments astronomiques, Paris 1967, completed by the more recent commentaries supplied by J. Sadan, Encore du nouveau sur scribes et copistes, in REI, xiv (1975). But we should not at the same time forget the influence exerted by the utilisation of different techniques, which were prevalent both for monumental and furniture inscriptions and could range from incision and sculpture in champlevé, in stone and stucco, to painting on plaster or pottery, to carving on metal, to inscriptions in relief or to the complex construction of mosaics with cubes of glass and especially, with fragments of brick and ceramic.

Actual fact does not allow us to establish, as has sometimes been suggested, that there are two separate categories of Arabic characters, one represented by epigraphic documents of every genre and the other by manuscript texts. It is known, in fact, that the eminent calligraphers often provided, by setting them down on paper, the models for inscriptions subsequently executed in every other manner and that a trait peculiar to the artisans of the mediaeval Muslim world was that they loved to prove their virtuosity by transposing, from one material to another, and from painting to sculpture, or from metal to ceramic, or conversely, worked. It seems, on the other hand, that the supple involutions of rounded letters, sometimes credited solely to the talent of the copyist, are found from the 6th/12th century onward in monumental inscriptions and that there is, on the other hand, no shortage of ancient manuscript having recourse to the angular characters incorrectly described as “lapidary”. But in any case, it must be admitted that the nature of the technique practised is often sufficient to explain the variations, at the same time multiple and concurrent, without being of exactly simultaneous usage, that are to be found among inscribed compositions, of the same date and of the same origin, established on different material bases. There is no doubt that here we find the determining cause of much in the way of subsequent stylistic ramifications, of which the birth would otherwise appear fortuitous.
Here should be added the effects of choices which are more difficult to discern in their motivations, for they were linked with the very attitude of mediaeval Muslim society to artistic invention, to its taste for the repetition of formulas and the conventions of workshops, to its admiration for redundancy and sumptuousness which developed under the aegis of patrons motivated as much by love of ostentation as by concern for their own glory, and which gave rise to the refinement of sumptuous manuscripts which multiplied in the same way as that of monumental and movable epigraphs. These last factors in the differentiation of shapes acted, however, without going against the spirit of conservatism which marked Arabic writing on the level of orthography and which held to a great extent to the spirit of an Arabo-Islamic civilization conscious of its superiority, at the same time reserving to a small elite the monopoly of a written communication of limited accessibility and destined to remain thus.

For all these various reasons (more extensively developed by J. Sourdil-Thomine, *The development of Arabic script*, in *Cambridge History of Arabic Literature*, i, ch. i), the Arabic script was abundantly used in an Islamic milieu over the course of the centuries, and innumerable documents bear witness to it. Such wealth excites admiration, but it also explains the difficulties always encountered by those wishing to study it methodically: the world of Arabic palaeography remains that of scattered and unevenly accomplished exploratory studies, where general surveys of sufficient completeness are lacking. On the one hand we shall stress the defects of patons motivated as much by love of ostentation and sumptuousness which developed under the aegis of patrons, and on the other hand we shall indicate the deficiency, we shall content ourselves here with a summary of the first efforts devoted to the study of the preceding account, replies to certain aspects of the problem (thus M. Minovi and S. al-Djaburi, *Dirasat fi ta'rikh al-khatt al-'arabi*, Beirut 1972, or to both of these at once (S. Y. Rice, *The unique Ibn al-Bawwab manuscript in the Chester Beatty Library*, Dublin 1955). Here there are only to be found provisional elements and incomplete syntheses upon groups of graphical variations which seem, by their very volume, to have dampened the enthusiasm of the specialists, who, although a list of their works might give the impression that each of these subjects was covered at length, have never dealt with more than a small part of an immense and still partially unknown field.

As the science of studying Arabic graphisms, which figures among the modern disciplines of orientalism but remains a science in its infancy, Arabic palaeography has not yet given birth to a single manual or introductory work other than one major publication, which after many years of planning remains incomplete. The idea for this work first occurred to Adolf Grohmann when he attended the lectures given on this subject by Josef von Karabacek in 1910 and 1912 at the University of Vienna. Only two volumes have appeared to this date (A. Grohmann, *Arabische Paläographie*, Teil i, Vienna 1967; Teil ii, Vienna 1971), which there is little hope of ever seeing completed. The historical summary of the first efforts devoted to the study of Arabic writing, first in the Islamic world (i, 4-32), then among a growing group of western orientalists from the beginning of the 17th century to the present day (i, 32-65) is followed, after remarks bearing on materials of writing (*Die Schriftenstofte*, ii, 66-131) only by analyses concerning the topics of script defined by the author as "lapidary" (*Das Schriftenstücke*, ii, 3-290), types whose study is certainly of vital importance, but whose various aspects are not sufficient to characterize the evolution of Arabic writing in its entirety.

There is also the survey, meticulous but of limited scope, compiled by B. Moritz in 1910 in the first edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* [v. ARABIA]. Other similarly hasty surveys followed, which attempted not to place Arabic writing among the various systems known of notation of language signs (thus M. Cohen, *Grande invention*, esp. 181-6, 234-8, and 328-30, where the previous works are mentioned and remarks of a methodological order made; see also J. Sourdil-Thomine, *L'écriture arabe et son évolution ornementale*, M. Rodinson, *Le monde islamique et l'extension de l'écriture arabe, in L'écriture et la psychologie des peuples*, 249-61, 263-77; and D. Divinger, *The alphabet, a key to the history of mankind*, London and New York 1968, i, 210-13), or which attempted to place it before a more extensive public by increasing the number of illustrations (thus E. Kühnel, *Islamische Schriftkunde*, N. Abboud, *Arabic palaeography in Art Islamique*, viii (1941), 67-104, which combined with a critical study of the preceding account, replies to certain positions adopted by A. Jeffery on the possibilities of identification of ancient Arabic scripts). Finally, there have been others who have confined themselves, either to geographical areas (for example O. Houadis, *Essai sur l'écriture maghrébine*, in *Nouveau mélanges orientaux*, 1886, 85-172, or to a period or to such-and-such a series of specimens and the information they provide.

In the absence of any means of ameliorating this deficiency, we shall content ourselves here with presenting a provisional survey of the results obtained. On the one hand we shall stress the defects in orientation of the scanty working-material that exists, and on the other hand we shall indicate the principal opportunities that present themselves for tackling this vast question, pursuing a double approach: bringing out on the one hand the specific traits of the Arabic script of sumptuous manuscripts of ambitious titles, of which the most important are those occurring in the preceding account, and the present day for the consistency of its system of transcription, whilst drawing attention on the other hand to important chronological phases discernible in the evolution of its shapes. Furthermore, it should never be forgotten that in addition to these major stages, there were secondary phases, linked together, following one another in succession or on the contrary overlapping, in a somewhat anarchic process of development, according to the changing modalities of usage and the great artistic flowering to which allusion has been made above.
London 1875-83; B. Moritz, Arabic palaeography, Cairo 1905; E. Tisserant, Specimens codicum orientalium, Bonn 1914; A. J. Arberry, Specimens of Arabic and Persian palaeography, London 1939; G. Vajda, Album de paléographie arabe, Paris 1955; S. al-Munadjidji, *İl-İlāb* ve *İl-İkhtiyarat*, i, i. al-Namâdji, Cairo 1960; and to which may be added collections of exercises in decipherment conceived at any early date (such as M. Bresniers, Eléments de calligraphie orientale, Algiers-Paris 1855, or L. Cheikh, Spéci-mens de écritures arables pour la lecture des manuscris anciens et modernes, Beirut 1885 and 1895).

In fact a search has to be made in works belonging to disciplines other than palaeography, in the narrow sense of the term, in order to find some of the most positive results regarding the study of Arab characters. Thus we may mention the important data obtained concerning the writing of the first centuries, through the progress of the science of papyrology. To the conclusions, today considered obsolete, reached by a Silvestre de Sacy and forming the basis for subsequent researches (as in his Noveaux apéritifs sur l'histoire de l'écriture des Arabes du Hâdjaz, in *JA*, s. (1827), 209-31), there have succeeded publications by a Grohmann, starting from the experience of Adolf Grohmann or of N. Abbott, as well as several other specialists (see on this subject the synthesis-data in A. Grohmann, *From the world of Arabic papyri*, Cairo 1952, esp. 69-93, and Einb. Jüdischer Texte, in *Einführung und Christentum des arabischen Papyrakunde*, i, Prague 1955, esp. 88-103; cf. *Arabisch Papyrakunde*, in *Handschrift der Orientalistik*, i/s, Leiden-Cologne 1966). These permit appreciation of the true value of such texts, difficult to decipher from equally identifiable mint centres and bearing inscriptions composed invariably in carefully executed scripts. These types of information have sel-dom been collated as they deserve, though mention should be made of the first results in this field, contained either in catalogues compiled according to modern rules (see the table of letter-forms set out by J. Walker, *A catalogue of the Arab-Byzantine and Post-Form Reconstructions*, London 1956, p. cii), or in specialised *Corpus* essays (see for example, the remarks of a palaeographic order contained in G. C. Miles, *Early Arabic glass weights and stamps*, New York 1948, 29).

Studies which have proved particularly fruitful, from the viewpoint of palaeography, are the works devoted by epigraphists to this decorative aspect of Arab inscriptions and to the ornamental distortions of their characters, which constitute one of the most significant features. Not only has the sys-tem inaugurated by Samuel Flury concerning certain artistic schools locatable in time as in space (see for example, his *Islamische Schriftstil*, Amida-Diyanet X1, Jahrhundert, Basel-Paris 1920; idem, *Le décor épigraphique des monuments de Ghazna*, in *Syria*, vi (1925), 60-90; idem, *Le décor épigraphique des monuments fatimid du Caire*, in *Syria*, xxvii (1936), 505-76; and *Ornamental Kufic inscriptions on pottery*, in *Melanges L. Masson*), iii, Damascus 1957, 301-17, and *Le style des inscriptions arabo-siciliennes à l'époque des rois normands*, in *Études d'orientalisme dédiées à Lévi-Provençal*, i, Paris 1962, 307-15; M. Ocaña Jiménez, *El cufico hispano y su evolución*, Madrid 1970), but a similar method has been applied to the study of inscriptions on movable objects (L. Volov-Golombek, *Plaïted Kufic on Samanid epigraphic pottery*, in *Ars Islamica*, vi (1966), 107-23). Then the procedure used for precise cases has also on occasion received particular attention (thus J. Sourdrel-Thomine, *Quelques réflexions sur l'écriture des premières stèles arabes du Caire*, in *Annales asiatiques*, xi (1972), 23-35). Elsewhere, observations of this type have been collected and linked together in an ambitious treatment, such as that which was attempted by Adolf Grohmann, starting from a truly encyclopaedic knowledge of the question, but in a manner too diffuse to allow a clear perspective of the evolution of the whole phenomenon (see A. Grohmann, *Arabische Paläographie*, ii, cited above, of which the plan of research has been announced by the author in *The origin and early development of floreted Kufic*, in *Ars Orientalis*, ii, (1957), 183-213).

Finally, the studies brought to fruition more specifically under the disciplines of codicology, the science of manuscripts and their dating, utilising with profit the examination of their various external characteristics, must in their turn not be forgotten, even if they are still far from attaining a degree of scientific precision sufficient to bring to palaeography the elements of certainty that might be expected. There is, in fact, a contrast between the minute care taken by these users and collectors of every copy of an Arabic text to add to it notes supplying its history, on the one hand, and the in-sufficient use, on the other hand, made of these notes in modern times to establish the dating of these copies and, thereby, the classification and verifica-tion of their scripts.

Certainly, the details recorded in modern cata-logues, details supplied by the title pages or the final pages of manuscripts and enabling us to dating them by means of their colophons as well as by the various marks of ownership, certificates of donation such as *wādk*s (*q.v.*), seals, reading marks and certificates of audition that they contain, have served as points of reference, in the case where they have been noted: introductions to critical editions of good quality, presentations of collections, studies bearing on the conditions of transmission of incipits, texts, announcements of discoveries shedding new light on opinions previously held (see for example, J. Schacht, *Sur quelques manuscrits de la bibliothèque de la mosquée d'al-Qarawiyyin à Fès*, in *Melanges Lévi-Provençal*, Paris 1962, 271-84, or S. M. Stern, *A Manuscript from the library of the Ghaznavid Amir 'Abd al-Rashid*, in *Paintings from Islamic lands*, *Oriental Studies* no. 4, Oxford 1969).*

Nor has use ever been made for purposes of system-atic classification nor of description of series of manuscripts belonging to such-and-such a type of
especially for the series of new hypotheses subsequently expressed by N. Abbott (The rise of the North Arabic script and its Kur'anic development, Chicago 1939), A. Jeffery (review in The Moslem World, xxx (1940), 191-8), R. Blachère (Introduction au Coran, Paris 1947, 83-9), and G. Levi Della Vida (Frammenti coranici in carattere cufico nella Biblioteca Vaticana, Vatican 1947), without forgetting the very illuminating note by A. Grohmann (The problem of dating early Qur'ans, in Litt., xxxii (1958), 213-31) taking the discovery of a new fragment of the Kur'ân on papyrus as a basis for proposing the attribution to the 1st/7th century copies of the style previously called bidâjî.

Certainly, the conclusions reached till now, especially concerning the calligraphic material in ornamental "kufic" known as "lapidary", remain fragile and imprecise. There is no scientifically defensible position other than to suspend in this regard all judgement until there have been made, with the most minute observations of detail, regroupings by families, which comparisons and careful indexing will perhaps enable us to apportion chronologically and geographically. There is no guarantee even that the points of reference established then will not appear to be deceptive in regard to the work of research and analysis which will have to be done and which would have to take account of extensive collections not yet inventoried like that of the Damascus Kur'âns of Istanbul (cf. J. Sourdel-Thomine and D. Sourdel, Nouveaux documents). But, in spite of these reservations, the several working hypotheses already adopted, according to which were recently classified in an approximative manner the 164 exhibits of a remarkable exhibition of Kur'âns of all kinds (see M. Lings and Y. H. Safadi, The Qur'ân. Catalogue of an exhibition of Qur'ân manuscripts at the British Library, 3 April — 15 August 1976), prove themselves to be indispensable in enabling the reconstruction, by means of Kur'ânic scripts alone, of the history of Arabic manuscript writing and its enrichment through elaboration of forms and the introduction of illuminations sometimes foreign to the shapes of the letters.

Beside these various scientific considerations, there are furthermore the data supplied by the ancient textual sources which have for a long time served as a basis for the reflections of the specialists and which should not be neglected. Even if most often they do no more than repeat one another and thereby ensure the permanence, to the modern milieux of calligraphers, of notions which were enunciated by the authors of the mediaeval period and which seem to have been subsequently perpetuated without being always fully understood, they show the interest felt by an erudite traditional society in the writing which it used, and they reflect in this sense the fruits of an instructive and solid experiment.

Certainly, the ideas which to this day have been extracted and expressed in western surveys correspond to a view of the problems at once formal and incomplete. What has been largely extracted from them is either the names of famous scribes considered to be the heads of schools and presented in the course of accounts of an anecdotal character, or enunciation of rules of calligraphy remaining obscure in the absence of an adequate terminology, or lists of technical terms, especially those which were in use to designate the styles of writing which scholars were content to enumerate. Even when an approach has been made on a more critical level, and attempts
made to determine the exact bearing of the terms adopted, to this day it is rare for sure conclusions to be reached. Whence arise the discussions which are still pursued among modern authors; and whence should be reached. Whence arise the discussions which are certain divergencies of interpretation concerning the adopted, to this day it is rare for sure conclusions to be reached. When the chronological indications developed in this manner have permitted them to determine, from Ibn Mūkla (273-328/886-940) to Ibn al-Bawwāb (d. 418/1022 or 432/1042) and to Yāḥyāt al-Mustaʿsim (640-58/1242-58) the most logically-supposed phases of a progression towards the elegance and suppleness which characterised, over the centuries, the evolution of the Arabic writing practised by scribes and copyists.

Such are the works on which at present our knowledge of the history of Arabic writing rests. The provisional assessments which may be drawn from them can conveniently be grouped under a small number of rubrics.

The first of these rubrics concerns the archaic Arabic writing which is seen to appear in the 1st/7th century and the importance of which rests on two fundamental features: the coherence, on the one hand, of its system of consonantal notation based on the existence of an alphabet, defective perhaps but already well established; and on the other hand, the normative quality accorded to it from that time, which was to enable its form to be maintained under the most elaborate of later graphical variations.

This archaic or primitive Arabic writing was employed in Arabia at the very beginning of Islam, from the lifetime of Muhammad and during the caliphates of his immediate successors. The most ancient sources of evidence other than literary at our disposal are firstly, rare and uncertain: fragments of undated copies of the Kurʾānic text or letters of Muḥammad on parchment of which the authenticity has not yet been firmly demonstrated. Subsequently, some inscriptions are found on coinages of the type known as Arabo-Sasanid or Arabo-Byzantine, and of greater importance are various lapidary remains, notably an epitaph from 31/652 preserved on a stele in the Cairo museum, of which the alphabet has already been extensively studied, and a historical inscription from 58/677-8 in the name of Muʿāwiya found in Arabia near al-Ṭāʾif on a dam out in the countryside. These texts permit a clear knowledge of the crude forms, so simple in fact as later to cause confusion, of the seventeen characters which constitute its alphabet, eighteen if we are to include the double letter ʾām-ʾalif, still more counting the variations imposed on the isolated, initial, medial or final letters, put forward by the grammarians, from the 2nd/8th century, according to an original scheme taking account both of their appearance and of their phonetic characteristics. The shapes thus used had been inherited from earlier Semitic scripts, but according to a line of descent which cannot easily be established. They required in any case an orthography which was the object of some later improvements, by the addition of supplementary signs, but which always demanded a reading of the Arabic based on the recognition of the words themselves and thus permitted only to trained scholars to do this.

This orthography was first based on the small number of signs adopted to designate the twenty-eight phonemes of the Arabic language, twenty-five consonants and three semi-vowels, without counting the long vowels ā, ī, ʾā, corresponding to the three vocalic tones of classical Arabic, and the short vowels which, in a Semitic language are generally considered as foreign to the "skeleton of the word" but which require no less a special system of notation, which became evident, according to the textual sources, before the end of the 1st/9th century, the sign having been assigned to two or three phonemes, these were subsequently differentiated by the
adjunction, above or below the line, of one, two or three of those diacritical points which have been preserved to this day and to which was added also a special sign, the ḍāddā or taḥdīdī, to mark the doubling of a consonant. Thus it became possible to distinguish letters such as bāʾ, tāʾ, thāʾ, nūn and yāʾ, in their initial and medial forms, or hāʾ, kāʾ and ḍīm, dāʾ and ḍādī, rāʾ and sīn, sād and ẓād, lāʾ and rāʾ, ʿayn and ḍhyn as well as fāʾ and kāf. The introduction of this practice, which in general may be seen as the initiation of a process put into practice by Syriac writing, cannot be dated with certainty, especially as the pointing appeared to be more or less necessary according the difficulty of the words transcribed and according to the more or less hieratic and stylised character required for the writing; but the example supplied by the inscription of Muʿāwiya mentioned above would seem to prove that its use in moderation, in the form elsewhere of little oblique strokes rather then points, dates back to the same antiquity as the use of the Arabic alphabet in the ancient Muslim era. Then, later in the same century, appeared special signs for vowels.

As for the shapes themselves, we should emphasise not only the simplicity of the contours and the irregularity of proportions, but also the abundant use made of ligatures, which joined the letters between themselves in the interior of the words, so as to give the illusion of a continuous line in which the letters were placed. This fact would seem to prove that the Arabic script derives from a "well-worn" script in which characters already degenerate were preferred to facilitate the joining of cursive script; but the question remains open as to where or when this degeneration took place, and the reasons drawn from the vast family of Aramaean writings which was formerly spread over the entire Near East.

The question of origins, for which the basic documentation continues to be limited to the rare inscriptions known as "Proto-Arabic", has excited a number of theories from the statements of Bernhard Moritz, re-examined by Nabia Abbott, to the recent hypothesis of J. Starcky (see on this subject J. A. Sourdel-Thomine, Les origines de l'écriture arabe à propos d'une hypothèse récente, in REJ, xxxiv (1960), 153-7; cf. on the same point the reservations of A. Grohmann, Arabische Paläographie, ii, 7-33), but to this day the question cannot be considered settled. The ancient Arabic sources, which attribute the invention of the Arabic script to persons of legendary nature, presented, according to the accounts in question, in different contexts, are on this point of very little help: they content themselves with affirming that the script was in use in the Arab kingdom of the Syria-Mesopotamia region as well as in Mecca in the 6th century A.D. On the other hand, the researches of modern scholars have as yet produced only controversial approximations. The opinion which has prevailed for more than fifty years would have it that there was a progressive transformation, in Arabic characters, of the symbols used, several centuries earlier, by the Nabataeans of the kingdom of Petra. The petitio principii on which this opinion rests and which consists in assimilating to the inscriptions known as "Proto-Arabic" the "Nabataean-Arabic" inscription of al-Namārā, quite different in appearance and two centuries earlier, has recently been vigorously opposed by specialist scholars of Nabataean who deny the existence, in its cursive forms, of the least resemblance to the future Arabic forms. These same specialists insist on the total hiatus that would in fact exist, as regards writing, between the distant period of the zenith of the Nabataean kingdom, in the 1st/2nd century A.D., and the birth, in the 1st/7th century, of the Islamic state whose development ensured that of Arabic writing. So there arises for them the necessity to search out the prototypes of the Arabic characters in the symbols which served for the notation of other languages used, between the 3rd and the 6th centuries A.D., in the pre-Islamic Near East, especially in the Christian Arab kingdoms of Lower Mesopotamia, around the famous intellectual centre of al-Hira [q.v.]. These symbols are not known to us today through any relics, but there remains as a clue the fact that the archaic Arabic script, this "linked cursive with reduced bodies for letters", as it has been strikingly defined, obeys the same principles as the Syriac script, of which some varieties no longer in use could well have been in practice in al-Hira and in its surroundings.

Distinguished from archaic Arabic writing by its concern for equilibrium and regularity—this will be the second rubric—is "the imperial script" of the following period, which deserves the dynastic title of Umayyad. While remaining faithful to the preceding orthographic system, eventually improved in copies of the Kūrān by the notation of short vowels, in the most anciently attested form, that of red dots, this script was in fact modelled, from a stylistic point of view, by the taste of the sovereigns who distinguished themselves in this sense by various innovations. Such was the official decision of the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik imposing the use of Arabic on the scribes of the central as well as of the provincial administration, and ordering the composition in that language of the coinage, which represented henceforth a new type, without any décor other than calligraphic. One notes that from his reign date the first specimens of Arabic writing worthy of comparison with Greek inscriptions previous to the conquest, and it is no accident that these specimens are found on milestones, themselves erected according to ancient usages. It subsequently fell to the lot of the successors of ʿAbd al-Malik to leave on the walls of the first monument of Islam, the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, an epigraphic band of hitherto unequalled importance.

Thus there rapidly came to be felt in full force the effects of a quest for equilibrium imposing on the various letters of the alphabet a stricter form, and permitting their classification into three series based on simple geometric schemes: tail and straight letters producing, above the base line, perpendicular or oblique strokes of variable dimensions; those which develop, on the level of this central axis or slightly above it, loops formed like little circles or like quadrangular figures of variable dimensions; and those finally which exhibit, still in a timid manner, below this same axis, curves which are more or less open and generally treated as simple fragments of almost perfect circumferences. These results had been obtained by the vertical elongation of the alif, the horizontal extension of the dāl and especially of the āʾāʾ or the kāf, the harmonisation of the shape of the letters with loops, the extension of the terminal curves of the rāʾ and especially of the kāf or of the final nūn, the eventual turning towards the right of the termination of the final yāʾ. The same shapes could be inscribed in a rigid manner on stone or rough parchment, for texts slowly copied and intended to last on account of their religious or historical value (manuscripts of the Kūrān or
royal inscriptions, for example), or on the contrary copied more casually, with rounding and modification of forms, when it was a question of less important texts and of private or even official letters, and written with light pens on the uniform and smooth surface of sheets of papyrus.

Differences in treatment thus began to engender observable graphical variations, without, however, permitting a distinction at that stage between a dignified and a cursive script, marked solely by the requirements of legibility and speed, and a more dignified script aimed purely at the requirements of art or of prestige. These differences none the less indicate the two directions which were soon to be followed and on the basis of which certain specialists formerly considered themselves authorised to insist on a supposed ancient duality of Arabic writing of which the two equally primitive forms, the angular form known as “kufic” and the flexible known as “nasīḥa”, would correspond to different systems destined to be perpetuated side-by-side. Today emphasis should be laid, contrary to such a hypothesis, on the fundamental unity of the earliest Arabic writing, which Bernhard Moritz and Adolf Grohmann agreed in recognising; but it is nevertheless correct to place in the Umayyad period the individualisation of the currents which subsequently led to the ramification of its styles according to two principal branches.

It is to the nature and the vitality of the first of these currents that the third rubric should then be devoted, envisaging an angular script, at the same time slow of execution and naturally ornamental, whose aesthetic value and nobility always prevailed over convenience, but whose usage no less characterised the ancient 4th-5th century. Not only were copies of the Kur’ān transcribed in this style until the middle of the 4th/5th century, but it was also used to preserve works of erudition or pious texts of all kinds which were written on parchment, while monumental inscriptions owed to it their astonishing decorative quality. Thus we may speak of a constant flowering of kufic over several centuries, simple kufic at first when the means for enriching and adding to it were subjected. Thus there came about a proliferation of vertical strokes with counter-curves applied in the guise of “rising tails” to continue, on the upper part of the band, the final letters, which originally finished below the base line. Use was already also made of breaks with rectangular turns, of elongations of all kinds, of braiding, indentations, ornamental ligatures and folding knots which characterise especially the multiple varieties of braided kufic, although such a succinct enumeration cannot possibly take into account the gifts of imagination which made of every new decorative kufic inscription a work of art that was unique, because based on the previous establishment of an alphabet and of an ornamental répertoire belonging to it.

Now these are precisely the typical details of this genre which marked the specific styles of the local schools which should be distinguished if one is to follow with any advantage the history of kufic writing. Thus we observe the Syrian characters of certain types of ḍjam, ḥā or ḫā’. Similarly, the taste for braiding certain letters which might be, according to local tradition, the ḍāl, the ḥāf or the ḥā for example, the taste also for superimposed motifs such as knots on tall strokes inserted between neighbouring letters such as the two ǧāms of the word Allāh, would distinguish the works from ḥurāsān where, in the 5th/6th century, particularly refined specimens are noted. In still another context, the direct decoration of letters with flowers would have prevailed especially in an Egyptian milieu, and the perfection attained in this respect by Fāṭi-
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mid inscriptions, belonging to the style to which the name Karmathī “Carmathian” was for a long time erroneously applied, would crown the success of efforts begun in the mid-3rd/9th century. Finally, the sobriety which for many years remained in use in the western provinces of the Empire, in Andalusia as well as the Maghrib—which should be interpreted as a sign of artistic regionalism—concealed in the 4th/10th century, at the time of the apogee of the Umayyad caliphate in Spain, the nature of a kufic script that was already scholarly beneath an archaic appearance of the inscribed line.

In this fashion, one may understand the fragmentation and proliferation of the local schools to which reference should be made in order to supply even a concise picture of the varieties of angular writing practised during the first centuries of Islam. Such a precise picture has never yet been drawn; but only this would enable us to understand the stylistic developments and variations which are seen subsequently to become blurred in the latter phase of this evolution, when kufic became, after the 6th/12th century, a script set in its purely ornamental role and in some respects outdated. If in fact it continued to be used for the ornamentation of architectural surfaces, it no longer had any other role—and this would be the final phase of the evolution—except to supply controlling outlines to purely decorative compositions, which could without any geographical restriction call upon all the formulae previously tried, mingle them in the most imaginative fashion, and in particular, set a seal on their transfer from East to West. But these compositions, while continuing to be legible, were no more than symbolic, henceforth used only for transcribing short religious invocations without historical counterpart. Aesthetic quality and concealed religious sense were all that counted, and they explain the birth of varieties such as “square kufic” which had been influenced by certain Chinese characters and which succeeded in engendering, from Central Asia to Turkey, complex and rigid types of lace-work where the distinctive fundamental features of ancient Arabic writing are barely recognisable.

It is, however, this writing whose original aptitudes for flexibility and speed are immediately revealed when one tackles, under the fourth and last rubric, the success gradually enjoyed, in the post-Umayyad period, by a rounded script whose use soon spread well beyond the offices of the administration. Not only, in fact, did this favourite script of the vizier Ibn Mukhān [q.v.] who, in the first half of the 4th/10th century, took the initiative in codifying for the first time in a precise manner, by measuring them with pointing, the relationships of relative proportions binding together the various letters of the alphabet; it also fell to him to make the first systematic treatment of the best-known “six styles”. A little later his reputation as a theorist of calligraphy was eclipsed by that of such accomplished artists as the great Ibn al-Bawwāb [q.v.] at the start of the 5th/11th century—the period in which cursive writing was judged of sufficiently high prestige to be employed subsequently in copies of the Qurʾān—and the no less famous Yākūt al-Mustaṣimī [q.v.] towards the end of the 7th/13th century. This was the period of the apogee of the rounded script often known by the convenient dynamism of the name of “Ayyūbīn masāḥah”, before the scribes of the Mamlūk period turned towards redundant forms and a taste for thick interweavings of vertical strokes, and also before the appearance of novel tendencies, belonging especially to Iran and Turkey, which had two principal objects: on the one hand, the deliberate segmentation of the written line into sections “suspended” obliquely, in the true sense, one above the others according to a new art of writing which developed under the aegis of ʿIlkhānīd and Timūrid princes before coming triumphantly into its own with the works of Mīr ʿAllah of Ḥarāt; on the other hand, the methodical pursuit of a “monumentalisation” of cursive writing applied to vast surfaces, as was the rule for example in the schools of Shāykh Hamd Allāh in the 13th/16th century or of Ḥāfīz ʿUṭmān more than a century later.

The rounded graphic forms thus ultimately held sway in the majority of Islamic lands, at all levels of the art of writing, and supplanting the hieratic forms for which they became substituted, since the 6th/12th century, in the lapidary inscriptions themselves. In this context, one could return to some of the remarks previously made in response to the more beautiful and baroque realisations of ornamental kufic, while bearing in mind that a chronological and geographical classification has not yet been made of the most original schools according to which they flourished. Nevertheless, we should not forget the relative consistency of shapes which remains an essential characteristic and which justifies in a sense the sentimental attachment still shown today by every literate Arab, the attachment to a script of which the apparent variations have never been an obstacle to legibility while being the source of constantly renewed aesthetic achievements.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(J. Sourdell-Thomine)

ii. — IN PERSIA

The calligraphy which developed in Baghdad culminated in Yākūt al-Mustaṣimī [d. 697/1298], the last great calligrapher at the ʿAbbāsid court. Thereafter Baghdad lost its importance, and in such
calligraphic styles as muhakka', riżān, thulūh, naskh, ta'wīl, riḍā'ī, all of which made up the "six styles", altāfrāfī, rifydnī, thulūth, naskh, tawfi*, riḍān, all of which made up the first period. This script was used for large-sized frames and also for public buildings and their inscriptions.

Although in the section on khāṭṭ al-masāḥif, Ibn al-Nadīm's Fīrūzī says that the Persians, in the first period of Islam's appearance, used a type of calligraphy called kirāmūs (read pirāmūs?). See Atlas-i Khatīf, 126-30 for writing their copies of the Kur'ān, yet there is no early-enough attested surviving manuscript here. Badrī Atābāyī, on pp. 399-400 of his work Fīrūzī-i Kur'ānā-yi khatīf-yi khāṭṭ-ka-hāna-yi saṭānātī, Tehran 1351/1972, gives a Kur'ān page as an example of this kirāmūs style of calligraphy, yet this seems hard to prove or dispense.

Some Persian scholars, e.g. Baγānī and Rūkīn al-Dīn Hūmāyūn-Farrūkhī have argued that this style of calligraphy emerged during the Sāsānid period and continued until just after the advent of Islam. (see Atlas-i Khatīf, 397-9).

In order of their development, the different styles of calligraphy are as follows:

Kūfī. Kūfī script continued to be in use for some five centuries after the advent of Islam, especially for writing Kur'āns. Moreover, it was used for writing the titles of manuscripts and their sections and the basmalas at their beginnings until almost the end of the 7th/13th century, often as an element of decoration.

The oldest extant Kur'ān written in Persian is dated 108/623, and appears to have been written for the 'Abbasīd caliph Ma'mūn, see Muḥīn al-Shāhī, Sahīh-i Irān dar naṣīr u taqwīs-i ma'dīrī-yi islāmī, in Wāḥidī, no. lxxvii, Tehran 1371, 75-85. The Kur'ān copied by Zayn al-Abīdīn Shārīfī in 1323/935 during the reign of the Kāḏūr Muzzafar al-Dīn, in kāfī and naskh script, represents a harking-back to the ancient kūfī style of calligraphy.

The Rīḍī type of kāfī script was often used, together with thulūh, as a decorative element on buildings until recent times. Good examples of kīfī writing, in various types, are the inscriptions of the Pīr 'Alamārī tomb (built in 418/1027) in Dāmghān, and the Haydariyya Mosque (built in the 6th/12th century) in Kāzarīn.

Muhakka ("strongly expressed [word], tightly-woven [cloth]") has as its main characteristic the feature that the left corner of the letters are angled. This script was used for copying Kur'āns, and like muhakka, started to go out of circulation after the 12th/18th century in favour of naskh.

Thulūh ("one-third") is generally said to have derived its name from being based on the principle of a third of each letter being sloping. This is the script from amongst the ḏālīm-i sittā which has survived longest. It was and still is used for every kind of frame and for book titles in all Muslim countries. The most able calligraphers in this script are: Bāyūnghur (d. 857/1453), Asād Allāh-i Kirmānī (d. 895/1480), Kamāl al-Dīn Hāfīz Hārawī (d. 974/ 1566), 'Abd al-Bāqī-i Tabrīzī (10th/16th century), 'Alī Kūlī-i Shīrāzī (10th/16th century), 'Alī Rūdāfī 'Abbāsī (11th/17th century).

Naskh ("act of cancellation, abrogation"). Here, the Persians, just like in thulūh, followed the style of Yākūt al-Muṣṭaṣimī. There are some Persian manuscripts in naskh of the 5th/11th century which already show a gradual transition from kūfī. The most clear example of this is a manuscript of Abū Mansūr Muwaṭṭāk b. ʿAlī al-Ḥarawi's pharmacological book, the Kitāb al-abimin ʿan ḥakīk al-adwiyā (now in Vienna); this was written in 447/1055 by a Persian scribe called Asādī Tāsh (see Flügel, Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der kaiserlich-königlichen Hof-Bibliothek zu Wien, 1865, ii, 534).

After a period of temporary decline, naskh, during the Mongol period, regained its beauty during the Timūrid period, but reedech again in the 18th and 19th centuries. Persian naskh had a flavour of the rīdān script until the 18th century. Aḥmad Nāyīrīzī gave to it in the 12th/18th century a new style and liveliness, until it almost acquired a nastaʿlīk character; it had an angular look and the verticals of the letters became relatively finer, giving this script a particular beauty and fineness. ʿAlī Ḏāhir Ṣāfārī (8th/14th century), Bāyūnghur, ʿAbd Allāh Tabbākh-i Hārawī, Asād Allāh-i Kirmānī, Muḥammad Ḏāhir-i ʾIsfahānī (d. 1195/1772), Zayn al-ʿAbīdīn-i ʾIsfahānī (d. 1300/1882), Mīrzā Tāhirī-i Tabrīzī (20th century) are the most powerful exponents of this script. Modern Persian calligraphers follow the example of Aḥmad Nāyīrīzī in thulūh and naskh calligraphy.

Taʿwīl is a variety of thulūh, with its letters somewhat more compressed and rounded. Another special feature of it is that the letters like َوُؤُرُدَث are joined to the letters following them. Sometimes, however, one may come across examples of taʿwīl in which all the letters are almost joined together; sometimes the final letter of a word would be joined to the first letter of the following word. This script was used in Persia for the final page, sc. that with the colophon showing the date and place of copying and the scribe's name, of elongated format Kur'āns.

Ribā is a smaller version of taʿwīl and has the same rules. Ribā, which was formerly used for writing letters, epics and stories, later came to be used for writing the final pages of a Kur'ān, especially those of learned books. The Ottoman calligraphers created a script called this tījāsā or khāṭṭ al-tījāsā.

Djalī, djalīl was a name given to every large type of script, but was more specifically used for the large type of thulūh. The djalī variety of thulūh, which was little developed during the Sādūqī period, gradually started to become more beautiful by the 9th/15th century, and reached its utmost beauty during the Timūrid and especially ʿAṣławīd periods. This script was used for large-sized frames and also for public buildings and their inscriptions.

Ghunar, ghubari (“dust,” “dust-like”) is a term for every type of very small script difficult to read with the naked eye, but is often found in the naskh script; some very small-sized Khur’ans were written in ghubari script.

Musalsal (“strung together”) is a term for the letters of Nastaliq script when joined to each other, rather than a special type of script. It was sometimes practised by calligraphers to show off their skill.

Shikasta, siyah, a script considered to have been used from the Umayyad period onwards, has no artistic appearance and was used in financial registers and suchlike. The question whether it existed during the Sasanid period has been put forward. See Ahmad Gulcin Majallat-i Ta’lik-i Siyak, in Majallat-i Diniyati-yi A’dabiyyat, Tehran 1344/1965.

Tashiki (“suspension, hanging together”) is said to have got this name from its letters being connected to each other, and is in fact a compound of tawashi, riqa and naskh scripts, according to Persian scholars, and it is alleged that the sinuous style of the letters of the Pahlavi and Avestan alphabets played a role in its formation. Tashiki was used for writing books and letters and also in the diwans for official correspondence; it apparently started to be formed perhaps in the 7th/14th or 8th/15th centuries and by the 7th/13th century it emerged in its definite form. It was not used very much until the 8th/15th century, but then started to slowly lose its importance, and give place to shikasta ta’lik; the works on calligraphy call the ta’lik either ta’lik-i hadim or ta’lik-i asli. The invention of this script is attributed either to Khwaja Abu’l-A’im (of whom nothing is known) or to Hasan b. Husayn ‘Ali Farisi Katib (4th/10th century). Ahmad b. Ali b. Ahmad-i Shahriz (8th/15th century) was one of the great exponents of this script. The letters of ta’lik are joined to each other, and letters like ۶۶ ۶۶ ۶۶ ۶۶ would be joined to each other, and the script simpler than shikasta ta’lik.

Shikasta ta’lik (“broken ta’lik”) is the result of writing ta’lik rapidly. The letters are written in a more intricate style, which makes shikasta ta’lik difficult to read. It started to appear in the 8th/14th century, and was developed by Khwaja Tadj Salimaniy-i Isfahani (d. 897/1491). Shikasta ta’lik declined in use when nastaliq started to spread everywhere in the 7th/13th century, and was used decreasingly after the 19th century. Nowadays it is used in Persia for artistic display and for variety. Khwaja Ikhshiyar Al-Din Munshi (10th/16th century) was especially famous for this script. Persians customarily call this script simply ta’lik without the prefix shikasta.

Tarassul (“correspondence”) is a name given by the divan secretaries to a plainer form of shikasta ta’lik.

Nasih-i ta’lik, nasih-tashiki, nastaliq, is said in the works on calligraphy to have been formed by joining naskh and ta’lik, and this compound gradually came to be pronounced as nastaliq. Although it is said that it was invented by Mir ‘Ali Tabrizi (d. 850/1445), the existing manuscripts contradict this view and show that the invention of this script goes back as far as the 7th/13th century. In Turkey and in Arabic countries it is erroneously called ta’lik.

Nasta’lik, after its emergence, became divided into two styles: (a) that of Mirza Dja’ar-i Tabriz (9th/15th century) and Agha-i Tabriz; (b) that of ‘Abd al-Rahman-i Khvarami (9th/15th century). The first style, developed in Khurasan, was accepted as being particularly suitable to Persian taste, whereas the second style, developed in Western Persia, was gradually forgotten. The first style, later called the “Khurasanian style”, flourished under such able masters as Sulain ‘Ali-yi Mashhadi (d. 926/1519), Mir ‘Ali Harawi (d. 951/1544) and Baha Shaha-i Isfahani (d. 996/1587), and reached its highest point of beauty with Mir ‘Imad-i Hasan-i Sayfi (d. 1024/1615 or 1027/1617), modern Persian calligraphers follow his path.

Shikasta nastaliq, hafl-i shikasta, came into existence at the beginning of the 12th/17th century under the Safawids, as a result of writing nastaliq rapidly and of the calligraphers being under the influence of shikasta ta’lik. Official correspondence had been done in shikasta ta’lik until then, but was now replaced by shikasta nastaliq. Murtada Kull Khan Shamlu (d. 1100/1688), Shafira (d. 1081/1670) and Darwish ‘Abd al-Majid-i Ta’likan (d. 1185/1771) are the great masters of this script. Nasta’lik was used in writing literary works, whereas shikasta nastaliq was used mostly in writing letters and sometimes for official correspondence. Nowadays it is sometimes used in writing poetry in an artistic fashion. The Turks, however, showed very little interest in this particular script.

Tahiri (“epistolary”) is a more simple form of shikasta nastaliq, used for writing letters and taking notes.

Muhannad, hafl-i muhannad (“facing each other”), is not a special script. Although it is possible to apply muhannad to any type of script, this was especially done with naskh and hafl.

gündgün-i Kurgan, in Wahid, Tehran 1350/1971, no. xc; Abd al-Hayy Habibi, Tārikh-i khatt wa nusfehПодробный текст здесь.

III. IN TURKEY

The Turks also followed the path of Vāṭūlāt al-
Musta’sīnī in the aḥlām-i sītā until the conquest of
Istanbul in 857/1452. But with refinements of mathe-
matical and dimensional precision introduced by
Shāykh Hamd Allāh (840-926/1436-1520), the famous
calligrapher of Sultān Meḥmemmed II and
Bayezīd II’s reigns, these scripts reached a peak of
beauty, and as a result of this a Turkish style e:
After the conquest, other types of script came
into existence, and gradually Istanbul became a
centre for the calligraphic art.

The Turks elevated the main Islamic scripts, the
Aḥlām-i sītā, to the highest point of beauty; hence
the expression became current, “the Kurān was
revealed in Mecca, recited in Egypt, and written in
Istanbul”.

Kafī. The Sāljuqīs if Anatolia inherited the use
of this script from the Great Sāljuqīs of Persia. The
best examples of its ornamental use on buildings
are on the Karatay madrasa (built in 649/1251)
and Indje Mināre madrasa (built in 662/1264 at Kon-
yā.

The Ottomans did not favour the kafī script much,
though it had a restricted use during the first two
centuries of the empire on buildings in Bursa, Edirne
and Istanbul, e.g. the Fāṭih mosque in Istanbul.
Muhābāk and rikān. Muhābāk was especially
used for writing inscriptions within frames, and
rikān for writing Kurāns. These two scripts reached
their artistic peak in the 9th/15th century, but from
the 10th/17th gave place to ṭaḥlīl. Notable
calligraphers here were Shāykh Hamd Allāh (840-
926/1436-1520), Ahmad-i Karahisarī sometimes used
the ṭaḥlīl style.

In the 10th/16th century, so that a distinctive Ottoman
script was followed for some of the texts done in
rikān during the period of the Anatolian Sāljuqīs.
This but method was mostly generalised to
thulūh. Ahmad Karahisarī sometimes used the
musalāsī style.

Siyākāt, siyāk. We already know that siyākāt was
used in the financial land register and naskh offices
by the Sāljuqīs of Anatolia (see Houtsma, Recueil
de textes, Histoire des Seldjoucides d’Asie Mineure,
ii, Leiden 1902, 253). We do not much know about
the situation of siyākāt during the first period of
the Ottoman Empire, i.e. up to the reign of Meḥmemmed
II, since very few official registers of this period
have survived. We do, however, come across the
use of siyākāt in the documents of that Sultan’s reign.

Ṭaḥlīl. Although we find some simple patterns in
this script in the documents of Meḥmemmed II’s reign,
it was little-used in the later periods, and was
not favoured to any great extent by the Ottomans.
(For examples, see: Fatḥ-nāma-i Ārbiq. Topkapı
Sarayi Arşivi no. E. 10822, and Naṣir Öz, Topkapı
Sarayiında Fatih Sultan Meḥmem devrine ait vekhalara,
in Belleten, xiv (1950) 49. Şıkasta taḥlīl and tarrassul,
like taḥlīl, were not used in Turkey.

Dīvānī. Although the script, according to the
Turkish sources, was allegedly invented for writing
official documents and registers of the Dīvān-ī
Humāyūn founded by Meḥmemmed II after the
conquest of Istanbul, there is no doubt that it must
have existed before then, probably evolving through
the inspiration of taḥlīl. Reading dīvānī depends on a
knowledge of its rules, since in this script letters like
waw and zaruruda are joined to following letters like
following them. Dīvānī written contrary to
the rules is called dīvānī kirmast “broken dīvānī”.

Authorise and sign it using rikāī script; hence this
last was called idgāha or khatt-i idgāha. The
calligraphers mentioned under thulūh and naskh also
used these two scripts very beautifully (see album of
Shāykh Hamd Allāh, Topkapı Sarayi Library,
E.H. no. 2084, 2086, and also album of Hāfiz Oth-
mān, Mehdī III, no. 3635).

Dīlāt. The most typical and beautiful examples of
dīlāt in the period of the Anatolian Sāljuqīs, al-
though they lack any dynamic quality, are on the
portals of Indje Mināre madrasa and the Sāhīb
Atatū kulliyye in Konya. The first change in dīlāt
made by the Ottomans dates from the 9th/15th
century, so that a distinctive Ottoman dīlāt starts to
emerge. The pioneer here was the calligrapher
Allā b. Yahyā al-Sūfī, writer of the inscription on
the Fāṭih mosque and the Bāb-i Humāyūn in Istan-
bul. Dīlāt acquired an especially vigorous character
in the 19th century through the works of Mustafā
Rākīm (1173-1241/1757-1825), and thus an “Ottoman
dīlāt school” was established. Mehmēd Dīlāl al-
Dīn (d. 1253/1837) also founded a school of dīlāt
reminiscent of Ahmad Karahisarī’s style of three
centuries previously, but it was only followed by a
few; Turkish calligraphers today follow the way of
Mustafā Rākīm. Şahlīk Bev (d. 1297/1880), Şamil
Efendi (d. 1310/1912), Bādī b. al-Khattāf al-’Arabī,
Baghdad 1388/1968; idem, Badī’ī al-Khāff al-
’Arabī, Baghdad 1391/1971; Muḥammad
Azīza, La calligraphie Arabe, Tunis 1971.
(All Alparslan)
This is also a result of writing dlwdnl rapidly. We do not know the names of the dlwanl calligraphers until those of the end of the 19th century, since it was not customary to sign the documents issued by the Dlwanl. Dlwanl reached its peak of perfection in the 19th century. Some of the dlwanl calligraphers, famous at the beginning of the 20th century, are Sâmi Efendi, Kâmîl Ağdî, Ismâ'îl Hâjkî Altunbezer (d. 1940), Hâljî Öyzağfî and the still-living Hâmjî Aytâz. The use of dlwanl passed to the Arab lands through the Ottoman influence, and is still used in those countries.

Dlal dlwanl. This is a variant type of dlwanl with the letters written within each other, and used for writing fomâns and berâtâs. It was written, like dlwanl, from the top-right hand of the sheet to bottom-left hand in an oblique direction and with every line upwards at its end. The same vowel points used in ìluluk ar used in this script, and empty spaces are filled with small dots. Dlal dlwanl flourished from the 9th/15th century onwards, its perfection being in the 19th century. The calligraphers of dlwanl also wrote in this script.

Nastâ'îlîk. We come across the first examples of this script in Turkey during the reign of Mohammad II. It was brought to Turkey by calligraphers coming to the Ottoman court from Persia, and flourished under Darâvsh ʿAbdî (d. 1257/1847) and Kâtîb-zade Mehmed Reftî (12th/18th century), and reached as high a standard of beauty as in Persia. It was Yasârîzade Mustafa ʿIzzet (d. 1265/1849) who freed Turkish nastâ'îlîk from Persian stylistic influence, and thus a distinctive Turkish nastâ'îlîk style came into existence. This last has unchanging geometrical and mathematical measurements, and the letters are slightly wider and longer than in Persian nastâ'îlîk. Şâmî, Khusûlî and Neqâm al-Dîn (d. 1760), are the great masters of this style. Although the Turks called the type of nastâ'îlîk written rapidly and contrary to the rules ta-lih kirmasî, it is more correct to call it nastâ'îlîk kirmasî. Nastâ'îlîk, used for writing poetry and for inscriptions, was also in use in the office of Şaykh al-İslâm.

Sâmak. This was very little used in Turkey, though the official papers of the Şaykh al-İslâm's office were sometimes written in this script. Turkish ẓikasta nastâ'îlîk is less complicated than that of Persia.

Rûhâ, rîhî. This was probably invented during the second half of the 12th/18th century by simplifying dlwanl script, on the evidence of the archival sources. The main characteristics of this script are that its letters are less rounded and more straight. Rûhâ was used along with dlwanl in the Dlwanl-i Humâyûn, and just like Persian ẓikasta nastâ'îlîk, it also became a standard form of hand-writing amongst Turks, used for letters and every kind of correspondence.

The type of rûhâ used in the Bâb-ı ʿAli was an improved form devised by Mumtâz Efendi (d. 1267/1852), and hence was called Bâb-ı ʿAli Efendi rûhâ. A second change in rûhâ was made by ʿIzzet Efendi (d. 1302/1920), hence is called ʿIzzet Efendi rûhâ; this has softer lines than the previous type. Rûhâ written rapidly and without adhering to the rules is called rûhî kirmasî.

Khaṭṭ-i muṭâlâmî. Much importance was originally attached to this script. There are very beautiful patterns of it in the Ulu Camii in Bursa, but use of it decreased after the 10th/16th century. It was also called ẓaynâl yazî “mirror-like writing”.

Appendix. Artificial scripts used in both Persia and Turkey.

These are the scripts which have been invented by distorting other scripts.

Resim yazî. This means drawing pictures with script. Although this could have some attractive aspects, the first-class Persian and Turkish calligraphers did not attach great importance to this practice. It was used in ìluluk, and is the re-arrangement of a kâdigit or some other important saying in a way which is difficult to read.

Khaṭṭ-i ʿabdul ("tree-like writing"). In this script, so-called by western scholars, the letters bear a resemblance to the branches of a tree. It was applied to ìluluk, and was sometimes used in both Persia and Turkey for writing book titles.

Khaṭṭ-i suvbîlî ("byzantine script"). The letters of this script, invented by the Turkish calligrapher ʿArif Hikmet (d. 1337/1918), resemble a byzantine, and are also reminiscent of the letters of dlwanl.

Ālev yazîlî ("flame-like writing"). The letters of this script, which was invented by the Turkish calligrapher Ismâ'îl Hâjkî Baltadjioghlu (still alive), resemble a flame. This style may be also applied to ìluluk.


(Ali Alparslan)

iv. — IN MUSLIM INDIA

The earliest extant Arabic writing in the form of
an inscription is found in South India at Trivandrum. This is an old mosque at Koelum and has been written in a very crude form of naskhī style of writing: Ismā'īl—109 [727]—b. Malik Dinār, in three lines (Maṭail Recorded, Ahmedabad. Dn, i, 51. However, the Pakistan Archaeological Department has recently discovered near Thāṭa at Būnhbāore two inscriptions written in ḥāfe script on marble slabs and dated 390/902 and 294/906 (M. A. Ghaffur, The calligraphers of Thāṭa. Tashkhit, 1965, 165). The conquests in Sind of Muhammad b. Kāsim in the Umayyad period (93/712) had extended beyond Daybūl to Multān, and he had built mosques in the conquered area; this doubtless implied the official introduction of Arabic script into the Indian subcontinent. There are two old inscriptions in Sind, one at Rorrh on an old mosque of Khrāṣṭa Khrāṣṭ dated 341/954, and the other at Sakhās showing the date of death of one Sa'd al-Dīn in 483/994. Both are in ordinary naskhī characters (Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, Calcutta 1952, 54, 120).

In the early 5th/11th century, the Ghurānidīs [q.v.] under Sultan Mahmūd began raiding into Northern India and established military headquarters at Lahore. Mahmūd had struck at Lahore his tankhas, which bore both Arabic and Sanskrit versions on their two sides and became a centre for literary activity. There is extant in the Panjab University Library, Lahore, an Arabic ms. of the Bahdīrat al-nūfūs wa'l-asrār fi ṭa'rifāth al-khīrat al-muḥkār by 'Abd Allāh b. Malik which was transcribed at Lahore in 438/1044 in a very ordinary naskhī script. The present writer has also discovered an Arabic inscription on the rear wall of the Katt Masjd in Ahmadābād which is dated 24 Rabi al-awwal 452/14 July 1065. It is in an ordinary naskhī script, and may be read as: "This Mosque was built on 24 Rabi al-awwal year 452". Its authenticity is guaranteed by two Persian separate inscriptions on the tomb of Atīka Kān in Karachi 1968, 49, 63). This style of writing, such as ṣughrā, ḥāfi, naskhī and thulth.

Also, during the period of the Slave Kings of Dīlī and after, the copying of manuscripts flourished, the naskhī script being especially popular. It is recorded that Șīhāb al-Dīn, the calligrapher, was made Șad-dīr Dīhān during the Khānlī period (Ṭabrīz-i Firāqgāhī, Calcutta 1865, 355; Farighi, ed. Lucknow, 189, 133, 322, 335, etc.). The introduction of the nasta’līk script into the sub-continent was mostly due to the Mughals, Mr ‘All Tabrīzī being generally regarded as its originator, who wrote one manuscript of the Kulīyāt of Khrāṣṭa Kirmān in 798/1395-6 (B.M. Add. t8.113) at the court of Sultan Ahmad Dīlāyīr at Baghādād. There exists an illustrated manuscript of the Memoirs of Būbur in this script which was copied by ‘All al-Kāthī in 937/1530-1 in Ahrar state in India, and many calligraphers seem to have used this style of writing. In the mausoleum of Akbar at Agra, the Emperor’s sarcophagus on top of the mausoleum was adorned in inscriptions this style of writing, written by the scribe ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm.

In the pre-Mughal period, when use of the naskhī script flourished, special attention was devoted to the writing of the Kurʾān, and a special style arose within the sub-continent for the Kurʾān; hence the script used on this paper came to be called the khāṭir-bīkhār (Wadjīl ʿAll, Maṭail wa-maḏjima al-funūn, Lucknow 1913, 331; Ch. Huart, Les calligraphes et les miniatures de l'Orient Musulman, Paris 1908, 51). There exists in the Kābul Museum a Kurʾān which was transcribed in this style by ḥāfe Abū Bakr Yaḡīb b. Nāṣir al-Dīn at Lahsī (Sind) on Friday, 17 Rabi al-awwal 1374. One manuscript of a commentary on the Kurʾān in the library of the Panjab University at Lahore has the text of the Kurʾān in this Būbur script and the commentary in ordinary naskhī.

During the absence of the Emperor Humāyūn in Persia, Shāh Shāh Sūrī built in stone the grand mosque in the old fort of Dīlī, with its arches and façade adorned with Kurʾānic inscriptions, including Sūrat Yāsīn on the central part of the façade in thulth characters, perhaps the finest example of thulth from that day.

Abū ʿ1-Fadl ʿAllāmā [q.v.] devoted a full chapter of his ʿAnānī ʿAbbarī to calligraphers and miniaturists, reflecting Akbar’s patronage of outstanding artists. Nasta’līk was especially favoured; its exponents included Mullā Muhammad Ḥusayn of Kāšmīr, ʿAbd al-Rahīm, Mūshkin Kālām. He was the lover of the Persian court in India. During this period, the calligraphy of Akbar’s reign (see Oriental College Magazine, Lahore 1934); also, there exists an inscription on the wall of a mosque in Nagawar (Rajputana) composed and written by Kāṭūb al-Mulk Dūrī in 976/1569-9 (Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1950, 38-9; Badāwīnī, Muntahhab al-tawāriskh, Calcutta 1869, iii, 227-9). There were many other calligraphers at Akbar’s court employed various styles; the calligrapher Bākī Muhammad of Buhārār, who wrote the decorative inscriptions on the tomb of ʿAtīk Kān in the compound of Ḥaḍrat Nīzām al-Dīn Awlīyā at Dīlī, should be mentioned here. At Akbar’s court, Aṣḥāf Kān (d. 980/1572) was the Mir Munsī [see Katīb, iii. In India], and also a poet; his duties included the inditing of farmāndās (Muntahhab al-tawāriskh, iii, 188). The calligraphy used for these farmāndās was the khāṭir diwānī, one of the varieties of writing which could not be immediately read by everyone ( Bakārī, Afghān, i, 376). This style for writing farmāndās was used only at the Mughal court in India.

Akbar died in 1014/1605, and his son Dāghānīr [q.v.] who succeeded him especially encouraged the fine arts. During this period, ʿAbd al-Rahīm, Muhammad Ḥusayn of Kāshmīr and ʿAbd Allāh, were given the titles of Anbarin Kālām, Zarrīn Rākīm and Mughīrīn Kālām. He was the lover of the Persian master Mr ʿAll of Harāt, and it is recorded that once he was given a special present by Khān-i Khānān ʿAbd al-Rahīm of Iranān of an illustrated manuscript of the Khamsa of Niẓāmī ( Taʿrikh-i Dinā
During the reign of Shah Djahân, who succeeded his father Djahangîr in 1037/1628, two great calligraphers came to his court from Persia, sc. Ruknâ, who wrote the manuscript of the Gulistân of Sa'dî in 1048/1638, and who was also a poet, and ʿAbd al-Rashîd Daylâmî, who was related to the famous calligrapher Mir Ḥusnî of Persia and was made the royal librarian. Muljam-mâd Salih Kanbu has a special chapter dealing with this art in his Amâl-i sâliḥ (Calcutta 1939, iii, 443-6). It contains mention of Muhammad Murâd of Kâvûr, Ākâ Rashîd Daylâmî, Mir Muhammad Šâhî and Muhammad Mu'min, the sons of Mir ʿAbd Allâh Muṣṭâfâ Râkâm, Šâraf al-Dîn ʿAbd Allâh, Mir Sayyîd ʿAllî Tabrîzî and Šâmil Muhammad Dîjâr Khân, called Kifâyât Khân and inventor of the shîkastâ style of writing, and Djamâl al-Dîn Yûsuf, who also used the same hand (see Art Islâmica, xi, 433-5).

This interwoven shîkastâ script is defined by Anand Ram Mukhlîs in his Miḥrâb al-isfîlîh. One manuscript of the Gulîstân of Sa'dî transcribed by Dîjâr Khân Kifâyât Khân in 1086/1675-6 is preserved in the National Museum of Pakistan at Karâčî, written for his son ʿAbd Allâh, called Darâyât Khân; this style was accordingly called Darâyât al-khatt, hulîl al-khattî, etc. It may be recalled that the Emperor Aurangzîb [q.v.] used to write out copies of the Kûrân and send them to the Holy Cities of Arabia, but he never signed these; he was the pupil in calligraphy of Sayyîd ʿAllî Khân Dîjwâr Râkâm, who died in 1092/1686 (Tadhkhirat-i khushnuvisân, Calcutta 1910, 56-7).

Bibliography: given in the article.

[M. Abdullah Chaghatai]

v. — In South-East Asia

Here the Arabic script was, until ca. 1500, almost exclusively used for writing Arabic, the Trêngguan stone inscription, dated probably 726/1326 or 788/1386 and written in Old Malay, being a noticeable exception. At the beginning of the 16th century the Arabic script became one of the most common scripts for Malay and other languages, and is still used. One of the oldest known texts in Arabic script in South Asia is the Arabic inscription of Leran on the northern coast of East Java, probably to be dated 475/1082. This tomb stone of “the daughter of Maymûn” may have been imported, together with its inscription. In any case, it remains so far an isolated testimony to the use of the Arabic script in Indonesia, since the next example, the tomb stone of Sultan Malik al-Ṣâlîh of Tarai in northern Sumatra, is dated 691/1292. This was followed by a number of other tomb stones, all but one written in ornamental Arabic script of Persian type and probably imported from Gûdjarât. The exception is the inscription from Mine Tujuh in Atjeh, dated 782/1380 and written in a type of Malayan script, but apparently influenced by the style of Arabic writing. A few other Arabic tomb stones in the Malay peninsula are dated in the 9th/15th century. In Java, the most important are found on Muslim tomb stones (maṣ'ûn) in Troloyo, near Tronlan. They have a quotation from the Kurûn or other sacred texts in Arabic on one side, and a date expressed in Old Javanese numerals on the other. The script, fully discussed by Damais (Études javanaises, i. Les Tombes Musulmanes datées de Trélody, in BÉFEQ, xlviii/2 (1957), 351-415), corresponds to that of contemporary Arabic inscriptions elsewhere in the Muslim world. The best known Arabic inscription in Java of this period is that on the tomb of Malik Ibrâhîm at Grèsik, northeast of Surabaya, dated 822/1419 and beautifully written in an ornamental Arabic which is similar to the contemporary inscriptions of Tasâû and Gûdjarât.

Bibliography: J. G. de Casparis, Indonesian palaeography, in Handbook der Orientalistik, vi, section 1, 70-2 and literature quoted there. (Ed.)

KHATT, more precisely al-ḥaft bi-râmi, the original name for Arab geomancy. In the Islamic era, râmi (or ẓâmil al-râmi) was dominant, but with the growing influence of astrology on the occult sciences, the term shâkîl (pl. aṣghâl), “figure” was used (see below, the expression aṣghâl al-râmi, aṣghâl al-turâb, hulîl al-aṣghâl), From shâkîl are derived “squill” a figure in geomancy, and “to squill”, to practise divination by sand, cf. G. Ferrand, in JA, roth Series, vi (1905), 193. In Madagascar, the words sikili and shidy also denote geomantic figures, cf. G. Ferrand and M. Steinschneider, in ZDMG, xxxi (1877), 762-5.

The development from ḥaft to râmi began with the juxtaposition of the two terms. Indeed, ʿaṭṭâr al-râmi is frequently used to denote geomancy (cf. for example, Ibn Khaldûn, Mukaddâma, i, 203-9, tr. by Slane, i, 232-40, tr. Rosenthal, i, 226-34, Leiden ms., Cat. de Jong and de Goeje, iii, 184). Instead of ʿaṭṭâr, darb began to be used especially in dialect; darb is in fact the modern substitute for ʿaṭṭâr, which was used originally to denote lithomancy, so we find that ʿaṭṭâr = ʿaṭṭâr = darb as terms for geomancy.

At first sight, ʿaṭṭâr is the line which the geomancer traces on the sand when, strictly speaking, he is practising psalmomancy. This is the meaning of râmi also, but, as well as the sand, râmi and ʿaṭṭâr mean the black or white lines on the hooves of wild cattle or on the flanks and the backs of stags (cf. TA, vii, 351, l. 29; details in T. Fahd, La divination arabe, Leiden 1966, 197 f.). Lexicographers have shown that ʿaṭṭâr, ʿim al-ḥaft and ʿim al-râmi (cf. TA, v, 129, l. 4) are perfectly synonymous.

Târîk and darb are also synonymous and originally denoted the “casting of pebbles”, that is, lithomancy (al-ʿarâb or al-arâb biʿl-ḥasâ). The technicalities of this cleromantic rite are unknown to us, but it is certain to us, that the marks made by the pebbles on the sand have been posed by a questioner, from the signs which resulted in making ʿaṭṭâr biʿl-ḥasâ the act of posing the question, which has been posed by a questioner, from the signs which are given by the way pebbles have fallen on top of each other. Instead of pebbles, grain or nuts could be used (cf. Ibn Khaldûn, op. cit., i, 192; ii, 177; tr. de Slane, i, 192; ii, 205 f.; tr. Rosenthal, i, 214, ii, 201).

From the marks made by the pebbles on the ground lines were traced in the sand, and from this idea there has been a gradual development which ultimately results in making ʿaṭṭâr (or darb) biʿl-ḥasâ the synonym of ʿaṭṭâr biʿl-râmi. The technicalities of this cleromantic rite are unknown to us, but it is certain to us, that the marks made by the pebbles on the sand have been posed by a questioner, from the signs which are given by the way pebbles have fallen on top of each other. Instead of pebbles, grain or nuts could be used (cf. Ibn Khaldûn, op. cit., i, 192; ii, 177; tr. de Slane, i, 192; ii, 205 f.; tr. Rosenthal, i, 214, ii, 201).

Thus al-ʿaṭṭâr biʿl-ḥasâ and al-ḥaft biʿl-râmi, two different divinatory practices, became progressively confused in the Islamic era and denoted geomancy in general; this may be explained by the great variety of geomantic procedures. ʿAṭṭâr was the observation of the fall of pebbles on sand; the marks they made were joined by other marks (khâft) in order to complete a figure (shâkîl). When these figures became
1. Kūfī (the inscription of the grave of Pîr 'Alamdar, 418/1027, Damghan, Iran).

2. Muḥakkak (top) and ṭiḥân (bottom) by Shaykh Hamd Allah (Turkey) (Topkapı Sarayi Kütüphanesi, Emanet Hazinesi, No. 2078).
3. Thuluth (top) and naskh (bottom) by Shaykh Hamd Allah (Turkey) (Topkapi Sarayi Kütüphanesi, Emanet Hazinesi, No. 2084).

4. Tawki' (top) and rika' (bottom) by Shaykh Hamd Allah (Turkey) (Topkapi Sarayi Kütüphanesi, Emanet Hazinesi, No. 2078).
5. **Djali thuluth** by the kādī-ʾaskar Muṣṭafā ʿIzzet (Istanbul, dome of the Aya Sofya) (Kurān, xxiv, 34).

6. **Musalsal** by Bekir Paktan (Turkey).

7. **Siyāhat** (Turkey).

10. Shikasta Nasta'liq by 'Abd al-Majid Talkahi (Iran) (Ghazali cand az Hafiz bā hatt-i khoshnuvsān-i maṭbūt, Tehran).


15. *Resim yazl* attributed to Müstafâ Râkîm (Turkey). The picture represents the *basmala*.

stylised at a particular place, a board was used, which was covered with sand or even flour, and the finger was drawn over it at random; the shapes formed in this way were then examined. A sheet of paper could be substituted for the board, and on it pencil dots were marked at random or, according to Ibn Khaldun, on four lines (cf. ref. in Doutté, *Magie et religion*, 3759; compare R. Jaulin, *La geomancie*, 17, n. 1).

Behind this popular, primitive practice lay a divinatory art of extreme complexity. Indeed, since the introduction of astrological and mathematical speculation into the science of geomancy, we must deal with a theory as esoteric as that of the *diafr* (v.-fr.). As in the *diafr*, one is successful in the study of geomancy by being able to isolate numerous speculations and determining laws from them. The *Analyse formelle* by R. Jaulin, with contributions by R. Ferry, F. Djean and B. Jaulin, achieves this aim. It is not possible to give a complete picture in an article of restricted size. But it should be said that the sixteen shapes, which are obtained by the permutation of the four basic lines and their eight joins, giving rise to four even and four uneven symmetrical shapes, reduce the basic geomantic values by assigning to them agreeable or contrary meanings; they are also associated with the "external" and "internal" elements concerned with more or less reassuring or dangerous, favourable or ill-omened ideas (cf. Jalil, *op. cit.*, 53-71).

In this mathematical analysis, arithmomanic and geomantic considerations have had their part to play, but they do not in themselves make a geomancer. In geomancy, two other components must be represented, astrology and a predisposition to "perceive hidden meanings" (*i'darak al-ghayb*). Ibn Khaldun emphasises these two aspects in a long paragraph devoted to this art of divination (*Muhadimma*, i, 203-9, tr. de Sane, 23-42, tr. Rosenthal, 226-34, with references and figures in the notes).

After a description of the sixteen geomantic combinations, each named and classified into favourable and unfavourable, Ibn Khaldun explains this classification by the astral influences which are brought to bear on each of these nhóm*.* In fact, the sixteen geomantic combinations are set under the domination of the twelve signs of the zodiac and of the four cardinal points. From then onwards the geomancers, called by him *munadidimamin*, "astrologers", have derived meanings to provide geomantic figures from astrological speculations. The author contests the validity of this method, disagreeing with the fact that the astrological deductions have natural signs as their basis while geomantic deductions rest on conventions.

Even more aberrant, Ibn Khaldun thinks, is the pretension of certain geomancers to succeed in perceiving the unknown by applying their minds to the geomantic figures and then abstracting a complete understanding of the human sphere and penetrating the spiritual realm, in the manner of the soothsayers and, particularly of those among them who practise omnolatry, hydromancy and lecanomancy. Ibn Khaldun thus concludes: "The truth that you must present to the mind is that the supernatural cannot be revealed by any technique; it cannot be perceived by an elite class of men naturally predisposed to pass from the conscious world into the spiritual". Concerning the doctrine of Ibn Khaldun relating to divination, see *La divination arabe*, 45-50. According to him, the astrologers qualify as the type of men called "Venusians" because of the influence which Venus exerts on them on the day of their birth, by which they are fitted to perceive supernatural phenomena.

Because of a verse in the Qur'ān (XLVI, 4), interpreted by some as alluding to geomancy (cf. Tabari, *Tafsir*, xxvi, 3, l. 3 ff.) and a hadith noted by Ajā'ib b. Yusār (Wensinck et al., *Concordance*, i, 40), which speaks of a prophet who practised geomancy excellently, some licence has been given to this art and it has been allowed to experience an amazing expansion across the Islamic world. Like oneiroscopy, Arab geomantic science extends beyond the frontiers of the Muslim empire, both to the Indian coasts and the coasts of Byzantium, and to the Latin West and Black Africa and Madagascar (cf. C. H. Becker, *Neue Literatur zur Geschichte Afrikas*, in *It.*, iv (1915), 305; B. Carra de Vaux, *La geomancie chez les Arabes*, ap. Paul Tannery, *Mémoires scientifiques*, iv (1920), 299-327; A. and L. Delatte in *Mélanges F. Cumont*, Brussels 1936, 575-658).

This expansion has led to a great number of manuals and treatises, examples of which can be found in almost all the Arab collections in the East and the West. Many are anonymous works like: *Risāla fi 'l-rāmī* (Aya Sofya, 4755 (1), *risāla 34*); *Rasā'il il 'silm al-rāmil* (ibid., 4860 (64), l-9, cf. also ibid., 2052 (36), 14); *al-Munawwab fi 'ulum al-rāmil* (Asir Ef. 1266, 6 = Reisulkuttab Mustafa Ef. 1268, 112b); *Kitāb al-rāmil* (Beşir Ağa, 450; al-Kašshāb al-ašhar wa 'l-šāhār wa 'l-rāmil* (ibid., 433); *Risāla fi 'l-rāmil*, in Turkish (Fatih, 3430); *Fi 'l-rāmil wa 'l-nudjām* (Kâmil, 189, 6); *Fi 'ilm al-rāmil* (ibid., 1468, 7); *Kitāb *fi 'ilm al-rāmil* (Nuruosmaniye, 3639); *Kutub 'ilm al-rāmil* (Bagdad Vehbi Ef., 920-6; Saray, Ahmet III, 3475 ff.); *Fi 'l-rāmil* (Leiden, Cat. de Jong and Goeje, iii, 184; Gotha, Cat. Pech, 457 ff.); *Ashkāl al-rāmil* (Cambridge, Trinity College, Cat. Palmer, p. 29, the page describes several geomantic figures); several geomantic mss. in Karşuni at Oxford (Bodleian vi, col. 596 f., no. 180, 3 and 4; col. 598, no. 181, 2, 4, 0); *Kitāb 'āqīb fi 'l-rāmil* (Aleppo, Sbath, 58, 5; 590, 1 (abridged) and 2: K. al-Shadara wa 'l-thamara wa 'l-mukhta, attributed to Daniel, 1180, 1 and 81); Vatican, Cat. Levi Della Vida, iii, 299-317; Berlin, Cat. Alt. wandt, 4200-12; Kanz al-mukhti (Copenhagen, xxiii, in Turkish); etc.

Among the best known authors of geomantic works are Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad al-Zanjātī, who founded a school in this field. His followers are called al-Zanjātīyya, and in fact a ms. from the collection Ismail Saïd Sinc er (Ankara), 1, 211, not foliated, 24.5 × 17.5 × 1, nakṣī, no date, entitled *K. fi 'ilm al-rāmil* (*ālā tarīb al-Zanjātīyya* ... (the same collection, under No. 1, 1970, contains a madājmū'a with two geomantic drawings; *Bayān fi darb al-rāmil*, pp. 1-38, attributed to al-Zanjātī, and *Risāla min *'ilm al-rāmil* (*sīhā-rāf al-damīr*, pp. 39-61, anonymous); the work which is attributed to him bears different titles: K. *Fi 'āf al-ašhāf* (*al-āqīl al-ašhāf* (Saray, Ahmet III, 1663, 120 ff., 28 × 20, nakṣī, very fine illustrated copy, no date); *Hulāl al-ašhāf* (Nuruosmaniye, 3638, 28 fol., 25.5 × 17, fine nakṣī, no date); lithographed in Cairo in 1280/1863 under the title K. *al-Fasī fi wāqī *'ilm al-rāmil*, and also edited in Cairo in 1316/1908 under the title al-Absāl al-mardisiyya: fi 'l-aṭhār al-rāmilīyya.* There is also Lūbāb al-lūbāb (*fi 'ilm al-ḥafṣ wa-āshāf al-tarīb* (Cairo ms. 7612). The geomancy of al-Zanjātī was translated from Persian into Greek verse by the monk Arsenius in 1266 (cf. M. Steinschneider, *Europ. Übersets.*, 7, no. 22).

Next in order of fame comes ʿAbd Allāh b. Maḥfūz
al-Munadjdim, who, according to the colophons of the mss. Esat Ef. and Raşg Pşa, died before 664/1265. His work is entitled Muhallalât Ibn Mahâfîz fi l-raml (Râşg P., 964, 72 fols. 21.5 x 16). It is a fine copy made by Abîmd İsa from an exemplar dated from 664/1265, and it was made by Abîmd İsâ (who is mentioned in the colophon of ms. Paris 5834, 2) under the name of Muthallat Ibn Majûfuf (see above). Other Arabic geomantic writings have been translated into Latin, the one of Ahmad b. ʿAbd b. Bakr al-Wanâharî (wrote before 1167/1753), Sâhâm al-râbî fî ʿl-muhammas al-khatt al-ramli (Leiden 1233; Algiers 1535; GAL S II, 1042); Saṭîn b. Saʿîd b. Ahmad b. Abî Bakr al-Wanâharî (wrote before 1176/1773) to one side and Kazîm and al-Shîbîr on the other. This difference of opinion is probably the result of the variation in extent of the name for the coast of al-Baljrayn and ʿUmân, which is also apparent in the usage of geomancy. In contrast to al-Khatt, a strip of coast on the Persian Gulf. The Arab geographers are not agreed as to its exact extent. While Yâkût limits the name to the coast of al-Bâbhrayn and ʿUmân, which is also apparent from the mention of al-Kaff, al-ʿUkayr and Katar, al-Bakrî says definitely that al-Khatt is the whole coast between ʿUmân and al-Baṣra on the one side and Kâzîm and al-Shîbîr on the other. This difference of opinion is probably the result of the variation in extent of ʿUmân and al-Bâbhrayn in the wider sense of these terms in course of time.

In addition to the authors cited in La divination arabe, the following should be mentioned: Abu ʿIsmâl al-Zanâtî, probably from the Zanâtiyya school, Dhakhrî fî al-khatt (ms. Paris, 1275, 9; GAL S II, 1040); Yâyân al-Dîn ʿUmar al-Khîţabî, al-Dhakhlrafi l-khatiṣiyya fi tâdîm ʿl-raml wa l-sâdidat al-khâtî (ms. Gotha, 1917; GAL S II, 1041); Muḥammad b. ʿAbd ʿAbd Allâh al-Andalusi, al-Durr al-muḥiṭ bi-ṣifat al-ʿamal bi-ḥukm al-basîf fi ʿl-raml (Berlin, 1947; GAL S II, 1040); ʿAbb Ahmad al-ţaqaţî, al-Hâghiya al-ṣâḥsîyya al-ramliyya al-falâkîyya (GAL S II, 1039); Yahyâ b. Abîl Allâh b. Saʿîd al-Manâni, Raʾif al-igdâl ʿan waqî al-ṣâkhî (Alexandria, 1279, 9; GAL S II, 1042); Saṭîn b. Abîl Allâh b. Saʿîd b. Ahmad b. Abî Bakr al-Wanâharî (wrote before 1167/1753); Sâhâm al-râbî fî ʿl-muhammas al-khatt al-ramli (Leiden 1233; Algiers 1535; GAL S II, 1042); Saṭîn b. Saʿîd b. Ahmad b. Abî Bakr al-Wanâharî (wrote before 1176/1773) to one side and Kazîm and al-Shîbîr on the other. This difference of opinion is probably the result of the variation in extent of the name for the coast of al-Baljrayn and ʿUmân, which is also apparent in the usage of geomancy. In contrast to

Several other geomantic writings are known which are enumerated in La divination arabe (202-4). It should be noted that two of them have been translated into Latin, the one of Abîm ʿAbd b. Zunbul al-Muḥâllâ, surnamed al-Ramâmî (died after 800/1400) entitled K. al-Muḥâllâ ʿaṣâ al-muḥâllâ fi ʿl-râmî (ms. Uskûdar, Selim Âga, 547 bis, 168 fols. 29 x 20, naskhî, no date), an excellent and well-illustrated treatise with an introduction and a thirty chapters (cf. F. Klein-Franke, The Goemancy of Abîm ʿAbd b. Zunbul: a study of the Ambic Corpus hermeticum, in Ambix xx (1973), 26-33 and that of Abû Sâʿîd Kâjîlî b. Fârûq b. Ṭârûbûs entitled Thabarrîst fî al-muḥâllâ ʿaṣâ al-muḥâllâ fi ʿl-râmî (ms. Paris 5834, 2) reworked by Abû ʿAbd Allâh b. Ḥârûn al-Sûsî, ms. Algiers 1531; Bayezit Umûmi 4652, 23 fols. 19 x 14 taḥîkî, in Turkish). It was translated into Latin by Hugo Sanctallens (M. Steinschneider, op. cit., 36, No. 545; P. Tannery, in CRAIBL xxv (1897), 319; partially edited ap. Tannery, Mémoires scientifiques, iv (1920), 373-402; tr. ibid., 405-9).

The Arabic geomantic writings have been translated into Latin, such as Aljahfîn arabici filii Quaesitiones Geomantiae a Platonete (= Plato of Tivoli) in latinum translatae ex antiquo mss., Fasciculus Geomanticus, Verona 1687, 2nd. ed. 1704 (Steinschneider, op. cit., 64b); similarly, Gerard of Cremona translated an Arabic geomantic work under the title Liber geomantiae de artibus divinentibus (Steinschneider, op. cit., 30, No. 84); Bernardus or Bernardus Silvestris translated a geomancy established according to the twenty-eight mansions of the moon under the title Experimentarius oder liber fortunae and many mss. of this survive (cf. ZDMG, xxv (1871), 338-90; other references in Steinschneider, op. cit., i, No. 27). An Astrologia terrestres attributed to one Abî ʿAbd b. ʿUmar has been translated from Arabic into Italian and German (Steinschneider, op. cit., ii, 132-33; Nic. Catani, Del "khet-er-Raml" ou art de lire Vavenir sur le sable, in RT, 1920, 267-76; R. Davies, A system of sand divination, in Sudan Notes and Records, iii (1920), 157-62, and in PW, xvii (1927), 123-9; N. Eliséeff, Thèmes et motifs des Mille et Une Nuits. Essai de classification, Beirut 1959, 127-8 (five examples of the usage of geomancy, three for indicating a person and two for predicting the future). Abou Bakr ben Choai'b, La bonne aventure chez les musulmans, in RA (1906), 63-70; G. Ferrand, Un chapitre d'astrologie Arabico-Maîgache, in JA, 10th series, vi (1905), 193-273 (a chapter taken from ms. 8 of the Arabico-Maîgache collection in the B.N., Paris); Hâghîy al-Khalîfa, iii, 478-81; J. Maxwell, La divination, Paris 1927, 135-7; P. Tannery, Le Rabolion, in Mémoires scientifiques, iv (1920), 295-311; A. and L. Delatte, in Mélanges F. Cumont, Brussels 1936, 575-578; R. Jaulin, La geomancie. Analyse formelle, Paris-The Hague 1966 (= Cahiers de l'Homme, N.S. IV).
these wide applications of a fairly general term there is a particular, according to which al-Khatt was a particular settlement on the coast which belonged to the 'Abd al-Kays. A. Sprenger has adopted this view, which was held by al-Baladhuri amongst others, and there is much in favour of locating al-Khatt preferably in the Gulf of al-Bahrain. The place was in any case noted as a market for the famous Khati lance-shafts imported from India and sold to the Bedouins. The name of al-Khatt seems to be old.

If A. Sprenger is right in connecting it with "regio Athene" and "Chateni" in Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, 28, 147, and the "Atta vicus" in Ptolemy, the name dates back long before the Islamic period.  

Tha'alibi, who reproduces a selection of poems by al-Khattabî, compares him with Abu 'Ubayd [q.v.].

Of the twelve or so works which are attributed to him, one only, so far as we have been able to ascertain, has been published, the Bayân Ǧâzâ al-Kur'ân, ed. 'Abd al-'Alîm, Alîgarh 1953; ed. 'Abd Allah, Alîgarh 1957. Tha'alibi, in Thalâth Rasûl fi Ǧâzâ al-Kur'ân, Cairo 1955, 17-66. Several others exist in manuscript (see Brockelmann, I, 165, S I, 275): Ma'ânî al-sunnah (al-sunan), commentary on the Sunan of Abû Dâwûd (see Brockelmann, S I, 267, adding the manuscripts mentioned by 'Abd al-'Alîm, p. wâw); K. Ǧâzâ al-Khâlidî; Ǧâzâ al-Ǧâdî'îma al-muẖâdînî; Ǧâzâ al-mâsâdî Ǧâzâ al-Ǧâfî'; K. al-Ǧârî; K. al-Mughîdî (or al-Ǧârâ); K. al-Ǧâlî; K. al-Ghunya Ǧan al-kalâm wa-awâlî; Ǧâlî da'wâtî li-Abî (Ibn) Khayyâm.

Bibliography: Whereas his contemporary Ibn al-Nadîm does not mention him in the Fihrist, his friend Tha'alibi considers him worthy to appear among the poets mentioned in the Yatîma (Iv, 321). Main notices: Samânî, Amâsî, 222b; Subklî, Ǧudâbâl al-Shâfi'iyya, ii, 218-22; Ibn al-Imâm, Ǧudâbâl, i, 127; Dhhâbî, Tadhkîra, iii, 209; Ibn al-Dhawî, Muntaṣâm; Ibn Khallîkîn, i, 153-5; Baḥâdî, Khânuma, ed. Sâwî, 1934, iv, 101-13; Yâlûf devotes to him two notices, the first under Ahmad, Irqâḍî, ii, 81-7 = Ǧudâbâl, vi, 246-60, and the second under Ahmad, Ǧudâbâl, xii, 268-72; Sîyûât, Bughyâ, 239; F. Buštânî, Da'îrât al-maʿârifî, ii, 494; Goldziher, Muh. St., ii, 256 (where Ceuta should be corrected to Bust, thus in Muslim Studies, tr. Barber and Stern, ii, 235 n. 6); Brockelmann, I, 165, S I, 275. (Ed.)

KHÂṬṬÂBIYYA, extremist Shi'î sect in al-Kufa founded by Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭāb al-Asâdî [q.v.] (killed ca. 139/755). Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâbî claimed that the Imam Ǧâfar al-Sâdîq [q.v.] had appointed him as his deputy and legate (waṣî) and taught him the Greatest Name of God. He was at first encouraged by the Imâm, but later, probably still before 139/748, was repudiated and cursed by Ǧâfar. As a result, his followers split up into several subsects.

The reports of the heresiographers about these early sects are based on two accounts which are partially complementary and partially contradictory, and which can be traced back to the contemporary Hâshâm b. al-Hakam [q.v.] and to Abû ʿĪsâ al-Wârâqî (writing after 270/883), whose ultimate source is unknown. The former account is reproduced by al-Nawbakhtî and Saʿîd b. ʿAbd Allâh, while the latter is quoted most extensively by al-Ǧâfî. The following summary combines the two accounts with additional information from other sources.

One group continued to accept Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb as their leader and asserted that he was a messenger prophet sent by Ǧâfar, who was God. They held that there must be at all times two prophets, one speaking (mâtûk) and the other silent (ṣâmîl). In the time of Muhammad, he had been the speaking prophet and ʿAll the silent one, and now Ǧâfar was the speaking prophet and Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb the silent one. They considered all imâm-prophets, including Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb, as God. This doctrine is to be related to the belief ascribed to the Khattâbiyya in general, that the divine Light or Spirit inhered in the bodies of the imâms. They held that Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb had lifted the fetters of the religious law from them, considered false testimony in favour of their sectarian brethren as licit, and interpreted the religious duties and sins mentioned in the Kur'ân as referring to certain specific persons.

A second group, the Bazâghiyya, were the followers of Bazâgh b. Mûsâ the weaver, who was killed during the lifetime of the Imâm Ǧâfar. They considered Bazâgh, like Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb, as a prophet sent by Ǧâfar. While they testified to the prophethood of Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb, the latter repudiated Bazâgh's claim. They asserted that every one of them was inspired (yâhâ ilâyihi), that they would not die but be raised to heaven when their worship reached perfection, and that they were able daily to see their "dead".

Their claim of immortality was repudiated by the ʿUmâriyya, followers of ʿUmâr b. Ǧabîl al-Adîlî. Like the Bazâghiyya, however, the ʿUmâriyya claimed that they were all imâm-prophets and that Ǧâfar was God. When they assembled in al-Kufa to worship Ǧâfar, ʿUmâr was seized and killed by Yazîd b. ʿUmar b. Hubayya (governor 129-31/747-9).

Another group were the followers of al-Ṣarî al-Aṣqâm, who claimed that Ǧâfar had sent him as a prophet, calling him the Yâmmâ (abnd* al-islâm) in accordance with the statement of the Prophet: "Salmân is the Son of Islam".

The Muʿammariyya, followers of Muʿammâr b. al-ʿAbhar the corn dealer, affirmed that the divine Light had been transferred from ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib through Abû Ṭâlib, Muḥammad and the Imâms, and the imam-prophets to Ǧâfar, Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb and finally to Muʿammâr. With the passing of the Light from the bodies of Ǧâfar and Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb, the latter had become angels, while the persons now claiming to be Ǧâfar and Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb were in fact impostors. Muʿammâr was the God on earth who was obedient to the Greatest God in heaven. The Muʿammariyya denied that the world would come to an end and held that the bliss of paradise and the punishment of hell took place on earth. They claimed that they would be raised to heaven alive with their bodies, and also taught libertinism.

The account of al-Ǧarrâ enumerates as a further subsect the Khattâbiyya [q.v.] the Mufâdaḍaḥiyâ, followers of al-Ǧuḍîr al-Muṣâbîr al-Muḥammadî [q.v.] of al-Kufa, who considered the Muṭṭalib, then the Imam Ǧâfar and Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb, the latter having become angels, while the persons now claiming to be Ǧâfar and Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb were in fact impostors. Muṭṭalib was the God on earth who was obedient to the Greatest God in heaven. The Muṭṭalibíyya denied that the world would come to an end and held that the bliss of paradise and the punishment of hell took place on earth. They claimed that they would be raised to heaven alive with their bodies, and also taught libertinism.

The account of al-Wârâq enumerates as a further subsect the Khattâbiyya the Mufâdaḍaḥiyâ, followers of al-Ǧuḍîr al-Muṣâbîr al-Muḥammadî of al-Kufa, who considered the Muṭṭalib, then the Imam Ǧâfar and Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb, the latter having become angels, while the persons now claiming to be Ǧâfar and Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb were in fact impostors. Muṭṭalib was the God on earth who was obedient to the Greatest God in heaven. The Muṭṭalibíyya denied that the world would come to an end and held that the bliss of paradise and the punishment of hell took place on earth. They claimed that they would be raised to heaven alive with their bodies, and also taught libertinism.

Statements attributed to the Imâm Ǧâfar accent the lowly social status of the followers of Abu ʿl-Khâṭṭâb and al-Muṭṭalib, characterising them as scum (ṣafila) and outcasts (ṣâḥîfî). Some sources identify the Khattâbiyya with the Mukhâmamsa sect [q.v.]. This identification does not appear valid for the early Khattâbiyya sects described above, but must refer to a later stage which may, however, have begun still in the time of the Imâm Ǧâfar.
The assertions of some Imami sources broadly identifying the nascent Khattabiya [q.v.] with the Khattabiya, must be viewed with caution. More specifically, it is reported that a group of supporters of Abu l-Khattab after the latter's death joined the followers of Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Di'aifar, claiming that the spirit of Di'aifar had devolved on Abu l-Khattab, and from him, on Muhammad b. Isma'il. There are also reports associating al-Mufaddal with Isma'il b. Di'aifar. After the death of Di'aifar, however, al-Mufaddal supported the imamate of Musa. Although he evidently did not approve of the condemnation of Isma'il pronounced in other Imami circles. The doctrine of the Isma'il movement emerging out of obscurity about the middle of the 3rd/9th century shows little affinity with the specific doctrines of either the early Khattabiya or the Muhummisa and generally repudiates Abu l-Khattab. Muhummisa texts which eventually were adopted into Isma'il literature, like the 'Umm al-Kitaab, are secondary importations. The bulk of the Khattabiya-Muhummisa evidently remained within-in the extremist fringe of the Isma'iyya. Muhummisa doctrine formed the basis of the beliefs of the Nusayriyya [q.v.], who revere Abu l-Khattab, al-Mufaddal and his son Muhammad as the sabs [q.v.] of the Isma'iyya. Musa, as Musa al-Rida.
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**KHAWAND [see KHAMUND].**

**KHAWARDJ (see KHARIDJITES).**

**KHAWARIZM, KHAWARIZMI, etc. [see KHANZAD, KHARAZMI].**

AL-KHAWARNAK, a place situated about a mile east of Na'dajf [q.v.] in Ifrak. Inhabited at first by the tribe of Iyad, a palace was built in it by the Lakhmid chief Nu'mân (d. after 418 A.D.) for his Sasanian suzerain. It was there that Parwiz heard the news of the defeat of Dhukar [q.v.]. The palace was enlarged and used by the early 'Abbasids. It was in ruins in the 8th/14th century. The pre-Islamic Arab poets frequently quote al-Khawarnak as one of the "30 wonders of the world", along with the neighbouring castle of Sadir (perhaps Ukhaydir [q.v.]). Al-Khawarnak is also celebrated for having given rise to the proverbial expression "the reward of Sinimmar", the Greek architect who had built it and who was executed by Nu'mân. The name Khawarnak seems to be of Iranian origin (Huvarna, "with a beautiful roof" according to Andreas, or Khawarnar, "place of feasting" according to Vulers), although Ibn Djinmi connected it with the Arabic Kharnik and Nöldéke with a Rabbinical Hebrew word meaning "arbour, plantation".


KHAWASS [see KHAASS].

KHAWASS AL-KUR'AN, the art of drawing prognostications from verses of the Kur'an to which beneficial effects are attributed. The sacred text is used here in the same spirit as in rhapso- donomy ("im al-hur'a") and onomatomancy [see GAPR and HURÔF]. But it is here more particularly a case of the "natural properties" (qaraxax) which certain formulae of a magical and superstitious nature can have, based upon suitable Kur'anic verses, letters drawn from these verse, words, names of angels, prophets or God, prayers bearing celebrated names and poems (e.g. the Burda). Hence these varied elements are treated just as the "science of properties" treats animals, plants and minerals, by calling attention to the sympathy and antipathy which exists between them (on this science, extensively developed in Islam, cf. P. Kraus, *Jabîb ibn Bayyân*, ii, 61 ff.; M. Ullmann, *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam*, Leiden 1972, 393 ff.). Two series of results are sought from this practice, prognostications and beneficial effects (mandii). Medical prognostications are the most sought-after,
and the treatises of popular medicine are crammed with them (e.g., see al-Dā‘ wa-l-dawā‘ of Ibn Kayyim al-Djawziyya), which deals more specifically with the medical properties of the Fā‘itha; the K. Khawā‘ṣ al-Fā‘itha al-ghartha‘i of ‘Abd al-Kādir al-Djīlī; and the literature on al-Tibb al-nahawā‘ī.

There is an abundant literature on these properties, and a large number of them are treated in compilations like the Durrat al-khwā‘ṣ wa-khaws al-tibrā‘ī ft ‘ilqat al-khaws al-tibrā‘ī (d. 244/858) or the Ta’dikriat al-l‘-lā‘ib of al-Anṭākī (d. 808/1409). There exist also some monographs, of which the most famous is the K. Manfūṣ al-kur‘ān of ‘Abd Allāh al-Tamīlī, who wrote at the end of the 4th/10th century (Istanbul Univ. Libr. A 2243, ff. 48, 28 × 13 cm, naskhī, N.D. but fairly old). This includes a large number of superstitious uses of the Kur‘ān aimed at arriving at a knowledge of hidden things. ‘Abū ‘l-‘Abbās al-Djīlī (d. 627/1232) wrote both a K. Manfūṣ al-kur‘ān (ibid., A 5582, ff. 132, 23 × 14 cm, very fine naskhī) and a K. Sirr al-maktab min al-t‘lām al-makhtūn wa-khaws al-kur‘ān (ibid., A 4514, ff. 71, incomplete, 15 × 9.5 cm, naskhī). A K. Manfūṣ‘ swar al-kur‘ān and a K. Khawā‘ṣ al-kur‘ān al-tā‘īom are attributed to Dī‘far al-Sādīq (see Sezgin, O.A.S., i, 430). One should also mention the K. Manfūṣ ‘fī fikr al-dā‘ of Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām b. Idrīs al-Marrakushī, which divides up the famous basīda of al-Būṣṭī into several sections and describes the beneficial effects residing in each (see Ullmann, op. cit., 445-16).

Bibliography: For other works and for fuller details, see T. Fahd, La divination arabe, 214-45, esp. 241-3. One can also find in Ahlwardt’s Berlin manuscript catalogue, under no. 4155, various works on the khaws al-kur‘ān and under no. 4176, six works on the akhtāb or ad‘īya reputed to have special properties. The magical character of such prayers has been demonstrated by Goldziher, Zauberelemente im islamischen Gebet, in Orientallische Studien zu Th. Nöldeke gewidmet, Giessen 1906, i, 303 ff. (T. Fahd)

KHAWBAR [see KHOBAR].

KHAWLĀN. i. The name of a South Arabian tribe, of great antiquity and now divided into two branches. The larger section, which al-Hamdānī calls Khawlān al-šaybī, is now known as Khawlān al-i‘ṣādī and dwells south-east of Ṣan‘ā‘ on the upper reaches of the Wādī Dhāna, with the lands of Murād to the south-east and Nahm, in the highlands proper, to the north-west. The tribe now belongs to Bakīl. Their territory, which was described by Carsten Niebuhr in 1763 and visited by Eduard Glaser in 1885-6, is a very mountainous region, bisected by numerous tributaries of the Wādī Dhāna, and with a widely scattered population. It is noted for the cultivation of cereals and grapes. The chief town is Džhāhān, and of lesser import are Bayt al-Kibīl and Tan‘īm. The latter was formerly renowned as a centre of the Yemeni Jews and possessed many synagogues. The Khawlān consist of many independent clans and families, rarely under a single ruler, dispersed throughout innumerable fortified villages, and have always been loyal Zayds. Their savagely fanatical temperament and warlike disposition have given them a reputation for feuding and division. The Arab genealogists give as their eponymous ancestor Khawlān b. ‘Amr b. Mālik b. al-Jarrīḥ b. Murra b. U‘dād b. Zayd b. ‘Arif b. Zayd b. Kabīl b. Khawlān al-i‘ṣādī.

The other branch of Khawlān, variously known as Khawlān al-shām, Khawlān b. ‘Amīr, or Khawlān Khudā‘a, lives just south of the Hijāz border, in the mountains north-west of Ṣan‘ā‘, on the Ṣan‘ā‘-Mecca road, four days’ journey from the port of Hall. They too are described by Niebuhr, who mentions a number of their villages but no large towns. Since it is alleged that gold used to be mined in the region at Kufā‘, some authorities, most recently von Wissmann, have identified Khawlān al-shām with the Biblical Hawlā. The district is fertile and produces grapes, wheat, and coffee in abundance. The Khawlān are also Zayddis and have their own sha‘b, but maintain no contact with the southern Khawlān. Their genealogy may be seen in the variant given for Khawlān by some Arab writers, notably Yākūt: Khawlān b. ‘Amr b. al-Hāf b. Ḫudā‘a b. Mālik b. ‘Amr b. Murra. Since, however, Ḫudā‘an states that the Khawlān al-ša‘īya also belonged to Ḫudā‘a, the distinction between the two tribes may be taken as regional rather than genealogical. Von Wissmann has suggested that originally the tribe of Khawlān occupied the entire area between Ṣa‘da and Šīrwa‘, but was split in antiquity into the two branches by which we now recognise them by the invasion of Ḫāṣid and Bakīl, who now occupy the intervening territory, and in which lands it is interesting to find the village of Bayt Khawlān on Ḫiṣāl Ḫāṣīr Nabi Shu‘ayb [q.v.] and the mountain Ḫur Khawlān.

The two-fold division of the northern and southern Khawlān is reflected in the ancient inscriptions where the tribe is frequently mentioned. The earliest reference, in RES 3022 (Minaeana), is probably for the southern branch. The inscription may be dated to the latest in the late 3rd B.C. and tells how Saba‘a and Khawlān attacked a Minaean caravan en route from Ma‘in to RGM (in or near Nadjārān). Later references, which belong for the most part to the time of the Sabaeo-Ḥimyarite wars of the 3rd century A.D., are more explicit in drawing a distinction between ḤWLN ḤDLM, with which the towns of ṢRWH and T[NM and probably the tribe KBSYM and ḤWLN GDDM (also GDDN, QGDDTN, and GDDHN), which possessed the city of 5TDGN (e.g., Jāmine 1577, 601, 616, 649, 649, 658, CH 308). There can be no doubt that the former were Khawlān al-ša‘īya and the latter Khawlān al-shām.

In Shābān 1o/Nov. 631, envoys of Khawlān appeared before Mūhammad in Medina and confessed Islam on behalf of their tribe. They were instructed in the teaching of Islam by the Prophet himself, and promised to destroy their idol ‘Amīr Anas; they then received the usual gift of honour of 1½ ounces of silver and returned home. After the death of the Prophet they at first joined the general movement of apostasy, but Ya‘lā‘ b. Munya, whom the Caliph Abū Bakr sent against them with an expeditionary force, succeeded in regaining them for Islam in the course of the year 11/632. Politically they were on closer terms with the government in Medina than the other tribes of the Yemen, which was probably the result of their relations with the Persian rulers in Ṣan‘ā‘. They afforded shelter to both the Persian princes Djuḥayyāh and Fayrūz who were driven out of Ṣan‘ā‘ by the rebellion of the Arabs under Kays b. ‘Abd Yagūḥ b. Makhir and supported them till help came from Medina.

Members of the tribe of Khawlān, after their lands were finally opened to Islam upon the submission of the Yemen in 13/634 or 14/635, played an important part among the south Yemeni Saba‘ites in the conquest of Egypt and settled there. We frequently find Khawlāns in important positions in Egypt; in Old Cairo (al-Fustāf) they gave their
name to a quarter, and the name generally is not rare in the papyri and on Arab tombstones. One of the most distinguished of the companions of the Prophet is buried there, `Abd al-Rahmān b. Mishkam ʿAbū Muslim al-Khawlān.

**Bibliography:**

### al-KHawlān, ʿAbū Muslim ʿAbd Allāh b. Thuwaḥ

One of the eight Successors allegedly famous for their asceticism (ṣuḥādā′). He was born of the tribe Khawlān in the Yaman. One report (Abū Nuʿaym, Hilya, ii, 125) has it that he only became a Muslim in Syria during the caliphate of Muʿāwiyah, but other reports say that he had already been converted to Islam during the prophet′s lifetime while still in the Yaman. When al-Awasd b. Kays (cf. Ibn Ḥadjar, Tahdhib, xii, 236 and Abū Nuʿaym, Hilya, ii, 128; or: b. Ḥab, cf. Taftari, i, 1795) al-ʿAnṣāf Ḥuʿl-Himār summoned him to embrace his cause, Abū Muslim refused and was consequently thrown into a fire which did not harm him. He was then given leave to travel to Medina, where he arrived a year later. To record the undertaking of a pious devotee and one of the kādīs, he was appointed to it. He eventually settled in Syria. It is also said that he participated in a campaign into Byzantine territory. The sources have preserved various reports in which Abū Muslim boldly criticised Muʿāwiyah. Furthermore, it is alleged that he offered Muʿāwiyah his services as a messenger in an endeavour to appease the latter′s attitude towards ʿAli. He died in 62/682.

Although Abū Muslim is considered as one of the forerunners of Islamic asceticism, reports about his ascetic behaviour are on the whole very few in number. The most extensive account of his habits and the miracles ascribed to him is preserved in Abū Nuʿaym′s Hilyat al-aʿlāyīt, in which also a few sayings attributed to him can be found. This information is, on the whole, insignificant. It seems, moreover, that he was not only claimed by Muslim ascetics. It is also suggested in several reports that he had affiliations with Jewish as well as Christian circles.

On the one hand, Abū Muslim′s suffering at the hands of al-Awasd reminds one of Abraham and Nimrod. Besides, Kaḥb al-Aṣbāḥ (q.v.) called him the sage (ḥākim) of the community, although he had to admit to Kaḥb on one occasion that the Torah was right where he himself had been wrong (Hilya, ii, 128). On the other hand, a Christian monk once asserted that in his books Abū Muslim was mentioned as a companion of ʿĪsā b. Maryam (ibid.). Furthermore, cf. the ṣuḥādā′ budnī discussed below, which smacks of Christian influence.

Although generally recognised as a reliable transmitter of traditions, Abū Muslim is credited in the canonical collections with the transmission of only a few. The best known of these is a ṣuḥādā′ budnī (q.v.): “My love will be realised for those people who love one another because of me, my love will be realised for those people who visit one another because of me”, etc. (cf. Muḥ. al-Madani, K. al-Iḥbāf al-a′nīyya fi ʿa-bādith al-budnīyya, Hyderabad 1323, 10, no. 47 and Abūn b. Ḥanbal, Mṣnad, Cairo 1313, v, 236, 237, 239 and 326). In several ṣuḥādā′s of this tradition (cf. Mālik b. Anas, Muwaffaqi,
ed. 'Abd al-Bakl, ii, 953 f., Ahmad b. Hanbal, *Musnad*, v, 229, 233, 247) his name seems to be confused with that of another transmitter called al-Khawlanī, namely *'A'idh* Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh Abū Idrīs, one time bādi of Damascus. Since Abū Idrīs is considered as really too young (born in A.H. 8, he died in 80/699, cf. *Tahdhib*, v, 86 f.) to have transmitted this *badī* *husūl* from the Companion Muḥammad b. Dābal, Abū Muslim's name may have been inserted to bridge the gap in an otherwise imperfect *isnād*. Confusion of the two Khawlanīs seems to be also apparent elsewhere (cf. Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-asgārī*, i/v, ed. M. Schloessinger, Jerusalem 1938, 60).


KHAYĀL, the most important song form in the classical repertoire of north Indian music, is regarded by some to have been invented by Amīr Khursāw (651-725/1253-1325) and attributed to others by Husayn Ṣāḥīb ʿAḍāmī (862-934/1458-1528), the ruler of Dāmūl, who was dispossessed by Bihālī Lodī in 1476. Whatever its genesis, there is little doubt that it saw its greatest development during the Muslim period of Indian history and that its major exponents have generally been Muslims. It arose as a reaction to the traditional composition dhūrūf, whose rigid and austere character seemed to inhibit improvisation and technical virtuosity. In contrast, khayāl, as its name implies, was intended to afford greater freedom to the musician's imagination. The two forms continued to exist in competition with one another, their advocates riving among themselves and claiming superiority for their respective styles. In the 12th/18th century, khayāl received a tremendous impetus as a result of the efforts of Muḥammad Ṣāḥīb (d. 1265/1758) and that of his court singers Ādā Rāng and Sādā Rāng. It now leads all musical compositions and is regarded as the most significant contribution to the development of music. Its content deals primarily with religious and amorous themes, and consists of a relatively short set piece employed as the basis for improvisation.


KHAYĀL, Miḥ Muḥammad Taṣṭ, of Ahmadābād in Gujarat (d. 1173/1760), author of a collection of tales in 15 volumes entitled *Bustān-i Khayāl*, composed in Persian prose between 1155/1742 and 1169/1756, at the request of his patron Nawwāb Rashīd Khān, or, according to some manuscripts, for the two brothers Nawwāb Rashīd Khān and Nawwāb Muḥammad Iṣbāk Khān, sons of Dījar ʿAlī Khān (Nawwāb of Bengal 1170-4/1757-61 and 1176/1763-5); an account of the contents of this work, which is made up partly of historical legends and partly of fantastic fairy tales, is given by Estē, *Cat. of Persian Mss. of the Bodleian Library*, No. 496, pp. 34-2 (Estē).

**Bibliography:** Estē, in Gr. I. Ph. ii, 342. (Ed.)

KHAYĀL AL-ZILL ("Shadow fantasy"), popular Arabic name for the shadow-play, possibly brought over from South-East Asia or India and performed in Muslim lands from the 12th century A.D. to the 20th one. Although occasionally presented during the long evenings of the Ramadan fast, it has now virtually disappeared with the spread of education, the cinema and television.

The only extant texts of medieval Arabic shadow-plays were composed in the 7th/13th century A.D. by an Egyptian ophthalmologist, Ibn Dānyāl (q.v.), and consist of a humorous pageant of Egyptian life under the Mamluk ruler Baybars I (q.v.). More frequently, the shadow-play amounted to no more than a general guideline for the performers. In the Ottoman period the shadow-play spread through North Africa and other Arabic-speaking countries, as the Ottoman Turks popularised the *Karagöz* (q.v.), in which several stereotyped characters amused an unsophisticated audience. The *Karagöz* also penetrated Anatolia, the Arab countries, Greece and Roumania. Iran had its own form of shadow-play, as had Muslim communities in Central Asia, but they did not attain the same popularity. After Ibn Dānyāl's time, one finds scattered references to Arabic shadow-plays; however, only from the 12th/18th century onwards is relatively more known. In Syria and in most of North Africa a *Karagöz*-type prevailed, but Egypt held to its own tradition of shadow-play, which usually presented the adventures and misadventures of characters in the market-place or on Nile boats (e.g. *li b* al-maḥrub, *li b al-imāsāh*).

A standard khayāl al-zill performance in the 18th and 19th centuries was usually constructed on the following lines: a large sheet was hung as a screen on an improvised stage in the open air, in a coffee-house, or, more rarely, in a public hall, and a bright lamp placed behind it. Between the two, small (often 30 cm. high) two-dimensional figurines, of thin coloured translucent leather, were manipulated by the shadow-play master, who was called the muḥaddīm. He used several sticks to move the head and limbs of the figures, through holes specially pierced into the figurines; the shadows thus cast on the screen were both lifelike and lifelike. One or more persons assisted the muḥaddīm in this task and in the recitations of the different characters. The texts recited were memorised, rather than read, but often seemed also to bear the mark of improvisation, not unlike the *commedia dell'arte*. The *li b* ("play") started with a *mašīa* ("prologue") and was divided into *fusūl* ("acts"), although some plays were of one *fusūl* only. Songs and music were interspersed as needed, prose alternating with verse. The vernacular predominated and the contents and style were geared to a familiar background, e.g. the bath-house or the market-place. The plot was simple enough, usually based on misadventures and misunderstandings. Slapstick— including severe thrash-
advised him occasionally on grammatical problems in his writing. In the capital, Khayal soon won the favour of Suleyman the Magnificent, to whom he was introduced by the Grand Vizier Makbül (Maḳṭūl) İbrahim Paşa [q.v.], who had patronised the poet on the Defterdar Iskender Celebi's recommendation. Almost all his ballades, which have no particular literary distinction, are dedicated to Suleyman. The more generous favours of the Sultan aroused the jealousy of most of his fellow-poets, particularly of Dhatī (‘All, ibid., f. 459a) and Tahsilgali Yabäy [q.v.] who frequently attacked him with his punget satires, to which Khayal did not fail to retort. Following the execution of Iskender Celebi and İbrahim Paşa in 947/1535 and 943/1536 respectively, Khayal lost two powerful protectors. Although ‘Aṣḥāb Celebi says unconvincingly that the Sultan's favours never diminished ('Aṣḥāb Celebi, ibid., f. 271b), it seems that Khayal began to feel uncomfortable at the court during the grand vizierate of Rüstem Paşa [q.v.], who was not particularly inclined to the arts. He must have hinted to the poet that his presence in the capital was no longer desirable, for we see Khayal pressing for a post outside Istanbul, more exactly, to become Rumeli Kebâbçul of an army to Sandıq Bey, the one in which he had obtained. Khayal's public life after this period is somewhat obscure. His meeting with Fuḫūlī in Baghdad, which must have taken place during Suleyman's sojourn in 947/1534, is mentioned only by ‘All (ibid., f. 5066) without further comment. He died in Edirne, where he is buried (for the present state of his burial place, see A. N. Tarlan, Hayalî Bey Divanı, Istanbul 1945, XI).

Khayal is an outstanding and original Dinâne poet of his time. He wrote a few dozen brilliant lyrics which are lost, to the casual reader, in the mass of mediocre ghâals of the most conventional type. His reputation is thus disproportionate to his poetical achievement. It may be that the circumstances in which he left the court after the disappearance of his powerful protectors, and the fact of his apparently being an ‘Alawī in an environment where orthodox Islam was predominant, were important factors for his comparatively secondary position among his more celebrated colleagues. Although his superiority to Bâkî [q.v.], as claimed by A. N. Tarlan (Hayalî-Bahi, in Edebiyat Fâhîlesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyat Dergi, no. 1 (1946), 20-38), may be debated, since Khayal is far from having the mastery of form and the flow of style of the “Sultan of Poets”, there can be no doubt that some of Khayal's lyrics are more heart-felt and are more imbued with pervasive mystic passion than is the case with Bâkî and with the two prominent followers of his school, Şeykül-İslâm Yabäy and Nedîm.

Khayalî’s Divan has been edited by Ali Nihad Tarlan (Hayalî Bey Divanı, Istanbul 1945); this is based on manuscripts available in Istanbul libraries. Bibliography: see the tekbâres of Sehît, Lâşîf and ‘Aṣḥâb Celebi, and the biographical section of Alî’s Künh al-akhbâr, s.v.; Mu'allim Nâjdî, Esâmî, Istanbul 1308/1892, 137; Gibb, Hist. of Ottoman poetry, iii, 58; Fahîr İz, Eski Türk edebiyatında nâmîn, i/1, Istanbul 1966, 272-80 (selections from his ghâzals). (Fahîr İz)

KHAYBAR, the name of a famous oasis, and of its principal settlement, about 95 miles/150 km. from Medina; the district owes its renown to events which took place there in the years 7 and 20 A.H., not to natural features which distinguish it from other oases in the region. For this reason the
ancient Arab geographers, although they do mention it, provide only the briefest of information about it, giving special praise to the abundance of its palm trees.

1.—Geographical information.

Only al-Bakri and Yākūt have devoted to Khaybar as much as two pages in their Muṣājam: the former is concerned primarily with the details of certain places in the interior in the light of their historical importance, the latter informs us that the place-name Khaybar encompassed the entire wilāya and that this wilāya comprised 7 hiṣn whose names were: Ḥisin Naṭm, al-Kamūs (= Ḥisin Abū 'l-Hukayk), Ḥisin al-Shiḳḳ, Ḥisin (al-)Naṭāt, Ḥisin Ḥ-Sullimin (sic), Ḥisin al-Watḥ and Ḥisin al-Katibī. All these place-names are found in the historical Arab sources and are listed alphabetically in the Muṣājam of Yākūt. Wustenfeld (Die von Medina auslaufenden Hauptstrassen... 15) adds to them two other names, al-Yaḳṭūlī, ii, 56, another two, al-Bakri, 331, one other.

Yākūt states in addition that Khaybar was the equivalent of Ḥisin in the dialect of the Jews and since there were several of these in the region, the locality was also designated by the plural form Ḥayyābir. He quotes some verses where mention is made of the fever which was endemic in the oasis, and of the abundance of its date-palms.

From the texts of modern geographers we can glean some supplementary information: distance from Medina: 60 mīls; altitude: 2,800 feet (thus Doughty ed. Wustenfeld, 313) states that Khaybar encompassed the entire oasis and that this oasis should have consisted of a movement from fertile regions towards the desert; and that the emigration began probably after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., but proceeded steadily on account of the persecutions which the Jews continued to suffer in Palestine. Also, in our opinion, a factor would have been invitations sent to relatives and friends by those who, having settled in Arabia, were satisfied with their new situation. How did this satisfy me? In our opinion, the Jews found in Arabia conditions favourable to their spirit of initiative and appropriate to their customs. We believe that sufficient attention has not been paid to the following circumstances: (1) The traffic in precious merchandise from India and the Far East, diverted from Mesopotamia to Arabia following a series of grave events, had brought to the inhabitants of Khaybar a certain prosperity; (2) The Arabs were not at that time capable of producing for themselves the tools, the weapons, the textiles, and the jewelry which they needed or coveted, and the Jews, being skilful artisans and drawn by nature towards commerce, were in a position to supply these objects because they understood the art of manufacturing them or the means of importing them; and (3) Arabia was a vast country with a sizable population which offered, now that economic conditions were much improved, considerable opportunities for commerce.

In our opinion, the Jews in Arabia, besides their activity in agriculture (they were the pioneers in the cultivation of the oasis) and their commercial activities in their capacity as craftsmen, bankers and money-lenders, probably carried on these in collaboration with the Arabs, who provided the capital, and that while the Arabs acted as intermediaries between them and the tribes of the interior. The Jews possessed considerable wealth and it would seem difficult to suppose that this was due solely to the work of farmers and artisans whose production was for local consumption only. In fact, despite the absence of precise information, we possess certain indications. Some objects found by the Muslims in a redoubt at Khaybar (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 6) seem to us significant: a siege-engine, 20 bales of Yemeni cloth and 500 cloaks. Wellhausen, apparently struck by the singularity of the existence of such a machine among the Jews, attempted to explain it, suggesting (tr. of al-Wạḳdī, 269, n. 1) that these were used for settling quarrels among the families of the community. It would seem more logical to suppose that it was being stored in a depot for future sale, in the same way that swords, lances, shields, etc. had been sold by the Jews. Equally, the 20 bales of cloth and the 500 cloaks must have been intended for sale, as it is not conceivable that such a quantity of luxury goods was kept for the exclusive use of the Jews. If one accepts the idea of commercial activities undertaken especially by the Jews of Medina (cf. moreover M. A. Shaban, Islamic history, a new interpretation (600-750), Cambridge 1971, 10, 13), one understands better the reasons for which Muḥammad attacked them in particular. His hostility towards the Jews would have had economic causes similar to those which have brought about persecutions and pogroms in so many countries during the course of history.

According to Caetani (7 a.H., § 7) Muḥammad was moved to attack Khaybar by motives of political opportunism: on the one hand, the pact concluded with Kurayḥ at Hudaybiyya gave him the assurance of not being attacked by them during the expedition; on the other hand, if he conquered Khaybar he would
be able to satisfy with ample booty those of his companions who, having hoped to capture Mecca, were disappointed and discontented.

Montgomery Watt has drawn attention to the fact that the Banu 'l-Nadīr, driven out of Medina, had taken refuge in Khaybar and that their chieftains and the chieftains of other Jewish groups, eager for revenge, were intriguing against Muhammad along with the Arabs tribes of the neighborhood. So Muhammad had not only a just motive for attacking them, but there was also the positive necessity to destroy these enemies, more formidable even than the Kuraysh because of their adherence to their own religion, their intelligence and their superior culture. Muhammad Husayn Haykal (385-6) maintains that the Prophet did not feel sure of the northern fringes of the peninsula: he was afraid lest the Jews established in the oases of Northern Arabia betray him, and lest Heraclius and Ksirā seek help from them against him. The sources give support to the view of Montgomery Watt, showing that the Jews, already responsible for the coalition which had laid siege to Medina in 5 A.H. and worried by the growing power of the Prophet, continued to stir up the Arabs against him. Haykal's opinion, however, is to be rejected in that it is inappropriate to consider him as the agent of subsequent developments. In the year 7 A.H. Muhammad was not yet a figure to be reckoned with in the estimation of the rulers of the empires to the north of the peninsula. While giving full credit to the opinion of Montgomery Watt, one should not overlook the fact that the Prophet was in great need of arms and money to accomplish his objectives and he knew that he could find these among the Jews at Khaybar (the sources give precise details of the arms and type of arms captured by the Muslims from the Jews at Medina and at Khaybar; Caetani, 4 a.H., § 13; 5 a.H., § 49; 7 a.H., § 34).

Muhammad marched against Khaybar with 1,800 or 1,600 men and 100 horses (according to al-Mas'ūdī, Tanbīth, 256, with 1,400 men and 200 horses). The date of departure indicated by Ibn Ḥishām, sc. Mubarram 7/May-June 628, is to be preferred to those of other sources (see Caetani, 7 a.H., § 7 and n. 2). The march of the Muslims was secret and rapid, and the Jews only became aware of their arrival when they went out to their work in the fields. Alarmed, the inhabitants of the oasis took refuge in their homes, confident of their ability to defend themselves there, and from that time onwards each family or group held defensive positions in its own redoubt.

The attack by Muhammad had been foreseen, but no serious preparations for withstanding it had been made; at Khaybar there was no political authority which could have imposed a communal defence policy, and it seems moreover that discord reigned there (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 9, and 8). Their defensive policy was limited to seeking, with promises of reward, the support of the neighbouring Arab tribes. In fact, several thousands of the Ghatafan, pressed by the insistence of and the rewards offered by the Jews, came to Khaybar to offer their aid, but they withdrew at the very moment when their aid was needed. The sources explain their departure, describing how they had left their women, children and livestock in an encampment in the middle of the desert and, hearing great uproar from that place, they believed that the Muslims were attacking it and they rushed to defend their families (another version attributes their departure to a mysterious voice which warned them of danger [Caetani, 7 a.H., § 22]). Now, the Ghatafan embraced Islam immediately after the conquest of Khaybar and they did not return to Khaybar until after the successful completion of the operation; Muhammad conceded to them a hill in the oasis and one may suppose that this concession was the price of their withdrawal.

The process of the military operation has not been clearly described in the sources, and for purposes of reconstruction, the historian cannot base himself on the topography of the oasis, nor on a survey of the remains of ancient constructions in the harra, nor on the local tradition which indicates the sites where Muslims and Jews fought one another. The actual place-names, which Doughty collected, differ entirely from those mentioned in the sources (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 6); one site alone can be identified, the place where 'All gave proof of his valour, and this only because there is a mosque bearing his name. We restrict ourselves here to drawing out from the detailed accounts of the sources those aspects which characterised the hostilities and the more famous episodes of the two facts should be noted. First, in the oasis there were three regions: al-Naṣāt, al-Shīb and al-Katība, probably separated by natural diversions (sā'ūdīs, lavadrits, swamps). Second, each of these regions contained several kisān. Those which Muhammad besieged and which provided for the Jews homes, store-houses and stables (Caetani, 7 a.H., §§ 26, 28) could probably be described as "farm-strongholds", the term applied by Ph. Lippens in his Expédition en Arabie centrale, Paris 1956, 37, to the buildings in another oasis, also called Khaybar, situated to the south of Mecca on the Bīṣā-Abā road (cf. Fu'ād Ḥāmza, Bilād, 263); "farm" because after the fashion of the buildings described by Lippens, the kisān of our Khaybar were surrounded by cultivated fields, and by many palm-groves (Muhammad ordered the felling of 400 palms around one kisān to force the defenders to capitulate; Caetani, 7 a.H., § 17); "strongholds" because they were raised up on the hills or on the basalt rocks of the oasis as to be more defensible, such as the kisān of the principal settlement which stands on a long, basalt crag (Doughty, ii, 76) and the kisān of al-Zubayr which, we are told by the sources, stood on the summit of a cliff (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 27).

The situation following the retreat of the inhabitants into their redoubts was as follows. The Jews, after a rather bloody skirmish in front of one of the kisān, avoided combat in the open country and Muhammad, having none but the most primitive means of assaulting the fortifications, found himself obliged to invest one kisān after another, and to wait until the capitulation of the defenders should become inevitable through lack of water and food. This did not prevent those besieged from transferring, under cover of darkness, women, children and treasures from one kisān to another as the situation demanded; sometimes the warriors themselves, to make their resistance more effective, passed from one region to another, from al-Naṣāt to al-Shīb and from al-Shīb to al-Katība.

There were, during these sieges a number of skirmishes preceded by duels, a number of sorties by the defenders, some attacks by the Muslims and exchanges of arrow-shots between the two sides (Caetani, 7 a.H., §§ 15, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 31); among the Jews there were spies and traitors who, in order to save their own skins, gave useful information to the enemy, in particular, concerning the use of certain machines of war which the Muslims learned to use at this time (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 28). All these episodes are recounted in great detail by the Arab chroniclers; there were others which had much greater
repercussions and consequences for Islamic history and law.

As those besieged in one of the ḥijras defended themselves stubbornly (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 20-3), first Abū Bakr, then ʿUmar, took up the standard in the hope of breaking down their resistance, by putting themselves at the head of the attacks; but they still failed. Muhammad then declared that the next day he would entrust the standard to "a man who loves God and his Prophet and whom his Prophet love"; he then called to ʿAll (this tradition, reported by Ibn Ḥīḥām, 1579 and 1580, shows a Shift tendency) and ʿAll, cured of his opthalmia after the Prophet had spit into his eyes, killed a valiant Jewish chieftain with a sword-stroke which split in two the helmet, the head and the body of the unfortunate victim. He then gave another proof of his exceptional physical strength. Having lost his shield, he lifted one of the doors of the ḥijra from its hinges and defended himself with it, then used it to make a bridge whereby the attackers gained access to the redoubt. The door was so heavy that later, when it was put back in place, eight men were needed for the purpose. ʿAll had showed his prowess at Badr, at Ubud and elsewhere, but this fact astounded the Muslims (al-Ṭabarî devotes a page and a half to it, 1579-51); it was greatly exaggerated (see Doughty, ii, 126), and finally became one of the reasons for which the futuwa [q.v.] made of ʿAll the prototype of heroes.

At the start of hostilities, the Muslims suffered from lack of provisions (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 24, and cf. 9 a.H., § 42). Their need drove them to kill, disable and cook a score of asses which had escaped from one of the ḥijras. Muhammad declared that the meat of horses, mules and asses was forbidden and the cauldrons in which the ass-meat was being cooked were overturned. This judgement was nevertheless mitigated: it is permissible to eat even forbidden foods when one is forced by necessity (Kurʾān, II, 168/173, VI, 119/118, XVI, 116/114).

One of the women taken prisoner in one of the ḥijras, Ṣafīyya, who was married to a Jewish chieftain, caught the attention of the Prophet (Caetani, 7 a.H., §§ 27, 30, 36 and n. 4); but she threw his mantle over her, a sign that he had chosen her for himself; then Ṣafīyya's husband was put to death, and she herself was married to the Prophet, whose sole concern at this time was that the oasis should continue to be cultivated, and by the Jews, since Arabs did not like working on the land. The Prophet limited himself to subjecting the Jews to a perpetual servitude, reducing them to the status of land-servants. For this reason, in later years when an interest in legal matters developed (see Doughty, ii, 5), and finally became one of the reasons for which the futuwa [q.v.] made of ʿAll the prototype of heroes.

A Jewess laid before Muhammad, who was dining with his Companions, a roast sheep (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 37). Muhammad took from it his favourite part, the shoulder, but putting it to his mouth he noticed that it had a strange taste and spat it out (according to one tradition the sheep spoke to him to warn him). One of his fellow-diners who had tasted the dish fell ill and died some time later. The woman confessed her crime (during the hostilities at Khaybar she had lost her husband and other close relatives), but it is not known whether Muhammad had her executed or pardoned her (al-Ṭabarî, i, 1584, says that he did not punish her, ṣadqāna lā ṣaad). The Prophet ordered the restitution to the Jews of the books containing the holy Scriptures (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 38). It was at Khaybar that he laid down instructions concerning the sale and exchange of precious metals (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 38).

After about a month and a half of hostilities which cost the Muslims very few casualties (a score of dead; Caetani 7 a.H., § 43), the Jews asked the Prophet to offer them an agreement and they capitulated, accepting his conditions (thus Ibn Ḥalîdîn, ii, App. 39, and his version is preferable, in its details, to those of the other sources: Caetani, 7 a.H., § 15 nn. 1 and 2, and § 33). Under the terms of the agreement, the Jews were to remain in the oasis on their land and were to cultivate it, but in future were to hand over one-half of the produce to the Muslims. From a legal point of view, the pact was defective, since it did not define the situation of the Jews and did not say whether they were to remain the owners of the soil which they were to cultivate (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 34); it must be assumed that the problem was not even envisaged by the Prophet, whose sole concern at this time was that the oasis should continue to be cultivated, and by the Jews, since Arabs did not like working on the land. The Prophet limited himself to subjecting the Jews to a perpetual servitude, reducing them to the status of land-servants.
tionists came to their aid—with material suiting the interests of one or the other party, as will be seen below when we shall deal with some of the traditions collected by Yahyā b. Ādam (d. 203/818) in his Kitāb al-Kharāṣṭī, on the nature and the distribution of booty and the spoils of war.

The goods of the Jews (Caetani, 7 a.H., §§ 39, 41-42), of which Muhammad took possession by his conquest of Khaybar, consisted of movable and immovable property. The former was divided among the warriors; all the objects would have been piled up to await distribution, and anyone who took anything out of turn was compelled to return it. As for the land, the sources are not clear, either what was the kind of property to be divided, or on the manner by which the distribution was effected. Caetani maintains that the Prophet divided solely the produce of the lands of Khaybar; on this point he is categorical (7 a.H., §§ 33, 41 n. 2 218; 10 a.H., §§ 100-102; 20 a.H., § 237; 25 a.H., § 559) and Montgomery Watt, 250, is in agreement with him; Caetani criticises (10 a.H., § 100 n. 1) Baron von Tornauw and M. van Berchem, who did not doubt that in 7 a.H. the Prophet divided up the property, the former in Das Eigenthumsrecht nach mosaischen Rechte, in ZDMG, xxxvi (1882), 298, the latter in La propriété territoriale et l'impôt foncier sous les Califes, Geneva 1886, 8-9. Caetani bases his conclusion on a passage of al-Baladhuri according to which the Prophet divided up the property, the former in the relevant traditions (ibid., §§ 9; on the significance of the word wafyafa in this text, see translator's note on p. 112 no. 9), and other parts were distributed (ibid., § 91). And §§ 90, 91), against expenses of his guests, and of delegations coming to him from the interior of the peninsula, and against any other eventualities (ibid., §§ 91, 94, 95). Thus the Prophet, when in the event of the death of 'Umar, was concerned with the interests of the state.

But let us examine the traditions collected by Yahyā b. Ādam which reveal the efforts made by the traditionists to import the concept of the Prophet at Khaybar. First of all, they draw a distinction between ghanima (that which is taken by force, *sulh* and *fay* (that which is obtained by treaty, *wakf*) (Yahyā b. Ādam, §§ 7, 12); since it could not be deduced that Khaybar had been captured *sulh* (see e.g. ibid., 18), and since it would have been difficult to expunge traditions according to which the Prophet had reserved for himself part of the lands of Khaybar (see the variant version of al-Baladhuri and Yahyā b. Ādam, § 9), there were traditionists who settled the question declaring that the fifth part of the ghanima having first been detriated—this part belongs to God and it is "given back" by God to those whom He has named (Kūrān, VIII, 42:42) His Messenger, the Messenger's relatives, the orphans, the needy, the wayfarer—the rest belongs to the Muslims who have captured it, and must be divided among them equitably (Yahyā b. Ādam, §§ 4, 11, and cf. 18, 12, end), one part for each warrior and two for his horse, if he has brought a horse with him (the question becomes controversial if he has two, ibid., § 7). Others (ibid., and § 8) declared that the lands are excluded from the ghanima: these (ibid., and § 101) are *fay* and (ibid., and § 48) belong to the Muslims, that is to say, to the Muslim community (al-Ṭabarî, i, 158a, is explicit: Khaybar was a *fay*). Others again, resorting to subtlety, claim that the Imām after having taken the fifth part and thus having made of the lands a ghanima, may distributed the remaining 4/5 between the warriors who had captivated it, or hand over the whole to the Muslims in perpetuity as a *fay* (Yahyā b. Ādam, §§ 9, 10, 101; in the *fay* there is no fifth share, ibid., § 12, and cf. §§ 17 and 101).

The Imām may abstain from the distribution to the warriors, because the Prophet at Khaybar kept for himself a portion of the lands (ibid., § 9) on the significance of the word *wakf* in this text, see translator's note on p. 112 no. 9), and other parts were distributed (ibid., § 9). Muhammad assigned some shares of the produce of al-Katiba (his fifth) to his wives and to

What makes the distribution of goods at Khaybar interesting to the historian is a variant account, presented as a tradition by al-Baladhuri (26) and confirmed by other traditions in the collection of Yahyā b. Ādam (§§ 90, 91, 94, 95). These traditions change substantially the account given above of the assessment and distribution of the lands at Khaybar, and change it in such a manner that one is tempted to suppose that all these traditions were inventions in spite of their provenance (we consider them to be authentic), in order to justify the decision of 'Umar about the lands of Sawād—a decision which was certainly judged politically correct, if not necessary, by most of the people, but which, to be rendered legitimate in the eyes of all, had to be supported by the precedents of the Prophet referred to in traditions. According to the variant account, the land of Khaybar was divided into 36 parts (instead of 18) and Muhammad divided half of this amount among the troops (Yahyā b. Ādam, § 90); of this half he also received a share for himself (ibid., §§ 91, 94); the other half he reserved to provide funds against administrative needs and matters in hand (ibid., §§ 90, 91), against expenses of his guests, and of delegations coming to him from the interior of the peninsula, and against any other eventualities (ibid., §§ 91, 94, 95). Thus the Prophet, when in the event of the death of 'Umar, was concerned with the interests of the state.
certain members of his family. Calculations have been made of the quantity of dates and grain which this fifth would have provided (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 42), and there have been attempts to assess the amount of the rents accruing to the Prophet from the oasis cultivated by the Jews; they were certainly considerable, but Sprenger's idea, that Muhammad could have maintained with these revenues an army of 4,000 or 5,000 men, is an exaggeration (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 40).

The Banu Bakr made a change in the situation established by the Prophet at Khaybar; 'Umar made no change during the first years of his government, but in 20 a.H. he modified it completely. That year (Caetani, 20 a.H., § 234-237) he announced in a speech delivered in the mosque of Medina that he had decided to expel the Jews from Arabia. To justify this decision, which reversed the pact concluded with them by the Prophet, he claimed to have learnt, and to have acquired positive verification, that Muhammad had declared before his death that two religions could not co-exist in Arabia. According to Caetani, the traditions which report this phrase of the dying Prophet and those which accuse the Jews of misconduct and of crimes were invented; equally, one should doubt the veracity of the suggestion that Muhammad warned the Jews that he was reserving the right to expel them later, and that he was leaving them their lands only in so far as it was pleasing to God, all land being the property of Muslims. These traditions tend evidently to absolve 'Umar from the charge of having acted against the will of the Prophet in his decision regarding the land of the Sawâd.

Caetani claims that the true motive for the new assault was made by the caliph's contingent and local: the oasis could henceforth be cultivated by slaves, whose numbers had been greatly swollen through military campaigns outside Arabia (al-Baladhurî in a way confirms this motive, saying that the Muslims, having become powerful, were now in a position to expel the Jews). Having removed the Jews far away from the oases of Arabia, giving them lands in Syria, 'Umar proceeded to a new partition of the oasis, in the sense that he assigned to the beneficiaries of the produce the ownership of the land from which they were receiving their rents.

The success of the Prophet at Khaybar had as an immediate effect an increase in his power, for several tribes, enemies until that moment, embraced Islam and recognised the hegemony of Medina (Caetani, 7 a.H., § 49); another consequence of great importance lay in the economic advantages which Muhammad and the Muslims, particularly the Muhadjîrin, gained from the conquest of the oasis: Muhammad because on now he could rely on fixed revenues, the Muslims because it was not only ʿĀisha who could cry out "Now we can have our fill of dates". Many had cause to rejoice in the change in their economic situation. However, the historical importance of the event lies not in the facts above indicated, but in the pact concluded between Muhammad and the Jews which set more or less directly the style for relations between the Muslims, conquering vast territories beyond the confines of Arabia and the non-Muslim peoples who fall under their domination. (For a juridical interpretation of this pact, the relevant traditions and the additions which were made to them, see Santillana, i, 359-62 and n. 235).

The history of Khaybar during the succeeding centuries is bound up with that of the Hijâjâd and of the Najîd, and offers nothing of interest.

It may be noted that some Jews either stayed in the oasis or returned there (al-Mukaddasi, 95; Caetani, 20 a.H., § 220; Vartebana, who travelled in Arabia during the early years of the 7th century, noted that in a locality between Damascus and Medina (Khaybar?) lived between 4,000 and 5,000 Jews (but Pirenne doubts this, pp. 215-16). Towards the mid-12th century, the Jews were in considerable numbers there (Pirenne, 76). In the mid-19th century, Khaybar was part of the amirate of the Al Rashîd, whose capital was at Ḥāʾil, and it stayed under the domination of this dynasty until its collapse following the death of ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz b. Rashîd (1906). It then belonged to the Sharîf al-Ḥusayn of Mecca until 1922, when it was captured by Taṭālûn, son of ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz Ibn Saʿūd (in 1918 he had defeated the troops of the Hijâjâd near al-Ṭâḥîf (OM, iv (1924), 599). On these events, see in particular, H. St. John Philby, Saʿūdî Arabia.


KHAYBAR or KHYBER PASS, one of the principal passes (together with the Kurram, Tochi, Gomal and Bolan Passes) through the mountain barrier separating the Indus valley plains from Afghanistan. The pass runs north-westwards for ca. 33 miles/50 km. from the Shadi Baglar opening up to a further 6 miles/10 km. beyond Fort Jamrud, itself 7 miles/12 km. from Peshawar, to the barren plain of Loi Dakka, which then stretches to the Kābul River banks. The highest point of the pass is at Landi Kotal (3,518 ft./1,070 m.), an important market centre for the region, after which the road descends to the beginning of Afghan territory and Landi Khana. The surrounding country, now falling mainly within Pakistan, is controlled by Afridi Pathans, with Mohmands to the north.

The pass has been of great strategic importance all through history as a gateway for invading armies to debouch on the plains of northern India. It was probably used by Alexander the Great's generals, and in Islamic times, was used at least once by Māmmūd of Ghazna and on various occasions by Bābur, and more recently, by Nadir Shah Afsār and Ahmad Shah Durrānī. In the 19th century, it became especially valuable as the most direct channel for the Government of British India to exert pressure on the Kings of Kābul, being little blocked by snow during the winter months. During the First Afghan War (1839-42) there were various skirmishes between British troops and the Afridis. A Khyber Agency was created by the Government of India, with a special officer in charge of it, during the Second Afghan War (1878-80), the guiding policy being non-interference with the undependable nature of the Khyber Rifles, they were disbanded and their place taken by regular government but supplying their own arms and equipment, by the Scouts and by the Frontier Constabulary. Under the viceroyalty of Lord Curzon (1899-1905), an extension of broad-gauge railway had been made to Fort Jamrud and a road to Landi Kotal, and in 1925 a narrow-gauge railway was constructed as far as Landi Khana. After 1947, Pakistan became responsible for the Khyber Agency, which was attached to the Peshawar division of the North-West Frontier region of West Pakistan.


KHAYL (a.), a fem. sing. noun with a collective meaning denoting the equine species. The term has no singular and, like ībīl “camel” and ghānam “sheep”, it is to be included in the category of collectives for domestic animals forming the basis of nomadic life (see Ch. Pellat, *Sur quelques noms d’animaux en arabe classique*, in GLECS, viii, 95-9); however, the plurals ḥhayl and ʿakhyl are found for it. The extent of the concept of ḥayl covers the whole range of terms comprising, in Islamic society, the activities based upon use of horses, such as, with āsh, the nouns barīd, ḥayl, ḥild, ʿakhd, ḥarād, ṣawī, ṣarrī, ṣaward, ṣawānd, ṣayd, and ʿabād [q.v.]. According to the Arab philologists, ḥayl “horses”, from the double radicals ḥ- ʿ, y.-l. is supposed to refer to the “haughty gait” of these proud animals (lit. ḥaylāl ʿāshīf al-khaylī); but this ingenious explanation is, even in the eyes of Ibn Sidūl himself, somewhat subject to caution (Mukhassas, vi, 165). One might well ask whether ḥayl is not from a substratum of terms inherited from the languages preceding Arabic, which may be confirmed by the parallel usage of preciser terms, like ṣarā “riding horse”, ḥawād “excellent runner”, ṣāʾīr “mule”, ṣāʾīn “stallion of noble blood”, ṣanā ṭah “non-thoroughbred mare”, bir ḥawān “nag of non-Arab stock”, which all have plurals. In the same way, Latin had, at the side of the classical equus, the vulgar caballus of Gaulish origin.

Starting from its metonymous sense of “mounted troop”, ḥayl furnished, by the process of derivation, some exact denotations, such as ḥaylāʾ “equitation” and ḥayyāl “horseman”, but without the knightly connotation of ṣurūr or the military one of the old Persian term swēdr (pl. swēdr, aswēdr, asūwēdr); it was also said of the Turanian peoples that they were a ḫawm ḥaylāyām “mounted race”.

In Arabia, at the outset of Islam, horses were very few in numbers and, thanks to the kūlwāt al-ḥayl bi, the names and pedigrees are even known for the most famous of them (see G. Levi della Vida, *Les <<Livres des chevaux>> d’Ibn al-Kalbi et d’Ibn al-A’rdbi*, Leiden 1963, index). After 1881, there were formed the Khyber Rifles, a force of jezailchis or tribal levies, who were paid by the Government of India and who guarded the pass until the risings of the Afridis and Orakzais under Mullah Sayyid Akbar in 1897-9. Thereafter, the Khyber Rifles were supported by a mobile British army column in Peshawar, and the British became responsible for the safe passage of caravans through the pass. After the Third Afghan War of 1919 showed the undeniable nature of the Khyber Rifles, they were disbanded and their place taken by regular British troops, by Khassadars (local tribesmen enrolled for escort and simular duties, paid by the government but supplying their own arms and equipment), by the Scouts and by the Frontier Constabulary. Under the viceroyalty of Lord Curzon (1899-1905), an extension of broad-gauge railway had been made to Fort Jamrud and a road to Landi Kotal, and in 1925 a narrow-gauge railway was constructed as far as Landi Khana. After 1947, Pakistan became responsible for the Khyber Agency, which was attached to the Peshawar division of the North-West Frontier region of West Pakistan.
was doubtless following these examples that the great confederation of Gharatân [q.v.], spread over Najd, utilised the system of the himâ, favoured by having at their disposal relatively rich pasture lands on the fringes and slopes of the great plateau, with drainage from running streams. The results of this well-thought out stockraising policy showed positive results, since in the 6th century, several tribes, including the Banû 'Abs, were each able to fit nearly a thousand riders; it is at this time that the sayydî assumes the name of fâris and the ra'is that of kâdî al-khayl. One of the oldest-established and most famous of these reserves for breeding horses was the vast himâ Darsìyya [q.v.], which in the time of the caliph 'Uthmân had several tens of thousands of beasts, horses as well as camels. Equally flourishing was the himâ of al-Baqî' near Medina, which had a permanent water supply for the whole year. Correspondingly, the great carvan centres of the Hijâz had near them their own himâs forming a protective zone against the depredations of nomads.

The Prophet Muḥammad, conscious of the supreme value of the horse for the success of Islam, was skillfully able to appropriate the resources of the existing himâs for the benefit of the new community, at the same time strengthening their invariable character by their integration of function into the Islamic karam. Consequently, the warriors for the faith benefited considerably from these reinforcements for their campaigns of razzias. Admittedly, there was a need at first to cope with the incredulousness and indiscipline of the Bedouin plunderers, but some severe reprisals soon instilled in them a respect for "closed tracts belonging only to God and His Messenger" (âl himâ illâ lillah). The effects of this policy of utilising horses were immediate, and thus one sees the Banû Sulaymân, at the time of the conquest of Mecca, bringing to the Prophet the support of some 800 horses. The karam territories were enlarged and new ones created.

The Orthodox caliphs, and 'Umar especially, concentrated their efforts on building up the potential forces of horses for Islam; the establishment of the reserves of al-Rabâdha, which was several hundred square km. in extent, and of al-Nâdidi (tasâlih), harnassing could not permit a tradition of equitation which might become a school. Moreover, shoeing was only a rudimentary cavesson or snaffle (lijâ[m], from Persian blance of a saddle. The bridle "the gourd-shoot" (kabak), in tournaments, polo, the dira'id. "the goad-shoot- ing" (kabak), jousting and arms-play on horseback; at the present time, only the Afghân bus-hakshi "goat-dragging" can give any idea of the spirit of competition and the enthusiasm animating these equestrian sports, in which virtuosity and brutality existed side-by-side. Far from equalising these feats, the Arabian Bedouins only used their horses for occasional straightforward charges over short distances, getting the maximum from the animal's resources. Hence their method of riding was of the simplest. Not knowing the use of saddles, stirrups and bits, they rode bareback or with a saddle-felt (mirghâba) strapped on, and with some padding attached in the rough semblance of a saddle. The bridle (lijâdm, from Persian liham) was only a rudimentary cavesson or snaffle-bit, whose snaffle was usually of cord or of wood (see Lâ, root lâ), min); such a primitive method of harnassing could not permit a tradition of equitation which might become a school. Moreover, shoeing horses with nails (tasmir), a Gallo-Roman invention in the 6th century, being unknown, some Nadjî tribes used, on hard and pebbly terrains, a sandal of iron or leather (nâl), as is attested in a verse of al-Kuhâyf al-'Ukâyli (see Aâhm, xxii, 250), which must have considerably restricted the horse's speed when ridden fast.

The method of riding used by the Arabs of 'Irâk and Syria was quite different and much more elegant. Amongst the Lakhûmids, heirs of the Parthian-Šâsînâd
method, and amongst the Ghassānids formed in a similar tradition of the Greeks, the tribes were much more habituated to use of the horse than their brethren in Arabia. They used at that time a method of harnessing perfected long before, and from antiquity till the 8th/14th century, hardly changed. The saddle shaped like a cradle, built upon a wooden saddle-bow (kayyab) and shaping both the cantle and the pommel, resembled somewhat the modern type said to be "for rapid riding". Held in place by a single or a double saddle-girth, it generally had also a breaststrap and a buttocks-strap to prevent it sliding either forwards or backwards. For display purposes, a large cloth over the hindquarters, richly decorated (the kunbādā), was added, as many Persian miniatures on equestrian themes show; the saddlery of persons of high rank showed a luxury sometimes excessive, in which applied work in precious metals and encrustations of precious stones competed in display. At a time when the Mamluks had levelled down the saddle-cantle so that they could shoot backwards in the ancient Parthian method, the Persians conceived the idea in the 8th/14th century of a saddle with a high back, not very compatible with a rational method of riding, but suitable for shooting with the archer or cross-bow, which had become a common weapon of war. The soldier thus armed had in fact to rear up in the stirrups and wedge himself against the cantle. This kind of saddle-cum-chair has persisted till the present day, above all in the Maghribi, but was strongly criticised by the Mamluk Muhammad ibn Maghfi, in his treatise on hunting written in 772/1371 (K. Ūns al-mala',..., Paris 1880, 13-14), who found in it seven major faults which militated against good riding technique (see F. Viré, review of Saracen archery by J. D. Latham and W. F. Paterson, London 1970, in JSS, xvi (1972), 260).

As for the bridle and its bit, these remained unchanged from the time of the great civilisations which evolved them. The ensemble comprised essentially a bridoon with a curb-bit (lazma), whose slender lower parts, curved inwards in an S-shape (whence the name mādīf, from Persian mādīh, "stylised"), operate as a lever. The beams could be more or less severe in degree, with or without allowing freedom for the tongue, according to the hardness of the mount's mouth. The deplorable invention of the curb-bit, called—perhaps wrongly—"the Arab curb-bit" and a real instrument of torture going contrary to all the natural principles of the horse's handling, seems to have come from a need to reduce the animal to a simple machine, at a time when there had been formed regular corps of mounted cavalry, mounted on entire horses or stallions which were hard to control and with which co-ordinated mass movements required absolute discipline and perfect execution. It is nevertheless true that, from the viewpoint of modern equestrian art, the backed saddle, the Arab curb-bit and the heavy stirrups with soles, all of which make up the image of the perfect "Arab knight" and the Maghrībi spahi, show a total ignorance of a rational method of riding based on the mount's accord with his rider's desires. The addition to the bridle of a fixed martingale (Persian sarafsar "headrope", Maghrībi jabābādā, classical bākama), Persian in origin, appears ca. the 5th/11th century in miniatures paintings.

Spurs, used in China from the 2nd century B.C. onwards, were probably known at the time of the Lakhmids, but not very widespread. In the likeness of the stirrups of Mexican gauchos and of the Mongols, these were made of wood, and according to al-Muhallab (Kāmilli, ii, 228, and ibn Khallīkān, Cairo 1299/1882, ii, 192, tr. de Slane, iii, 510), it was allegedly al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra, governor of Khuṣaynīn in 79/699 and leading figure in the suppression of the Khāridjīs of al-Diayfārī, who was the first to equip his cavalry units with forged iron stirrups, since the wooden ones then in general usage broke too frequently in the course of military engagements. These schematic details about the harnessing of the horse in Islam cannot be absolutely authentic for all space and time, since each land and each period had its own usages and customs in regard to equipment, according to its own special resources. Differences of detail appear when one compares, on one hand, the information of western authors like the Andalusī Ibn Hudhayl [q.v.] with that of easterners like Ibn al-Munghir [q.v.], and on the other hand, places them alongside the documentation provided by iconography. Riders and horses were indeed one of the most-used themes in the minor arts; miniatures, ceramics, textiles, carved ivories and engraved copper-ware objects depict a great variety of types of harnessing and accoutrements in sense of princely court-life. The richness which these objets d'art endeavour to depict confirms the description given in the 6th/11th century by the chronicler Ibn al-Tuwair (525-627/1131-1220) of Fatimid ceremonial at the festival of the New Year (see M. Canard, La procession du Nouvel An chez les Fātimides, in AIEO Algiers, x (1952), 374-9). He speaks there in fact of saddles worked with gold, silver and enamelling, hung with brocade and siglattun; the 70 mounts of the caliph himself bore necklaces of gold and amber collars round their necks, and anklets plated with precious metals round their feet. An animal equipped was estimated to be worth a thousand dinārs.

With the help of all the Arabic texts dealing with horses and, especially, the two mentioned above plus the "Book of agriculture" (K. al-Fīlāṭa) of the Andalusī Ibn al-'Awwām [q.v.], one can get an idea of the level of horsemanship practiced by the Muslim cavalryman in the Middles Ages, apart from the Arab Bedouin. The authors, whoever they may be, were never able to disentangle the three concepts of hippi-
forward in the so-called “French” manner gave an adequate amount of stability. The insistence of the authors on an indispensable equal length of reins and on the synchronisation of the use of the two spurs brings out clearly the absence of any predominant action of a rein or a leg.

In contrast to all the other treatises, an accephant manuscript of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale (Az. No. a815) puts forward a more thoughtful method based on a constant exercise: a circular training-routine (nadwar), at all the varying paces and with two hands. Without being described completely and explicitly, it envisages the change of pace and the correct backing, with release of the bit, followed by a period of the grand trot, and describes this perfectly. Nevertheless, this documentation is a late one, and one may well think that it has been inspired by western techniques; one accordingly wonders whether in this method of riding, the average Muslim rider ever, one day, rose to this degree of perfection. Whatever the truth, it must be admitted that over a long period of time, equitation amongst the Muslims regressed, whereas amongst Christendom, it improved progressively up to the methods of the great school of horsemanship.

It can easily be imagined how important, in the economic life of the Islamic world up to the modern period, was the upkeep of cavalry units, with all that they needed of furnishings and equipment. Because of these exigencies, a number of specialist artisans, connected with farriery, saddlery and harness-making, had an era of prosperity, and there were hardly any Islamic settlements without their susb al-sarradjin or their bāb al-haddādin. A good amount of the basic equipment required for these activities were imported in Bāqf al-wad. Saddles and boots, from Berbera [q.v.], via the Red Sea and from Hīfījia via Kayrawān and Barka, where they were tanned, there came luxurious panther skins, the saddle-carpets preferred by the Mamluks and whose use was spread by the Turks to the cavalry forces of Central Europe. The saddle felts (misb, pls. ansāb, musāb) were sought from Armenia, Adhbar, Jīlān, Kūnis and Mawṣil, as well as pack-saddles for beasts of burden. In Susa furnished expensive sumpter-cloths. Imports was not limited to these materials and manufactures, but extended also to lively nags (birdakh, pl. bardakh) from the Mongol and Byzantine worlds, equally good as mounts and as beasts of burden; they formed a lively element of trade at markets and fairs set up at the gates of towns. As for mounts of Arab stock, these were most often the objects of direct trade between breeders and purchasers, see the K. al-Tobayṣir attributed to al-Dīḥūs, tr. Ch. Pellat, in Arabica, i (1954), 158-60; J. Sauvaget, Historiens arabes, Paris 1946, 10-12; M. Lombard, La chasse et les produits de la chasse dans le monde musulman (VIII-XI siècle), in Annales, xxiv/3 (1960), 577-85. Despite all the speculations in horse-dealing and trading which this lively commerce in horses engendered within Islam, one can be certain that no one ever thought of speculating financially in regard to the semen (sāb) of stallions, since the Prophet had formally proscribed making money out of breeding. According to certain traditions, the mating of mares and asses was allegedly forbidden, but the importance attached to mule-breeding studs [see BAGH] by people in the Islamic world proves that such a prohibition was never in fact put into force; even so, the mules of the Caucasus, and especially of Barqā’s [q.v.], were imported and prized for their speed and endurance.

But if the Muslims freely imported horses, their sale outside the Dār al-Īslām [q.v.] was, in the first Islamic century, absolutely prohibited and considered as an illegal act by the majority of jurists, who based themselves, in the interests of the legal requirement of ḥijād, on the divine words “Prepare against them whatever force and cavalry you are able to get to-gether, of those held ready (min ribāt al-ḥayl), to overawe thereby the enemy of God and your own...” (Kūr’ān, VIII, 62/60). The horse was thus elevated to the rank of fighter for the faith and received two shares in the plunder if it were of Arab stock, whereas its rider had only one. The horse-potential thus revealed itself, for the new community, as the nerve-centre of warfare and the secret of victory, it was further forbidden for Dhmimīs [see DHMIMA] to ride horses. Later on, when the Islamic frontiers had reached their maximum extension, these rigours were relaxed and applied only then to horses of pure Arab stock, to which Abū Ḥanīfa added valuable mules. However, in Morocco right up to the eve of the Protectorate, the prohibition of riding horses was applied to the Jews, at a time when elsewhere, and for a long time back, this law no longer bore down on non-Muslims. The latter, all through the Ottoman empire, only had the bother of obtaining a special authorisation from the sultan in order to export horses to foreign lands. Since then, horse-breeding among Muslims were abandoned in all Muslim states. Certain lands relaxed these at quite an early date; a proof of this is the felicitous introduction, in the 18th century, into the British studs, of the famous stallions Darley-Arabian and Godolphin-Arabian which inaugurated the Stud-Book and were the origin of the present pure-bred English stock. From this last and by breeding with new Arab stocks, M. Gayot obtained in 1833, in the Pompé de China, from Chânlup, the perfected type of Anglo-Arab horse, which now holds the top rank in international racing. At the side of that, the Maghribi Barbary horse has continued to restock the numerous stables for training horses and equestrian centres of France, after having built up over a century and more, the glory of the splendid squadrions of North African spahis.

Bibliography: For addition to the references given in the article, see the bibliographies of the respective articles further referred to within the article. (F. Virkē)

KHAYMA (A.) “tent”. When the ancient poets and the writers of the Middle Ages spoke of a nomad’s tent they generally described it by the very widely-known Semitic term bāyi [q.v.], which refers to a dwelling of some kind, either permanent or temporary, and so is not without ambiguity. A more precise term is bāyi ḡawar, lit. “dwelling of hair”. But this word can also cause confusion since the ductus is the same as in bāyi ḡawar, “verse of poetry”. There is, however, less confusion in the spoken language and the expression has a typically bedouin air; it is still current among nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes from North Africa to the Near East where, beside the normal name for tent, bāyi/bh, b. ḡawar, there occurs no less frequently, in the speech of rural peoples, town dwellers and even transhumants, the term Khayma/ khyama. This word has followed a curious semantic evolution (see below) and has come to acquire the general meaning of a mobile dwelling made of animal hair, wool or any other material except leather. Today, among many rural people and even town dwellers, the memory of a former nomadic way of life is preserved by their actually using khaymah/khema to denote a house, and it has totally replaced bāyi/bh. For a number of reasons, therefore, it seems conve-
nient to record under this heading a general exposition of the use of the tent among the tribes of the Muslim world including the nomadic, semi-nomadic and those becoming sedentary.

1. — ANCIENT ARABIA

Arab philologists of the earliest periods of Islam have collected the vocabulary of the tents that were used in pre-Islamic Arabia; in particular al-Asma‘, author of Kitab al-akhkhas wa-al-bayyit (quoted in the Fihrist, Cairo ed., 82). Mediaeval commentators on archaic poetry and lexicographers have widely exploited the documentation which they repeat in their work, and from this material ancient terminology may be reconstructed, even though there is no hope of answering all the questions that arise from it. Given that ancestral practices tend to be maintained, it may be possible to infer from the present-day situation, to a certain degree at least, what obtained before and immediately after the birth of Islam.

According to the author of the Lisān, the mīqāl, mazāla, made of goat’s hair, was the most spacious tent. Although the term has several meanings it does not appear to have been used frequently; one occurrence of it is found in the Nābi‘id of Dhjafr and al-Farazād, ed. Bover, 506, for example. Next in size were those tents which was also made of hair according to Abū Zayd al-Anqār (in L.A.). This word would seem not to have been widely used, for the lexicographers are not agreed about its meaning and some even take the wasāf as the smallest tent.

The bāyī or bāyī ṣa‘ar was also of goat’s hair and of average size. It served as a dwelling for breeders of small livestock (that is to say, of numerous beduin) and the term takes on a type of generic significance.

The khibd was probably similar to the bāyī in size, but was distinguished from it by the camel hair (wabar) or wool (ṣif) that was used to make the awning. Apparently it was the usual dwelling of the camel-bearing nomads, who were called akh al-wabar in contrast to akh al-madar, the sedentary peoples. Although the influence of alliteration may have played its part in the formation of these expressions, their literal meaning must have some significance. Even so, it is impossible to be certain whether the distinction between bāyī and khibd, which are both equally frequent in ancient texts, corresponds to a different geographical distribution, or to a contrast between two large categories of nomads in Arabia [see BADO], or simply to different levels of life within one tribe.

Suradik denotes a cloth tent of quite large dimensions; a jistik was a smaller tent used by travellers; the midrab, described as a “royal jistik”, was likewise a tent under which important people camped when travelling (today the word occurs in military vocabulary); and bubbā was applied to a hide tent (adim).

Finally, there is the term khayma. It does not figure in the lists of various tents that can be gathered from classical lexicographical works, but it seems to be approximately synonymous with julla, arish and ṣarīḥ, all of which denote simple shelters. Originally a khayma was erected on three or four stakes (a‘wād, ā’l) driven into the ground with supporting cross-members (ṭawrūd) covered with branches (ṣadjar) or grass (yummān, one of the Graminaceae). It was essentially a rudimentary shelter, circular in construction, which the nomads would erect especially near wells and watering-places. Its welcome coolness would have provided shelter from the rays of the sun and they must have also erected frames around their tents to benefit more completely from the slightest breeze. There is, therefore, nothing surprising in the fact that in the Kur’ān, LV, 72, the plural bhiyām denotes the tents in which were the houris. ‘Hilla (Kur’ān, VIII, 170/171) means a sort of canopy and these two terms are the only ones of those under discussion which are attested in the Holy Book—except bayī, which is very frequent but which never denotes a nomad’s tent there.

The meaning of khayma given by the dictionaries is found again in classical poetry (e.g. Nābi‘id, 173, 333-4, 395, 1004), and just when this meaning evolved—an evolution which is being maintained today—is not known. The extension of the meaning (for which the reason is not clear) had arisen at a fairly ancient period, since the mediaeval lexicographers use khayma or one of its plurals to define a tent of any type whatever (e.g. Lisān, s.v. b.b.b.: al-bubbā, min al-bhiyām). Given that in ancient Arabia there does not seem to have been a specific term to denote the awning, it is not impossible that before it was applied to the entire tent, the word had a more restricted meaning; the roof of a khayma implies the idea of stretching it over something and it may follow also from a passage of al-Bark al-ṣahīmi by ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī (ms. Oxford, Marsh 425, f. 4b), where it is stated that among the main products of the town of Āmid appeared busa‘, furush and bhiyām, all woven products.

Whether the material used was hair or wool, the awning of the Arab tent was made of bands (faliṣja, ḥubka) sewn side-by-side and forming a rectangle. The length and number of these bands would vary according to the desired dimensions, but their width had to be of the order of 50-80 cm., so that they would be more easily manageable and replaceable. Those that were placed at the two edges, that is, those that form the larger side of the rectangle, were called kisr or kars. Inside the awning, one or several bands of hair or wool (jarihā), about twenty cm. wide at the most, were attached to the sewing of the faliṣjas and ended perpendicularly at the large sides with two kisrs. Each jarihā was equipped at each of its extremities with a device for anchoring it called hâtār, and it was to this that the ropes (funub, pl. a‘fūb) were attached and tied to pegs (waṣīd, pl. wa‘ād) driven into the ground some distance away with a mallet (miyad or miyada). The anchoring of the tent was completed on the small sides of the awning by cords (ṣār, pl. suṣūrṣāra), shorter than the ajnab, but similarly joined to pegs (also called ṣār). The words hâtār and hīštubutu both denoted a band placed vertically around the awning to fill the space which separated it from the ground.

In a bayī, so the dictionaries say, the main ridge piece, which was of considerable importance, was called dā‘īṣa, but Arab tents do not seem to have used a ridge pole, since the central jarihā takes its place. It is said that this jarihā rested on vertical posts (ṣamūd, dī‘ ṣma, budnī‘ budnī‘) and there were pads of felt (lībā, pl. al-‘ībā) on which the chamfered ends of the posts were cushioned to prevent it from being pierced. The same precaution was probably taken for the side jarihās, which in the big tents leaned on slanting poles, shorter than the others, in order to diminish any sag in the awning. The same construction may still be seen in the East (see below) and it is worthy of note that in North Africa, where the ridge pole is used, it is the only part of the tent, mutā‘is mutandis, not to have a name which is attested in ancient Arabia.
Finally, to prevent water from penetrating underneath the tent it was surrounded by a drain (mu'ayyayin) edged with moulded earth (iyād). Inside, the lay-out scarcely differed from what can be seen today (see below). The section reserved for women, like the palanquin, was generally called ḥādir, pl. ḥādir, from the name of the curtain which separated it from the rest of the tent; poets frequently hymned the rabīṭ al-ḥādir.

**Bibliography:** Apart from the dictionaries, see especially G. Jacob, Altsarabisches Beduinleben nach den Quellen geschildert, Berlin 1897. (Ch. Pellat)

### ii. — In the Near East

The noun khayma belongs primarily to the city-dwellers’ vocabulary. It is applied to various kinds of tents, whatever their form and whatever they may be made from. The desert peoples are aware of this, but for preference they use the term bayt ša‘r for their portable home, often abbreviated simply to bayt.

Apart from the question of size, bedouin tents vary very little from one region to another. Essentially, the bayt is always rectangular and never circular; it is made out of a roof covering of the hairy skin of a black goat, sometimes mixed with camel’s wool (suf, gotba, Sba), walls of the same material, poles and cords. The technical terms used to designate the different parts of the bedouin tent are not always identical in all tribes.

The roof is called ṣafi al-bayt by the Tiyāḇa of BiR al-Sab. It is made up of several oboi̇ng bands or panels, shīhā (pron. shegag, pl. shibāb (shegag) sewn together, their number depending upon the importance which one wishes to accord to the tent. The dimensions and especially the roof covering fluctuate between 8 and 12 m., and the width, which is limited by the weaver’s technical skills, is rarely more than 70 cm.

The roof covering is supported by several tent-poles (‘āmūd, pl. ‘āmūdā) placed in parallel rows, one of which, in the centre, forms the ridge-pole. Since there is a danger of its being torn through tension and especially through its own weight where it is stretched over the poles, it is reinforced by transverse strips called ḥāfānā, tarīga, etc. These are sewn together on the internal surface in such a way as to hold together between themselves the shibāb. These strips are 10-15 cm. wide, and they extend beyond the dimensions of the tent, from one side to the other, by some 15 cm. After being folded over and sewn, a loop is thereby made at each extremity, through which a small stick can be placed. Thanks to an attachment contrivance which has a V-shape, the connection between these sticks and the tent-pegs (awāt̤, pl. awāt̤ā) can be effected. The pegs are fixed into the ground and held by cords (kabāl, pl. ḥādāl, or ānb, pl. ānāb), which secure the tent and make the roof covering taut and in place.

In the customary law, reparation for the tent’s honour, as an insult to the host but equally to his dwelling. When a stranger comes into a Bedouin’s tent, he must, at the moment of taking possession, be made to feel not only his physical or moral, whilst he is there, is considered to be a guest. Any attack on his person, or any interference with the objects or the personal belongings in the tent-walls. The rear wall, placed against the frame of only middling status who have newly adopted se- dentary life, since they no longer have to make big upheavals and migrations.

The names of the tent-poles vary according to position. In an ʿādiya tent, the central pole is called ʿamūd al-ʿusāfī, or ʿamūd al-ʿamūd; the front one is called ʿamūd yad al-bayt; and the rear one, ʿamūd al-ridjīl, according to the terminology of the Tiyāḇa.

The tent is open at the side opposite the direction of the wind, and the other three sides are closed by the tent-walls. The rear wall, placed against the direction of the wind, is called ṭawaf. A narrow band, about 25 cm. wide, is sewn on to the top edge, and reinforced with an additional strip. When the wind changes direction, the ṭawaf is moved and the opposite side opened up. In summer and weather permitting, the tent is opened as far as possible; even the side-walls are rolled up, thus making the bayt into an open octagon. At this time, the bayt changes its colour; the heavy goat’s hair roof covering is replaced by a cotton cloth. Often, old jute sacks are used, on which can still be seen imprinted the exporter’s trade-mark.

The bayt is divided into two parts, separated by a curtain hooked on to the internal tent-poles, which has sufficient height for the people in one compartment not to be able to see what is happening in the other. One of these two compartments is reserved for receiving menfolk and is called the rabā‘a or magʿad al-ridjīl. In the middle, a hearth is scraped out and used for making coffee. The other one is reserved for the womenfolk, and is called the mahrām or nahrām. Here, the cooking is done and the provisions stored.

The womenfolk are responsible for preparing the materials and sewing up the various components of the bayt, their erection and dismantling. This is an essentially feminine activity, for the men must always be ready to ward off a possible attack.

Despite its apparent frailty, a bedouin tent is hard-wearing and often lasts for a whole generation. The erection, bind, of a tent often means that a new hearth has come into being. The master of the new dwelling must, at the moment of taking possession, offer a blood-sacrifice to appease the spirit of the place where the tent has been raised up. The central pole (al-ʿusāfī) is then smeared with the sacrificial blood; sometimes the ṭawaf is also sprinkled with it. A further sacrifice is necessary if the tent is significantly enlarged. Finally, when the ṭawaf is worn out and has to be replaced, a blood-sacrifice often accompanies this operation.

However humble it may be, a Bedouin tent is above all a dwelling-place. It has accordingly certain strictly-defined rights, and contravening them can have extremely serious consequences for the offender. When a stranger comes into a Bedouin’s tent, he is considered to be a guest. Any attack on his person, physical or moral, whilst he is there, is felt not only as an insult to the host but equally to his dwelling. In the customary law, reparation for the tent’s honour is as severe as the penalty attracted by someone guilty of an involuntary homicide. In his turn, the guest must show great respect for the dwelling
which has received him. If he shows himself unworthy of the confidence shown to him, the tent’s master brands him as a traitor to the rules of hospitality; he may then be liable to corporal punishment, abhorrent to the Bedouin, and be perpetually dishonoured.

The right of asylum also inheres in the ḥaṭy. A murderer who manages to escape his pursuers and to take shelter in any dwelling, which is not his own or that of a close relative, has secured refuge from danger. Moreover, it is not necessary, for his security, actually to enter the tent; he may merely touch the ropes or even reach the protective zone around the tent, sc. the inviolable area called by the Bedouin maḥārīm or maḍārīḥ al-ḥaṭy. In order to delimit this, a strong and vigorous man stands at the entrance of the tent and hurls a large stick straight in front of himself. The spot where it falls marks the extreme edge of the zone within which the rights of the tent operate. This idea of inviolability is not dissimilar to that of the sacred area of pre-Islamic times, like the ḥaram, the ḥimā and the baṣfa.


iii. — NORTH AFRICA

The nomads and semi-nomads of North Africa and the Sahara live in several different types of tent, but these are basically similar, and the differences can most often be explained by economic and geographical features. Besides batt and bat ʔ-string, the usage of which has now spread to the major nomadic groups, the word ʔ-ʔarma is the one most current in Arab speech. In Berber three main terms appear: ʔem and variations among the Touareg, ʔarga and variations in the east and south-east of the Berber area, ʔahma and variations in the central and western areas. The first two terms are Berber, while the third could be derived from the Arabic, although a convincing etymology has not been established. In the different northern Berber languages, words denoting the main parts of a tent are borrowed from Arabic, treated in different ways and not of major interest. Those belonging to Berber are extremely varied, and could give rise to an interesting study in linguistic geography, but it would be too much to cite in the present article, which must be restricted to discussing essentially Arabic (and Touareg) terminology.

As elsewhere, the rectangular awning is made of bands (ʔelq, pl. ʔelfa) 70-100 cm. wide and varying in length up to 18 m. They are black or brown in colours and sometimes have a white border (in Libya). In some regions, the wool and goat or camel hair which make up the main material are sometimes mixed with palm fluff (ʔif) or vegetable fibres. A more rudimentary awning can equally well be made with long plaits of dwarf palm leaves (ʔówn, or ʔarín (ʔstįpą barbüśa) or of alfa grass (ʔal bénéfic [q.v.]). Among the Touareg, the awning is made from the skins of goat, sheep, moufflon (less and less) or even ox, coarsely cut and sewn one after the other to form equal bands (ʔalhähr). The whole is supported either by a single vertical pole (ʔaŋṣānkiyi) about 2 m. long, surmounted by a little wooden ridge-pole, or by two arches (ʔengu) of tamarisk wood aligned 1.5 m. apart and linked by a cross-bar. In the first type, the vertical pole is used especially in the rainy season so that the awning has a sufficient fall for water to drain away. At other times it is replaced by two poles supporting a cross-bar, but this second type is becoming less common.

In the rest of North Africa, only the first type of frame is used and there are some significant variations in it. In the east the ridge pole is a broad square stay-block (Tripolitanian: ʔorťał) which becomes longer and narrower in the Tunisian South (ʔorťał) and the Algerian South-East (ʔenję); in Morocco, longer ones are seen, called ʔammar, and reaching a length of 2 m. The ridge-pole may be supported by a single vertical pole (ʔaša), as in the Sahara, Libya and Tunisia, or by two slanting poles as in the large tents of Tripolitanian (except the Djaɓal Taʕlis), or by two intersecting poles, which may be quite short as in Tunisia and Awrâs, or simply by vertical poles, more widely spaced as the tent becomes longer.

The ʔfrgā, the descendant of the classical ʔarîka, is everywhere to be seen but it is supported by a ridge-pole. Often secondary ʔfrgās are added to the main one; they are supported by slanting poles which raise the awning to drain off rainwater and to maintain a convenient height inside. The awning is fitted with small cords (ʔibl, ʔärfa, ʔemghbl) which are fastened to the ʔfrgās and to the ʔfrgās on the small sides with wooden hooks; at the other ends they are fixed to pegs (ʔutd, ʔelesem). Among the Touareg these pegs (ʔataq in the east and west sides, ʔunu in the north one, ʔmadəq in the south one) generally number twelve, equally spaced around the cardinal points and fastened directly to the edges of the awning, which they support. On the south side the central peg (ʔagm) is longer than the others and is used to raise the awning to provide an entrance. Nowhere does the awning touch the ground, and the empty space is filled according to the climate with brushwood, rush matting or special long narrow covers (ʔefsā, ʔefsā). In North Africa the place where the ʔfrgā ends on one of the long sides is directed towards the centre of the encampment or the ʔdawr [q.v.], and access is gained by lifting the edge of the awning; this forms a door during the daytime. Finally, the tent is surrounded by a trench (ʔnįwęn) or; cf. above, ʔnų’y) for draining away any rain-water.

The classical ʔąjįli “room in a bay” survives as ʔįli (Fr. guitoune), the name given to shelters made of sackcloth or pieces of material or of canvas produced in Europe (South Tunisian: ʔįli). In Morocco, the official tent of state authorities is made of unbleached cloth decorated with black patterns and is of conical design; it is called a ʔbšmān.

The nomads load the dismantled tents on to asses. When they arrive at the camping ground the task of erecting them (verb: ʔbnd) is reserved for the women. Once the frame and awning have been stretched out on the ground and the pegs put into position—by guesswork but generally exactly spaced—the woman calls her neighbours to help her. She creeps under the awning to lift it over the poles, and then the tent is anchored and the usual furniture put back into place.
Among the Touareg, the left side on entering is reserved for the man and there are placed his seat, his arms, his saddle-bags and also his water-skin. The woman uses the right side where she puts her possessions as well as the bags of food, the kitchen utensils and dishes, which are rudimentary. Two fires are built in front of the tent, one for warming oneself and the other for cooking. Each tent is occupied by a family. The boys sleep with their father, the girls with their mother on sheep skins spread on the ground; the richer families have carpets.

Elsewhere the interior arrangement of the tent may vary, but it shows some common features. The kitchen utensils usually include a cooking pot, a copper pan, a dish on which to bake bread, a water jug, platters and winnowing baskets of esparto grass, wooden spoons, leather water bottles—which are also used for churning butter—a sieve, skin bags for dry food, and woollen or hair bags for grain. The fire is kindled in a hollow in the ground, which is surrounded by three large stones or topped by an iron tripod. In some tents an opening is made in the awning above the fire to allow the smoke to escape. A pottery stove is used especially for the preparation of coffee and tea and it is fed with charcoal. The mill is generally shared between several tents. The simplest type consists of two semi-spherical millstones. The upper one is pierced by two holes, one hole in the centre is to receive the grain to be milled and the axle mounted in the nether millstone; the other is set at an angle to hold the wooden crank, which sets it working, and often requires the efforts of two women. In addition to all this equipment, there is a loom for the flilhs and a second loom for weaving carpets, covers and woollen garments etc. The nomads sleep on mats and wrap themselves in covers. The area kept for the women (kḅafla) is sometimes separated by a curtain (kḅyl) hung between the poles, but often carpets, covers, clothes and miscellaneous possessions are piled on nets mounted on legs to provide an adequate separation.

It is the men's responsibility when the flilhs have to be sewn to make a new awning (they rarely last more than five years) or to replace a damaged band; (a) to prepare the wooden pieces for the frame.

Each operation is accompanied by prophylactic rites intended to protect men and beasts. The ornamentation of the ridge pole, which has a symbolic value since it supports the whole construction, includes drawings which originally had a magical significance. Finally, various objects and amulets are supposed to ward off the djinn and to assure the prosperity of the tent's inhabitants.

prised both the forest zone of northern Mongolia
and the Lake Baikal region and also the steppelands.
The characteristic modern Mongol felt tent or ger is
essentially similar to the Türkmen őy, i.e. it has trellis
walls, and the roof of light poles, also felt-covered, is
born upon a roof-ring, though the shape is usually
conical rather than domed. Thus a great deal of
wood is required for its construction, a commodity
scarce in the steppes and one which often has to be
brought from a considerable distance. The Mongol
do, however, have another type of tent, the mųyɣan,
which is a low tent requiring much less wood and
in recent times covered with cotton cloth purchased
from Chinese traders; this is taken on Mongol cara-
vans, with the ger used for camping at the regular
pasture grounds (see O. Lattimore, The geographical
factor in Mongol history, in Geogr. Jinnal, xx(1) (Jan.
1938), 9-10, also in Studies in frontier history, col-
seems accordingly probable that the Mongol ger
evolved in the prehistoric (sc. pre-13th century) past
of this people from the tents of the forest peoples,
perhaps from an origin like the tepee or wigwam of
the Tuva forest tribe of northern Mongolia, of Turk-
ish peoples of this region like those dwelling in
proximity to Mongol tribes around Lake Khubsugul,
and of the reindeer-herding Tungus, which is a con-
ically-shaped covered mobile with skins or birch-
bark (Turkish uruda, Mongol obuyбабай, cf. A. Róna-
Tas, Preliminary report on a study of the dwellings
of the Altai peoples, in Aspects of Altaic civilisation,
Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the PIAC, ed.
D. Sinoz, Bloomberg-The Hague 1963, 50). Cer-
tainly, the Mongol epics of recent times, of the Orot
of north-western Mongolia, describe the hero's tent
as made with a framework not of wood but of animal
bones, and as covered not with felts (since forest
dwellers have no sheep) but with animal pelts (B.
Vladimiritsov, Le regime social des Mongols, le foda-
lisme nomade, Paris 1948, 49). In regard to the fit-
tings and furnishings of the ger, the central fireplace
or hearth has always been the focal point; amongst
the Kazak Turks of western Mongolia, this is now
usually a four-legged iron fireplace, and it is gradually
replacing the old stove (see Róna-Tas, Notes on the
Kazak yurt of West Mongolia, in Acta orientalia
Hung., xii (1961), 84).

The earliest Mongol sources, such as the Secret
history and the accounts of the Mongol expansion of
the 13th century, both Islamic and European (the
latter including e.g. the travel narratives of William
of Rubruck and John of Plano Carpini) state that,
at that time, the steppe peoples, Turks and Mongols,
often transported their tents in ox carts (see Vla-
dimiritsov, op. cit., 50-1, and also ыраbа and
кaнqни; these last were not only highly-mobile
within the steppe, but could be very quickly loaded
up with the tents and the whole encampment (Mongol
хүнyянгүриyн "circle") quickly broken up.

Bibliography: given in the article, essentially,
but note that Part A of Aspects of Altaic civilisa-
tion (see above) is devoted to "The dwellings
of the Altaic peoples". (C. E. Bosworth)

KHAYR (A.), charity, gifts in money or kind
from individuals or voluntary associations to needy
persons. The religious significance of khayr in Islam
is still quite clear, although assistance to the needy
is nowadays extended mainly by secular govern-
mental agencies; such assistance is regarded as
"public welfare" rather than "charity". A public
benefit is indeed implied in khayr. The word has the
sense of freely choosing something, i.e. virtue or
goodness, a service to others beyond one's kin. It
also means goods such as properties or things that
have material value (H. Wehr, A Dictionary of
Modern Written Arabic, Wiesbaden 1961, s.v.). There
are few studies of khayr in earlier or modern times,
though there are brief references scattered through
the literature on the Ottoman Empire, Khedivial
Egypt and the Indian subcontinent.

Khayr must be considered in relation to zakáй and
sadaka (qq.v.). See also practically synonymous
with khayr in the sense of charity. Zakáй refers to
an obligatory tax collected by Islamic governmental
agencies and prescribed in the Kur'án and Sunna.
Zakáй in its traditional and precise form has almost
disappeared, but khayr, as a broader and more
informal quality and activity, continues. Khayr
occurs in the Kur'án in its general sense of virtue and
good works in obedience to God and religious law
(e.g. III, 103, XXII, 77, IV, 113) as well as material
wealth (e.g. C, 8). In interpretations of Kur'án and
in philosophical works the term is used similarly.

Private charity and public welfare are extended
out of mixed motives: humanitarian, to relieve
misery, and political, to reduce instability. On the
part of the private donor, moreover, there is the
motive of doing good in accordance with religious
precepts. This motive operates strongly in khayr
among Muslims as well as non-Muslims minorities
living in larger Islamic communities. Christian and
Jewish charities were an important function of the
millets under the Ottoman rule and continued after
it, often with help from co-religionists in Western
countries.

Today charity by individual Muslims to less for-

tunate members of their religious communities is
still widespread. Part of these donations are those
made by voluntary associations which stand
between the individual and the government and
disburse larger sums more widely. A United Nations
survey made in the mid-1960s found several hundred
such associations in Lebanon, Jordan and Syria,
and a beginning even in Kuwait, where the govern-
ment, with vast oil revenues, was already the main distri-
butor of funds going to the needy (U.N. Economic
and Social Office in Beirut, Survey on Social Develop-
The activities of these associations, though signif-
ificant, have been seldom studied in detail, though
published reports and observations yield some details
on several countries.

In Egypt in 1960 there were about 3,200 voluntary
charitable associations (джам'ийат диниyyat or
кhayrriyya) with a religious basis, with 700,000
members, a total income of £ E 6 million (coming
from members' dues, modest fees paid by the needy,
and governmental subsidies), extending a variety
of services to several million people at a total cost of
£ E 4 million (M. Berger, Islam in Egypt Today,

In Iran the structure of voluntary associations
seems to be looser. As in other Muslim communities,
however, in Iran individual donations are made to local
imáms for formal institutions such as clinics,
schools and scholarships, as well as directly to the
needy. Donations to poor families occur mainly on
the anniversaries of the deaths of Fáṭima and the
imáms venerated by Shi'is. They are also made in
times of threat or danger, even in connection with
"modern" activities. For example, in 1974 a business-
nan started to construct an air-conditioned building,
with the help of several architects and engineers
trained in the U.S.A., in the most expensive and
modern area of Tehran. Before the first column went up, the foreman told the builder he must sacrifice a sheep for the workers to eat and protect them: the blood of the sacrificial sheep would avert the shedding of the workers' blood on the job. Very little is known about the distribution of funds by the local ωμάς, nor are they taken into account in governmental calculations of need. Donors to these ωμάς do not have a formal role in the distribution of these funds, although they are duly registered by accountants who keep records of income and disbursements (source: personal observation and interviews).

Khayr and ωωφ [q.v.] overlap, for example in public conveniences such as water fountains [see ωωφλ] and soup kitchens (ωμάτελ) erected in Ottoman times. Somewhat similar to Khayr, also, is the largesse often distributed by rulers, especially on accession to power. Such largesse is, in turn, a forerunner of the welfare programme of modern states.

Although women in Islamic countries have not traditionally been active in public affairs, their recent emergence into public roles has been associated with private charity and governmental welfare programmes. Among the earliest employments outside the home which became widely approved for women are teaching, nursing and social work. These professions are regarded as extensions of the Islamic ideal of women as the guardians of home and family. In several countries it has been customary in recent decades for the women members of the families of heads of state (in republics as well as monarchies) to be active in promoting education and the care of the needy. Thus in 1973 the شهلا-بند of Iran opened the first national seminar on social welfare by reviewing the development of private philanthropy, defining current social needs, and indicating the need for governmental coordination of the means of meeting these needs (Plan and Budget Organization of Iran, Nakhustin.simimad-i milli-yi rifākh-i idżima', Isfand 1352 (February 1973), Tehran, n.d. and no pagination). This seminar, indeed, was the prelude to the creation of a Ministry of Social Affairs a year later. Such ministries had already been established in other countries, for example in Egypt as early as 1939. The first woman to become a member of an Iranian cabinet, Farrukhru Parsay, was Minister of Education from 1968 to 1974. Similarly, the first woman to join a cabinet in Egypt, Hikmat Abū Zayd, became Minister of Social Affairs in 1962.

The state has always assumed some of the burden of assisting the needy. Its role increased as modern industry and urbanisation developed, while public needs grew and the capacity of individuals and voluntary associations from public consideration in Islamic countries. Khayr, however, continues, and even zakāt has been men-


In Islamic countries where socialist ideas and rhetoric have recently made headway, welfare has been tied to ideology and to the religious tradition of mutual social responsibility among Muslims, or al-takāfūl al-idżima as developed by several writers, especially in Egypt (Sami A. Hanna and George H. Gardner, eds., Arab Socialism. A Documentary Survey, London and New York 1967, 3). The increasing role of government has led to widespread exaggeration of achievements, for example a claim by an official Egyptian agency reporting to the United Nations in 1967 that: "After the revolution of 1952, equal opportunities were eventually granted to the people" (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Organization and Administration of Social Welfare Programs. A Series of Country Studies, United Arab Republic, New York 1967, 1). A U.N. evaluation of state programs only two years later described them as still rather weak in concept, administration and effect (United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut, Studies on Social Development in the Middle East, 1969, New York 1970, 1, 11-13).

On top of the increasing role of the state came, after World War Two, the increasing role for the organisation of states, the United Nations. Through publications, surveys, seminars and conferences, various U.N. agencies encouraged the "developing" (or formerly "underdeveloped") countries to expand and systematise their welfare programmes. The U.N. also spread the new conceptions of welfare, going beyond traditional "remedial" care of the needy to "preventive" policies to enable the needy to maintain themselves and even further to "developmental" programmes which would enable the people of all classes to play a greater part in national growth based upon broad planning (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Proceedings of the International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare, 3-12 September 1968, New York 1969, 76, and Training for Social Welfare, Fifth International Survey. New Approaches in Meeting Manpower Needs, New York 1971, 2, 64-5). Special United Nations seminars for the Arab states have been held since 1949 (see, for example, Fourth United Nations Social Welfare, Seminar for Arab States in the Middle East, Baghdad, 6-21 March 1954, New York 1955).

These governmental and inter-governmental influences and discussions have all but removed Khayr by individuals and voluntary associations from public consideration in Islamic countries. Khayr, however, continues, and even zakāt has been men-
tioned noticeably in one of the aforementioned U.N. seminars. In preparation for it, the U.N. Secretariat sent a questionnaire to seven Arab states, which elicited reports that in most of them this tax was still being collected and spent "in accordance with Islamic principles" (Third United Nations Social Welfare Seminar for Arab States in the Middle East, Damascus, 8-20 December 1952, New York 1953, 60). It is possible that the welfare programmes of governments are overestimated through the tendency of states and international agencies to issue many reports, while traditional khayr is underestimated because individual donors and voluntary associations are scattered and not given to public reporting.

For a treatment of charity in Turkey see the Supplement, s.v. Khayr.

Bibliography: M. Berger, Khayr Allah Efendi, Ottoman physician, historian and administrator; born in Istanbul ca. 1235/1819-1820 of a family which had provided chief physicians for the Empire. He followed in the profession of his father 'Abd al-Hakk Molla (d. 1270/1853-1854) and after completing the madressa education he became the mullah of Izmir in 1256/1840-1841, to be promoted in the following year to the rank of kadi of Mecca. Meanwhile, he studied medicine at the Mektebi-i Tibbiyye and graduated in 1260/1844. Appointed ders nizâri (director of studies) at the Tibbiyye School, he transferred from the 'timiyyeh (religious) to the mülhiyye (civil) branch of administration. Thus in Radjab 1265/May-June 1849 he was appointed as the President of the Council of Education. In 25 Radjab 1267/18 May 1851 he was also entrusted with the vice-presidency of the Enstrûmen-i Dânîh (Academy of Arts and Sciences) and in Shawwâl 1268/July-August 1852 he became a member of the Medîlis-i Wilâyî-İ Ahkâm-i 'Adîlîyeye (High Council for Judicial Ordinances). Nominated Mekâîyi-İ Umâmîyyeye nizâri (Minister of Public Schools) on 22 June 1854, he returned to the field of education. Upon the establishment of the Ministry of Education in March 1861 he was charged with the function of mústekhir (undersecretary) and on 7 Safar 1275/16 September 1858 he assumed responsibility as deputy minister. On 21 May 1859 he became the administrator of the Mektebi-i Tibbiyye. In Radjab 1278/January 1862 he was moved to the directorship of the 6th sector of the Istanbul Municipality [see Baladîyya]. He was again appointed a member of the Medîlis-i Wilâyî-İ Ahkâm-i 'Adîlîyeye on 12 Safar 1278/July-August 1864, and in the same year he visited Europe to take a cure. Back in Istanbul, he went to Tehran on 3 May 1865 as Ottoman minister to the Persian court, and died there in Shawwâl 1282/December 1865-January 1866. His younger son is the well-known poet 'Abd al-Hakk Hâmid [q.v.].

Khayr Allah Efendi contributed much to the modernisation of Turkey through his publications. He undertook to write a general history of the Ottoman Empire, but could not go further than the year 1026/1617. This work was published under the title Develî-İ 'âliyeye-i 'Umâmîyyeye ta'rikî (Istanbul 1271-81, 15 vols.), and was later continued by 'Ali Shewki, who took it up to the year 1058/1648 (Istanbul, vols. xvi-xviii, 1289-92). The author abandoned the annalistic method of Ottoman chroniclers and adopted the modern systematic treatment of history. He also made use of Western sources written in French. He seems to be the first Ottoman playwright, with his Hikâyet-i İbrâhîm

Pâşâ be İbrâhîm-i Gulgeni written ca. 1260/1844 (first printed in Türkç, no. 1 1935, 77-91, for the second time by Aytekin Yakar, İstanbul, Ankara 1964). His publications also include translations from the French on subjects ranging from medicine to agriculture. Among his printed works are Mahdîi-İ tibbiyye (Istanbul 1258), a collection of medical articles, Beýi-i dehdânî (Istanbul 1264), a treatise on agriculture, Kâfi-i Afrikâ (Istanbul 1268), Malte-Brun's work on geography, and Maudî-î hicmet (Istanbul 1270), a textbook on physics prepared for rüştüyye (secondary) schools. His Avrâmpî siyâhat-nâmesî, a narrative of his European tour in 1864, still remains unpublished (Ms., Library of the Faculty of Language, History and Geography, Ankara).

Khayr al-Din Pasha

beylical madjlis al-’akhbar, and a member, and then president, of the madjlis al-akbar or Parliament set up in 1861. In these positions, he worked for the reform of the judicial system (which, of course, did not affect personal law, which remained within the sphere of competence of the sharī’īa courts, but was confined to criminal law and to commercial and agricultural practices).

In November 1862, Khayr al-Din gave up his posts as Minister of Marine and president of the madjlis al-’akhbar, whilst remaining a member of the latter and of the madjlis al-’akhbar. Behind this partial retirement, which lasted till 1869, was his opposition to a Tunisian loan raised in Europe; the agreement for this was nevertheless made, and it opened the country to bankruptcy. In 1864 a revolt sounded the knell of the period of reforms begun in 1857. During these years, he acted as the Bey’s envoy to Istanbul and other European capitals.

When he returned to politics in 1869, Tunisia had to accept, because of Muṣṭafā Khaznadār’s maladministration, a financial commission to direct the country’s finances, in which French and British influence was paramount; Khayr al-Din now became president of this. Till July 1877, he endeavoured—at first, as waṣīr muwdhār, and then, after Muṣṭafā Khaznadār’s fall on 21 October 1873, as waṣīr iṣlāh—to reform the Tunisian administration and to introduce a sound financial programme which would enable a debt which swallowed up about half of the country’s annual revenue to be reduced. Amongst the measures which he adopted during this time was an agricultural regulation defining the rights and obligations of all those concerned with agriculture, including the khāmmāzīs and others. He also set up a mixed tribunal for cases between Tunisians and foreigners involving less than 1,000 piastres. He tried to improve the economy by decreasing export dues and increasing import ones. To help corn exports, he planned to build a railway line between Jendouba and Tunis. One of his most valued collaborators at this time was Muhammad Bayram al-Khamis, who became president of the muwaṣṣal al-mamlakī and was able considerably to increase the income from these charitable foundations. The sums confiscated from Muṣṭafā Khaznadār were used to finance a new modern school as successor to the maktab harbi, al-mudaraṣa al-sādikīyya, opened in 1875 as a place where the Tunisian élite could receive an adequate education.

Khayr al-Din wanted above all to fulfil Tunis’s financial obligations to the foreign creditors of the financial commission, in the hope of preserving the country’s political independence. This involved necessarily a careful and economical policy, precluding the adoption of large-scale reforms. Moreover, the Tunisian people had a greater need, psychologically, for a period of peace and of just government than for reforms, since the memory on the period 1857–64, when taxes had risen and there had been a culmination in the rebellion of 1864, was still very fresh. Nevertheless, Khayr al-Din made an effort in 1877 to inject fresh life into the constitution and to re-open the Parliament, at the time when the Turkish constitutionalists had achieved temporary power in Istanbul; but Muḥammad al-Šādīk Bey [q.v.] firmly opposed this.

On the international plane, Khayr al-Din was always a firm supporter of close links between the Bey’s official suzerain, the Ottoman Sultan, and Tunis. It was, in his view, the best safeguard against an increasingly burdensome European influence; whilst the Ottoman empire continued in existence, the Regency of Tunisia could retain a de facto political independence. During the Balkan War, in 1876, he showed his support by sending considerable material aid to the Porte, whilst refraining from sending troops in order not to incur French displeasure.

His departure from office on 21 July 1877 was due to various reasons. The Bey, under the influence of persons like Muṣṭafā b. Ismāʿīl, preferred a more pious and less economical-minded prime minister; because of two consecutive bad harvests, the treasury was empty, and the instalment of debt had to be paid. As for France and Britain, the twin pillars of the financial commission, the latter had never supported Khayr al-Din, and France abandoned him above all because of his help to the Porte and his refusal to let the Jendouba-Tunis railway line be linked with the Algerian network.

On his leaving office, Khayr al-Din fell into disgrace, and even feared lest his property be confiscated. But in August 1878, thanks to the mediation of Muḥammad al-Ṣafīr, head of the Madaniyya religious order [q.v.], he received an invitation from ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd II [q.v.] to come to Istanbul, where on 4 December 1878 he was made Grand Vizier. The sultan, who had just managed to throw off the Young Ottomans, hoped to find in an efficient and pliant and less economy-minded prime minister; il, preferred a more revolutionary and with the tanzimât [q.v.] style. During the eight months when he was at the head of the Sublime Porte, he was concerned with the deposition of the Egyptian Khedive Ismāʿīl, among other things. The main motive behind his dismissal, on 28 July 1879, was that his personal experience at Istanbul had turned him into a belated Young Ottoman, advocate of a parliamentary system and of ministerial responsibility. Until his death on 30 January 1890, he lived in retirement at Istanbul.

Khayr al-Din, as well as being a politician, was one of the first Muslims to be concerned with the causes of the decadence of the umma [q.v.]. In 1868 he published his study Aḥwām al-masālik ji maṣrījat aḥwāl al-mānālīk, the greater part of which gave a review of the countries of Europe from the economic, political, etc. points of view. More interesting is the introduction (2–89), in which Khayr al-Din sets forth his ideas on the possibility of the Muslims regaining their former grandeur. A good government which inspires the people’s confidence is the best means of achieving this. Khayr al-Din averred that Europe has not become strong thanks to Christianity, but rather to a good system of government in which the monarch has had to delegate some of his powers. Then he notes that it is permissible for the Muslims to borrow from the Europeans their technical inventions and their political system. It ought not to be difficult for the umma to re-introduce good government, since the sharī’īa prescribes it, and in the past, it had been shown as perfectly attainable, always bringing with it a period of glory for the Muslims. It should be further noted that, for Khayr al-Din, the modern European parliament is nothing but the institution of the ašr al-hall wa’l-‘awd [q.v.] adapted to modern needs and conditions. He claimed to remain within the tradition of classical Islamic political thought, and this explains why he considered his ideas as valid for the whole of the umma and why he was especially concerned with the position of the Ottoman empire, at the time the main Muslim power, and with the tanzimât. His opinion on these last was favourable. Although he favoured an Ottoman parliament, he did not consider it indispensable for the realisation of his ideal of a good government,
This explains why at the same time he paid so much attention to the 'umma? and the role which they ought to play in helping modernisation of the umma, since they comprised the greater part of the elite and could pronounce on whether the desired reforms were consonant with the ghara'a or not. In this regard, Khayr al-Din had an influence on the thought of Rifa'i Raffi al-Tahtawi (q.v.). Concerning Europe, Khayr al-Din adopted a suspicious attitude, for he feared that some day or other the Muslim world would fall an easy prey to the expansionist continent.

In the person of Khayr al-Din, statesman and theorist were combined in a happy manner, since the politician was himself always faithful to the principles set forth in his Akhwm al-masalik.

Ottoman sultan, sending an embassy with four ships and with 40 slaves for Selim I and an equal number for the pasha of the Dodea, together with a petition of the Algerian people, during the first ten days of Dhu 'l-Ka'da 925/25 October 3- November 15, whose text has survived in a Turkish translation (in Topkapı Sarayi, pub. by A. Temimi, in Revue d'histoire maghrébine, v (1976), 95-101). The envoys were very well received by the sultan (who died on 9 Shawwal 926/22 September 1520), and Selim accepted the overlordship of Algiers and sent via Hâjjî Hüsûn an investiture decree (khatî-i sherîf) and a flag (sandûq). Moreover, he sent to him 2,000 Janissaries and some artillery, and authorised him to enrol volunteers, to whom he promised the rights and privileges enjoyed by the Janissaries (Hađî, i, 249). The Turkish squadron coming from Istanbul was greeted on 20 September 1520 off Cerigo (see M. Sanudo, xxix, 284). From that moment, the name of the Ottoman sultan was inscribed on coins minted at Algiers and his name placed in the khatîla, thus affirming his suzerainty (Ghazawûtî, fol. 88b; for the coins struck at Algiers from 926/1520, see I. Artuk, Kanûnî Sultan Süleyman adina basîlan sikkeler, Ankara 1972, 29-31).

Soon afterwards, whilst his fleet was seizing Mostaganem, Khayr al-Din helped 'Abd Allah unseat Mustafa in Tlemcen, receiving payment of an annual tribute of 10,000 gold pieces (Ghazawûtî, fols. 93b-102a).

Khayr al-Din's domination in Algiers was temporarily interrupted through an attack of the sultan of Tunis, Muhammad, who had allied with Ibn al-Kâdî and Kara Hasan, head of the Turkish garrison in Cherchell. Defeated on the lands of the Flissat Unmunûd (Gomarîd, i, 126) and provisioned. At the opening of May 1529, Khayr al-Din attacked the fortress and took it on the 27th. With the débris, he built a causeway linking the islet with dry land, and thus secured a roadstead to protect his ships against the winds (Ghazawûtî, fols. 148a-152b; Gomarîd, 35). A few days later, an Algerian squadron seized nine Spanish ships which had come to the relief of Peñón (Ghazawûtî, fols. 154b-156a).

In summer of the same year, Khayr al-Din sent a detachment of fifteen ships under Aydin Reşîd to the vicinity of Oliva in Spain, in order to help the Moriscoes who were in revolt. Aydin Reşîd, having loaded his ships with as many Moriscoes as possible, put to flight off Formentera a Spanish squadron commanded by Rodrigo Ponce de León, and forced him to pay tribute of 30 loads (yilk) of silver (Ghazawûtî, fols. 162b-162a; fifteen ships, of which three were burnt and three sunk). Khayr al-Din sent two galleys to Istanbul to proclaim this victory to Süleyman. The dâ'û was Mustafâ told him about the negotiations with the King of France. (Ghazawûtî, fols. 163a-164b).

In May 1531, news reached Khayr al-Din that Andrea Doria was sailing towards Cherchell with a fleet of 40 ships, including 20 French ones (Ghazawûtî, fol. 167a-b), according to the terms of the Treaty of Cambrai of 5 August 1529 (Manfoni, 291, assures us that there were 30 ships, including 13 French ones). Khayr al-Din planned to go out and engage him with 48 ships, but Doria had to delay his departure through lack of supplies (Ghazawûtî, fol. 172a; Giovio ii, 129-30); he was in the vicinity of the Baelares when Andrea Doria had already attacked the fortress and after being repelled, had fled to Cadix, leaving on the ground 1,400 dead and 646 prisoners (Ghazawûtî, fol. 173a-b). Khayr al-Din then ravaged the coasts of Liguria and Spain, capturing abundant plunder. In 1532, he attacked the sultan of Tlemcen, who had the support of 14 Spanish ships based on Oran, and forced him to pay an increased tribute of 50,000 gold pieces. He then sent five ships to plunder the Spanish coasts, capturing inter alia 14 out of the 15 ships responsible for the defence of the coasts. Soon afterwards, he put down a revolt of 7,000 captive Christians, led by twenty Spanish nobles, for whom he had previously refused a ransom of 20,000 sequins (Ghazawûtî, fols. 215a-223a).

However, Khayr al-Din assumed the role of intermediary between Francis I and Süleyman, receiving in 1533 a French ambassador making his way towards Aleppo (J. Utsu, La politique orientale de François Ier Paris 1906, 76-80). Having received an invitation in a khatî-i sherîf which Sinân Câwûsh brought to him, he left from Algiers, and was there that the most famous corsairs of the age, like Sinân Reşîd (Ebreo) and Aydin Reşîd (Cacciavolo) joined him. With a fleet of 41 ships, Khayr al-Din and his corsairs ravaged the coasts of the western Mediterranean, seizing large amounts of booty (Ghazawûtî, fols. 123a-126b; Gomarîd, 393-5). Now feeling that he was strong, he decided in 1525 to march from Djidjelli on Algiers, invited thither by the populace, who were suffering hardship because of the loss of revenue from the corsair spoils. The occasion for this was Ibn al-Kâdî's prohibition of some ships of Khayr al-Din's loaded with Moriscoes from mooring in the port of Algiers. Ibn al-Kâdî went forth with 20,000 men to engage Khayr al-Din, but was beaten at Wadi Bugdura, and then at the head of the Banû Abbas, where he was beheaded by his own men (Ghazawûtî, fols. 127a-130b; Grammont, 31). From 1526 till 1528, Khayr al-Din strengthened his position by retaking Cherchell, where Kara Hasan had 500 men, at the same time forcing 'Abd Allah, sultan of Tlemcen, to pay the tribute for the past six years and to pay in the future 20,000 pieces of gold per annum; he also took Ténès and Constantine again, where the people had rebelled (Grammont, 34), and forced Hüsûn, brother and successor of Ibn al-Kâdî in Great Kabylia to pay tribute of 30 loads (yilk) of silver (Ghazawûtî, fols. 130b-146a).

The Spanish still controlled the island of Peñón, which faced Algiers at a distance of some 300 metres only, but they were poorly-armed and poorly-provisioned. At the opening of May 1532, Khayr al-Din attacked the fortress and took it on the 27th. With the débris, he built a causeway linking the islet with dry land, and thus secured a roadstead to protect his ships against the winds (Ghazawûtî, fols. 148a-152b); Grammont, 35). A few days later, an Algerian squadron seized nine Spanish ships which had come to the relief of Peñón (Ghazawûtî, fols. 154b-156a).

Khayr al-Din and his corsairs ravaged the coasts of Liguria and Spain, capturing abundant plunder. In 1532, he attacked the sultan of Tlemcen, who had the support of 14 Spanish ships based on Oran, and forced him to pay an increased tribute of 50,000 gold pieces. He then sent five ships to plunder the Spanish coasts, capturing inter alia 14 out of the 15 ships responsible for the defence of the coasts. Soon afterwards, he put down a revolt of 7,000 captive Christians, led by twenty Spanish nobles, for whom he had previously refused a ransom of 20,000 sequins (Ghazawûtî, fols. 215a-223a).
pursue the fleet of Andrea Doria, who had left
Coron for the Adriatic, and finally reached the Otto-
man capital at the end of the year (Ghasawdi, fols.
224a-226b).

Shortly afterwards, he departed for Aleppo after
an invitation from the Grand Vizier Ibrahim Pasha,
who bestowed on him officially the office of Kapudan
Pasha [q.v.], with the title of Naseer-i beglerbegi
(Ghasawdi, fol. 239a; State Archives of Venice, coll.
Tskbd. docs., dossier xv, 7, last ten days of Radjab
940/5-14 February 1534), which should be under-
ested as “Beglerbeg of the Islands” (i.e. Naseer-i
bahr-i sefidi), and not of Algiers (cf. Alberi, iii: 1. 30,
narrative of Daniele de’ Ludovisi of 3 June 1534:
“beilerbei del mare”; Ramperti, Libri tre delle cosei
die Turchi, Venice 1939, c. 22: “beglerbeey del mare”).

Some months later, Khayr al-Din set sail with a
fleet of 84 ships, of which 18 were his own, five be-
longing to corsairs and 61 newly-built. The mission
entrusted to him was the conquest of Tunis, whose
throne had been claimed by Rashid, brother of
Mawlay al-Hasan. After pillaging Reggio, San Lucido,
Cetraro, the Gulf of Naples with the adjacent islands,
Sperlonga, Fondi (on the flight of Giulia Gonzaga,
see E. Nicollini, Giulia Gonzaga e la crisi del Val-
desimo, in Atti dell’Accademia Fontianiana,
N.S., v [Naples 1942], 204-8) and Terracina, and
then taking on supplies of water and wood at the
Tiber mouth (Guglielmotti, iii, 384-5) and capturing
Bizerta, he seized La Goletta (Khalk al-Watdi) on
16 August and then on the 18th, Tunis, which had been
abandoned by Mawlay al-Hasan. The whole of
Tunisia fell into his hands after Mawlay al-Hasan
had been defeated at al-Kayrawan by an army of
10,000 men (Ghasawdi, fols. 235a-241a). He then
pacified a revolt of the Arabs for calling for Rashid,
who had remained in Istanbul, where he died shortly
afterwards (Hadjdil Khalifa, 44: Pecewli, Ta’irikha,
i, 492).

In April 1535, a new French ambassador, La
Forest, visited Barbarossa in Tunis and from there,
left for Istanbul; he had the task of preparing a
joint expedition of the French and the Ottomans to
plunder Corsica and conquer Sardinia and Sicily,
then under Spanish control (D. C. Rouillard, The
Turk in French history, thought and literature (1520-
1660), Paris 1938, 111-12). Charles V decided to
take action, and assembled an armada of 300 ships
and about 30,000 men. He reconquered La Goletta
on 14 June and on the 20th attacked Tunis with the
support of the Arabs and over 4,000 Christian
captives, who had broken their fetters and now threw
the Turkish ranks into disarray (these Turkish forces
amounting to 9,700 men). Khayr al-Din was hurled
out of Tunis and headed for Bône, whence, with 15
ships, he went to Algiers. He set off with 32 ships
for the Balearics, burnt and sacked Port Mahon in
Minorca (P. Estamislo - K. Agulo, Documentos re-
lativos al sitio y saqueo de Mahon por Barbarroja,
in Revista de Menorca (1898), 137-56; [1909], 261-80;
nom vidi) and Palma in Majorca, and returned on 15
October to Istanbul (Ghasawdi, fols. 257b-272a).
In the following spring, he went with 30 ships to the
coasts of Calabria, where he sacked La Castella
(Ghasawdi, fol. 272a-b; G. B. Moscato, Cronaca dei
mandamenti in Calabria, Cosenza 1963, 102).

Till spring 1537, Khayr al-Din was busy getting
ready the fleet which Suleyman had promised Francis
I for supporting his Italian expedition. During this
period, Suleyman took up a position with his army
at Valona, and the fleet, comprising 280 ships, con-
centrated along the Albanian coast. Whilst the
greater part of the ships under the Third Vizier
Lutfi Pasha headed for the coast of Apulia, Khayr
al-Din went with 60 galleys to escort 20 ships loaded
with provisions from Egypt. He then took part in
the unsuccessful siege of Corfu. From there, and
after the main part of the fleet had returned to
Istanbul, he went with 60 ships and seized Nio,
Zea and Naxos. In the next year, 1538, he attacked
and occupied Skiastos, Skiros, Tinos, Andros, Karpa-
tos, Kandelares and other islands of the Venetians
in the Aegean. Also, Crete was plundered for a week
and over 15,000 captives taken (Ghasawdi, fols.
278a-282b).

On 27 September, the Turkish fleet of 120 ships
commanded by Khayr al-Din clashed before Preveze
with a Christian fleet of 138 galleys and 70 ships
(Manfrouni, 137), which had been got together by
the Emperor, the Pope and Venice, under the command
of Andrea Doria; the engagement ended in the retreat
of Doria’s Imperial forces after some skirmishing by
the vanguards (for the battle, see now A. Büyükt-
Tugrul, Preveze denis munharebesine itikin geregeler,
in Belleten, xxxvii (1973), 51-85). The existence of
secret negotiations between Doria and Barbarossa,
shown in numerous published documents (see
Manfrouni, 332 f.; C. Capasso, Barbarossa e Carlo V, in Archivio Storico Italiano, lxix (1939), 159-208,
304-48) explains why the two admirals never pro-
vided each other and why they both adopted an
extremely prudent attitude towards each other.
Barbarossa, without hurrying overmuch, pursued
the Christian fleet and forced it to retreat to Ste.
Maure.

In the next year, Khayr al-Din went with 150
ships and reconquered Castelnuovo, taken in the
preceding year by the Christian fleet after the battle
of Preveze.

Khayr al-Din’s last appearance on the sea was in
1543, when, after the agreements reached between
Süleyman and Francis I, he was given the task of
co-operating with the French fleet in the western
Mediterranean. After ravaging the Italian coasts,
staying three days at Reggio and terrorising Rome
by a halt at the Tiber (Guglielmotti, iv, 177-18), he
joined the Duc d’Enghien, commander of the French
fleet, at Marseilles. The two united fleets sacked
Villefranche and unsuccessfully besieged Nice, Khayr
al-Din attributing this check to the shortcomings of
the French fleet (cf. Charrière, i, 578-9). The arrival
of Andrea Doria’s fleet and the Marquis del Vasto’s
army compelled Khayr al-Din to retreat and to
spend the winter at Toulon, which was evacuated on
this occasion by its inhabitants. However, he sent 25
galleys under Sâlib Reis and Hasan Celebi to plunder
the Gulf of Lyons and the Spanish coasts (J. Laroche,
L’expedition en Provence de l’armée de mer du Sultan
Suleyman sous le commandement de l’Amiral Hayred-
din Pacha dit Barberousse (1543-1544), in Turcica,
i (1969), 161-211; Ghasawdi, second part, ms. 1186
of the B. N., Paris). The Peace of Crépy in 1544 ended
the war between Charles V and Francis I, and Khayr
al-Din sailed back to Istanbul after pillaging the
coasts of Tuscany and the kingdom of Naples (ms.
1186, fols. 412a-45a; Guglielmotti, iv, 123-5).

Khayr al-Din spent the rest of his life in pious
works, amongst other things, having a madrese and
a mosque built at Beşiktaş, of which however no traces
remain (see T. Öz, İstanbul camileri, ii, Ankara 1965,
30). He died on 4 July 1546, and was buried at Be-
şişat, with the chronogram
[=953/1546] engraved on his tomb. The mausoleum was
 KHAYR AL-DIN — USTAD KHAYR AL-DIN

built by the architect Sinân (Öz, op. cit., ii, 10), and became the place for the ceremony of investiture for new bâbûdan pâgâhs (note at end of ms. 2639 of Istanbul Univ. Library, fol. 392-b). The Turkish fleet, before leaving on an expedition, would go there and fire a salvo in greeting (Uzunçarşı, Osmanlı defterinin mürkez ve bahriye teşkilâtı, Ankara 1948, 429; A. Bombaci, Le fonti turche della battaglia delle Gerbe (1560), in RSO, xx (1942), 279).

Very little is known of Khayr al-Dîn's private life. He was twice married: once, at Algiers, with a local woman, who bore him a son Hasan [q.v.], who was on several occasions beglerbegi of Algiers; and a second time, at the age of 77, with the 18-year-old daughter of the governor of Reggio (pillaged in 1543, see above), Flavia or Maria Gaetani (Haedo, i, 272; Guglielmotti, iv, 117). He also had a daughter who is buried near his türbe (Öz, loc. cit.).

Khayr al-Dîn gave the Ottoman empire a well-organised North African province. As Grand Admiral, he strengthened the Ottoman maritime presence, assuring it of a total domination which lasted for over 30 years. He has remained in the Turkish memory as a national hero. His name struck terror in the Mediterranean, but he also had a reputation for generosity and prudence (see the letter written to him by Pietro Aretino, beginning "Salve, o re iner[...]

On the other hand, on several occasions he had a daughter of the governor of Reggio (pillaged in 1543, see above), Flavia or Maria Gaetani (Haedo, i, 272; Guglielmotti, iv, 117). He also had a daughter who is buried near his türbe (Öz, loc. cit.).

Bibliography: Sources. The most important contemporary source is the Ghasawî-i Khayr al-Dîn Pağha by Sayyid Murâd, composed on the basis of directly-communicated reports from Barbarossa and his travelling-companions, and also on the basis of what he himself had personally witnessed; two redactions of the original exist, one in prose and one in verse, and there are other, second-hand redactions. It is preserved in several manuscripts but still unedited, and is divided into two parts; the first narrates Khayr al-Dîn's adventures from his birth till 1541, whilst the second, concerned with the French expedition of 1543-4, has only come down to us in ms. 1186 of the B. N. in Paris. Scholars have used it basically through the intermediary of a bad French translation of an Arabic résumé of the Turkish text (the Arabic text was published at Algiers in 1934 by Nûr al-Dîn 'Abd al-Kâdir; on this is based al-Zuhra al-na?ira, ed. S. Baba 'Umar in Jurnal de istorie et de civilizare al Maghreb, iii (Algiers 1969), 1-18 of the Arabic section). The French tr. was published in two vols. at Paris in 1857 by S. Rang and F. Denis as Fondation de la Régence d'Alger. Histoire de Barbarossa. On the other hand, the Italian tr. made from a Spanish version of the Turkish text (ms. 1663 of the Escorial, to which the citations in this article refer), was published by Giovanni Luigi Aicamora in 1758, and has been little used. This Italian tr. was published at Palermo by E. Peleaz in Archivio Storico Siciliano between 1880 and 1887 and as a monograph in 1889 with the title La vita e la storia di 'Abbâs ben Hîsâb, di Barbarossa (see A. Gallotta, Le gazzavî di İayreddin Barbarossa, in Studi Magrebini, iii (Naples 1970), 79-160).

Another contemporary work on Barbarossa is the Lüdîgâzî al-abîr or Lüdîgâzî al-abîhâr of Yeṭîm 'Ali Câlebi, d. 959/1552 (see A. S. Levend,  конструкци, is known, that in the private library of I. H. Uzunçarşı. There is an extract from this work in 'Âlî, Kûnîh al-âbbâr, 4th section, 3rd part, still unedited; this has been used by published at Madrid in 1955 (Biblioteca de autores españoles, lxxx-lxxxii), and in the Topografia et historia general de Arzgl by Diego de Haedo, written towards the end of the 16th century (Valladolid 1612 and Madrid 1927-9, in 3 vols.). The citations in this article refer to this last edition.

Collections of documents: Collezione di documenti inediti in relazione all'esperienza di Espana, 112 vols., Madrid 1842-95, for which there is a catalogue raisonné by J. Paz, Catalogo de la colección..., 2 vols., Madrid 1930-1; E. Charrière, Néociations de la France dans le Levant, i, Paris 1848; E. de la Primaudaûe, Documents inédits sur l'histoire de l'occupation espagnole en Afrique, in Rev. Afr., xix-xxi (1875-7); M. Sanudo, I diarii, 56 vols. Venice 1879-1902; E. Albéri, Le relations degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato, Sen. 3, vol. i, Florence 1840; M. T. Gökбülgin, Venedik devlet arşivindeki vesikalor külliyatında Kanunt Sultan Süleyman devri belgeleri, in Belgeler: Türk tarih belgeleri dergisi, i (Ankara 1964), 119-20 (nos. 27-8, 34, 40-1, 61, 82; the document xv. 7 is not included in this collection); idem, Venedik devlet arşivindeki birçok belgeden kolleksiyonu ve bizimle ilgili diğer belgeleri in Belgeler, v-viii (1968-72), 1-151 (nos. 131, 188).

Khayr al-Dîn's life is included, from the historical point of view, in H. D. de Grammont, Histoire d'Alger sous la domination turque (1515-1830), Paris 1887; C. Manfroni, Storia della marina italiana dalla caduta di Constantinopoli alla battaglia di Lepanto, Rome 1877; A. Samih Iler, Şimali Afrika'da Türkler, i, Istanbul 1937.

There are several more or less recent works, the last of which being E. Bradford's The Sultan's Admiral, the life of Barbarossa, London and New York 1968, of little worth. (A. GALOTTA)

KHAYR AL-DIN PASHA [see DİNDARLI].

USTAD KHAYR AL-DIN, Ottoman architect, popularly considered as the founder of Turkish architecture. We have very little certain knowledge of his life, and do not even know when he was born and died, but his father Ustad Murâd is known to have restored the Galata Tower after the earthquake of 913/1509. His name is not included in a list of architects in a defter from the first years of Sultan Süleyman's reign (Topkapı Sarayi Arşivi, D 7843), indicating that he may no longer have been alive then. In Ayvânsarayi Hüseyin Efendi's Hâdîbât al-Dinâmî, written in pers, the following information is given about him: "Khayr al-Dîn, the architect—who was the builder of the Mi'îmâr Khayr al-Dîn mosque opposite the mausoleum of Sinân Pağha in Diwân Yolu—was the architect of..."
Ustad Khayr al-Din — Khayr Pür

Sultan Bayezid. He is buried outside the Sinan Paşa mausoleum. There is a quarter bearing his name. This mosque, according to its inscription, was burnt down in 1316/1898 and rebuilt by Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid II. Taşyâr-zade Ahmed 'Aţâ Enderûnî, in 'Ata' Ta'rîkhî, Istanbul 1291, i, 76, attributes to him buildings in Edirne, Amasya and Istanbul during the reign of Bayezid II (886-916/1481-1512), and his information is repeated in Mehmed Târîhî, Şâh-i 'Âli 'Oltâmâdî, ii, 314.

Khayr al-Din seems to have begun his career outside Istanbul. The külliyye or complex of religious and educational buildings in Amasya of Sultan Bayezid, founded by the prince Ahmed, governor of Amasya, in his father's name, was his first major work, and was completed in 891/1486. In this project, on the banks of the Kizilirmak River (of which only the madrese, mosque, 'imaret, türbe and fountain survive today), the architect tried to give unity to the whole site by the plan chosen, which included two large domes, one after the other, and then three smaller domes at their sides.

The second and larger külliyye of Sultan Bayezid was built by Khayr al-Din in Edirne between the years 889/1484 and 893/1488. With its mosque, 'imaret, hospital, madrese, baths, kitchens and provision depots, this is one of the biggest social-religious foundations of the 9th/15th century. The mosque, with many tombs, dominates the architectural complex; it has a lofty dome, 21 m in diameter, mounted on four walls 19 m high. The low, nine-domed, small tâbâhânas are adjacent to the mosque. At the outer corners of the fountain courtyard, in front of the tâbâhânas, are two minarets with galleries.

More controversial is Khayr al-Din's role in the construction of the mosque of Sultan Bayezid in Istanbul, which was designed as a külliyye and completed in five years between 906/1501 and 911/1506. In this, the first plan of the single half-domed Fâtih mosque is taken up and developed further by the addition of a second half-dome to the north and one small dome on each side. The central dome is 18 m in diameter; the fountain courtyard has two rows of windows, and the two minarets, with single galleries and 87 m apart from each other, are at the outer corners. The various domes and arches of the mosque were restored by Sinan after the 915/1509 earthquake, according to the Tübâfat al-müt'mârîn.

Now Mustafâ Nuri Paşa, in his Notatîdî al-ułowî 'âtî (Istanbul 1327), put forward the name of Kemâl al-Din as the architect of the Bayezid mosque, whilst more recently, Rifki Melî Merî has suggested the name of Yaşâbî b. Sultan Şahî as the architect, basing this on records in Istanbul Belediye Library manuscripts; see his Bayesîd camii mimarî, in İlahîyet Fikhiîesi, Yuluk Araştırmalar Dergisi, i (Ankara 1958), 4; and i, 26. The architect of the mosque is Bayezid d'Istanbul, in Pros. First ICTA (Ankara 1961). There exist many certainly obscurities and chronological difficulties about the dating of the building process, but according to the mosque's inscription, work started on it at the end of 906/1501 and was completed in 911/1506; the dome was completed in the third week of Rabi'1 910, and in the next month, the outer courtyard of the mosque in the garden of the Old Palace and its boundaries were marked out and enclosed with walls. There does not seem to be any specific information about Yaşâbî's hand in it; Khayr al-Din had become architect-in-chief previously, and the sources indicate that Khayr al-Din was alive after Yaşâbî's death. It is also known that he was in charge of construction at the caravanserais, later known as the Pirînci Kham, at Bursa, built by the Sultan as a waqf to provide income for his mosque in Istanbul (Bursa Múzesi arşivi, Sharî'a register-defters, No. 20, entry No. 67; Kâmil Kepeci, Bursa Hanlari, Bursa 1935).


Khayrâbâd.

i. — A small town in Uttar Pradâsh, India, 27° 32' N., 80° 45' E., 75 km. north of Lakhnaû (Lucknow) on the Barell road, now of small importance but in Mughal times the headquarters of one of the five sârâhs of the sâba of Awadh (Abu 'l-Fadîl 'Allâmî, 'Abî-i Akbar,-eng. tr. Jarrett, Bibl. Ind., ii, 93, 176). Under the kingdom of Awadh [g.v.] it became the residence of the viceroy of Awadh; but after the British annexation of Awadh its importance declined with the rise of Sitâpur 8 km. to the north. Before the partition of the Indian sub-continent, the population of the town and surrounding district was about 60,000 Muslim. Except for the Dâlimî masjid, of the time of Shahjâhan, its buildings are undistinguished; Abu 'l-Fadîl's lists show it as possessing a brick fort.


ii. — A settlement on the west bank of the river Indus opposite Afak [g.v.] (Attock). Whether or not the name was deliberately given for its assonance with Afak at the south-eastern extremity of Akbar's dominions, as Abu 'l-Fadîl asserts (Akbarnâma, ed. Bibl. Ind., iii, 355), the name certainly means "obstacle". A popular legend (not in the Akbarnâma) has it that Khayrâbâd is the "habitation of well-being" attained after the "obstacle" has been successfully passed, and was named by Akbar after the successful bridging of the Indus at a notoriously treacherous point. The sârâh of Khayrâbâd is frequently referred to in accounts of Akbar's operations in the north-west after 989/1581.

Bibliography: Akbarnâma, iii, index s.v. Afak; and see Bibliography to Afak.

(K. Burton-Page)

Khayrâpur.

A forsightive state of the province of Sind in British India, now in Pakistan, lying to the east of the lower-middle Indus River between lat. 27°46' and 26°10' N. and between long. 78°20' and 70°14' E., and with an area of 6,018 sq. miles; it is also the name of a town, formerly the capital of the state, lying some 25 miles south-west of Sukkur and Rohri.

The southeastern part of what was Khayrâpur state is largely desert, but the alluvial plains in the north and west, adjacent to the Indus, are fertile and are irrigated by canals from the Indus valley, so that such crops as cereals, cotton, sugar cane, tobacco, oilseed and indigo can be cultivated.

The separate historical existence of the state
dates only from the late 18th century. In 1783 the Balúch chief Mr Fatih ʿAll Khan Talpur overthrew the Kalhoras of Sind and secured a sanad from the Durrān ruler in Kandahār as titular ruler of Sind. His nephew Mr Suhrab Khan (d. 1830) asserted his power in Khayrpur town, and founded a state of his own, whilst continuing to acknowledge the supremacy of the Tālpūr Mir of Sind at Haydarabad. By conquest and intrigue he enlarged his possessions beyond the environs of Khayrpur town southwards and eastwards to the Great Indian Desert fringes and westwards to the Indus. During the internal convulsions in Afghanistan which led to the supersession of the Sadozāy line by the Bārakzāy line of Dūst Mūammad [see ʿAFGHANISTĀN. v. History], the Mīrs of Sind withheld tribute, and by ca. 1813 the province had become virtually independent; in 1832 the independent existence of Sind was acknowledged by Britain. The Mīrs of Sind attempted to impede the passage northwards of British troops during the First Afghan War (1839–42), but one of the sons of Mr Suhrab Khan in Khayrpur, ʿAll Murād, was more co-operative, and after the operations in Sind by Sir Charles Napier and its annexation in 1843, ʿAll Murād became Mir of Khayrpur and also honorary Raʾīs of Upper Sind.

In the internal disputes in Khayrpur and friction with the Government of India—Sir Bartle Frere was placed at the Mir's side as chief executive with his successor preferred mats of palm leaves. Mir ʿAll Murād did not die till 1894, and was then succeeded by his son Faʿiz Muhammad.

In 1947 Khayrpur state acceded to Pakistan, but after the administrative reorganisation of 1955 it was merged into the province of West Pakistan, and is now a District, under a Deputy Commissioner, with 6 sub-divisions named after the earliest Mirs (Khaypur, Gambat, Kīti Dīgī, Mr Wah, Faʿiz Gandj and Nāra). In 1961 the population of the District was 472,137, this being overwhelmingly rural and 83 % Sindi speaking. The town of Khayrpur, which is today an important textile centre, had 34,144 inhabitants in 1961.

Bibliography: E. A. Langley, Narrative of a residence at the court of Meer Ali Moordah, with wild sports in the valley of the Indus, London 1860; E. H. Aitkens, Gazetteer of the province of Sind, Karachi 1907, 121-8, 150-1, 510-19; Imperial gazetteer of India 4, xv, 210-16; H. T. Lambbrick, Sir Charles Napier and the conquest of Sind, Oxford 1952 (Genealogical Table 2 at p. 387, "the ruling house of Khairpur"); H. T. Sorely, The gazetteer of West Pakistan, including Khairpur State, Karachi 1968; Population census of Pakistan 1961. District census report, Khairpur, Karachi N.D. 2000; and tābīt of the former Bahāwalpur State [q.v.] in West Punjab, now in Pakistan; the town is situated in lat. 29°35′ N. and long. 72°28′ E., 38 miles to the north-east of Bahāwalpur town. See Imperial gazetteer of India 9, xv, 216.

KHAYSH (A.; pl. ḫayyāḥ, ḫayyāḍ, n. of unity, ḫayyān, a coarse, loose linen made with flax of poor quality and used in the manufacture of sacks, wrappings and rudimentary tents. The Arabic dictionaries only mention, in its literal sense, this meaning; Dozy (Suppl., s.v.) renders it by "canaves; linen; serpillière; treillis", and de Goeje (BG 4, iv, 355) remarks that this linen is manufactured in Tabaristan. Sometimes, the expression ʿArab al-ḥaysh is used to designate the Bedouins (Quatremère, Mém. géogr. éth. sur l'Égypte, Paris 1821, ii, 218).

However, this term clearly designates a means of obtaining a certain freshness of air, without the texts in which it appears being always explicit, for example when Ibn al-Fakhrī (Buldān, 88; tr. Massé, 388) says that the Cordovans have no need of water in summer. In a certain number of mentions, the use of the expressions fi ḫaysh or, better still, bayt ḫayyāḥ (al-Dījāhīs, Bukhālāʾ, 187; idem, Rasāʾīl, ed. Ḥārūn, i, 393) leads one to think that it has the meaning of a summer room. T. al-Hādjīrī (the editor of Kišāb al-Bukhālāʾ, 322) puts forward the view that ḫaysh, in this sense, is the Persian ḫamān "a summer room" and it is probable that the usage comes in fact from Persia. Al-Muṣṭaḍaff (449) says that he saw at Shirāz some baytāt al-ḥaysh "where water runs constantly, brought by pipes which encircle the room, reaching it from high up". Perhaps the walls were bare, but they may also have been covered with ḫaysh; in any case, al-Ṭabarī (iii, 418) recounts that al-Manṣūr had a pavilion hung with ḫaysh that was constantly moistened; his successors preferred mats of palm leaves (Gaudfroy-Demobynes and Platonov, Monde musulman, 381; cf. Mez, Renaissance, 354-60; ḫubbāt al-ḥaysh).

Finally, the word ḫaysh designates another process that can be identified with certainty when it is used in connection with the verb āllāba "to hang up" (al-Dījāhīs, Bayawān, i, 82; al-Bayhaqī, Maḥāsin, 394): in this case, it means a kind of fan, of which a detailed description will be found in Dozy (Suppl., s.v.); al-Shārshālī, (Sharī, ii, 313; cf. al-Ghusūlī, Maḥādī, i, 65; Miskawāyih, i, 167; Mez, loc. cit.; M. Canard, in AIEO Alger, vi (1942-7), 177, n. 79) speaks in the same way of a mirawahat al-ḥaysh and says of this apparatus that it "has the form of a ship's sail; it is hung from the ceiling and a cord is attached to it set it in motion; it is moistened with water and sprinkled with rosewater. When anyone wishes to take a siesta or sleep at night, he pulls the cord and the apparatus moves back and forth the whole length of the house, directing a fresh, perfumed breeze on to the sleeper". In fact, young slaves were appointed to work the ḫaysh, whose use, which seems to have made its first appearance in ʿIrāq from the 8th/7th century, has not disappeared in that country, where it is, however, designated by the Indian name pānda (see Lughāt al-ʿArab, ix (1931), 621-3).

Bibliography: Given in the article. (Ch. PELLAT)
Tailors, whether free men or slaves, were well-paid. According to al-Abbas b. al-Hasan, vizier to al-Muktafi (289/902-8), and to al-Muktafiri (295/908-9), "when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with silk brocade (dibda) he earns a thousand dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then forty dinars; when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with cotton, he earns then twenty dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then five dinars; when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with cotton, he earns then twenty dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then five dinars. Tailors, whether free men or slaves, were well-paid. According to al-Abbas b. al-Hasan, vizier to al-Muktafi (289/902-8), and to al-Muktafiri (295/908-9), "when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with silk brocade (dibda) he earns a thousand dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then forty dinars; when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with cotton, he earns then twenty dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then five dinars; when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with cotton, he earns then twenty dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then five dinars. Tailors, whether free men or slaves, were well-paid. According to al-Abbas b. al-Hasan, vizier to al-Muktafi (289/902-8), and to al-Muktafiri (295/908-9), "when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with silk brocade (dibda) he earns a thousand dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then forty dinars; when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with cotton, he earns then twenty dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then five dinars; when an artisan like a tailor (khayyam) works with cotton, he earns then twenty dinars a day, but when he works only with kufi (cloth of inferior value), he gets then five dinars.
AL-KHAYYÁT, ABU 'ALI YAHYA B. GHÁLÁB, astrologer and pupil of MÁSHÁLÁH [g.], died ca. 220/835. He was known to mediaeval Christendom as Albohali (vars. Alghihac, Albenahait, etc.), and should not be confused with the Andalusian as-
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K. al-Farb b. Mubásír (cf. Baghdadí), d. 220/835. He was known to mediaeval Christendom as Alboháli de iudiciis nativitatum liber unus (see below), above all by the shock caused through the books of Ibn al-Ráwandi, a co-disciple of his in the school of 'Ísá b. al-Háyám al-Súfí. He was very well informed about the history and the doxo-
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K. al-Masdiil [fi afríd al-nudium]
tries to preserve a certain self-determinedness of the created world in relation to God's almightyness: God cannot interfere with the laws of nature (cf. Aghfar, Makabdit, 314, ll. 3 ff.), perhaps even not by a bharak at-\"oda\" as the BasrI school believed. The qualifying momentum (ma\#alsi\#at\") for an action lies in the action itself, not in the agent (cf. Sahl al-Makabat, al-\"A\"am al-\"Id Làmik), Cairo 1328, 21 ff.). The order of causality is guaranteed through tawallud (cf. Intis\"ur, ed. Nader, 50, ll. 1 ff.). Similarly, God has no power to do injustice (cf. Intis\"ur, 22, l. 4). For the same reason, Khayyat is able to hold an extreme position concerning the much-debated thesis brought up by the BasrI Mu\#azzil al-Shabham that "the possible in the state of its non-presence in the world, has some reality" (cf. R. M. Frank, in Al\#i del III Congresso di Studi Arabi e Islamici, Ravello 1966, 324 ff.). The potentially existent (ma\#adim) is, insofar as it is known by God and comprised by His power, not only "something" (g\"ay\" = 39), but also "body" (\"izim\", i.e. it is ma\#adim and ma\#adur \"alay\" in its corporeality as composed of substance and accidents. Through its accidents it possesses already in its pre-existence all qualities, with the exception of createdness (ma\#adur or ma\#adhit), which are added through the fact of creation and movement (because a body is not moving in the moment of its coming-into-existence; cf. Ibn Hazn, Fisal, v, 42, ll. 12 ff.; Baghd\"ud, al-\"Ar\"bayn al-\"Isr\"ab, 164, ll. 13 f.; R\"azi, Mu\#hasal, 38, ll. 14 f.). Incompatible with the possible as not-yet-existent is also the quality of permanence (b\"ab). In this case, however, Khayyat concluded that b\"ab is no separate quality or accident at all, but only an expression for the continuance of being. This meant that annihilation, too, does not result from God's withdrawing the quality of b\"ab and subsequent disintegration of the different parts of the body, as it was frequently believed, but through direct conversion into non-existence (\"id\"; cf. Abu Ra\#hd an-\"I\"\#ab, al-Ma\#ad fi l-\"I\"\#hab, in A. Biram, Die atomistische Substanzenlehre aus dem Buch der Stofffragen zwischen Basr\"ud und Baghdad\"ud, Berlin 1902, text, 58, apu. ff., and 69, l. 4 f.; also al-Mal\"ahimm, al-Falak\"i fi usul al-din, fol. 154b. with special reference to the death of human beings).

The theory seems not yet to be fully developed in Intis\"ur, 79, and passed over in silence in Intis\"ur, 23, ll. 2 ff.; on the other hand, it is not easy to differentiate it from the ideas of Shabham (cf. Aghfar, Makabdit, 504, ll. 16 ff.). Djubb\"ud attacked it on the basis that it implies the eternality of bodies (and matter, because bodies are material, whereas atoms and accidents are not, as long as they are not put together; cf. Baghd\"ud, Far\"b, 165, ll. 3 ff.). Khayyat, however, did not apparently react against Djubb\"ud, but against the older BasrI Mu\#azzil Abu \"I\"\#basyn Muhammad b. Muslim al-\"Ibl\"i, an adherent of Sahl\"i Kubba (from whom he seems to have got his niza\#a). Sahl\"i rejected the ma\#dud-theory (cf. Aghfar, Makabdi, 501, ll. 8 ff. and Baghd\"ud, Far\"b, 163, apu. ff.) as well as tawallud (cf. Aghfar, 233, ll. 3 f.); he stressed God's power to interfere with the laws of nature (cf. Aghfar, 309, ll. 12 ff., and esp. 310, ll. 9 ff.; also 370, ll. 1 ff.).

Khayyat differed from Sahl\"i in yet another point about which his discussions with him are expressly attested (cf. Ibn al-Mur\"ad, 72, ll. 26 f., sc. concerning t\"ad\"a\", i.e., the definition of belief and the eternity of punishment for the grave sinner. Khayyat upheld the intransigent and moralistic outlook of al-wa\"\#d wa l-wa\"\#at which he may have inherited from the ascetics among the Baghdad\"ud Mu\#azzil (ga\"\#syyat al-Mu\#azzala), in whose circle he had grown up, and which remained the view of the majority of the school; it is for this reason that he rejects, e.g. the intercession of the Prophet (\"as\"\#a\") (cf. Mu\#fdd, al-Fus\"u\#al al-mu\#\"\#fur\"a\", i, 47, ll. 7 ff.). The contrary attitude, centering around the idea of final remission for Muslim sinners or at least for some of them, according to God's free decision, was, however, quite frequent at this time. He also reacted against the caliphs in the theology of the influential "\"Idl\"ah\"" theologian Bishr al-Mar\"ad (d. 218/833), and was taken over also by another Mu\#azzil contemporary of Khayyat, al-Na\#h\"i al-\"I\"\#kh\"ar (cf. Van Ess, Fr\"uehe mu\#\"\#azzilische \"H\"asenographie, 144).

Khayyat considered the caliphate (\"in\"\#ma\") as necessary by reason, not only by revelation (cf. Ibn \"A\"rafa, in Hau\#\"\"ufiy\"a\"\# Di\"ma\"\#a al-Tan\"is, ix, 1972, 190). The sovereign may act freely according to his id\"at\"ah as long as he thinks to serve the benefit (gall\"a) of the community. This is how some irregularities of \"U\"\#man may be explained (cf. Ibn A\"b\"i al-Hadd, Shar\"k Na\"h\"i al-bal\"\#\"a, iii, 34, ll. 6 ff.). All had the highest qualities among the \"\#abh, but as he did not object to the caliphate of his predecessors, the \"\#abh must have been right in elevating him then. The reason for this and for their benevolence are unknown (cf. Ibn al-Murtad\"a, 86, ll. 12 ff., and Shar\"k Na\"h\"i al-bal\"\#a, i, 7, ll. 6 ff.). In the first civil war, \"U\"\#a acted in legitimate performance of dj\"ob, but the \"\#abh among his opponents, sc. \"A\"\#s\"a, Talba and al-Zubayr, will be exempt from divine punishment because they repented (cf. al-Sha\"y\"k al-Mu\#fdd, al-\"I\"\#d\"amal Na\"\#f\"u\#\"a, 132/1953, 28, ll. 3 ff.). There is, however, no exception for his enemies, especially Mu\#\"\"a\"\#a and \"A\"\#m b. al-S\"A\"\# (cf. Intis\"ur, 74, ll. 8 ff.). The agreement of the contemporaries (a\"b\"i al-\"I\"\#s) may be considered a convincing argument (\"ud\"\#i\") even if a few of them did dissent (cf. Abu \"I\"\#-Husayn al-\"A\"\#r, al-Mu\#\"\#amad, 456, ll. 14 ff., a reflection of the situation of the Mu\#azzil after the \"in\"\#ma\"). The community is infallible when it transmits hadith from the Prophet (cf. Intis\"ur, 72, ll. 3 f.), but isolated traditions (ahd\") have to be rejected (cf. Baghd\"ud, Far\"b, 165, ll. 10 f.). The Prophet is infallible when he speaks as a lawyer, because God demands obedience towards his commandments; in other cases, he may commit light sins which do not entail eternal punishment and do not cost him the solidarity of his adherents (cf. Intis\"ur, 71, ll. 16 ff.). In kalam, only the Mu\#azzil are competent (cf. ibid., 43, ll. 6 ff.); in spite of numerous disagreements in minor details (cf. ibid., 79, ll. 5 ff., 106, ll. 1 ff. etc.), they are held together through the usul al-bhamsa (cf. ibid., 93, ll. 2 ff.).

Bibliography: (a) additional sources for the biography: Ta\"r\"ih Bagdad\"ud, xi, 87; \"A\"\#b \"A\"\#bd al-Di\"ib\"ar, Fa\"\#l al-\"I\"\#\#\"a\", ed. F. Sayy\"a, Tunis 1974, 256, ll. 4 ff.; San\"a\"n\"i, Ans\"a, v, 250, ll. 9 ff.; Ibn Had\"a\"ar, Lisan al-mi\"\#am, iv, 8 f.; Ibn al-Mur\"ad, Ta\"b\"ah\"a al-Mu\#\"\#s\"a, 85, ll. 12 ff.; GAL S I, 341; Zir\"a\"il, A\"i\"\#m, iv, 122 (taken over by Ka\"h\"a\", Mu\#\"a\"\#am al-mu\"\#\"\#\"i\", v, 213). (b) for the doctrine: M. Horten, Die philosophischen Systeme der spekulativen Theologen im Islam, Bonn 1912, 376 ff.; A. S. Tritton, Muslim theology, 155 ff.; Aghfar, Makabdi al-\"I\"\#\#\"a\"\#yin, 353, ll. 6 ff. (cf. the corresponding doctrine of Na\"h\"i in Fr\"uehe mu\#\"\#azzilische \"H\"asenographie, 129); Intis\"ur, 89, ll. 12 ff., and Ibn al-Mur\"ad\"a, 86, ll. 1 ff. (doctrine of free will); Intis\"ur, 83, ll. 7 ff., 84, ll. 6 ff., 85, ll. 5 ff., and 87, ll. 5 ff. (God's know-
ledge has no predetermining effect); Makdisi, al-Bad' wa l-‘a‘rīqā, ii, 121, ll. 12 ff. (definition of man).

AL-KHAYYURĀN BINT ‘ĀTĀ AL-DIJURA-
SHIYYA, a former slave of Yemeni origin (on the Dijurāsh, see Ibn al-Kalbl-Caskel, Tab. 278), who was freed, and then was married to al-Mahdī, to whom she bore three children, Mūsā (al-Hādī), Hārūn (al- Raṣḥīd) and a daughter called al-Bānūkā (Ibn Kūtaybā, Ma‘ṣūrī, 180). According to a tradition given, in particular by al-Djahshiyyār (Wuṣ‘arāt, 136), she suckled al-Fadl b. Yahya b. Khalid al-Barmaki, whilst al-Fadl’s mother provided milk for Hārūn; this kind of alliance through co-lactation would accordingly explain the devotion shown to her by Yahyā b. Khalid, together with whom she ended up doing the work of government during the first three years of al-Rashīd’s reign, i.e. until her death in 173/789.

During the caliphate of al-Mahdī (158-69/775-85), she played a more obscure part but, even so, the strong influence which she held over him can be seen from his designation of Mūsā as the heir presumptive from 159/775-6 and then of Hārūn in 160/782-3; furthermore he excluded from the succession all other sons, especially those borne by his Hāshimī bride Raytā, daughter of al-Saffār (Ibn Kūtaybā, ibid.). Although Mūsā seems to have been submissive to his mother during his childhood, traditions agree in stressing that Hārūn was the preferred son. Al-
Khayzuran accordingly schemed to exclude the older son from the caliphate, and al-Mahdī may even have decided to change the order of succession in favour of Hārūn before he died suddenly in Muljarrām August 785.

Immediately after the caliph’s death an army mutiny broke out in Baghdad. Al-Khayzuran is accused of having started this disturbance in order to put Hārūn on the throne, but it does not seem to have had a political nature, for the troops were complaining of Harun before he died suddenly in Muljarram August 785.

Chroniclers vie in stressing the enormous fortune amassed by al-Khayzuran, and she engaged in some undertakings of public interest. It is particularly noted that she bought the house in Mecca in which the Prophet was thought to have been born, had it restored and turned it into a mosque. She is frequently cited in adāb literature and it must also be mentioned that ‘Utbah, the beloved of Abu ‘l-‘Atā’iyah, was one of her slaves.

Bibliography: As well as the references cited, see Djābīz, Bayān, ii, 269; Ibn Habīb, Mushabbār, 45; Balādhurī, Futuḥ, 274, 276; Ṭabarī, index; Djahshiyyār, Wuṣ‘arāt, index; Ibn al-‘Aḥjur, index; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbīḥ, ‘Iḥād, index; Makdisi, al-Bad’ wa l-‘a‘rīqā, iv, 114; Ibn al-Sā‘ī, Nisā‘ al-bayyana‘; Ya‘kūbī, Historiae, index; Suyūṭī, Mustafaṣār, Beirut 1963, 24-5; N. Abbot, Two Queens of Bagh-

KHAZAF (A.), ceramics. The radical transformation of ceramics under the rule of Islam took place chiefly in areas where their production had long been established, such as near the vital river beds of Mesopotamia, Egypt and Transoxiana, as well as on the banks of ancient inland seas, lakes and the shorter rivers of Syria and Iran. Pre-Pharaonic beakers, bowls from Jericho, jugs from Eridu, ewers from Sialk, all point to early skills in shaping and painting. By the 20th century B.C. in Egypt, the glassy potential of certain minerals led to the firing of a ceramic body, often called Egyptian faience, made from a mixture of natron or plant ash and powdered quartz from pebbles. A glaze of similar composition, but previously pulverised, and often coloured turquoise, was added to the shaped body and might be painted with a black pigment. In Assyria, glazing started as early as the 12th century B.C., rhytons from Ziwibeh probably go back to the 8th century B.C. and the glazed friezes from Babylon and Susa are well-known examples. Under Parthian and Sasanian rule, the same area and adjacent lands produced a large series of vessels, including coffins, with a coarse sandy body and an alkaline glaze often coloured turquoise with copper oxide. Coloured lead glazing became standard in the Eastern part of the Roman world from the 1st century B.C., probably at about the same time as in China, but with neither influencing the other at that stage. The moulded shape, as well as the dark copper green colour, tended to imitate metalwork. It is difficult, prior to the zenith of the ‘Abbasid caliphate in the 3rd/9th century, to distinguish any new ceramic production. At Khirbat al-Mafjjar (q.v.), the Uma-
yyad complex near Jericho, pre-Islamic and lead glazed shapes are found in the undisturbed level
Problems of archaeology, classification and technique. Although archaeological missions have long worked in Western Asia, it is only recently that the Islamic levels have been examined scientifically, rather than being discarded before reaching the classical and prehistoric levels. Since the Islamic levels are the most easily accessible, they are often found disturbed either by more recent buildings or by unofficial excavations. Most of the ceramic finds belong to pit and sewer fillings and only rarely to sealed levels. Too few excavations have yet been fully published to permit anyone without an intimate knowledge of the material to gain a clear understanding of the development of Islamic pottery. Thus the crucial publication of the finds from Sāmarrāʾ in 1925 has conditioned most subsequent studies. Although other Islamic towns are as important from the ceramic point of view, they lack proper archaeological records. Apart from the Kalʿat Banāʾ Hammād (1913 and 1965), Bahlīk (1925), Susa (1928 and 1974), Mileta (1935), al-Minā (1938), Ani (1948), Ḥamāt (1938), Lashkari Bāzār (1963), Apamea (1972), and Nishāpūr (1974), the specialist must be content with preliminary reports such as those of Baṣra, Wāsit, Ctesiphon, Kūsh, Istakhr, Ray, Takht-i Suleyman, Kangāvār, İznik and Tarsus. In order to reduce considerably the time lag between excavation and publication, the whole study of the ceramics is best done in the field; photographs, profiles, descriptions of bodies with Munsell chart number and basic tests with chemical and microscopical examination should thus be included.

In such a vast area as the Islamic world, there has been a tendency in ceramic studies to rely on historical, and more particularly, dynastic classifications, with names of towns used in a rather arbitrary manner and subdivisions based on colours and decorative motifs. As a result it has been found more convenient to restrict such terminology and to bear in mind the wide spread of a technique at one given time, while concentrating on terminology and technical problems. When seen in the context of world ceramics, the Islamic potter has contributed fundamental glazing techniques in the field which, in turn, have made certain European developments possible. The compulsion to create a white background for decorative motifs led the craftsman to evolve various formulae in glazing which would allow for whiteness, first routine to the colour decoration and substitutes for the precious metalwares forbidden by the Faith. Chronologically, three methods of producing whiteness exist in early Islamic pottery: first, an opaque white glaze on a yellowish body; second, a white slip under a transparent and clear lead glaze, usually on a pink body; and third, a composite white body called sgraffito. The colour effects rely on the use of certain metallic oxides which fuse at similar temperatures as those required for the glazes: green and turquoise from copper, purple from manganese, blue from cobalt, all shades of brown from iron, and yellow from antimony or arsenic. Finally, the last technical step in Islamic pottery, is the controlled use of underglaze painting, which came into its own in the 7th/13th century and has been the dominant decorative technique ever since. A large variety of vessels and pottery bodies were made throughout Islam, as well as wall and dome revetments of baked bricks, glazed tile mosaics and tiles.

Early development of Islamic pottery. By the middle of the 3rd/9th century, a striking departure from the pre-Islamic shapes takes place in the creation of a visual reproduction of the plain porcelain from China datable to the 3rd—early 4th/9th—early 10th century. Numerous sherds of original bowls have been found in Mesopotamia with everted, straight or lobed rims and narrow or broad base rings. They are first mentioned in the Taʾrīkh-i Masʿūdī of Abu l-ʿAbad Bayhaqī [q.v.] as gifts by the governor of Khurasan to the caliph Ḥarūn al-Raṣūlī. Most of the Islamic copies are decorated with sparse, often spongy-looking, blue motifs; they consist of palmettes, loose calligraphy and stylised leaves, sometimes with added copper-green runs on an opaque white glaze. At times, the glaze, which might be an underfired alkaline one, is made grey by the addition of minute specks of manganese oxide. In other cases, dense compositions, not unlike the patterns of Byzantine mosaics, fill the cavetto of the short-lived polychrome lustre painted bowls and dishes; dashes and circles or both and even plain sang-de-boeuf lustre, decorate the outside. The 139 square tiles around the mihrāb of the Sidi Oqba mosque in Ǧayrāwān, ca. 248/862, provide a fascinating pattern book; the tiles with more complex designs in polychrome lustre were imported from Mesopotamia, whereas the simpler ones with bichrome designs could well have been made in the area. Monochrome lustre decoration on bowls, usually with simple compositions of animals, birds and even human beings silhouetted against a stippled background, have been found from one end of the Islamic world to the other throughout the 4th/10th century, including at Mardin al-Zāhrāʾ. The shape is usually that of the porcelain bowls already mentioned. A monochrome lustre painted bowl in Cairo with traditional palmette and tree design bears an inscription in the name of Ǧīhān, the commander-in-chief of Ḥākīm, who died in 403/1013; it seems to mark the end of a fairly abstract style. After this period, more freely-handled lustre painting, often incised through the lustre on to the tin-opacified white background, points to the traditional realism of the local Egyptian Christians with fish patterns, or representations of a priest, as well as a definite revival of Hellenism in the arts of Eastern Mediterranean with scenes of banquets or dancers, often painted in reserve. Such a new departure coincides with a change of body and shape away from earlier imitations of Chinese porcelain and formal designs of palmettes or animals. The simple flaring walls of bowls with either straight rims or everted, flattened ones have a coarser, gritty body; the glazed base ring remains narrow and occasionally the base bears the signature of a potter or pottery workshops. Earlier signatures are found inside the cavetto, such as that of Ibrāhīm, or inside the base ring in the case of Muslim. In Romanesque churches during the early period of
Italian commercial activities before and during the time of the Crusades in Syria, Fatimid lustre bowls had been embedded in the outer fabric of walls to adorn the structure of new churches in Lombardy and in the republic of Pisa. Excavations at the Kafāt Banī Hammad in the Maghrib have brought to light cross-shaped tiles painted in monochrome lustre of the 5th/11th century.

Besides vessels with cobalt or lustre painting, early moulded wares have been found on various Mesopotamian sites, at Fustat, and also below the collapsed structures abandoned by the last Zoroastrians in Takht-i Sulaymān, dated 331/943. Details, not unlike those of terra sigillata, and beaded geometric band compositions on the larger surfaces, are all covered with lead glaze, often coloured green or yellow; shapes vary from flat dishes, some with small feet, to bowls with vertical walls, and small cups. Other vessels of the same shapes, but not moulded, have a similar fine pinkish body with a vivid yellow and green colour scheme. Contrary to Sarre’s theory, life continued in Sāmarrā after the return of the ʿAbbāsids caliphs to Baghdaḏ in 278/892. The mint worked until as late as the middle of the 4th/10th century, while the potters continued even beyond that time. Their production, although less spectacular, emphasises technical research in the use of metallic oxides for runs, splashes and spots, with an increasing proportion of lead in the closer fitting glaze; the body colour changes from pale salmon to pink, the potting becomes thicker and the profiles less graceful. Such production is also common to Susa, Iṣṭaḵr, Rayy and Nishāpūr amongst other places. In Egypt, wares of the Fāyūm indicate a better control of the runs; excavations of Aḥḥabīd and Zīrīd towns of the Maghrib have brought to light deep bowls with straight vertical rims and simple animal decoration inside in yellow, green and manganese; the latter two colours are found in Umayyad Spain on an opaque background starting in the 4th/10th century.

The uses of slip. By the 5th/11th century, true Islamic shapes had evolved on the Iranian plateau and in Transoxiana: large dishes with flattened rims, and at the earlier stage, bowls with a wide lip encircling the middle, flaring walls. At this point, the second method of producing whiteness appears in the use of a white clay slip which hides the pink body. According to the visual impact required, the potter would paint the slip with plain metallic oxides in order to obtain variegated runs of colour, or else he would thicken the oxides with slip in order to prevent running under the transparent lead glaze. The first group has often been equated with T’ang three-colour funerary ceramics. It has now been proved that such a luxurious production in China virtually ceased after the An Lu-shan rebellion in 756 A.D., and in any case, could not have been the object of international trade. A more likely parallel could be found in the production of Northern kilns under the Liao dynasty in Southern Manchuria (907-1124 A.D.).

A second group, making full use of the slip technique, has been in turn labelled Nishāpūr or Samarqand wares according to the quality of design and execution. Recent publications have made it difficult to be so definite, since similar wares appear in Khurāsān, Transoxiana as far as Frunze and Sistān throughout the Sāmānids, Gāznavid and Ghūrid periods, by which latter time the production had become rather simplified and mechanical. The fact exists to this day in the Uzbekistan SSR. Early on, superb examples of calligraphy, such as blessings and proverbs, elaborated palmettes, such as textiles and designs, stand out against a white or colour slip background. A particular instance is the use of human representations on simpler bowl shapes from the area of Nishāpūr. The Zoroastrian survival with the Gabrī or fire worshippers, has long been overstressed at the expense of the thriving Nestorian and Syrian Christian communities of the region. This could partly explain the appearance of concrete scenes, the falconer on horseback and the more prosaic birds and horned quadruped compositions. Later, abstract and heraldic slip painting of a rather coarse kind also decorated bowls and cups under the Mamlūks and the Ottomans before the fall of Constantinople. A more refined type of slip decoration was occasionally used on Şafawīd and Ottoman ceramic shapes in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries. A third group, that of sgraffiato wares, technically runs parallel in time with the two previous ones. The incised pattern through the slip into the pink body is designed either visually to counterbalance a splashed decoration, or later, it seems, to stand out as the sole ornament under a clear lead glaze, with the occasional green run, or with the glaze sometimes coloured green with copper oxide. In the latter case, the incision can be narrow as in metalware, or broader not unlike champi, in which case large areas of slip are lifted out; the contrasting shade of the naked body is often made even darker by painting in black or brown. The potters of Aḥbarbāyḏān seem to have produced the best specimens of sgraffiato, as emphasised by the excavations of Takht-i Sulaymān, and finds from the area of Gārūs, Aḵghānd, Rīdāliyya and Āmul in Māzdārdān. Less inspired animal designs with narrow incisions, have come from Rayy, Nishāpūr, Iṣṭaḵr, Širāz and western Afghanistan. There has been a tendency to date sgraffiato wares rather early, whereas it seems more now that if one is to relate the best of slip painted wares to the latter part of the Sāmānids rule, then sgraffiato, technically speaking, has to be placed later during the rule and more specifically the decline of the Great Saljūḳs (429-590/1038-1194), in particular under Togrūl III in Hamadān and the thriving regencies of the Khwarizmians such as the Gūrids (531-622/1136-1222 [g.v.]), both courts providing suitable conditions for a renewal of original ceramic production under their realm.

Although it was at its best in north-west Persia and was only used for a relatively short period, sgraffiato technique was subsequently produced throughout the Caucasus and Eastern Turkey as shown in the excavations of Ānl and Dvin. On the whole, the incised designs of diaper patterns or fanciful birds and animals, and also of figures, convey an impression of haste rather than of skill, although the latter do not lack humour. Either the lead glaze is colourless or made green with copper, or else the typical scheme of purple, yellow and green is used in an uncontrollable way. The technique seems to have spread to Cilicia, known at the time as Lesser Armenia, and to areas ruled over, if intermittently, by the Crusaders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D. The better-known production is that of Cyprus, with high-footed deep bowls or drinking cups; human décor, usually incised through the white slip under a colourless lead glaze, is unlike the heraldic Mamluk cups of the 7th/13th century and onwards, although the shapes belong to the same repertoire. It is not yet clear when and where the true style started to evolve in the Byzantium, but it certainly reached Europe in the late Middle Ages and flourished in Renaissance Italy.

Soft paste. It could be suggested that the second
half of the 6th/12th century was the very period which must also have witnessed the last of the three methods of producing whiteness. It is described by Abu 'l-Kāsim in his by now famous treatise of 700/1300, and consists of a man-made body; the ratio of ingredients between body and glaze is such that they adhere closely together. This fine white soft paste (also called frit) proved to be the ideal material to reproduce local metal and glass shapes, as well as the delicate Chinese northern white wares and the Ch'ing-pai (Ying Ching) porcelain of the south in the 6th/12th century. Never again were beakers and bowls to be so light and elegant; the shapes, when moulded or carved, remain pure white or might have a coloured glaze. A short-lived group of pitchers and bowls, called silhouette wares, is sparsely decorated with single animal or human figure at the centre; the thick design in black sharply contrasts with the white background; occasionally the transparent glaze is coloured turquoise. Lapilli (painted) wares are also shaped out of the same hard composite body with raised outlines for the broad designs of animals, so as to prevent the colour from running. On vertical shapes the result is less satisfactory. It is likely that these latter wares were produced in northern Mesopotamia as well as in north-west Iran.

On-glaze painting: Minā'ī. In the last resort, it is the paint brush which lends itself to the most fluent and versatile decoration; on the new white body of various shapes, from low stands to moulded vessels, the potter paints either in lustre or minā'ī (enamel) on the glaze, or in black and blue under a transparent glaze. Both minā'ī and lustre techniques require a second firing in a muffle kiln at a lower temperature. The more intricate manner of minā'ī painting, although varied and subtle in colour, failed to survive beyond the 7th/11th century. The best two examples are an undated slender beaker with scenes from the story of Bidjen and Manšijīa in the Shāh-nāma of Firdawsī, and a large dish with a vivid battle scene datable to the early 1250s A.D. on the basis of the names written alongside the main figures. A simpler bowl, with a seated figure and two attendants on a turquoise background, is dated 640/1242. Soon after this, the colour scheme deteriorates and the body, at times, reverts to earthenware. Only echoes of the best minā'ī survive in the 8th/14th century.

Lustre painting. A fragment of a lustre painted ewer in the British Museum, the earliest dated Persian piece so far known (575/1179), has a large band of seated figures, separated from a lower arabesque by a frieze of racing quadrupeds. Although Persian lustre painting (including lamp bases) has been traditionally divided into two main schools, Rayy and Kāshān, it might be that after the great feud in Rayy between Sunnī and Shi'ī communities in 582/1186-7, the latter group fled to their own in 7th/13th century Anatolia. One of the earliest uses of more than one colour appears on the entrance to Kay-Kā'ūs I's tomb in his hospital of Sīvas (614/1217-18). The inner dome of the Karatay madrasa in Konya (650/1251-2) illustrates the technique at its best, with a colour scheme of blue, turquoise and dark purple-black. In the Sirgali madrasa (640/1242) the glazed work is signed by a craftsman with a misba from Tūs. Although Tabriz buildings of the Mongol period no longer exist, tile mosaics do cover part of Oldjeytī's mausoleum in Sulţāniyya. The final phase starts with the Muzaffārids, especially in Yazd and Iṣfahān, with the introduction of green and brown colours with the addition of white. The patterning of glazed bricks with glazed ones to simulate courses of bricks (bindī technique) also increased and effects as well as the use of various ines of mosaics or terra cotta in panel compositions. The bulk of the production was sponsored by the Timūrids, seen at its best in Harāt and Samarqand. Later examples
are those of the Ak Koyunlu in the so-called blue mosque in Tabriz (870/1465) and at Isfahān, followed by the early buildings of the Ṣafawid era in Ardabil, Isfahān and Kirmān. The Ǧinlī Kōsk in Istanbul (877/1472-3) relates to the bindaʾrevetments in Harāt. Some of the best tile mosaic works of North Africa and Spain are datable to the late 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries A.D. Spasmodic attempts at glaze tiling and tile mosaics were made in the first half of the 9th/15th century in Cairo. In the Indian subcontinent also, five colourful tombs in Multān bear dates from 547/1152 to 724/1324, and glazed bricks were used in the Bahmani complex of buildings at Bīdar; tile panellings were included in Rajput buildings of the 18th century A.D.

A Sevillian document of 1558 A.D. mentions cuerdas de seca for the first time; however, it is now used to describe a technique which prevents the glaze colours fusing into each other during the firing; the barrier consists of a purple line of paint with an added greasy substance which vanishes in the firing. The technique was already used in Achaemenian Susa; there are some examples at Madīnat al-Zahrāʾ; it came into full use in 8th/14th century Persia in order to imitate tile mosaics at a smaller cost. Examples are known from Timūrī Samarqand, the Yeğil mosque and tumb in Bursa, the Selimīye (931/1521) and the Ahmet Pasa mosque (ca. 961/1554) in Istanbul. Saḥāwī buildings from the 11th/17th century onwards used the technique extensively, as did those of the Kāḏjārs. There are a few examples in Lahore in conjunction with tile mosaics. The best-known remain those of Spain.

Underglaze painting. When the mediaeval potter discovers, often by accident, a new technique, it spreads rapidly in an already mature form. It is difficult to determine where underglaze painting came into being either on earthenware or soft paste, but by the first half of the 7th/13th century this last and major break-through was well-mastered; it gradually superseded earlier methods of decoration and became established over the centuries through a series of changing styles. Prior to the Pax mongolica, Persian underglaze painting in black or blue or in both under a transparent glaze, often coloured turquoise, either recalls the arabesques and figures scene from the lustre répertoire or reveals new motifs of flowing water weeds, fish or sharply contrasted striations. Both genres are well illustrated in the so-called Gūrgān material. Some soft paste bowls recall similar shapes in glass with the same slender splayed foot, although the T-shaped rim only occurs in ceramics. Other shapes include double-shell pitchers, one dated 612/1215, the ewers with phoenix heads, sweet-meat dishes, globular jars and a series of small figurines, including birds, animals, musicians, riders and mothers suckling their babies. In the so-called Raḵḵa wares, the Syrian potter developed during the same period a less contrived style of painting on dishes with flattened everted rims: typical court figures, riders, aquatic birds, compositions of arabesques, dragons’ heads and palm tree leaves. Similar treatment of motifs exists on the eight-pointed star tiles in the palace of Kubābādābād in Anatolia ca. 633/1236, as well as on simpler cross and star tiling under a turquoise glaze in other official buildings of the sultāns of Rūm in Kayseri, Aspendos, Alarān and Alanya.

The Pax mongolica. In the same way as the final extension of Ḥabbāṣid rule ruled a political vacuum early in the 3rd/9th century and thus made possible the creation of one area of influence, so, after a period of strife and weakening foreign influences in cosmopolitan Syria, the Mongol era was one of stability and brought about decided contacts with China along both sea and land routes, even as far west as Europe, as is proved by the Chinese silk damask of Pope Benedict XI dated before 1304 A.D. Through the rich Kāḏjīrī and other seagoing merchants, and many of the sinkiśed retinue of the Ilkhan court of Tabrīz, alien decorative themes, drawn at first from large quantities of celadons, textiles and no doubt commercial paintings and block prints, triggered off the new Islamic style in the most recent technique of underglaze painting from Cairo to Sarāy Berke. The transition from two-dimensional textiles to three-dimensional vessels implied skilful adaptation of the foreign motifs to a totally Islamic system of distribution. Two motifs new to ceramics stand out: the spiky lotus and leaf already picked up in miniature painting and enamelled glass, and the ogee panels, well-known from Islamic carved stone, stucco and metalwares. An intense leafy background, a general impression of grey, and the stylised imitation of the petal design on the outside of celadons, characterise the so-called Sūlṭānābdāb types. At their best, the main themes under a clear glaze are set in relief by a thickness of white clay also outlined in a greenish brushstroke on a manganese slip. Both genres are well illustrated in the so-called Gūrgān material. Two motifs new to ceramics recall the arabesque of flowers and the peony painted underglaze with petal panels of flat cobalt may warm the compositions of phoenixes or cranes in flight, cantering gazelles and sedate geese or Mongol couriers. The earlier and later wares rely more on a white background, with greater emphasis on traditional geometric divisions, radiating panels filled with crosshatching, groups of four dots, dotted circles, zigzag patterns or calligraphy.

Transition. By the middle of the 8th/14th century, the new blue and white Chinese porcelain of the Yūnān period had started to reach the Islamic world in as great a quantity as the long-favoured Lung-ch’iān celadons (also called Ghūrī or Martabani). In the same way as the latter was faithfully imitated, including the saucer base, so the potter took over the new bi-chrome treatment, without appreciating, it seems, that it was in fact the product of imported cobalt from Persia as well as a new experiment in export wares especially designed for the Islamic market by the Chinese potters, in shapes and in a style totally alien to their own taste. Traditional motifs were reorganised on the larger surfaces of dishes in concentric circles and lobed panels possibly akin to early so-called Sūlṭānābdāb panelled bowls and certainly to metalwares easily available in the large colonies of Muslim merchants established from the 3rd/9th century onwards in South China ports. Not only in Persia, but also—and perhaps even more—in the Mamlūk territories, variations on the Chinese lotus pond were produced in quantity, as gradually the running of the cobalt was controlled by the introduction of an added layer of frit over the soft paste body. In the first half of the 9th/15th century, Chinese export blue and white compositions, although still preserving a certain geometric quality, gradually reverted to a more delicate and restrained treatment of the surface. The Islamic potter, prior to his İznik follower in the 10th/16th century, picked up the trend and adapted the arabesque of flowers and the peony blossoms, dragons and waves to his own taste, using in turn, classic scroll, meander bands or diaper patterns, with petal panels on the outside of bowls and dishes. He seems to have been undaunted by the raids of Timūr and the internal strife in both Mamlūk and Ottoman lands at the turn of the century. It
should be emphasised that throughout the 9th/15th century, from Sistan and Farghana to the Mediterranean, this imitative production never overtook the more traditional decorative approach of radiating motifs and panels, either in blue and white or when black was added on the mediocre soft paste body. Such an approach is apparent on early so-called Kubachi wares, dated to the second half of the century: the well-controlled panels or circular compositions are painted in black under a turquoise coloured glaze. So-called Miletus wares are now known to have prevailed in the early stages of the Ottoman rule in Iznik, among other sites, as well as at Miletus. They differ in that the body is red earthenware, but the visual impact often remains geometric with little of the white slip left undecorated. More background is visible when debased Chinese motifs of flowers or birds appear on a field of scattered shapeless leaves. Only the more elaborate Mamluk wares carry a signature such as that of Ghaib or his atelier.

To this period also belong several series of tiles, also under-glaze painted and hexagonal in shape. The decoration recalls either elements of the early 9th/15th century A.D. Chinese blue and white dishes which display geometric blossom compositions or a bunch of flowers, or else the geometry of the transition period. The tiles in Miletus (ca. 843/1440) could have been made in Iznik like related ones a century later; they are neatly finished and the largest in dimension of the series. The Damascus group, including the tiles of the mausoleum of Tawrîzî (ca. 853/1453), is more freely painted with occasional purple and a turquoise border. Egyptian examples, hardly recalling Chinese themes, draw on architectural and bold vegetal motifs.

Ottoman rule. On the whole, the Ottoman potters of Asia Minor produced soft paste vessels with a fine white slip under a transparent lead glaze for the metropolis; and to a lesser extent, those of Syria, Egypt and North Africa also drew on the same technique and on a fund of designs from the nakkâshân, the special studio of court designers. Around the turn of the 9th/15th century, they borrowed from book-bindings and illuminations for the controlled, if austere, dark blue and white arabesque variations of stylised flowers and palmettes on dishes and deep bowls with a splayed foot. The lay-out of the ever signed by İbrâhîm of Kütahya (916/1510) is already less dense in design. By 923/1517, the final conquests of Selîm I had made available a large booty of Chinese wares in the area, including the famous red, Kutahya survived better and its 18th century A.D. production is well known by a series of dated pieces ranging in fact from 1716 to 1843. A most important group of tiles dated 1718-19, intended for restoration work in the Holy Sepulchre, are now in the Convent of Saint Saviour. The Monte Carlo group also belongs to this first period and was presumably inspired by the flimsy spirals of official tughrâs; sherds first found in Istanbul gave it the label; more have now been excavated in Iznik. A broken bottle in this style bears an Armenian dating which corresponds to 1529 A.D. The long- vexed problem of Armenian craftsmanship has now been resolved by the study of archives, which indicate participation and production of the non-Muslim minority at most stages of Ottoman history. The mosque lamp from the Dome of the Rock (956/1549) is the only dated piece of Iznik; it could well be one of the last examples of the first group, also known as the İbrâ-
16th century, the capital was moved first to Tabriz, then to Kaeswān and finally to Isfahān in 1006/1597-8, by which time the frontiers were more secure, the new sea route by the Cape had proved itself and the European East India companies felt strong enough to open new markets. It is difficult to locate precisely the ceramic production of the time, despite some indications given by foreign embassies, travellers and merchants. Mashhad, Kirmān, Shirāz and Yazd are mentioned. Isfahān must have been a great centre, too, although there is no reference other than to the tiled monuments. Be this what it may, the Persian potter of the 10th/16th century A.D. reacted to the impact of Chinese celadon and blue and white porcelain much the same way as his Ottoman counterpart; a substantial amount must have been available to provide inspiration, besides the specimens looted by the Ottomans and those in the collection of Şah ʿAbbās I which he donated to the shrine of Ardashir in 1015/16/1607-8. The blue and white blossom compositions and the wave border were re-interpreted on a soft paste body, as well as the polychrome Anatolian flower compositions down to the bent branches and the saz. Yet the zodiac dish of 571/1563 illustrates the regular recurrence of the geometric division of space. Eventually a style of impressionistic vegetal and animal designs was developed on jars, bowls and dishes, the shape of which owed little to the outside world. The less dramatic visual impact was probably due to a reduced contrast in the colours and relative control of the firing and the irregular quality of the glaze.

Although a few examples of so-called Kubād wares were found in that remote town of the Caucasus, it is not clear where in fact they were made; the early fortunes of the Safawi capitals eventually led them to Isfahān. The unusual compositions break away from controlled geometric; sketches of human busts verging on caricature, are more usual than animals or unidentified plants. Turbaned youths, foreign merchants and sailors, suitable females, enliven the répertoire of impressionistic vegetal and animal designs. Eventually a style of impressionistic vegetal and animal designs was developed on jars, bowls and dishes, the shape of which owed little to the outside world. The less dramatic visual impact was probably due to a reduced contrast in the colours and relative control of the firing and the irregular quality of the glaze.

Since emulating large export celadons and Chinese monochrome bowls and ewers, with moulded or carved designs, the Persian potter remained, in essence, faithful to his predilection for blue and white, contrary to his Ottoman counterpart who abandoned it fairly soon. Patterns of the Chia-ching (1522-66) and Wan-li (1573-1619) reigns were swiftly adapted, with a partiality for wild birds and animals, ludicrous landscapes and garden genre scenes, totally misunderstood. A few dates and potter's marks have been recorded such as the tassel mark. In most of the painting a black outline holds in the various shades of cobalt wash. At its best and most original, the production takes the shape of a large dish with a very white soft paste body; a carved arabesque in the cavetto surrounds a medallion densely filled with wild beasts or birds and foliage. A possible added reason for the continued production of Persian blue and white was the greed of the European market for the export porcelain, all the more so when the Chinese ports closed from 1659 to 1682 and replacements had to be found. Kirmān within reasonable distance of Bandar ʿAbbās (Gombren) on the Gulf certainly rose to the occasion and imitated Kraak porcelain with its paneling in the cavetto and central themes of flowers or bird on a rock. A number of 17th/17th and 17th centuries dated pieces show the gradual deterioration in the decorative treatment with a few exceptional pierced wares, imitation of celadons, humorous or slip-painted wares on a dark background, often called Gombren wares, the Persian version of similar Ottoman specimens, in both cases, copies of Chinese originals.

Some of the best underglaze painting remains that of the continuous tile programme undertaken in Isfahān, and later under the Zands and the Kašgāris in Shirāz, Kirmān, Tehran and Simnān. The introduction of famille rose colours brought a new flavour to flower compositions in mosque and madrasa tile panels from the end of the 18th century. It is also reflected in bowls of the 19th century, in which attempts to imitate European porcelain only preserve a certain Persian flavour. To this day, ceramics are a living tradition in Iran and all Islamic lands, more for practical purposes than as a distinctive part of the artistic production of the period.

 Unglazed wares. Undaunted by the passage of time, the large storage jar with lid, and the bowls which allows its water content to keep cool through slow evaporation, are a permanent product of the potter's workshop. It would require more systematic studies to appreciate their various shapes, volumes of content and ornament. Although decoration can be produced by incising or by painting on the leatherhard body, the best visual effects come from the use of dies and moulds, either as a complete half of a flask, two identical halves being luted together by a central band with the addition of handles and neck device, or in the shape of stamps. The best examples seem to have been produced from the 4th/10th to the 8th/14th century from the Mediterranean to Afghanistan and Transoxiana. Specifically Egyptian is a large series of surviving filters where the pierced area is made to allow its water content to keep cool through slow evaporation, are a permanent product of the potter's workshop. It would require more systematic studies to appreciate their various shapes, volumes of content and ornament. Although decoration can be produced by incising or by painting on the leatherhard body, the best visual effects come from the use of dies and moulds, either as a complete half of a flask, two identical halves being luted together by a central band with the addition of handles and neck device, or in the shape of stamps. The best examples seem to have been produced from the 4th/10th to the 8th/14th century from the Mediterranean to Afghanistan and Transoxiana. Specifically Egyptian is a large series of surviving filters where the pierced area is made to


Technique.—J. Allan, Some observations on the origins of the Medieval Persian faience body, in Percival David Foundation Colloquy, No. 4 (1974); M. Centlivres-Demont, Une communauté de potiers en Iran, Wiesbaden 1971; H. Hodges, Artifacts, London 1964; C. Kiefer, Les céramiques silicieuses


KHAZAL KHAN, IBN HADIJID DIABIR KHAN, Shakh of Muhammara, born ca. 1860, died 27 May 1936. On the death of Shakh of Hadijid Diabir Khan in 1881, leadership of the Muhasayn tribe, the great bulk of which resided in Persian territory, passed to Muzaffar Khan, Shakh Shadi's fifth son. His rule became unpopular on account of his meanness and avarice and on June 2, 1897, Muzaffar and his nephew 'Abd al-Djalal were shot dead, as they were disembarking from a boat at Fallahiyya, by three negro slaves. A large number of Arabs under Salman b. Mansur, a cousin of Khaz'al, were, however, on hand to give further support if necessary in the assassination attempt. It seems that Khaz'al approved the murder, even if he did not actually instigate it. (A. T. Wilson: A précis of the relations of the British Government with the tribes and sheiks of Arabianistan, Calcutta 1912, ch. iv) Muzaffar left no sons. Khaz'al quickly took charge of affairs and was later confirmed as Shakh by tribal election. The Persian Governor General of 'Arabistan, Sardar Akram, opposed Khaz'al's candidacy and endeavoured to have a councillor appointed as Shakh. He failed in this attempt and Khaz'al's position was confirmed by the Shah in April 1898 when the lahad of Mu'izz al-Saltana, which had also been held by his predecessor, was conferred upon him (J. G. Lorimer, Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, 'Oman and Central Arabia, Calcutta 1915, i/2, 1744-1754).

Khaz'al followed with great success his brother's policy of endeavouring to extend the area over which the Muhabsayn held sway. The submission of the Karab (Ca'sb) tribe was completed during 1897 and in the autumn of 1898 Khaz'al mounted a successful expedition against the Bawiyya tribe in the area between the Kārān and Djarrābī rivers. By 1904 the Shakh had the de facto power to nominate the governors of Ahwāz and Māshūr and the central government was reported to exercise little authority south of Band-i Kfr (Major E. B. Burton to Government of India, Rawalpindi, Feb. 28, 1904, in F.O. 416/17). The weakness of the central government was also revealed by the fact that the collection of arrears of taxation from the Bant Turf could be undertaken in 1903, and again in 1905, only with the support of Khaz'al and his armed followers.

When the Persian government proposed to introduce Belgian customs officials into 'Arabistan in 1902, Khaz'al objected strongly, fearing that his power over his followers would be weakened as the degree of central government control increased. Wilson agreed that any attempt to impose new taxes on the Arab tribes of the area would have caused serious unrest and could have resulted in the deposition of Khaz'al unless he was successful in defending the tribes' traditional rights. (Wilson, op. cit., ch. v). One of Khaz'al's advantages in the subsequent negotiations was the fact that he owned a large area of land in Turkish 'Irak, and could realistically threaten to leave Persian territory together with his followers. More important reasons for Khaz'al's success in the negotiations over the introduction of the Belgians were, however, the degree of support which he received from the British diplomatic mission in Tehran and the number of armed followers which could call upon. A. H. Harding, the British Minister in Tehran, estimated that he could put 20,000 armed men into action against the central government if he so wished. (Hardinge to Lansdowne No. 57, 12 April 1901, marked confidential, in F.O. 609365). In May 1902 the authorities in Tehran agreed that the Shakh should receive a salary as the Director-General of Customs in 'Arabistan and that the Belgian official who was to be appointed should accept the Shakh's orders with regard to the duties to be paid by the local Arab inhabitants (see H. J. Whigham, The Persian problem, London 1903). In 1903 the Shakh received three important farmans confirming his land holdings and proprietary rights in 'Arabistan from Muzzafar al-Din Shah.

It was because Khaz'al possessed such local power, because he was suspicious of Russian designs in the Persian Gulf, and because he made serious endeavours to reduce the level of piracy in the waters under his control, that his friendship was regarded highly by local British officials (see the despatch by Major E. B. Burton cited above). After the discovery of oil at Masjid-i-Sulayman in 1908, Khaz'al's friendship became even more important, for the pipeline that was necessary to carry the oil to a deep water port had to cross his territory as well as that of the Bakhtiyār. Khaz'al granted the necessary wayleaves in 1909 and also leased land for the building of a refinery and loading jetties at Abadān (see S. H.


2. Ewer with zoomorphic spout, H: 36 cms, carved slipped design filled in black under transparent green-tinted glaze. Āḏharbāyjān, 6th/12th c. Musée du Louvre, Paris No. 7247.

1. Dish, W: 26.6 cms, H: 7.6 cms, black design under transparent turquoise glaze. Syria, early 7th/13th c. Freer Gallery of Art, No. 47.8, Courtesy of the Smithsonian Institution, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington DC.


1. Dish, W: 45 cms, blue and black design under transparent colourless glaze. Iran, ca. 1000/1600. Museum für Kunsthandwerk Frankfurt/M.

Longrigg, *Oil in the Middle East*, London 1961, 19-20. The Shaykh also assisted the British after Turkey joined the First World War. In 1910 the Shaykh had been made Knight Commander of the Order of the Indian Empire (K.C.I.E.) in recognition of his friendship towards British interests.

After the end of the war and with the rise to power of Rüştü Khan, the situation began to change. The official British promises of support for Khażal had been made conditional on the recognition of his obligations towards the Persian government. While the British government was weak the issue was largely academic, but when Rüştü Khan began to extend the power of the central government the problem became a pressing one. Khażal probably expected greater British support than he received. He was encouraged by London to seek an agreement with Rüştü Khan (see G. Waterfield, *Professional diplomat: Sir Percy Loraine of Kirkharle Bt.*, London 1973, chs. 6-9 for details and further references to the British diplomatic archives on this complex issue). In Nov. 1923 Khażal came to an arrangement with the central government over the payment of taxes (A. C. Millsbaugh, *The American task in Persia*, New York 1925, 216-36), but Rüştü Khan's expedition in the spring of 1924 against the Lurs to the north alarmed Khażal. He refused, with good reason, to go voluntarily to Tehran and in August he stated that he would resist Rüştü Khan by force if necessary. British intervention failed to bring about a reconciliation. The famines of 1903 were revived by the Šah and in September Khażal accused Rüştü Khan of violating the laws of Persia and of acting as a usurper. This outburst lost Khażal the sympathy of the British government which had begun to realise that British interests lay in the creation of a strong central government in Persia (R. M. Burrell, *British, Iran and the Persian Gulf: some aspects of the situation in the 1940s and 1950s*, D. Hopwood (ed.), *The Arabian Peninsula: society and politics*, London 1972). Khażal offered an apology for his statement in Dec. 1924, but Rüştü Khan was by now determined to extinguish the Shaykh's power. Military preparations were made by the Persian army during the winter of 1924, and on 19 April 1925, Khażal was arrested on board a boat at Muhammara. He was transferred to Tehran and kept there under virtual house arrest until his death.


(R. M. Burrell)

**KHAZAR**, a nomadic people in the South Russian steppes who flourished in the early Islamic period. The Khazar tribal union emerged in the course of the 6th century A.D. in the aftermath of a series of migrations of nomadic peoples from Inner and Central Asia. With the collapse of the European Hun state in 454 A.D., some of the nomadic elements of Attila's horde withdrew to the Pontic steppe zone. They were joined here, ca. 461 A.D., by waves of Oghur tribes which had been driven from Western Siberia and the Kasağh steppe by the Sabirs who, in turn, had been forced to migrate to the Kazakh steppe from their Central Asian homeland by the expansion of the Avar (Juan-juan, Uar-Hun) tribal confederation (on the history of these migrations, see C. Czegledy, *A nomád népék vándorlása napkeletől napnyugattyal* ['The Migration of nomadic peoples from East to West'], Budapest 1969). The Sabirs themselves arrived in the North Caucasian steppes and Volga region in the opening decades of the 6th century. When Avar (Juan-juan) hegemony in Mongolia was overthrown by the Turks (Türk, KÖK Türk) in 552 A.D., elements of the Avars (or perhaps the Hephthalites, whose tribal union was composed of kindred Uar-Hun tribes) migrated westward and entered the Volga-Pontic steppe zone after 557 A.D. where they subjugated some of the Oghur tribes. Avar dominion in this region was short-lived, for they were soon forced to migrate, together with some of their Oghur subjects, to Pannonia (ca. 567 A.D.), by the advent of their enemies, the Turks.

Although there are indications in Armenian sources (see *The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movses Dâshourânsî*, tr. C. J. F. Dowsett, Oxford 1961, 70) and Arab sources (al-Baladhuri, *Fustûk al-buldân*, ed. De Goeje, 1941; al-Yâkîbî, *Historiae*, ed. Hostasna, i, 200-4) that would appear to give evidence of a Khazar presence in the Volga delta and in the Caucasus prior to the middle of the 6th century (see D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton 1954, 20-22, and M. I. Artamonov *Istorija Khazar*, Leningrad 1962, 116-7), for an evaluation of these sources the Khazars have nothing to do with the Akatsiv/Akatsir, Khotirs etc. who figure in Byzantine and Syriac sources during this period, see O. Maenchchen-Helfen, *The World of the Huns*, Berkeley 1973, 427 ff.; it is only under the aegis of the Turks that the Khazar tribal confederation (most probably an amalgamation, by this time, of Hunnic, Sabir, Oghur, Turk and other nomadic, Altaic elements) fully emerges on to the historical scene. It cannot be determined, at present, whether a tribe named "Khazar" actually existed prior to the conquest and organisation of the Volga-North Caucasian-Pontic steppe nomads by the Turks. It may well be that the Khazar tribal union was a creation of the Turks and the name of this new tribal grouping was thus coined, phonetically and historically, by our early sources via local, oral historical tradition, to those earlier tribes which ultimately came to compose it. In many of our early accounts, the ethonyms Khazar and Türk are interchangeable. In any event, it is under Türk leadership (the *Didebul Khaqan* of Movses Dâshourânsî, the *Didebul* of the *K'arMis Ts'khovreba*, Ziğnda of the Byzantine writers, perhaps to be identified with the T'ong Yabgu* of the Western Turks, see J. Marrott, *Osteuropdische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig 1903, 394, 498) that the Khazars figure prominently in the Preo-Byzantine wars of the first third of the 7th century. The Khazars, as allies of Byzantium, relieved the Sásânid pressure on Heraclius (610-41) by devastating Persian holdings in Transcaucasia. In 626, the *Didebul* Khaqan and his nephew, the Shâd (Shâtî in the Armenian sources) ravaged Caucasian Albania and in the following year turned on Georgia whose capital, T'bilisi, fell to them in 628 (Daskhurants'î, tr. C. J. F. Dowsett, 81-8, *K'arMis Ts'khovreba*, ed. S. Kaukhî-îshvili, *K'arîz* 1955, i, 225, 374-5). The Khazar-Byzantine alliance cemented during these wars remained, although subject to occasional buffets, the cornerstone of the Byzantine defence network against the nomads of the Eurasian steppes until the roth century.

Türk overlordship in the western half of their
realm had been steadily weakening during the first half of the 7th century as the result of internecine strife. With the submission of the Western Turks (On Ok) to the Chinese in 659, it came to an end. Two Turk successor states emerged in the western sector of the Eurasian steppes, the Khasar Kaghanate (perhaps under a scion of the ruling clan of the On Ok, the Nu-shih-pi as suggested by Artamonov, op. cit.) and the Bulghar-ongogur/Onogghundur state (a tribal union composed largely of Ogur elements led by the Dulo, the rivals of the Nu-shih-pi in the On Ok confederation. The Bulghar ruling clan may also have had Attild affiliations, see O. Pritsak, *Die Bulgarsche Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Protobulgaren*, Wiesbaden 1955, 36-8). The inevitable conflict that broke out between the two (reported, with mythic overtones, in Theophanes, Nicephorus Patriarchus and the Letter of the Khasar ruler, Joseph) ended with the defeat of Pontic (Magna) Bulgaria (Πιλατικα Βουλγαρια) in the 670s. In the course of this struggle, and perhaps even earlier, some Bulghar (the name may be etymologised in Turkic as meaning “the mixed ones”, see Gy. Németh, *A honfoglaló magyarország kialakulása* (“The Formation of the Hungarian State in the Conquest Period”), Budapest 1939, 95-6) elements migrated to the Volga-Kama region founding Volga Bulgharia. Another horde, under Asperukh, made its way to Byzantine Moesia and established Danubian Bulgaria there ca. 679. Other Bulghar tribes remained in the eastern Pontic steppe zone under Khasar rule.

The Khasars were now undisputed masters of the western Eurasian steppelands. Their hold over the North Caucasus, however, was contested by the Arabs who had begun to penetrate this region by 21/642-2. This was the first thrust in a series of wars that spanned a century. Much of the campaigning centered on gaining possession of Bâb al-Abâw (Derbend) (q.v.), a strategically-important town guarding the approaches from the steppe zone to Transcaucasia, and the Khasar cities Balandjar (Balangar, probably of ethnonymic origin, cf. the “Bârandjar” mentioned in Ibn Fadlan, *Kniga Al'hamda ibn Fadlana o ego puteyescestvi na Volgu v 927-922 gg.* (“The Book of Ibn Fadlan on his Journey to the Volga”), tr. and facs. ed. A. P. Kova-
levskiy, Kharkov 1995, 323 (f. 207b), or Z. V. Togan, *Ibn Fadlan’s Reisebericht*, in *Abh. K. M., xxi/vi/1* (1939), Arabic text, 30, or tr. M. Canard, in *AEOL*, i (1950), 107, who were, at this time, ruled by “Alp Ilit” (Il-teber/tever), a Khasar vassal (or perhaps a representative of the royal clan; this is implied in the Turkic title *il-teber* and was a practice common in the nomadic world). The detailed description of North Caucasian “Hunnic” shamanism given in *Daskhurants*’ account of Israyel’s mission is extremely valuable as it sheds some light on the religious practices that were, undoubtedly, present amongst the Khasars as well. The worship by these “Huns” of “Tangri Khan”, the cult of the sacred forest, worship of fire, thunder and lightning and the funeral practices described in *Daskhurants*’ (tr. Dowsett, 153-6, 161) all conform in general and in many of their specific traits to the descriptions of Turk shamanism in Chinese sources and later accounts of Turkic shamanism as practised up to the present century. The Islamic geographers (cf. Ibn Rusta, 139; for a discussion of these sources, see B. N. Zakhradz, *Kaspiyskiy svod svedenii o vostochnoi europe*, Moscow 1962, i, 146-7) note that the Khasar pagans practise a religion “similar to that of the Turks” (Gardizi specifically states that it resembles that of the Ogur/Ghuzz, i.e. shamanism).

During this same period, the Khasars apparently came into possession of most of the Crimea, except for Kherson which remained under a Byzantine administration. From here, they began to play an important rôle in the domestic politics of the Byzantine empire in connection with the ill-fated reign of Justinian II (685-95, 705-11). In the opening years of the 2nd/8th century, the Arab-Khazar struggle for hegemony in the North Caucasus quickened in pace. In 95/723, Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik retook Bâb al-Abâw which had, apparently, changed hands several times in the preceding years, and drove deep into Khasar North Caucasian “Hunnic” territory. Difficult but indecisive fighting continued until 111/730 when Djarrab b. al-Hakami, who alternated command of this important theatre of operations with Maslama when the latter’s services were needed elsewhere, was defeated and killed by the Khasars under the command of “Bârdîk (so Balfami, Ibn A’tham al-Küfî, *Kitâb al-Futâh*, Ms. Topkapi, Ahmed III, 2959, ii, ff. 180a-188b, has Bârsbîk. The relationship of Bârdîk/Bârsbîk to *P’arsbîk* (in Lewond, *Paimûf-ism*, ed. Ezeang’; St. Petersburg 1887, 101) noted...
as the “mother of the Khagan”, is unclear), son of the Khakan, as the “mother of the Kaghan”, at Ardabil. Perhaps with a view towards strengthening the resolve of the Khazars, a Byzantine-Khazar marriage alliance was arranged in which Constantine (later Constantine IV Copronymous), son of Leo the Isaurian, married Ciçek, the daughter of the Kaghan, ca. 732-733. Their son, Leo (755-775), was known as “the Kaghan”. The decisive campaign came in 119/737, when Marwan b. Muhammad (called “Marwan the Dear”, in Georgian sources), through a clever ruse was able to advance deep into Khazar territory, by-pass the Khazar capital, Attil, on the lower Volga and catching the Khazars unawares pursue him into the land of the Finno-Ugric Burţas, a subject people of the Khazars. Here, the defeated Kaghan agreed to become a Muslim and a subject of the caliph (the campaign is described in Ibn Aṭham al-Kūfī, al-Baladharī, Bālamū, and Ibn al-Aṯīr). Al-Baladharī, 208, reports that Marwan settled 20,000 Śakūlaba families from Khazar territory in Khákht and had Khazars transplanted to the steppe zone in the province of al-Laz between Šamūr and Shābīrūn. Continued Khazar submission, however, was contingent on a strong Arab presence (i.e., an army of occupation). This was an impossibility and consequently the conversion of the Khazar Kaghan was short-lived. Leo III’s victory over the Arabs some three years later, at Acroinon, in addition to further weakening the Umayyads, undoubtedly enabled the Kaghan (if he had not already done so) to break free of Arab overlordship. Thus, despite Marwan’s brilliant generalship, Arab rule was not and never would be firmly established on the Volga or even in the more accessible Daghistan where, in the 4th/10th century, Khazar rule reached almost up to the wall of Derbend [see Daghistan]. In effect, the Khazars and Arabs had fought each other to a standstill in the Caucasus. Although the campaign of 119/737, unlike the Arab advance defeated by Charles Martel at Tours several years earlier, was successful, the results were similar. The Caucasus and the Pontus became the border zone between the Arab world and Europe.

The Khazars, whose raiding was resumed by the second half of the century and was combined with the frequent revolts of the Christian peoples of Transcaucasia, gave little peace to the Arabs in that region; never again, however, did they constitute a serious threat to the Arab possession of Transcaucasia. The caliph al-Mansūr (136-58/754-75), undoubtedly in an attempt to better relations with the Khazars, ca. 760 ordered Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulamī, the governor of Armenia, to marry a daughter of the Kaghan. The name of the Kaghan appears to have been *Baghārūs, cf. Ibn Aṭham al-Kūfī, ii, f. 241b. The marriage was arranged (the bride bringing a dowry of 10,000 dirhams) and her death in childbirth and that of her child shortly after (Baladharī, 210) perhaps served as the cause for two large-scale Khazar raids into Transcaucasia in 145/762-3 and 147/764-5. Perhaps the name of the commander of the Khazar forces is given in al-Tabraī, iii, 328, Cairo ed., vii, 7, as “As Tarkhan al-Khārazmī” and in al-Ya’qūbī as “Ras” (Historiae, ii, 446; John Rylands, Arabic Ms. 231 (801), i. 1524) or “Rāṣ” (Cambridge QCO, i, 1922). These names and the nisba “al-Khārazmī” point to an Iranian origin. Following Minorsky, Hist. of Shārān and Darband, 147, we may conclude that
indifference usually manifested by the Altaic, nomadic peoples of this time, and may well be a pious Karaim in Poland, "Les Karaimen en Galicie" (in Polonie, tom 2, 1947, 61-6; idem, Karaimen in Poland, Warsaw-The Hague-Paris 1961, 16 ff., amongst others, that the Khazars adopted Karaitism rather than Rabbinic Judaism has been forcefully countered by Z. Anker, "The Karaites in Byzantium, New York-Jerusalem 1959, 64-79.

At some time in 861, Constantine (later St. Cyril, the "Apostle to the Slavs") led a Byzantine mission to Khazaria, the ostensible purpose of which was to participate in a religious debate at the court of the Kaghan. The real motivation behind the embassy undoubtedly had to do with the 860-1 Rus' raid on Constantinople and questions of joint Khazar-Byzantine cooperation. According to the Life of Constantine (Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses, Fontes, ed. F. Grivec, F. Tomšić, Zagreb 1960), some Khazars asked to convert to Christianity and were allowed to do so.

The later reports of the conversion of the Kazar Kaghan to Islam after the collapse of the Kazar state in 354/966 (Ibn al-Athîr, viii, 418; Ibn Miskawayh, ed. Fr. Amedroz-Margoliouth, text, ii, 203, v, 223, and al-Mukaddasî, ed. de Goeye, 361). In the latter adoption of Islam as the result of the campaigns of al-Ma'mûn (Abû 'I-Absâb Ma'mûn b. Mu'ammad) ruler of Gurgând (and later of all Khârāzm [see Khârâz shâhs]) may well be historical. Prior to 354/966, Islam had adherents not only among subject peoples (cf. in particular the Volga Bulgars) but amongst the Khazars as well. Attil, according to al-Mâlikî (220), had 10,000 Muslim inhabitants. Al-Baladhurî, 203, tells of the Khazars who were settled by Bugha the Turk in 240/854-5 in Shankur (Shankor) or "Shânkor" because of their interest in Islam and security. Confirmation of Bugha's activities in this area (warfare against the Khazars and Alans) is found in Mûneşcedîm bâšiî (Minorsky, Hist. of Shârûn and Darband, Arabic text, i, 3, tr. 25) and in the Kârtûtî T’skhouwrba (i, 256-7) which further notes that he settled 300 Khazar families in "Shânkor" (no mention is made of their Islamic affiliations), but then came under the suspicion of the caliph who feared he was taking council with the Khazars, his tribesmen ("tomâ misîa", which can also be translated as "his kinmen") and relieved him of his post. Bugha's campaign against this time, against the Georgian mountaineers, the Şanariyya (in Georgian Şanar) which led to an unsuccessful attempt on their part to enlist the aid of the Byzantines, Khazars and Şâkâlîba, should be viewed in light of the above.

The conversion of the Khazars to Judaism was no obstacle to continuing Kazar-Byzantine cooperation, especially in view of the unstable situation that was developing in the steppes. In 838 (for the dating, see S. Aliev, O datirvke nabega ruskov, upomnyatâ bîn Istanbûlgrom v Amolî, in Vostochnâe Istoriâkh po istorii narodov tugo-vostônîx i sântal'nîx evropei ("Eastern Sources on the History of the Peoples of South-Eastern and Central Europe"), ed. S. Tveritinova, Moscow 1967, ii, 316-21). Al-Mas'udî reports another raid after the year 300/912-3 (Aliev, op. cit., places this raid after 310/922).

Kazar willingness to allow the Rus' access to the Volga route in order to carry out these raids may perhaps be related to the hostilities between the Arabs and the Khazars in the Caucasus recorded in Mûneşcedîm bâšîî (as above). In the raid reported by al-Mas'udî, the Kaghan is said to have given his assent on the condition that the Rus' give him half of the booty. The Kaghan was unable, however, to prevent the slaughter of the returning Rus' by (probably for Byzantine Crimes) against the Hungarian tribal union, or elements of it, and the Pechenegs who were beginning to cause problems for the Khazars and ultimately the Byzantines (Ibn Rusta, 143; Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperii, ed. and tr. G. Moravcsik - R. Jenkins, Washington 1967, ch. 42; Theophanes Continuatus, ed. Bonn, 122 ff.; Scylitzes, ed. Bonn ii, 129-30; for a full discussion of this question see F. B. Golden, The migrations of the Oğuz, in Archivum Ottonianicum, iv, 1972).

During the caliphate of al-Wâthîk (227-32/842-7), two Arab embassies were sent to Khazaria, one led by Mu'ammad b. Mîsâ al-Khârâzmi and the other that of Sallâm the Interpreter (al-Mukâddasî, 362; Ibn Khurrradâdbîhî, 162 ff.; Ibn Rusta, 149).

Kazar-Arab hostilities in the North Caucasus continued during the course of the 3rd/9th century on a reduced scale. Mûneşcedîm bâšîî (in Minorsky, Hist. of Shârûn and Darband, text, i, 17, tr. 25, 46) speaks of warfare that, apparently, persisted from Râdjâb 288/August 901 to ca. 300/912. The name of the Kazar ruler who figured in these campaigns is given as K-sâ (or T-niz K-sâ) b. Ibrîân (cf. Bûthân, the name of a Kazar commander mentioned in the Kârtûtî T’skhouwrba, ii, 218).

Kazar power was now on the decline. As with all nomadic tribal unions, there were continual centrifugal tendencies on the part of individual clans or tribes to break away from the power of the Kaghan. The first signs of serious internal difficulties of this nature may be seen in the revolt of the Kâbars (whose name may be etymologised in Turkish as "rebel", see Nêmheth, op. cit., 236-7) some time in the second half of the 9th century (Const. Porphyrogenitus, op. cit., 174). The Hungarian tribal union (to which the Kâbars attached themselves), which had, in the early 9th century, been hostile and had later become an ally (the Arpâd dynasty came to power under Khazar auspices, Const. Porph., 172) had now been replaced in the Pontic steppes by the Pechenegs. Moreover, elements of the turbulent Ogûz tribal union which had been allies of the Khazars against the Pechenegs were now under pressure from tribes to their east. They began to push towards the Volga, occasionally crossing it in search of winter pasturage (al-Mas'udî, Muradî, ii, 19; ed. Pellat i, 218) and skirmishing with Kazar patrols. Another new factor was the unification, ca. 853, of the Eastern Slavie tribes, some of whom had been tributaries of the Khazars, under the Rus' who were drawn to the Volga because of the lucrative trade that passed through Atlî. A series of daring Rus' raids into the Caspian lands of Islam began in the last quarter of the 9th century. Two large-scale raids took place in 298/910 and 299/911-2 (on the dating, see S. Aliev, O datirvke nabega ruskov, upomnyatâ bîn Istanbûlgrom v Amolî, in Vostochnâe Istoriâkh po istorii narodov tugo-vostônîx i sântal'nîx evropei ("Eastern Sources on the History of the Peoples of South-Eastern and Central Europe"), ed. S. Tveritinova, Moscow 1967, ii, 316-21). Al-Mas'udî reports another raid after the year 300/912-3 (Aliev, op. cit., places this raid after 310/922).
KHAZAR

Khazar Jews are mentioned as coming to the court of Vladimir I in 986 in connection with the religious debates that are alleged to have preceded his conversion to Christianity. The account, however, rather supports the parallel, in that Vladimir I, a son of Vladimir I, see G. Vernadsky, "the Khazar) "the Tzoule" (this form T'roule, found in the 12th century Vienna Ms., Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Hist. Gr. 35, f. 132a and in the 13th century Vatican ms. 977, f. 287a, is to be preferred to the "Tzoulus" of the Bonn ed.) was attacked and conquered by a joint Rus'-Byzantine force in which "Sphengus, the brother of Vladimir, who was the brother-in-law of the Emperor" (Basil II, cf. γαλανός τοῦ βασιλέου of the ms. cited above and not "brother" as in the Bonn ed.) led the Rus' forces. The identity of "Sphengus" and the location of "Khazaria" have not been convincingly demonstrated thus far (it has variously been suggested that Sphengus is Mstislav, a son of Vladimir I, see G. Vernadsky, Kievan Rusia, New Haven 1948, 75 and that "Khazaria" is to be found in the Crimea, in the Oghuz, the Torki, the Abkhaz or Djurz (Georgians), both of whom had hostile relations with the Amirs of Gandja. Münzdijmin bāshī, in Minorks, Studies, text. 11, tr. 17, states that the Abkhaz attacked Arran and were beaten off by Pađ of Gandja in 417/1026. The Khazars' history is probably more geographically accurate than the information reported in the 12th century Vienna Ms., Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Hist. Gr. 35, f. 132a and in the 13th century Vatican ms. 977, f. 287a, is to be preferred to the "Tzoulus" of the Bonn ed.) was attacked and conquered by a joint Rus'-Byzantine force in which "Sphengus, the brother of Vladimir, who was the brother-in-law of the Emperor" (Basil II, cf. γαλανός τοῦ βασιλέου of the ms. cited above and not "brother" as in the Bonn ed.) led the Rus' forces. The identity of "Sphengus" and the location of "Khazaria" have not been convincingly demonstrated thus far (it has variously been suggested that Sphengus is Mstislav, a son of Vladimir I, see G. Vernadsky, Kievan Rusia, New Haven 1948, 75 and that "Khazaria" is to be found in the Crimea, in the Oghuz). Münzdijmin bāshī, in Minorks, Studies, text. 24, tr. 51, reports that in 456/1064 the remnants of the Khazars, consisting of three thousand households, arrived in Kievan Rus'. Münzdijmin bāshī, in Minorks, Hist. of Sharvdn and Darband, text. 24, tr. 51, reports that in 456/1064 "the remnants of the Khazars, consisting of three thousand households, arrived in Kievan Rus' (which Minorsky, Hist. 107, identifies with Khâyuk, lands now occupied by the Turkic Kumaks in Dâghistân) from the Khazar territory. They rebuilt it and settled in it". In January, 1016, a territory called "Khazar" in Scylitzes (ed. Bonn, ii, 464) which was ruled by a certain Georgius (now probably a Christianised Khazar) "the Tzoulus" (this form T'roule, found in the 12th century Vienna Ms., Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Hist. Gr. 35, f. 132a and in the 13th century Vatican ms. 977, f. 287a, is to be preferred to the "Tzoulus" of the Bonn ed.) was attacked and conquered by a joint Rus'-Byzantine force in which "Sphengus, the brother of Vladimir, who was the brother-in-law of the Emperor" (Basil II, cf. γαλανός τοῦ βασιλέου of the ms. cited above and not "brother" as in the Bonn ed.) led the Rus' forces. The identity of "Sphengus" and the location of "Khazaria" have not been convincingly demonstrated thus far (it has variously been suggested that Sphengus is Mstislav, a son of Vladimir I, see G. Vernadsky, Kievan Rusia, New Haven 1948, 75 and that "Khazaria" is to be found in the Crimea, in the Oghuz). Münzdijmin bāshī, in Minorks, Studies, text. 11, tr. 17, states that the Abkhaz attacked Arran and were beaten off by Pađ of Gandja in 417/1026. The Khazars' history is probably more geographically accurate than the information reported in the 12th century Vienna Ms., Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Hist. Gr. 35, f. 132a and in the 13th century Vatican ms. 977, f. 287a, is to be preferred to the "Tzoulus" of the Bonn ed.) was attacked and conquered by a joint Rus'-Byzantine force in which "Sphengus, the brother of Vladimir, who was the brother-in-law of the Emperor" (Basil II, cf. γαλανός τοῦ βασιλέου of the ms. cited above and not "brother" as in the Bonn ed.) led the Rus' forces. The identity of "Sphengus" and the location of "Khazaria" have not been convincingly demonstrated thus far (it has variously been suggested that Sphengus is Mstislav, a son of Vladimir I, see G. Vernadsky, Kievan Rusia, New Haven 1948, 75 and that "Khazaria" is to be found in the Crimea, in the Oghuz). In 1079 and 1083 A.D., the Khazars are again mentioned in the Rus' chronicles in connection with events in the principality of Tmutorokan' where they appear to have wielded some power (PRSL i, 204-5). Individual Khazar took service with the various Rus' princes. Thus, s.a. 1106 A.D. we read of an Ivan Kozarin ("the Khazar"), the voivoda of Kiev who drove off a Polovtsian (Coman) attack (PRSL i, 140). A Hungaro-Latin source (Thuróczi, cap. 500) mentions a "princes Bissemor (= Ung. Besemô "Pečeneg") nominee Kazar", which would indicate that Khazar elements had joined the Pečeneg union. Documents from the Cairo Geniza purport to tell of religious debates among Khazars in "Khazaria" in the 11th and 12th centuries. The reference, however, was probably to events in the Jewish communities in the Crimea which was regularly called "Khazaria" or "Gazaria" in later Greek and Latin
As with many steppe empires, Khazaria did not suddenly vanish, although it appeared to, but rather it gradually melted back into the steppe. The nomadic elements were undoubtedly incorporated into the Pee-neg, Oghuz and ultimately Coman-Kipçak tribal confederations (this would probably explain the presence of the Hebrew loanword Shabbat in Coman-Kipçak: Shabat kium, Karağıy-Balkar: Shabat K’un, cf. also Çuvaş: Şəhəm). The collapse of Khazar power after 354/965 had severe consequences for Byzantium which—as the orientation of Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ De Adm. Imp. would indicate—was already seeking to establish a new balance of power in the steppe zone in the 940s-950s. With Khazaria now unable to blunt the thrusts of oncoming nomadic invaders, Byzantium’s Balkan borders and, even more crucial, the Crimea, Constantinople’s eye into the steppe, were extremely vulnerable. The volatile Oghuz tribal union in the steppe to the east of Khazaria which had hitherto been held in check by the Khazars (cf. the Oghuz prisoners held by the Khazars as reported in Ibn Faḍlān, ed. Togan, text 16, tr. 31) or allied with them (in joint operations with the Pee-neg, ed. Kovalevski, 313, ed. Togan, 44, reports that there were 25 subject peoples who sent hostages to the Khagan’s court) which, in addition to the tribes that formed the Khazar union, included the Volga and Pontic Bulgars, the Burjas and other Finno-Ugrians (including at one time the Hungarians), the ‘Huns’ of the North Caucasus as well as the aboriginals of that region, the Iranian Alan/As of the Caspian steppes and North Caucasus and various Slavic tribes. Its borders extended to Kiev in the west, the Volga Bulghar realm in the north (near present-day Kazan’), the steppes of Khazarazm in the east and the Crimea and the northern Caucasus in the south. The Khaganate, in its political and economic organisation, evidences all of the characteristics of other, Altaic, nomadic tribal empires of the period. It was presided over by a ceremonial Khagan (probably of Türk-UFACT origin, descent from the Türk royal clan being one of the main criteria for the assumption of the Khaganal title), while the actual governance of affairs was in the hands of the ḍaʿid (the head of the Ibn Rusta-Gardżid tradition) or the ḍag (cf. the règ of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Adm. Imp., 182, the Bek-Vülək of the al-Iṣṭakhri, ibn Hawkal, ed. Kramers, ii, 390, tradition). Ibn Faḍlān (ed. Togan, text. 43-4) calls him the ‘Khākān B-h’ who he notes, was assisted by the ‘K-n-dr Khākān’ and Dəwshīhe-r’. This system is a variant of the well-known Turkic dual kingship. The ceremonial Kagha-nate, described by the Islamic geographers (who regularly distinguish between the Khākān and the ‘Khaqan’), has parallels in the Turkic world. The earliest precedent for this particular evolution of the Khaganate may be seen in the institution of the I K’e-han (‘reb Khagan “House Khagan” of the Turks themselves) noted in Chinese sources. Seen in this light, Artamonov’s speculations (op. cit., 275 ff.) associating this institution with the judaization of Khazaria and the alleged coup d’État of Obadiah in the early 9th century, are to be dismissed. Many of the ancient Türk traditions which underscored the shamanic aspects of the Khaganal office, were preserved by the Khazars. Thus, the ritual of the ceremonial strangling of the Kaghan at his investiture (al-Iṣṭakhri, 224), during which the new Kaghan on the verge of losing consciousness is asked to state the length of his rule (should he exceed it, he is killed; Ibn Faḍlān notes that the Khākān may rule no more than forty years) is identical to the ritual practised by the Turks as described in Chinese sources (Liu Mau-Tsai, Die Chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T’u-küe), Wiesbaden 1958, i, 8).

The Khazars, or at least the “royal” or core tribes, continued to practice a modified form of nomadism, wintering in their cities (which were large conglomerations of nomadic yurts, hence little archaeological evidence has survived) and passing the summer in the steppes (al-Makdisi, iv, 66). Agriculture and fishing were also practised. (On the nomadism of Western Eurasia, see G. Gyorgy, A honfoglalás magyarázat (Conquest Period Hungarians), in Archaeologiai Értesítsé, xxvii (1970), for a description of this system as practised by the Árpád Hungarian. On the material culture of the Western Eurasian nomads, see S. A. Pleteneva, Ot kolyev k gorodom (“From nomadic encampments to cities”), Moscow 1967). The importance of fishing in Khazaria is confirmed by al-Iṣṭakhri who notes that isinglass was the only product made by the Khazars themselves. Khazaria exported to Byzantium and the lands of Islam large quantities of furs, obtained as tribute from subject peoples, but imported the material for clothing from Gurgan, Tabaristan, Aqharbāyjān and Rüm. The Hudd al-ʿAlam, tr. Minorsky, 161, indicates that livestock breeding, as might be expected, was practised and was one of the numerous exports of Khazaria. But, unanimously with our other sources, the Hudd, 162, notes that “the wealth and wealth of the King of the Khazars are mostly from the maritime customs”. Khazaria took ample advantage of its favourable geographical position lying astride the great commercial arteries between east and west, north and south. The Kagha-nes of All, like the Volga Bulghar ruler, took a tithe on all trade passing through their territory. Nomadic empires (cf. the Turks and their relationship with the Soghdians) regularly encouraged trade because of this lucrative source of revenue. According to al-Mas’ūdī, Muruǧi, ii, 22, ed. Pellat, i, 220, the Khazars had no sea-going vessels; yet according to Hilāl al-Šābī (ed. Amedroz, 217, below), the dams built at Derbend were intended as a defence against the ships (mārkāb) of the Khazars. There is some evidence to indicate that the Khazars minted their own coins. These were imitations of contemporary Arabic coins with many mistakes. Some, apparently, bore Turkic runic inscriptions; see A. A. Blikov, O Khazarškom šekane VIII-IXw. (“On Khazar Minting”), in Trudi gosudarstvennogo ermitaža, xii (1971).

With regard to Khazar urban sites, our sources present a number of a Khazar toponyms, few of which can be located or given etymologies with absolute certainty. In addition to Balagur and Samsun (see above), we may note All, the name of the Volga and the Khazar capital located in its delta. L. N. Gumilyov, Otkritie Khazarii, Moscow 1966, has recently advanced the thesis that the Khazar capital
was submerged by a rise in the level of the Caspian and consequently hopes of finding this largely “tent” city are slim. The al-Iṣṭaṣḥārī: Ibn Hawkāl tradition reports that it was divided into two parts (al-Masʿūdī, Murādī, ii, 7, ed. Pellat, i, 212, and the Letter of Joseph, Kokovtsov, op. cit., 74-5, 102, say it was divided into three parts), a western (called "Khazarān") in Ibn Hawkāl and in Ibn Rusta, 165, who elsewhere, see below, reports a different tradition (p. 130), in which the king, al-Iṣṭaṣḥārī: Ibn Hawkāl, ed. Kramers, ii, 389) and an eastern part. Another tradition, that of Ibn Rusta: Gardīzī al-Bakrī and al-Marwazī, going back to al-Dījamī via al-Dījamīdī, calls the Khazar capital *Sarācshīn (Sarācī = common Turk, “yellow”) whose relationship to “al-Bayūdā” (“the White City”); Sarācī in some Bulgharo-Oghuric dialects denotes “white”) is unclear. It should be borne in mind that “white” cities and fortresses in this region are not toponymical rarities and may have taken their name from the coloration of the bricks used in their construction. The later Sakṣiṃ may be a garbling of this name. Within Sarācshīhīn is another city: H-bn-l- or Khamīlihī (Ibn Rusta, 139; al-Muṣkaḍī, f. 355; Yākūt, Muʿjam al-Buldān, i, 730, 793, ii, 477; Huddād, Tuṃsiniysky ms. f. 38b (H-m-d), Ibn Khuwādādbbīb, 124, 154-5), all of which may be corruptions of *Khan Dakhh “The Khan’s City” (cf. “Cambaļuc” of Marco Polo for Peking). The relationship of this form to the city *Kulūgh, Turk, “blessed, fortunate” (Gardīzī, Oxford, Bodl. Ouseley 240, p. 474; Huddād, Tuṃsiniysky ms. f. 38b; cf. also the H-th-ch, H-l- or of al-Bakrī and al-Marwazī, which may be either a separate and distinct city or the same city reported in the not-always-critical al-Dījamīdī, which form the bulk of our sources for the Khazars, is not clear. Marquart (Streisfues, 18), Lewicki (Zrîldi arabškies, i, 29, 129) Zajczkowski (Ze studidw, i, 29, 115, 177 respectively). Unfortunately, we do not, as yet, possess any texts in the Khazar language (a recently discussed Hebrew document from the Cairo Geniza, see Cambridge, ms. T-S 12.122, which may have been written by Khazar Jews in Kiev, has an inscription in a variant of the Türk runic script which was used by many of the nomadic tribes of Central Asia and Eurasia. It has yet to be satisfactorily deciphered. Moreover, it consists of one word and hence can hardly be considered decisive). It is generally accepted that Khazar must have been, broadly speaking, Alatī; whether this was common Türkic or a form of Bulgharo-Oghuric is still the subject of polemics. Our sources provide little guidance here. Thus, al-Iṣṭaṣḥārī: ed. de Goeje, 222, in one passage, remarks that Khazar does not resemble Türkic, Persian or any other language. Elsewhere (p. 225), he states that it is similar to Bulgharic. Al-Bīrūnī (al-Āṭār al-bābīya, ed. Sachau, 42) remarks that the Bulghar and Sūwār speak a language which is a mixture of Türkic and Khazar. This would seem to contrast Türkic and Khazar and perhaps place Khazar in the Bulgharo-Oghuric grouping. But one must bear in mind the complicated nature of our sources, which undoubtedly compounded the complexities of the linguistic situation in Khazaria where common Türkic, Bulgharo-Oghuric, Finno-Ugric, Iranian and Slavic were spoken. Individual Khazar words, names, titles, hydronyms and toponyms scattered in Arabic, Persian, Hebrew, Byzantine, Rus’, Armenian and Georgians cannot fully answer this question because the difficulties of interpretation and the paucity of their number (depending on what one is willing to consider Khazar, there are, roughly, some fifty known Khazar words), Khazar titles are invariably Türkic or an-and connects this with Varašan, Swār (in the north Caucasus and Volga Bulghar lands, undoubtedly from the ethnonym Sabur), Kīshal (?) and Bełānd.

The religious situation in Khazaria was quite complex. In addition to Jews (whose numbers grew due to the migration of their co-religionists from Byzantium as the result of the persecutions of Romanus Lecapenus (919-44) reported in al-Masʿūdī, Murādī, ii, 8, ed. Pellat, i, 212, and the Khazar Cambridge Document, Kokovtsov, op. cit., 35, as well as from the Islamic lands) and Khazar converts, there were large numbers of Muslims and Christians as well as pagans of various types (Türkic, Slavic and Finno-Ugrian). In Aṭṭī there was a principal mosque with a lofty minaret and 30 mosques. In the year 310/922-3, the Khazar ruler received a report that in a Muslim country a synagogue had been destroyed (the name given in Yākūt, Muʿjam, ii, 440 is not clear; cf. Marquart, Streisfues, 4, 477 ff.). He therefore had the minaret destroyed and the muʿaddābidhīn killed. He left the mosque unharmed for fear that all the synagogues in Muslim lands would be destroyed.

The question of Khazar ethnic affiliations remains one of the most difficult aspects of Khazar studies. Given the context in which the Khazar state came into being, we may perhaps look to the Türkic world more specifically, perhaps, to the Türkic world for an answer (al-Masʿūdī’s comment, Tanbīh, ed. de Goeje, 83, that the name Khazar is Iranian and in Türkic is Sabīr is undoubtedly a garbling of the fact that elements of the Sabirs formed one of the constituent tribes of the Khazar confederation. Both names may be explained in Türkic with the meaning “nomad”, “wanderer”, “North”, “conqueror” (cf. Yaqūt, A ḥadith, 37. This might also account for al-Masʿūdī’s confusion). Unfortunately, we do not, as yet, possess any texts in the Khazar language (a recently discussed Hebrew document from the Cairo Geniza, see Cambridge, ms. T-S 12.122, which may have been written by Khazar Jews in Kiev, has an inscription in a variant of the Türk runic script which was used by many of the nomadic tribes of Central Asia and Eurasia. It has yet to be satisfactorily deciphered.

Given the context in which the Khazar state came into being, we may perhaps look to the Türkic world more specifically, perhaps, to the Türkic world for an answer (al-Masʿūdī’s comment, Tanbīh, ed. de Goeje, 83, that the name Khazar is Iranian and in Türkic is Sabīr is undoubtedly a garbling of the fact that elements of the Sabirs formed one of the constituent tribes of the Khazar confederation. Both names may be explained in Türkic with the meaning “nomad”, “wanderer”, “North”, “conqueror” (cf. Yaqūt, A ḥadith, 37. This might also account for al-Masʿūdī’s confusion). Unfortunately, we do not, as yet, possess any texts in the Khazar language (a recently discussed Hebrew document from the Cairo Geniza, see Cambridge, ms. T-S 12.122, which may have been written by Khazar Jews in Kiev, has an inscription in a variant of the Türk runic script which was used by many of the nomadic tribes of Central Asia and Eurasia. It has yet to be satisfactorily deciphered. Moreover, it consists of one word and hence can hardly be considered decisive). It is generally accepted that Khazar must have been, broadly speaking, Alatī; whether this was common Türkic or a form of Bulgharo-Oghuric is still the subject of polemics. Our sources provide little guidance here. Thus, al-Iṣṭaṣḥārī: ed. de Goeje, 222, in one passage, remarks that Khazar does not resemble Türkic, Persian or any other language. Elsewhere (p. 225), he states that it is similar to Bulgharic. Al-Bīrūnī (al-Āṭār al-bābīya, ed. Sachau, 42) remarks that the Bulghar and Sūwār speak a language which is a mixture of Türkic and Khazar. This would seem to contrast Türkic and Khazar and perhaps place Khazar in the Bulgharo-Oghuric grouping. But one must bear in mind the complicated nature of our sources, which undoubtedly compounded the complexities of the linguistic situation in Khazaria where common Türkic, Bulgharo-Oghuric, Finno-Ugric, Iranian and Slavic were spoken. Individual Khazar words, names, titles, hydronyms and toponyms scattered in Arabic, Persian, Hebrew, Byzantine, Rus’, Armenian and Georgians cannot fully answer this question because the difficulties of interpretation and the paucity of their number (depending on what one is willing to consider Khazar, there are, roughly, some fifty known Khazar words), Khazar titles are invariably Türkic or an-
cient Inner Asian loanwords long associated with Turkic: Kaghan, Khatun, Alp (both a name and title, as is true of many names in Turkic), Baghatur, Beg, Tegin (Ir-tigin), Diaghul, Il-teber, Shak, Tarbaghan, Tarmal (Tolmal), Tudun and Yilik (Ulik).

Other titles (or perhaps names) are problematic, cf.: Baligitis (Belgits?, Ballidget, B-i-Ehkiti?, Tsiutté (Tsilti?), Didauqit-git, K-na-ti, Salfitan. Similarly, some Khazar personal names are clearly Turkic, cf.: Æxi (Æsxi), Bulan, Cizch, Corfan, Kadiitik (Kədəritik), Barsbeht (Barsbeht?), while others pose numerous difficulties of interpretation: Bārδjīk (if it is not a corruption of Barsbeht?, see above), Balbšt, Blušťa, Cersan, Ækš, Kasar,imals (both a name and title, as is true of many names in Turkic), BolusÚll, Bdshtwa, BluFánFulBschütan, &at* Kasar, &at'n, Bhāgatur, Ziebel. A few names show Iranian influence (cf. Hasir Targhan and perhaps Kündagis, with the Turkic diminutive suffix -lik). Of the tribal names, we know only Khasar (K'azar), Karda Khasar and Kabarl Kavar. The clan name Ænsa (Hudād, ms. Tumanskii, f. 38b), if it is not a corruption of Ighā/İşāh, may well be a garbling of the Turk Āqghina. Of the nomina, we know only the obviously Arabised al-liğāda (Ibn Âš'ām al-Kûfî, Topkâpl, Ahmed III 2956/i, f. 19b), a kind of tent-cart. With the possible exception of Sahnab (if it is to be read as Sharkil), none of these forms shows specific Bulghar-Oghric characteristics (i.e. Turun for Tudun).

Another major question of Khazar studies, for which there is as yet no ready answer, is the relationship of the Khazars to the origins of Eastern European Jewry.

Bibliography: Partial bibliographies of the Khazar question are found in: A. Varnolmskins, Th' Khasars; A Bibliography, in Bulletin of the New York Public Library, xliii (1939) and his later Th' Khasars: (an annotated) Bibliography, in ibid., lxiii (1959); B. D. Weinryb, Th' Khazars, an annotated Bibliography, in Studies in Bibliography and Booklore, Library of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, vi (1963); Gy. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, Berlin 1935, l, 83 ff.

The major works on the Khazars are M. I. Artamonov, Ol'kh donezechovedstvo istoriy ("Outline of the Most Ancient History of the Khazars"), Leningrad 1936 and his later Istoriya Khazar, Leningrad 1962 which is useful from the archaeological standpoint. A. Zajczkowski, Zv Studiow nad zagadnieniem chazarzhkim ("Studies on the Khazar Question"), Cracow 1947, is important from the Turcological viewpoint, but rather weighted in favour of Khazar-Karaim ties. D. M. Dunlop, Th' History of the Jewish Khazars, Princeton 1954, an excellent outline of Khazar history with detailed treatment of Arabic, Hebrew and Byzantine sources. P. B. Golden, Q'azar Studies, An historico-philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Q'azars, in Monographs on Medieval Eurasia, i, Lisse-Budapest, forthcoming, is a detailed treatment of the Khazar "Sprachreste" with emphasis on the Turcological aspects of the Khazar question. Z. V. Togan's "Hazarlar" in IA is fanciful and at times uncritical.

The major Arabic sources for the Khazars are, in addition to the geographers of the Bâq'a series, al-Balqahri, Ktâb Fu'âdh al-Bulladân; al-Dimahkîl, Cosmographie, ed. F. Mehrens, St. Pb. 1866, Ibn Âš'ām al-Kûfî, Ktâb Fu'âdh, Istanbul, Topkâpl, Ahmed III 2956 (extracts can be found in Togan, Ibn Fa'djân's Reiseberichte and A. N. Kurat, Muhammad bin Â'sam al-Kâ'fû'nîn Ktâb al-Fu'âdh, in Anth. Unw. Dil ve Tarîkh-Cografya Fakûllesi Dergisi, vii (1949); Ibn al-Âdîl, al-Kâmî fi 'l-Tarîkh, 1851-76; Ibn Fa'djân (see the Kovalevskiy and Togan editions cited in the text); al-Idrisi, Geographie d'Edrisi, tr. A. Jaubert, Paris 1836-40; al-Makdisî, Ktâb al-Bad' wa'l-Tarîkh, ed. C. Huart, Paris 1899-1919; al-Kazwînî, Cosmographie, ed. Vüstenfeld, Göttingen 1848; Sharaf al-Zamân Tâhir Mîrâj, Qutb al-Usrâ fi sharh Kitâb al-Bulût, tr. A. J. Yâkubâ, Historia; Yâkût, Muqaddamât al-Bulûtân, and the Judeo-Arabic work of Yehuda hal-Levi, Book of Kusar (Ktâb al-Khazar), tr. H. Hirschfeld, New York 1946. The Armenian sources are extremely important: Lewond, Paqmûram, ed. I. Ecezangâ, St. Petersburg 1887, as Ghévond, Histoire des guerres et des conquêtes des Arabes en Arménie, by V. Chahazarian, Paris 1926; Movses Khorenats, (see the Armenian Studies, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1885; Theophanu Continuatus, Historiae, ed. J. Beker, Bonn 1838. The Georgian compilation, the K'art'lis Ta'khovneba (see text above), contains valuable supplementary material on Khazar activities in the Caucasus, but is generally unconcerned with events outside of Georgia proper. P. K. Kokovtsov's Evreysko-Khazarshch'ke Perepis'ka (see text above) contains critical editions of the Khazar Hebrew correspondence and the Cambridge Document with an exhaustive commentary. Of Persian works, Movses Khorenats' Histoire d'Arménie, ed. and tr. P. E. Le Vaillant de Florival, Venice 1841 and the Geography ascribed to him, Geographie de Moise de Corine, ed. and tr. A. Sokury, Venice 1882. The most important Byzantine sources for the Khazars are Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio (see text above), which gives a detailed analysis of the situation in the steppe in the mid-fourth century; Nicephorus Patriarchus, Brevarium, ed. J. Beker, Bonn 1837; Georgius Cedrenus, Ioannis Scylitzae ope, ed. J. Beker, Bonn 1839; Theophanu, Chronographia, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1885; Theophanu Continuatus, Historiae, ed. J. Beker, Bonn 1838. The Georgian compilation, the K'art'lis Ta'khovneba (see text above), contains valuable supplementary material on Khazar activities in the Caucasus, but is generally unconcerned with events outside of Georgia proper. P. K. Kokovtsov's Evreysko-Khazarshch'ke Perepis'ka (see text above) contains critical editions of the Khazar Hebrew correspondence and the Cambridge Document with an exhaustive commentary. Of Persian works, Movses Khorenats' translation and re-working of al-Tabari is extremely useful as he adds many details missing in the Arabic original. The work is available (in full) only in H. Zotenbergs' translation, Paris 1867-74. The ms. of M. Minovis facsimile edition, Astan-i Kuds 7481 (Tehrân 1345/1926-7). The ms. of M. Minovis facsimile edition, Astan-i Kuds 7481 (Tehrân 1345/1926-7).
is, regrettably, damaged and difficult to read; the Oxford Ms. (Bodleian, Ouseley 240), is probably derived from it and should be used. The Rus' chronicles (Polnoe SobrаниеRusskikh Letopisey, i, Lawrence'eskaya letopis', Moscow, reprint 1962, and ix, Nikonorovskaya Letopis', Moscow, reprint 1965) make occasional references to the Khazars.

Important collection of sources (texts, translations and commentaries are: Ch. Fraenkl, Ibn Fadlan's and other Arabo-Armenian Sources über die Russen alter Zeit, St. Petersburg 1823; A. Ya. Garkavi (Harkavi), Shasaniyus musul' mamshchikh pisateley o slavyanakh i russikh ("The Accounts of Muslim Writers on the Slavs and Russians"), St. Petersburg 1870, and his Shasaniyus evreyshchikh pisateley o kozarskikh i kosarmorskikhistorii ("The Accounts of Jewish Writers on the Khazars and the Khazar Kingdom"), St. Petersburg 1874; A. Kunik - V. Rosen, Inostroya al-Debi i drugih avtorov o Rusi i slavyanakh, St. Petersburg 1878-1903, and the more recent F. Kuper - T. Lewicki, Žrđoba hebrajskije do dziejów Słowian i niektórych innych ludów środkowej i wschodniej Europy ("Hebrew Sources on the History of the Slavs and some other Peoples of Central and Eastern Europe"), Wroclaw-Warsaw 1956, and T. Lewicki, Žrđoba hebrajskije do dziejów słowiańskich, ("Arabic Sources for the Hist. of the Slavs"), i-ii, Wroclaw-Cracow 1956-69; the latter is still in progress. An interesting discussion of the "Hebrew Sources on the History of the Slavs and some other Peoples of Central and Eastern Europe") has contributed a number of very useful analyses of specific problems of Arabic sources relating to Eastern Europe in general and Khazar problems can be found in J. Marquart, Ein Arabischer Bericht über die arktischen Länder aus dem 10 Jh., in Ungarische Jahrbiicher, ix (1924); idem, Kultur- und sprachgeschichtliche Analekten, in Ungarische Jahrbiicher, ix (1920); T. Lewicki, Eorosvans arabes du IXe au XVIe siècle traitant de l'ombre jaune de la Baltique et de son importation en pays arabes, in Eosia Orientalia, ix (1962-3); S. G. Klyshansky, Drevneyshie upominanija slavyan v nizhem povolž'e ("The Oldest Mention of the Slavs in the Lower Volga Region"), in Vostočnole Istotschniki, ed. Tveritinova (1964), i; A. P. Novosel'egov, Vostočnole istotschniki o vostochnih slavyanakh i Rus' VI-IX evo ("Eastern Sources on the Eastern Slavs and Rus' VI-IX cents."), in Dvynaruskoe gosudarstvo i ego mesto v narodnoj zhizni ("The Ancient Russian State and its International Significance"), ed. A. P. Novosel'egov, V. T. Pashuto et al., Moscow 1965; F. Kmetiowicz, The Term Rdddniya in the Work of Ibn Ḥurāṣdīgh, in Folia Orientalia, xi (1969).

The Hungarian scholar, K. Czegtedy, in additoion to his important articles are: H. H. Howorth, The Khazars, were they Turks? in "La troisième session du Congrés International des Orientalistes, St. Petersburg 1876; S. Patkanov, Über das Volk der Sabiren, in Keleti Szemle, i (1900); J. Thüy, A Khazar is a mělčůšského ("The Khazar title Khazara"), in Keleti Szemle iii (1903); (J. Gy.) Moravský, Príběh plánar doba Tiszaki-
ký ("The Origin of the word Tiszákony"), in Seminárium Kondosanum, iv (1913); V. Mi-
norsky, The Khazars and the Turks in the Arab Sources de la des Chazarenreiches im neunten Jahrhundert, in Korosi Goma Archivum, iii (1940); M. I. Arta-
monov, Belaya Veša, in Sovetskaja Arkeologija, xvi (1954); H. Schonebaum, Zur Kabarenpfrage, in Aus der byzantinistischen Arbeit der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (BBA 5, 1957); M. I. Artamonov, Sarkel-Belaya Veša, in Trudi volgo-
donskoj arkeologicheskoj expedicii, Materiali i issledovaniem po Arkeologii SSR, liii (1958) (Works of the Volga-Don Archaeological Expedition, Materials and Researches on the Archaeology of the USSR); see also there the article of I. I. Lysyshkin, Pamjatniki saltovo-mayatskoy kul'tury v basseyne r. Dona ("Monuments of the Saltovo-Mayats Culture in the Don river basin"); N. Ya. Polovoy, O marginale pokhoda russkich na Berdja i rusko-Khazarskich otnoshenijach v 934 g. ("On the Route of the Russian Campaign on Bargha and Russo-Khazar relations in 943") in Vissiniyshkh Frenemykh, xxv (1961); T. Lewicki, 'Arku', Un nom de tribu éminigique cité dans le lettre du roi Khazar Joseph (943e siècle), in Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique, iiii (1962); O. Pritsak, A. Yodnur und Kazašskie Kaurar, in Ural-
Altaische Jahrbiicher, xxxvi (1965); P. B. Golden, The Qasaro-Hungarian Title of Personal name پنک ~ Tekh in Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi, i (1975); idem, The People in ibid.

On the Turkic runic script and inscriptions that
may have Khazar connections, see: A. M. Shcherbak, Neskol'ko slov o priyomakh Kena'yi runeishchikh
nadpisey, naydenikh na Dona ("A Few Words about
the Methods of Reading the Runic In-
scriptions Found on the Don"), in Sovetskaya
Arkheologiya, xix (1954); idem, Zhurnale na
keramike i kirpicakh iz Sarkela-Beloy Veli ("Signs on the
Ceramics and Bricks from Sarkel-Bela Veta"), in
Materiali i issledovaniya po Arkheologii SSSR
("Materials and Researches on the Archaeology of the
USSR"), lxxv (1959); idem, Les inscriptions
inconnues sur pierres de Khoumara (au
Caucase du Nord) et le proble de l'alphabet runique des Turcs
Occidentaux, in Acta Orientalia Hungarica, xvi
(1962); Gy. Németh, The Runic Forms
from Nagy-Szent-Mikl6s and the Runiform Scripts
in kind (ghallat) and stored them in the state granaries and
warehouses, giving out receipts (bara?at [see BARA'A.
In addition to some of the works cited in the
text, there is a relatively large body of literature
dealing with the history of the peoples and cul-
tures of the Eurasian steppes which has a bearing
on a number of problems of Khazar studies. The
following is by no means exhaustive, but should
provide a good guide to the study of the area as
a whole: N. I. Ash'amar, Bolgar i Cuvash ("The
Bulgars and the Cuvash"), Kazan' 1902; Z. Gombech,
Arpadkori irodok szemelynevvezek ("Our Turkic Per-
sonal names of the Early Period"), in Magyar
Nyelve, xi (1915); I. Berlin, Historicko-sud?bi
esvychnego naroda na territorii russkogo gosudarstva
("The historical Fate of the Jewish People in the
Territory of the Russian State"), Petrograd 1920;
V. V. Bartold (Barthold), Mesto prihlasivshikh
oblastey v istorii musei'mskogo mira ("The Place of
the Caspian Region in the History of the Musul-
main World"), first appeared in Baku 1925, now
to be found in V. V. Bartold, Turcs d'hommes et de
peuples finissant en -ar, (W. BARTHOLD — P. B. GOLDEN)
KHAZIN (A.), usual pl. khazin (the pl: Khazans
is found in the Kur'an in XXIII, 71, 73), etc. for
the angels who guard Paradise and Hell, literal-
ly, "he who keeps safe, stores something away", a
term of mediaeval Islamic administra-
tion for certain members of the financial depart-
ments (on which see BAYT AL-MAL and, for
Ottoman times, also KHAZINE and also of the
chancery. It was used in 'Abbasi times, for there
was prominent in the early 4th-10th century Mu'nis
al-Khazin (so-called in the press to distinguish
him from the commander of the guard Mu'nis
al-Muzaffar [q.v.], an associate of the vizier Ibn
al-Furat's in a kind of regency council, al-sâdâl,
set up when al-Mu'ktadir regained the throne in
296/908 after the failure of Ibn al-Mu'tazzî's putch;
Sourdel has suggested that Mu'nis may have been
the treasurer of the personal revenues (mal al-
hâsâ), the caliph's (Le vizirat abbâsidi, ii, 387-8,
742). But the term khazin could equally be used at
this time for quite menial and lowly members of
the caliphal household; in his detailing of the bud-
get for 306/918-19, Hilal al-Sabi enumerates the
wages of such servants as those who kept the stores
of bedding (khazîn al-faraq) and the one who
kept the supply of candles (khazîn al-Îam), these
being classed with the attendants of the
private chambers and the audience hall, the porters,
etc. (Vusara, ed. 'Abd al-Sattar Fârâji, Cairo 1958,
23).
We have some information from treatises on
finance and administration in Egypt about the
term's usage there under the Fâtimids, Ayyûbids
and Mamlûks. According to Ibn al-Mamûtî (d.
606/1209 [q.v.], the khâzîn was a secretary in the
Dhîân al-Mâl who collected the taxes paid in kind
(ghâzal) and stored them in the state granaries and
warehouses, giving out receipts (bara?at [see BARA'A,
KHAZIN — AL-KHAZIN

i) for these, and also securing the repayment (murtadi'i) of advances to the cultivators of seed (ikabadi); he kept an inventory of the holdings, for which he was strictly accountable, and then issued the produce when required (A.S. Cooper, Ibn Mammati’s rules for the ministries: translation with commentary of Qawanin al-Dawawin, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Ph.D. thesis 1973, unpublished, 238, 244; Cl. Cahen, Contribution à l’étude des impôts dans L’Égypte médiévale, in JESHO, v (1962), 269-70 (citing Makhlûme); Hasanain Rabie, The financial system of Egypt, A.H. 364-741 (A.D. 1169-1341, London 1972, 160-1). An extension of this function of store-keeper is that of keeper of books or librarian (khâzin al-kutub), whose duties included the careful guarding of books and their issue only against pledges of the equivalent value (Subki, Mu‘ad al-mi‘am wa-mudlib al-mukam, ed. Mub. ‘Ali al-Nadîdîr al-‘ali, Cairo 1367/1948, iii, and see further, Khâzîn.

However, the term was also used simultaneously in Egyptian administration for an official in the chancery or Dîwân al-‘Inâdî who acted as registry clerk and archivist in the department. According to the Kânûn dîwân al-rasâ‘îl of Ibn al-Sayrâfî (dispersion of what I have reproduced [q.v.]), the position of the Dîwân had under him seven speakers for various specialist jobs plus two non-specialists, the khâzin and the bâdî as doorkeeper of the office. Whilst not required to possess the encyclopaedic knowledge of adab and of administrative procedures required of the kâibî, the khâzin had to be a man of intelligence and the highest probity, for he kept the record of all incoming and outgoing chancery documents, placing copies of all letters sent out plus the originals of those received in a file or portfolio (îdhûra, pl. â’dîbîr) for each separate month. Hence if he was susceptible to corruption, he could easily abstract confidential documents, and Ibn al-Sayrâfî accordingly states that “the guiding reins of the whole dîwân are in his hands” (cited in Kâlqâlandî, Subh al-‘alâmî, i, 135-6, cf. W. Björkman, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei im islamischen Ägypten, Hamburg 1928, 22, 39, 89).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C. E. Bosworth)

AL-KHAZIN, ABU DŻAFAR MUHAMMAD b. MUHAMMAD b. AL-‘USAYN AL-KHURASANI, astronomer and mathematician, originally from Khurâsân (not to be confused with al-Khâzîn [q.v.]). He was a protégé of Abu ‘l-‘Afdî Ibn al-A‘mîld (d. 159/969-70), minister in Rayy of the Buwayhî Rûkûn al-Dawla (326-66/937-76), and died between 350/961 and 360/971. Amongst his purely mathematical works, the Fûhrîsî, 282, ed. Cairo 393, and Ibn al-Kîtîf, 396, ed. Cairo 1936, of Kûn al-Madârîsâ al-‘adâdîyya (now lost), whilst Naṣr al-Dîn al-Tûsî, K. Shâkî al-‘alâfî ra İstanbul 1891, 148-51, mentions the Maţâlîb â’dîbiyya, mayl al-mu‘ayyî al-‘adâdîyya wa l-maţâlîb fi l-‘hûrâ al-mustâkîma, which contained a demonstration of the theorem of the sine for right-angled spherical triangles. According to the Fûhrîsî, 266, ed. Cairo 371, he wrote a commentary on the Elements of Euclid, but the only part of this that survives, in several manuscripts, is the commentary on the opening of Book X. Abû Naṣr Mânsûr, Rishût fi taṣâkî ma wa‘âsâ’l Abî Dżafar al-Khâzîn min al-tawî li’l-Sîdîr al-sâfîyîn, in Râdî’s Abî Naṣr ila ‘l-Bûrûnhî, Hyderabad 1948, 3, speaks of “his book on the Elements of geometry”, and we know that he set forth a defective proof of the fifth postulate of Euclid; ms. 1014 Leiden contains the reply of Abu ‘l-Dżûd Muhammad b. al-Layîf to a geometrical problem set out by al-Khâzîn. Moreover, it was possibly our al-Khâzîn who demonstrated, with a method closely connected with Hero’s procedure in his Dioptra, the formula of this latter author for finding out the surface of a triangle as a function of its sides. By using conic sections, he resolved the so-called equation of al-Mâhâ’în (x² + a²b = c²).

One of his best-known astronomical works is the Zâdî al-sa‘âbî (table of the plates of the astrolabe?), which he wrote for Ibn al-‘Ammîld (al-Bûrûnhî, Tahbîd nîdîyît al-amâdhîn, in RIMA, viii (1962), 110-20; two brief chapters concerning astronomical instruments in ms. Berlin 5857 may conceivably belong to this work, which Ibn al-Kîtîf considered as the finest and most splendid on the subject. According to al-Bûrûnhî, Abdâr, 326, in this work the author adequately sets forth the theory of the trepidation of the equinoxes along an 8° arc. The same author, in an obscure passage of the Tamhût al-mustâbarr li-taṣâkî ma’nd ‘l-mamarr when he deals with the correction of the transit in depth (comparison of the vector radii of two consecutive planets, each in relationship to its own maximum and minimum distance), states that Naṣr al-Sâdî deals only with the problem in his Zâdî al-sa‘âbî, although he was mistaken in another, unspecified work; he also sets forth the criticisms levelled by al-Khâzîn against Abû Maṣ‘ûr on this topic (On transits, tr. M. Safouri and A. Ifram, comm. by E. S. Kennedy, Beirut 1959, 85-7, 172). Abu ‘l-Dżûd Muhammad b. al-Layîf reproduces (ms. Leiden Or. 168 (a)) al-Khâzîn’s assertion in the Zâdî in which he deals with the chord of an angle of r° provided that it were possible to trisect the angle. Abû Naṣr Mânsûr devotes the rishût mentioned above to the correction of certain errors made by al-Khâzîn in this work. It can accordingly be deduced that the Zâdî al-sa‘âbî included at least two maddîs, together with a third one in which the author dealt with the following topics: a method for determining the ascendant, when the degree of the “midpoint of the heavens” was known but the oblique ascension was unknown (R. fi taṣâkîh..., 4-14); the way of determining the meridian when the degree of the sun is known (15-33); the determination of the azimuth of the hûbî “by means of the instrument” (fi ‘l-dîa = astrolabe?, 33-9); the movement of the apogees (39-42); and in a spherical triangle, if the sides are known, the angles are also known, and vice-versa. This last topic was one of those about which he corresponded with İbrahmîn b. Sinâ¼ (42-9).

Al-Khâzîn also wrote a commentary on the Almâgest in which he gave information about the value of the obliquity of the ecliptic (23°35’) obtained by the Banû Mûsä at Baghdad in 245/860 (al-Bûrûnhî, Tahbîd, 95), and also about the observations, likewise made at Bagdad in the year 212 of the Yazdîgird era’s 444 A.D. by Kâlqâlandî, 21, in which the observation of the spring and summer was determined (al-Bûrûnhî, al-Kâmîn al-mas’âdî, Hyder-abad 1954 ii, 655; on this work, see also al-Bâsî, Shâhî al-‘alâfî, 123). In another work, now lost, al-Khâzîn had in which the title Sirr al-‘alâmîn, al-Khâzîn probably set forth his theory according to which the heavenly spheres are solid, and developed the earlier ideas of Ptolemy’s Planetarûs hypotheses; this latter theory was later set forth by Ibn al-Hayyam and al-Khâräkî [q.q.v.]. Al-Khâzîn was furthermore the author of a al-Madârîsî al-habîr ila ‘l-im al-nâjîm,
in which were set forth two methods of determining the *aldmat Mujiarram (sc. the day of the week *aldmat Mujiarram, i.e., the day of the week corresponding to the 1st Muharram in any given year, cf. al-Bîrûnî, *Alâbarr, 202-3). In an unspecified work, he tried to pin down exactly the date of the Jewish Passover in the year of Jesus's crucifixion (idem, *Kânûn, i, 332). Finally, we know that in a *Kĩbûf ft 'l-âbâ'd wa 'l-adîrûn, he gave the diameters of stars between the first and the sixth magnitudes, but without specifying whether these calculations were his own personal ones or how he had arrived at them (ibid., iii, 1312).

Al-Khâzîn seems to have been an astronomer who made practical observations. He is associated with one or more determinations of the obliquity of the ecliptic; according to al-Bîrûnî, *TAhâdîd, 98, he was present when Abu 'l-Fadl al-Harawi made his observations in 348/959, which gave the value \( e = 23^\circ 40' \). All b. Abúmad al-Nasawî also speaks of the determining of \( e \) made by al-Khâzîn and a certain number of colleagues, by means of a circle ca. 4 m. (in diameter?), but does not mention any date or place; according to yet another source, al-Khâzîn measured \( e \) at Edessa in 359/970. At all events, al-Khâzîn and Ibn Sinâ (?) were both working on the idea of a progressive diminution of the obliquity of the ecliptic caused by the movement of its poles round "a point" (al-Bîrûnî, *TAhâdîd, 101). It is also of interest to mention that according to al-Bîrûnî, *AÎgâr, 258-9, *TAhâdîd, 57-8, and *Kânûn, 630-2, al-Khâzîn wrote a *mâdâla in which he put forward the idea of a solar model different from that of Ptolemy, and was concerned about the eccentricities or epicycles: viz., the sun goes round the centre of the universe in a path which is circular but moving with irregular speed, and a point situated on the line of the apsidles and different from the centre of the universe is the centre of the uniform movement of the sun. This system finds its justification in the fact that, according to al-Khâzîn, Ptolemy failed to observe any change in the apparent diameter of the sun in the course of the year. The same system was set forth by Henry of Hesse (1325-97) in his *De reprobatione eccentrorum et epicyelorum (cf. Claudia Kren, in *Iisîs, lv (1968), 269-81), but it is not easy to see any possible connection between the two authors. Finally, one may note that Ibn Khâlidîn in his *Proleggomena, tr. de *Slane, i, 111, tr. *Rosenthal, i, 115, tr. Montelli, i, 114, gives al-Khâzîn's determination of the latitudes corresponding to the seven climates.


KHÂZÎNE (al-Khâzîn), state treasury. In Turkish, the word khażîne acquired a meaning close to this at least in the 7th/13th century (*Tâmâlînî, *Tâmâlînî, *saraş teşkilâtî, Ankara 1945, 316), whereas at the end of the 12th/18th century the Treasury was supervised by the Superintendent of the Treasury, with the head clerk of the treasury under him; the seal of the Treasury was kept by the Superintendent of the Treasury and its key with the head clerk. When it was required to extract something from the Treasury, the Sultan's permission was obtained and it was opened in the presence of a number of clerks, the operation being registered on the spot and an entry being made in the main register. The officials working in the Treasury were under strict control, and could not fill their own pockets while working.
Thus at this time the supervision of the Treasury was done by the Superintendent and the ağhas of the Treasury, whilst the requisitions upon and the stocks contained in the Treasury were recorded by the clerks of the Treasury (Ta'rikh-i ʿĀṯār, i, 198, 199; for the stocks and a description of the Inner Treasury, see J. B. Tavernier, Nouvelle Relation de l’Intérieur Séral du Grand Seigneur, Paris 1675, 109 ff.). After an Ottoman sultan came to the throne, he would go to the Treasury and inspect the deposits personally. This was an important ceremony, in which the interior palace personnel would take part, and the head clerk of the Treasury would present a register, showing details of the Treasury deposits, to the sultan before he entered the Treasury (Şeb-i Arz, Dhayl-i Râhid, Istanbul 1202, 19; Ta'rikh-i ʿĀṯār, i, 254-6).

The Outer Treasury was under the management of the Head Treasurer, as a member of the Exchequer or Ḵâzîne-ye Ṿāmere, who was directly responsible to the Defterdar or Minister of Finance. The actual expenditure of the State was made from this Treasury. In 933-4/1527-8 there were in the Ḵâzîne-ye Ṿāmere 9 treasurers, under the Defterdar, 32 clerk and 23 apprentices, comprising respectively the Ḵâzîne-ye Ṿâme Ḵâzîne-ye Ṿâme a Ḵâzîne-ye Ṿâme Ḵâzîne-ye Ṿâme.At their sitting in a row behind the General or of the financial department the latter included braziers and an iron oven, as well as the money put into or taken out of the Treasury, see J. B. Tavernier, Le Voyage de Monsieur d'Araman, Paris 1675, 43, 52). In time of war, the money required for every use of the word “treasury” in this way indicates that the term was used as the equivalent of “finance” in general or of the financial department (Defterdarlı). For example, tax policy in Aleppo was determined according to the registers kept in “the treasury of the province” (wildyet ḵâzînesi).

The money brought to the Ḵâzîne-ye Ṿâmite was examined by the official in charge of weighing and assaying (veşezān, veşnezâr), who decided whether there was any spurious coinage and whether the total was correct. The money put into or taken out of the treasury was registered and recorded by the clerks sitting in a row behind the defterdar, and at their side were the weighers and assayers, who would count and fix the value of the money. The equipment of the latter included braziers and an iron oven, as well as scales and balances. After being weighed, the money would be put into bags and these bags would be taken to the treasury which was beside the assembling room before the Defterdar, or Bağdatlî, Le Voyage de Monsieur d'Araman, ed. Ch. Schoeler, Paris 1887, 237-8; Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahrîye teşkilâtı, Ankara 1948, 369-70).

The word “treasury” gradually came to be used from the end of the 10th/16th century onwards with a more diffused meaning in Ottoman usage. Thus the collected monies set apart for the supplying of a fortress garrison (e.g. that of Egri in 1011/1602) was called a “treasury” (see Orhonlu, op. cit., 39-41, 43, 52). In time of war, it would be sent by a suitable kind of the soldiers’ needs, and the state treasury containing the treasury registers were sent along with the army under the title of the “army treasury” (Ordu ḵâzînesi). The army treasury was transported.
in chests on camels, and was kept under the guard of Janissary cavalrymen in the Treasury tent at halting places. It was therefore necessary that the defterdâr should accompany the Sultan and the Grand Vizier on campaigns, taking with them the treasury registers in order to record the daily expenditure in detail. The treasury registers, together with the army treasury, were kept in the Treasury tent (Ferîdûn Bej, Münâbed-i âl-êslâmîn, Istanbul 1274, i, 139-99; Mustafa, Tarih-i Murâd, Istanbul 1290, i, 94; cf. Firdûsî's Mehmed Ağa, Nusret-nâm, simplified version by İsmet Parmaksızoğlu, Istanbul 1962-4, i, 177, 281, 294, 299-300). In order to give an idea of the size of the army treasury, one may note that there were 26 trains of camels assigned to carry the treasury for the army commanded by the Vizier Lâlâ Mustafâ Paşa during the Persian campaign of 1286/1287 (Başbakan Arşiv Genel Müşterîliâ, Kâmil Kepeci tasnîfi, Ruus defteri, no 232, p. 397).

The Interior Treasury was still richer in money and goods than the Khâzîne-i Âmire at the end of the 12th/13th century. Even at this period, there was very little aid given from the inner treasury to the Khâzîne-i Âmire or Outer Treasury, except in time of wars and financial crises. Nevertheless, these subsidies were credits and were returnable, as was the case in earlier times. In times of crisis, confiscation was often resorted to whenever the state treasury was in financial straits; these confiscations were usually of the wealth of officials, see Cavîd Baysun, IA, art. Mişâderê.

The losses of territory by the state during the various wars necessitated a reorganisation of the inner and outer treasuries. The need to find a new source of income led to the foundation of the "new receipts treasury", îsrâdî-î dîjâtî khâzînesî. Some sources of income were assigned to the new treasury, and whenever there was an annual surplus of more than 10 purses from the income of the state lands and the Haramayn, it was also transferred to this treasury. The "new receipts treasury" consequently grew richer than the state treasury, which was deprived of some of its income, so that further reorganisation became necessary (Djewdet, Ta'rikh, Istanbul 1309, vi, 272-3; Âşlm, Ta'rikh, ii, 350). The "new receipts treasury" continued its existence, despite its ups and downs, during the reign of Selîm III (see Enver Ziya Karal, III. Selimîn Hatt-î Humayunlân, Ankara 1946, 89, 92-3), but it was abolished after he was deposed (Başbakan Arşiv Genel Müşterîliâ, Hatti Humayun Vekilnamesi, no. 19418). As a result, part of the "new receipts treasury"'s income was stopped and the rest transferred to the treasury of the mint, the darâbbân-e-yi 'âmîre khâzînesî, which was a branch of the inner treasury. Thus state expenditure was met, as before, from the state treasury, and the surplus income was transferred to the inner treasury, the latter once more serving as a reserve treasury giving subsidies to the outer treasury in times of war or crisis. In the 19th century, changes began to be made in the Ottoman financial system. From 1820 onwards, about 15 of the Anatolian sandjaqs began to be governed by lieutenant-governors or muṭâsâlîms, without the appointment of provincial governors or wâlis, and of mutasarrifîs in the sandjaqs, and the income assigned to the wâlis and mutasarrifîs was registered as income to the mukuâla't treasury, which was the treasury for the niyâma-yi new army. After the abolition of the Janissary corps and the simâr system, the financial department was in 1834 divided into two, the khâzîne-yi 'âmîre, and the

mansûra khâzînesî, which supervised the income and expenditure of the Imperial army (muîkîme-yi 'âskerîyye). At the death of Mahmûd II in 1255/1839, there were the khâzîne-yi 'âmîre and exchequers for the mukuâla't, the munitions manufacture (bâråd-khâne) the awbâfî, the Haramayn and the zâhire in existence. With the establishment of separate ministries and government offices, it appears that branches of the treasury such as the dockyard, the arsenal, the kitchen, the zarîf and the Haramayn acquired a more definite shape. Each one of these branches of the treasury had an emin or superintendent, and a treasury assistant (kâtîhîyya) (Muştafa Nûri Paşa, Netâyişî al-awbâfîdî, Istanbul 1292, iv, 114-5, 118).

Formerly there was a special imperial treasury (gîîyî-î humâyün khâzînesî) for the private expenditure of the sovereign, and then in 1839 the office of the Sultan's privy purse (khâzîne-yi kâhîsâ dâ'îrîsî), in charge of the palace income and expenditure, was established. Because the property owned by the ruler was at this time all transferred to the state treasury, this office, which was made into a ministry, looked after the part of the estates and property left to the sovereign on condition of paying tax. The ministry of the Khâzîne-yi Khâsîsî continued in existence until 1908.

The Ministry of Finance was founded on 28th February 1838 and the financial matters, which were then in chaos, were more centralised. During the first months of 'Abd al-Medjid's reign, the Finance Ministry was abolished and divided into the financial department of the exchequer (neşârî-î khâzîne-yi 'âmîre defterdârîlîgî) and that of the mukuâla't treasury, but the Ministry of Finance was re-established in 1840 (Mehmed Thürîyya, Nûkhtet îl-awbâfî, Istanbul 1298, i, 48-9, 63, 72).

In 1871 it was decided to divide the ongoing expenditure into two headings for the annual budget (devletî muvaçârane defterî), the first was for specified and private expenditure for every government office, and the other was for the general expenditure incurred in the Ministry of Finance. For the first heading, there were included the Sultan's privy purse, the military treasury, the treasury of the dockyards for naval expenditure, the appropriation for the salaries of judges and Şâhrîa matters, the awbâfî treasury, the appropriation for internal domestic affairs, the appropriation for foreign affairs, the financial appropriation for the finance organisation abroad, the appropriation for trade and public works, and the appropriation for public education. Apart from the privy purse treasury or khâzîne-yi khâsîsî, every ministry and office was required to submit a register in the following year showing its annual expenditure and the payments for unexpected outlays which had been taken from the financial treasury (mâliyye khâzînesî) for details, see Dostîr, 1st Series, Istanbul 1290, ii, 70 ff.; the provinces were also to submit a budget and send the registers of balance, which they had prepared, to the financial treasury.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works mentioned in the article, see Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devletinin saray teşkilâtî, Ankara 1945, index; idem, Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilâtî, Ankara 1948, 362 ff.; Kâtip Celebi, Dişîar al-şâ'mî, Istanbul 1280, 133-5; Thornton, The present state of Turkey, London 1809, ii, 3-4, 46; Muştafa Kesbî, 'Ulbî-nûmâ-yî devlet, Ali Emîri kütûphanesi, Ta'rikh kism, no. 484, ff. 61b-62a; M. Belin, Essais sur l'histoire économique

Al-KHAZINÎ, Abu'l-Fath 'Abd al-Râhamân (or Rahmân) or 'Abd al-Rahmân Mangûrî, astronomer and physician who lived in Persia at the opening of the 6th/12th century. He is occasionally confused with Ibn al-Hayyâm, al-Khâzînî and other authors bearing similar names and writing on the same topics. He was in origin a young Greek slave of 'All b. Muhammad, treasurer of the court in Marv; his master took it upon himself to give him the best possible education, but we have written not the biographical details, and therefore do not know that he was a man of austere morality, that he had some pupils and that he enjoyed the patronage of the Sâlûqûk sultan Sandjâr b. Malik-Shâh (511-52/1117-57).

He wrote the following works: (1) al-Zûdî al-mu'âsâbar al-sanâfîr al-salânî, astronomical tables dedicated to Sandjâr and based on his personal observations, of which he mentioned in 525/1130. These were utilised, either directly or indirectly, by the Byzantine scholars George Chrysococces (in its accuracy to all those constructed by his predecessors. The concept of weight which emerges from his work stems clearly from Archimedes, and according to his definition (1, 1) it is the force inherent in solid bodies which causes them to move, of their own accord, to the right of the centre of the earth and towards this centre alone; this force, in turn, depends upon the density of the body. Al-Khâzînî also has some idea of the influence of temperature on density, and his tables of specific weights are in general correct. Bibliography: Brockelmann, S I, 902; Sarton, Introduction, liii, 216; Suter, 122 (no. 293), 226; Bayhâkî, Tâtimma, i, 128 ff. There is a basic study by R. E. Hall, in Dictionary of scientific biography, vii, New York 1973, 335-51, s.v. Amongst the works mentioned above, only the Mîzân al-bîkhâma has been edited (Hyderabad 1359/1940 and Cairo 1947); see also on N. Khânîkoff, Analysis and extracts of Kitâb mîzân al-bîkhâma... by al-Khâzînî in the twelfth century, in JAS, vi (1859), 1-128, and E. Wiedemann, Aufsätze zur arabischen Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Hildesheim 1970, indices. (J. VERNET)

Al-KHAZİR, a right-bank affluent of the Greater Zâb river [see Zâb], which drains the kûra of Nakkhâ, to the east of Mâwsîl; locally, it is called Barrîshû. It was on the banks of this river that there took place, on 10 Muḥarram 67/6 August 686, a decisive battle between Fârîd b. Ibrahim al-Mukhtar [q.v.] and 'Ubâyd Allâh b. Ziyâd [q.v.]. After having suffered a defeat at 'Ayn Warda [q.v.], 'Ubâyd Allâh made for 'Irâk with his army, but was intercepted by the forces of Ibn al-Ashâr, who was fighting in the name of al-Mû'âkhtâr [q.v.]. According to tradition, 'Umây r b. al-Hâbû b. Su'lâmî, who commanded the right (or left?) wing of Ibn Ziyâd's army, wished to get revenge for the defeat suffered at Mârdisî pâshî [q.v.] by the forces of Muhammad. Since he had formerly been Ibn al-Ashâr's secretary, he met the latter secretly and betrayed his own leader. Thanks to this act of treachery, Ibn al-Ashâr defeated Ibn Ziyâd, who was killed in the fighting together with several other Syrian leading figures. Another battle of very minor importance took place at Ma'rûbâ on the banks of the Kâdzîr in 293/905-6, see Canard, H'amandânî, 342.

Bibliography: Yskût, s.v.; Tahbari, index; Masûdî, Murâdî, index; Mubarrad, Kâmi, Cairo 1353/1938, 1012-13; see also KALB B. WABARA, 'Ubâyday Allâh b. Ziyâd. (ED.)

KHAZNADAR, KHAZINDAR, variants of khânînadar, "Keeper of the treasury" in Mamlûk usage. It is a compound of Arabic khâzîna, meaning treasury, and Persian dâr, meaning keeper; according to Kalkashandî (Subh, v, 463) "fast-talking scribes" transferred the alif from the second to the first syllable and dropped the tā' marbūta from khâzînâ, thereby producing khâzînâdar, which is the form found most frequently in Mamlûk texts. According to Ibn Taghrîbirdî (Nûṣûm, Cairo, vii, 183-4) the khânînâdar was one of several offices that Sultan Baybars al-Bundûkidîr either introduced or transformed, assigning them to military personnel. In addition to the khânînâdar, these included the dawâdâr, amîr âkhrâr, sarâghârâr, sukhâr, gâmadârîyya, budûjâd, ruûs al-huwâb, amîr sîlakh, amîr madjîs and amîr gîsidh. The context in which this passage occurs would suggest that Baybars made these innovations under the influence of Mongol practice. During the Fâtimid period this official was called sahîb bayd al-mâl, according to Kalkashandî (iii, 481).

Although the term was used in Mamlûk times for any person who served as keeper of treasures—to the caliph, for example, or to an amîr—it refers in par-
ticular to the officer who acted in this capacity for the Mamluk sultan in Cairo. Originally the office was given to an amir of forty, but later was upgraded and was filled by an amir of one hundred. The office ranks as twelfth among the twenty-five positions listed by Kalkashandi as reserved for military personnel in attendance on the sultan. Furthermore, the khāznindār was almost certainly overshadowed by the civilian nāṣir al-khāṣṣ, who, during his heyday in the Bahri period, often exercised almost complete control over the sultan’s financial affairs. The primary duties of the khāznindār were custodianship of the sultan’s treasuries (cash and otherwise) and distribution of gifts on certain ceremonial occasions. These duties were at times divided among three keepers. The khāznindār al-sinjī was responsible for the sultan’s precious fabrics (brocades, embroideries, silks), gold saddlery, and furs; this official worked in conjunction with the nāṣir al-khāṣṣ. The khāznindār al-‘ayn had custody of the sultan’s jewels; since these were kept in the harem, this functionary was a eunuch. The khāznindār al-kis was responsible for distributing alms to the needy during royal processions and to the sultan’s guests on ceremonial occasions. In Damascus the viceroy appointed four eunuchs as khāznindāriyya; they were responsible for the royal robes of honour and other gifts stored there.

In Ottoman Egypt, the khāsinndār was in charge of the Imperial Treasury, and variants of this title were given to similar officials elsewhere in the Ottoman empire. Khāsinndār and khāznindār were also used as titles for officials in India under the Dihli sultans and the Mughals.


(D. P. Little)

KHAZNADAR, Muṣṭafā [see Muṣṭafā KHAZNADAR].

AL-KHAZRAJJI, one of the two main Arab tribes in Medina. With the other tribe, al-Aws [q.v.], it formed the Banū Kayla in pre-Islamic times and the Ansār [q.v.] or “helpers” (sc. of Muḥammad) under Islam. The ancestors of the al-Khazradji are given under al-Aws. The following are the main subdivisions of the tribe:

- Amr al-Hārith
- Awf
- Ka'b
- Djinsham

Thā'abā

- Ghām
- Amr
- Tāzīd
- Ghāḍb

al-Nadīdīr

- Salīm (al-Ḥublā)
- Awf

- Salīm
- Salīma
- Amīr

Kawākila

Mālik
- ‘Adī
- Māzin
- Dīnār

Zurayk Bayḍā

Al-Khazradji and al-Aws settled together in Yathrib or Medina after leaving the Yemen, and for a time were subordinate to the Jews there. The leader in gaining independence from the Jews was Mālik b. al-‘Āqīlān of the clan of Salīm (Kawākila) of al-Khazradji. It is doubtful, however, whether at this time al-Khazradji was thought of as a unity, for the effective units seem to have been certain subdivisions, which may be called “clans”. It was groups of these which were involved in the feuds in Medina before the hijra. In the Constitution of Medina (Ibn Hishām, 341-4) there is no mention of al-Khazradji but only of its two main clans: al-Nadīdīr, al-Hārith, Awf, Sāʿīda and Djinsham.

In the period before the hijra, one of the prominent men among al-Khazradji was ʿAmr b. al-Nuʿmān of Bayḍā. He gained some advantages over the neighbouring clan of Zurayk, and later appears to have been involved along with al-Hārith in fighting against some clans of al-Aws. Hostilities between them increased until about 617 there took place the battle of Buʿāth [q.v.] in which ʿAmr b. al-Nuʿmān with support from al-Nadīdīr and some nomads defeated various groups of Awsis and others under Ḫudayr b. Simāk. Both leaders were killed. Two important Khazradjis, ʿAbd Allāh b. Ubayy of B. al-Hublā and ʿAmr b. Ḫimār of Salīma, were neutral at this period. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ubayy [q.v.] hoped, before the coming of Muhammad, that he might have become “king” of Medina.

The Khazradijīs seem to have been more numerous and more enthusiastic Muslims than the Awsis; 10 at the first ʿAkaba agreement as against 2; 62 at the second ʿAkaba agreement as against 11; 9 nukabāʾ as against 3; 175 men at Badr as against 63; 228 women named by Ibn Saʿd as against 121. Khazradji poets included Ḥusayn b. Ḥabīb of Maghāla of al-Nadīdīr [q.v.], Ka'b b. Mālik of Salīma [q.v.] and ʿAbd Allāh b. Rawḥa b. al-Hārith [q.v.]. Many descendants of the last were later found in Spain. During the Umayyad period, the Khazradijīs mostly supported the ruling dynasty, but al-Nuʿmān b. Baṣḥir, governor of Himṣ, threw in his lot with ʿAbd Allāh b. Zubayr.


(W. Montgomery Watt)

AL-KHAZRAJJI, Diyaʾ al-Dīn Abī Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUṭmān al-Mālik al-Andalus, the author of a long poem which contains a versified treatise on Arabiometric poetry. This poem, entitled al-Rūmān al-Shāfiyya fi Ṭamay al-ʿurūd wa-l-ḥāṣiyya, is popularly known as al- Kaṣida al-Khażradiyya. The Khazradiyya is a didactic poem of 96 verses composed in ṭawwī metre containing the essence of al-Khalli b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad’s theory of meter, and was thus originally meant to be learnt by heart. Many manuscript versions of this work have been preserved, but nevertheless almost nothing is known about the author. He is mentioned by Ḥādīdī Khallīa (see bibliography), who gives no information concerning his life, but he appears to have been active during the 7th/8th century in the western regions of Islam. His work became widely known in the East as a result of numerous commentaries which appeared subsequently.

In the West, the interest of orientalists in the Khazradiyya seems not to be justified by the rather
The contents of the Khazradiyya may be summarised as follows: Vv. 1-2 definitions of metres and rhythm feet; 3-9 the syllables as formative elements in a rhythmic foot; 10-12 the circles which al-Khalli b. Ahmad invented for his graphic representation of the Arabic metres, and the 16 metres contained in al-Khalli's circles; 13-17 general definitions; 18-24 simple and complex elision (zihdî); 25-51 exhaustive treatment of all possible changes in rhythmic feet; 52-70 application of the rules given in vv. 25-51 to certain well known verses in particular; 50-96 a discussion on rhyme (hâfiya) and all possible deficiencies of rhyme.

The biographical dictionaries give virtually nothing on his life, except that Sakhib states that he met him in Zabid and that his ancestor Ibn Wahhaâs had been praised for his learning by the commentator Zamaâshshari. According to Hâdidi Khalîfa, Khazradijî wrote three histories of the Yaman, impelled, so he says, by the prevailing disregard for the study of history. One was in annalistic form, apparently Al-Siqût al-masbâh wal-sabarjadi al-mahbûh fi man waliya al-Yaman wa-'l-Islâm. Of this work, the best-known part is Al-'Ukud al-lulu'iyya fi akhbâr al-dawla al-rasuliyya (ed. and tr. Sir J. W. Redhouse and Shakhî Mub. 'Asaıl, GMS, iii, Leiden-London 1906-18). This is for earlier times very much a compilation, drawing on authors like Bahî al-Din al-Djândjî and his K. al-Sulûk, the fulsome eulogies in it of the Rasûls, and its comparatively late date, have led G. R. Smith to compare it unfavourably as a source for Rasûlid history with the earlier historian of the Yaman Badr al-Din Muhammad b. Hátim al-Hamdâni, who wrote ca. 694/1295 the K. al-Simî al-qâhil fi al-thaman min al-Ghazî bi 'l-Yaman (see GAI I, 394). A further point of significance is the virtual identity of Khazradijî's al-Yaman with the Fâkhût al-samân... fi akhbâr man malaka al-Yaman of the Rasûlid monarch al-Malik al-Ashraf Ismâ'il b. al-'Abbâs (778-803/1377-1400); it is difficult to tell which of the two was written first, see Mingana, Catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, cols. 406-10, and GAI S II, 236-7. The third history, some commentaries on the Khazradiyya are mentioned below in chronological order: Abu 'l-Kâsim al-Sharîf al-Andalus al-Sabîlî al-Gharnâtî, d. 760/1359 (Brockelmann I, iii, 321, S I, 545); Abu 'Abd Allah b. Abî Bakr b. Marzûk al-Khâtîb al-Tilmânî, d. 781/1379 (Brockelmann II, 239, S II, 335); Abu 'l-Kâsim al-Fattûb al-Sanhâdî al-Zamânnî, his commentary finished in 816/1413 (Brockelmann I, 312, S I, 545); Muhammad b. Abî Bakr al-Damâmînî, d. 837/1434 (Brockelmann II, 26, S II, 21); Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. Muhammad al-'Kurashl al-Bâṣtî al-Kalaşdî, d. 892/1486 (Brockelmann II, 226, S II, 378, does not mention his commentary, but al-Ma'kãri, Analecets, i, 936 does); Abî Dîs'far Ahmad b. Dâwûd al-Balawî al-Gharnâtî, his commentary finished in 908/1502 (whether he himself nor his work mentioned by Brockelmann, but mentioned in Hâdidi Khalîfa ed., Tawd, iv, 203); and Zayn al-Din Zakariyyâ al-Ansârî al-Samâyîl al-Shâfi'î, d. 926/1520 (Brockelmann II, 100, S II, 117). In addition to the above-mentioned works, other commentaries exist: see lists in Brockelmann I, 312, S I, 545. Bibliographical details of editions of commentaries can be found in the Introduction of Basset's La Khazradiyyah.

Bibliography: Hâdidi Khalîfa, ed., Tawd, iii, 340, iv, 201, 203, 536; G. W. Freytag, Darstellung der arabischen Verskunst, Bonn 1830, 3-38. Editions of the Khazradiyya (in addition to the works by Guadagnoli and Basset mentioned in the article): Madîma min muhimmat al-mustûn, Cairo 1328/1910, 505-153; edition and commentary by al-Damâmînî, with a second commentary added in the margin by Zakariyya al-Ansârî, Cairo 1323/1905. (P. SMOOK)

AL-KHAZRAJII. MUWAPPÂK AL-DIN ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALI B. AL-HASAN AL-KHAZRAJII AL-ZABIDI, called Ibn Wahhaâs, South Arabian historian who wrote under the Turkish Rasûlid dynasty (933-1126) in the Yaman, d. late 812/early 1410 aged over 70. The biographical dictionaries give virtually nothing on his life, except that Sakhib states that he met him in Zabid and that his ancestor Ibn Wahhaâs had been praised for his learning by the commentator Zamaâshshari. According to Hâdidi Khalîfa, Khazradijî wrote three histories of the Yaman, impelled, so he says, by the prevailing disregard for the study of history. One was in annalistic form, apparently Al-Siqût al-masbâh wal-sabarjadi al-mahbûh fi man waliya al-Yaman wa-'l-Islâm. One of the events dynasty by dynasty, Al-Kifdya wa'l-i'a'id al-Yaman wa-sakanahd fi 'l-Isâm, of which the best-known part is Al-'Ukud al-lulu'iyya fi akhbâr al-dawla al-rasuliyya (ed. and tr. Sir J. W. Redhouse and Shakhî Mub. 'Asaıl, GMS, iii, Leiden-London 1906-18). This is for earlier times very much a compilation, drawing on authors like Bahî al-Din al-Djândjî and his K. al-Sulûk, the fulsome eulogies in it of the Rasûls, and its comparatively late date, have led G. R. Smith to compare it unfavourably as a source for Rasûlid history with the earlier historian of the Yaman Badr al-Din Muhammad b. Hátim al-Hamdâni, who wrote ca. 694/1295 the K. al-Simî al-qâhil fi al-thaman min al-Ghazî bi 'l-Yaman (see GAI I, 394). A further point of significance is the virtual identity of Khazradijî's Al-Yaman with the Fâkhût al-samân... fi akhbâr man malaka al-Yaman of the Rasûlid monarch al-Malik al-Ashraf Ismâ'il b. al-'Abbâs (778-803/1377-1400); it is difficult to tell which of the two was written first, see Mingana, Catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, cols. 406-10, and GAI S II, 236-7. The third one was in biographical dictionary form, complementing Djandji's work, compiled at the behest of al-Malik al-Alshraf. And called Tirâş a'dâm al-samân fi tabâbât a'sân al-Yaman or Al-'Ihâ al-fâkhîr al-hasan fi tabâbât akhâr ahi al-Yaman. Kâbhûla further mentions a local history of Zabid and Aden, the Mirât al-samân fi ta'rîkh Zubâb wa-'d-dâm, and Khazradijî's poetry was also collected into a disma. Bibliography: Sakhib, Danî, v. 210; Ibn al-'Imâd, Shadârâsh, vii, 98-9; Hâdidi Khalîfa, ed., Tawd, i, 159, ed. Cairo, i, 310; Kabbîla, Mu'dim al-mu'âllifin, vii, 61-2; Zirîkî, Al-'Adâm, v, 83-4; H. C. Kay, Yaman, its early mediaeval history, London 1892, pp. xv-xviii; F. Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, Leiden 1968, 322, 443, 483-6; G. R. Smith, The Ayyubids and Rasûls, the transfer of power in zihdîd century Yemen, in IC, xliii (1969), 175-88; M. L. Bates, Yemen and its conquest by the Ayyubids of Egypt (A.D. 1117-1202), unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 23-5. (C. E. Bosworth)

AL-KHAZRAJIIYYA. [See AL-KHAZRAJII].

KHAZZ [See HARIR].